1. Introduction

Frantz 1971:18-21 noted three unexpected facts about verb agreement in Blackfoot:

a. Certain inflectional suffixes necessarily have shorter forms if a nominal with which they agree follows the verb; eg. compare (1) and (2):

(1) Noko'siksi ayo'kaa-yaawa.
    my:kids sleep-3pl

(2) Ayo'kaa-yi noko'siksi.

b. With a third person subject, number of a direct object is reflected in the verb suffixes only if there is no overt noun phrase as direct object in the clause; eg., compare (3) with (4), and (5) with (6):

(3) Kiksisstsinnoona iihpommatoom-a amostsi iinaistsi.
    our:mother bought-3sg these bananas
    'Our mother bought these bananas.'

(4) Kiksisstsinnoona iihpommatoom-a-istsi.
    'Our mother bought them.'

(5) Nohkowa iinoyii-wa koko'siksi.
    my:son saw-3sg your:kids
    'My son saw your kids.'

(6) Nohkowa iinoyii-wa-iksi.
    'My son saw them.'

A similar situation was shown for imperatives:

(7) Pommatoot omistsi!
    'Buy those!'

(8) Pommatoot-aawa
    'Buy them!'

c. Verbs often "agree" with third person nominals which are 'non-terms' (neither subject nor object), but again, only if there is no overt noun phrase in the clause:

(9) Nits-itap-sskonaki omiksi aattsistaiksi.
    I-toward-shot(intrans) those rabbits.
    'I shot toward those rabbits.'

(10) Nitsitapsskonaki-aawa.
    'I shot toward them.'
If another third person is involved in such cases, there is even a suffix seemingly agreeing with a singular non-term:

(11) Itap-sskonaki-wa-yi.
    toward-shot-3sg-3sg
    'He shot toward it.'

In this paper we are able to give unified treatment to the facts illustrated in a-c by recognizing that they all involve pronominal suffixes rather than verb agreement.

2. Evidence for Pronoun Status

We present three arguments that the phenomena in a-c above involve enclitic pronouns rather than verb agreement.

2.1 Complementation

The illustrations of (1)-(11) indicate that suffixes -aawa, -(a)istsi, -(a)iksi, and -(a)yi share a property: they appear in these examples only if the triggering nominal (ie., the noun phrase with which they "agree") is not in post-verbal position. Such complementary distribution is characteristic of pronouns, not of verb agreement. That is, the term "pronoun" is generally applied to elements which "take the place of" nominals, while "verb agreement" is generally unaffected by presence or position of the triggering nominal.

This status of "replacer" of a noun is even clearer when a type of focus, used primarily to indicate 'new topic', is involved. This is marked by sentence-initial position and a following pause (orthographic comma), as illustrated in (12) and (13):

(12) Amostsi iinaistsi, kiksi.sstsinnoona iihpommatoom-a-istsi.
    these bananas our:mother bought-3sg-PRO
    'These bananas, our mother bought them.'

(13) Noko'siksi, nits-ikstaa m-aahks-o'kaa-hs-aawa.
    my:kids I want 3-might-sleep-sub-PRO
    'My kids, I want them to sleep.'

Observe that in both (12) and (13) the verbs have suffixes which we are claiming to be pronouns. In such cases, using relational grammar" terminology, we say the nominals which are in focus bear two initial relations: a grammatical relation to the verb and an "overlay" relation of focus. But the preposed nominals bear only the final focus relation, while pronouns have replaced these nominals as final bearers of the grammatical relations to the verbs. This use of pronouns is common to numerous other languages.

2.2 Precedence Constraint

There generally are constraints on relative order of pronouns and fuller noun phrases with which they are co-referential, ie. their "controllers". For example, in English a pronoun in a main clause must not precede its controller if the controller is in a subordinate clause. Thus while he in (14) can refer to 'John', the he in (15) cannot:

(14) He went to John last night.
(15) Last night he went.
(14) After he ate, John went to sleep.

(15) He went to sleep after John ate.

In this section we show that the Blackfoot suffixes in question act like pronouns in this regard as well.

As discussed in Frantz 1974, a sentence such as (16) has paraphrases in which the matrix verb is TA, as in (17) and (18):

(16) Noko'siksi, nits-ikstaa m-aahk-a'po'taki-hs-aawa.
   my:kids I-want(intrans.) 3-might-work-sub-PRO
   'I want my kids to work.'

(17) Nits-ikstat-a-yi maahka'po'takihsi noko'siksi.
    I-want(trans)-direct-3pl

(18) nitsikstatayi noko'siksi maahka'po'takihsi.

Within the relational grammar framework, we would account for this by saying that in all three noko'siksi is the initial subject (SU) of the embedded verb, but that in (17) and (18) noko'siksi is both final direct object (DO) of the matrix verb and final SU of the embedded verb. Comparing (17) and (18), we see that noko'siksi may be positioned according to either of its final relations, but that if it precedes the matrix verb (preverbal position generally indicates some kind of emphasis) as in (19), the embedded verb has suffix -aawa.

(19) Noko'siksi nitsikstatayi maahka'po'takihs-aawa.

In this case, as in (16), we claim that -aawa is a pronoun bearing the final SU relation to the embedded verb. But notice that this suffix cannot appear on the matrix verb when noko'siksi is placed with the embedded verb; see (20):

(20) *Nitsikstatay-aawa maahka'po'takihsi noko'siksi.

We claim that (20) is bad simply because the pronoun -aawa precedes its controller noko'siksi.

Adverbial clauses also illustrate this controller precedence constraint. (21) and (22) show that noko'siksi, as SU of both verbs, may occur in either clause. In (21), the main clause has the pronoun -aawa as final SU, and noko'siksi appears in the adverbial clause. In (22), noko'siksi appears in the main clause but no pronoun is possible in the preceding adverbial clause, as (23) shows, because it would precede its controller.

(21) Noko'siksi ikkam-ssoks-o'kaa-si, ik-oht-a-isok-a'po'taki-
      my:kids if-good-sleep-subjunct, very-result-dur-good-
      -y-aawa.
      -3pl-PRO
      'If my kids sleep well, then they work well.'
Ikkamssokso'kaasi, noko'siksi ikohtaisoka'po'takiyi.

*Ikkamssokso'kaas-aawa, noko'siksi ikohtaisoka'po'takiyi.

2.3 Shape Independent of Mode

The shape of the suffixes which we claim to be pronouns is constant throughout all Blackfoot orders and modes. This statement cannot be made for any of the verb affixes of Blackfoot which are clearly of agreement status. Here is a sampling from various modes, of the pronoun -aawa:

Conjunct
(24) Otayo'kaahs-aawa,
'that they are sleeping'

Subjunctive
(25) ikkamomai'tootsiiniki-aawa
'if they believe me'

Imperative
(26) Kokkit-aawa.
'Give them to me!'

Independent non-affirmative
(27) N-imat-aino-a-waiksaawa.
I-neg-see-direct-3pl(non-affirm)
'I don't see them.'

3.0 'Defining' the Four Pronouns

In 2.1 we listed the pronouns which are enclitic to the verb. In this section we will "define" them in terms of person, number, and distinctness of third person. The following chart does this roughly:

-aawa 'Third person plural, animate or inanimate gender.'
-(a)iksi 'Third person plural, animate gender, and distinct from another third person in the context.'
-(a)istsi 'Third person plural, inanimate gender, and distinct from another third person in the context.'
-(a)yi 'Third person singular, animate or inanimate gender, and distinct from another third person in the context.'

(The parenthesized a of three of these forms is present only if the preceding vowel is not a.)

We will discuss the notion of 'distinct third person' in the next section.

4.0 Distinct Third Person - A New Notion

The notion of 'distinct third person' (DTP) is closely akin to obviation, but not identical to it. First of all, obviation, as reflected in both noun and verb inflection, is limited to animate gender nouns. Thus the inanimate
nouns and agreeing verbs of (30) and (31) contain no obviation marking; cf (28) which does involve an obviative object. Comparing (29) and (30), it is clear that the third person possessor of the object in (30) does not effect the verb inflection.

(28) Nits-iino-a-yini omi otomitaami-i.
I-saw(TA)-direct-obv that his:dog-obv
' I saw his dog.'

(29) Nits-iinii'p-a omi mohkatsi.
I-saw(TI)-3sg that foot
' I saw his dog.'

(30) Nits-iinii'p-a omi ohkatsi.
I-saw-3sg that his:foot
' I saw his foot.'

(31) Iinimm-a omi mohkatsi.
 saw-3sg that foot
' He saw the foot.'

Yet if 'foot' of (31) is focused (32) or clear from context (33), the suffix -(a)yì necessarily appears:

(32) Omi mohkatsi, iinimm-a-yì.
' That foot, he saw it.'

(33) Iinimm-a-yì.
' He saw it.'

This is not true for (29) or (30) unless the speaker wishes to emphasize distinctness of third person. So, eg., both (34) and (35) are possible:

(34) Omi ohkatsi, nitsiinii'pa.
' His foot, I saw it.'

(35) Omi ohkatsi, nitsiinii'pa-yì.
' His foot, I saw it.'

Another difference between obviation and DTP is that there are situations in which indication of the latter is optional, though obviation is necessarily marked. Thus in (36) 'dog' is necessarily obviative, being of animate gender and possessed by an animate third person; yet the DTP pronoun -ayì is not used unless the speaker wishes to highlight the distinctness of the dog from the possessor (or some other third person in the context) as in (37):

(36) Otomitaami, nitsiinoayìni.
' His dog, I saw him.'

(37) Otomitaami, nitsiinoayìni-ayì.
' His dog, I saw him.'
Perhaps the most significant difference between obviation and DTP is that the governing nominal must be of animate gender for the former, but not for the latter. By 'governing nominal' we mean, for obviation, the nominal which remains non-obviative ("proximate"), thus requiring obviation of other animate nominals in the immediate context.

Thus in a sentence such as (38) involving two animate gender third persons, one must be obviative; in (38) 'my daughter' is obviative and 'my son' is not; and so we say that 'my son' governs the obviation of 'my daughter'. It is also possible to have 'my daughter' govern obviation of 'my son', as in (39).

(38) Nohko-wa iino-yii-wa nitan-i.
    my:son-3sg saw(TA)-direct-3sg my:da-obv
    'My son saw my daughter.'

(39) Nitan-a ots-iino-ok-a nohko-yi.
    my:da-3sg 3-saw(TA)-inverse-3sg my:son-obv
    'My son saw my daughter.'

But if we substitute an inanimate gender noun for 'my daughter' as in (40), there is no obviation necessary, because inanimates cannot be obviated nor govern obviation.

(40) Nohko-wa iinimm-a omi naapioyiisi.
    my:son-3sg saw(TI)-3sg that house
    'My son saw that house.'

In the case of the 'distinct third person' phenomenon, we use the term 'governor' for the nominal from which the DTP is kept distinct. There is some evidence that this governor need not be of animate gender. Some speakers allow DTP pronouns for the Goal in (42), (44) and (46); the governor of DTP in these cases is evidently miistsiistsi 'sticks', an inanimate gender noun.

(41) Amostsi miistsiistsi, nits-itap-a'apiksii'p-i-aawa omistsi
    these sticks I-toward-throw(TI)-3pl-PRO those
    naapiyoistsi.
    'These sticks, I threw them at the houses.'

(42) Nitsitapa'piksii'piaawaa-istsi.
    'I threw them at them (inan).'

(43) Nitsitapa'piksii'piaawaa omi naapioyiisi.
    'I threw them at the house.'

(44) Nitsitapa'piksii'piaawaa-yi.
    'I threw them at it.'

(45) Nitsitapa'piksii'piaawaa omiksi poosiksi.
    'I threw them at the cats.'
(46) Nitsitapa'piksii'piaawa-iksi.
'I threw them at them (anim).'

Surprisingly, however, no speakers allow a DTP pronoun in such cases if the DO is singular; instead, such sentences simply lack a pronoun for the Goal:

(47) Nitsitapa'piksii'pa*-yi.
'I threw it at it.'

(48) Nitsitapa'piksii'pa {*-istsî} {*-iksi}
'I threw it at them.'

Even though DTP is not limited to animate gender governors and targets, it is more limited in some ways than is obviation. As we saw in (38) and (39), there are often options as to which of two animate gender nominals will be obviated. In cases of DTP such as those of (41)-(46), however, there is no option as to which nominal will be governor and which DTP. We have not done extensive investigation in this area, but in general the governor will outrank the DTP with respect to grammatical relation. In relational grammar, grammatical relations are descendingly ranked as follows: subject, direct object, indirect object, non-term (non-terms are relations such as instrument, goal, etc.). For example, in (41)-(46) 'sticks' is DO, but 'house(s)' and 'cats' are directional Goals. The only exception to this statement of ranking involves inverse combinations with TA verbs. In (49) and (50) the DTP enclitics are replacers for the logical subject:

(49) Omi imitaayi, ot-ssiksip-ok-a-yi amo ninaaw-a.
that dog-obv 3-bit-inverse-3sg-PRO this man-3sg
'That dog (obv), he bit this man.'

(50) Omiksi imita-iksi, ot-ssiksip-ok-a-iksi amo ninaaw-a.
those dog-pl 3-bit-inverse-3sg-PRO this man
'Those dogs (obv), they bit this man.'

To the extent that our statement of ranking of grammatical relations determines which of two nominals governs DTP, sentences such as (49) and (50) can be viewed as evidence that clauses requiring inverse verb forms do not have the initial subject as final subject.3 (We will see in section 6. that there is another, related fact, which also supports that hypothesis.) Compare the (semantically bizarre) direct counterparts to (49) and (50); note that they take the same enclitic pronouns:

(51) Omi imitaayi, iisiksip-ii-wa-yi amo ninaaw-a.
that dog, bit-direct-3sg-PRO this man
'That dog, this man bit him.'

(52) Omiksi imitaiksi, iisiksip-ii-wa-iksi amo ninaaw-a.
those dog, bit-direct-3sg-PRO this man
'Those dogs, this man bit them.'
5. Examples of Grammatical Relations Born By Pronouns

5.1 Subject of intransitive. This has been illustrated in (2), (21), and (25).

5.2 Direct object of TI. See (4), (8), (32), (33), and (35).

5.3 Subject of TI

(53) Iihpommatoom-i-aawa amoiy sinoaakia'tsisi.
    'They bought this book.'
    (cf. Iihpommatoomi omiksi ninaiksi amoiy sinoaakia'tsisi.
      'Those men bought this book.')

5.4 Subject of TA Verb

(54) Nits-iino-ok-i-aawa. 'They saw me.'
    I-saw-inverse-3pl-PRO

(55) Ots-iino-ok-a-iksi oma ninaa-wa.
    3-saw-inverse-3sg-PRO that man 3-sg
    'They (obv) saw the man.'

(56) Iino-yii-y-aawa omi ninaa-yi.
    saw-direct-3pl-PRO that man-obv.
    'They saw the man (obv).'

Compare (54)-(56) with (57)-(59), respectively, in which no pronoun is needed because the corresponding noun is present.

(57) Nitsiinooki noko'siksi. 'My kids saw me.'

(58) Otsiinooka oma ninaawa oko'siksi.
    'His kids saw the man.'

(59) Inoyiiyi noko'siksi omi ninaayi.
    'My kids saw the man (obv).'

5.5 Direct Object of TA. See (6), (27), (37), (51), and (52).

5.6 Initial but non-final DO of ditransitive

Here we are assuming, with relational grammarians, that when Blackfoot verbs agree with other than their initial (logical) DO, that other nominal is the final DO and the initial DO is a final non-term (a DO 'chomeur,' or ex-DO). So the pronouns in (60)-(62), as well as in (26) above, are functioning as DO chomeurs.

(60) Nohko-wa iihkots-ii-wa-istsi koko's-iksi.
    my:son-3sg gave-direct-3sg-PRO your:kid-pl
    'My son gave them (inan) to your kids.'

(61) Nit-ohkot-a-wa-iksi nitan-a.
    I-gave-direct-3sg-PRO my:da-3sg
    'I gave them (anim) to my daughter.'
(62) Nit-ohpomm-o-a-wa-istsi kitan-a.
  I-bought-ben-direct-3sg-PRO your:da-3sg
  'I bought them (inan) for your daughter.'

5.7 Other final non-terms

Instrument

(63) N-imoh-awayaki-ook-a-yi.
  I-instr-hit-inverse-3sg-PRO
  'He hit me with it.'

(64) Nimoht-awayakiooka-istsi.
  'He hit me with them (inan).'

(65) Nimoht-awayakiooka-iksi.
  'He hit me with them (anim).'

Subject chomeur (The logical subject is a final non-term as registered in the verb by the instrument preverb.)

(66) Omistsi miistsi-istsi, iihts-issin(i)-aa-wa-istsi.
  those sticks  instr-contact-direct-3sg-PRO
  'Those sticks, they hit him.'

(67) Omi miistsisi, iihtssissiinaawa-yi:
  'That stick, it hit him.'

(68) Omiksi pokoiiksi, iihtssissiinaawa-iksi.
  'Those balls, they hit him.'

Directional Goal. See (10) and the following:

(69) Omiksi matapiiksi, itap-sskonaki-wa-iksi.
  those people toward-shoot-3sg-PRO
  'Those people, he shot at them.'

(70) Omistsi naapioyiistsi, itapsskonakiwa-istsi.
  'Those houses, he shot at them.'

Source

(71) Omistsi naapioyiistsi, iiht-aiisto-wa-istsi.
  those houses  from-come-3sg-PRO
  'Those houses, he came from them.'

(72) Omi naapioyiisi, iihtaiistoowa-yi.
  'That house, he came from it.'

Location

(73) Nohkowa, it-ohkit-opii-wa-yi.
  My:son there-upon-sit-3sg-PRO
  'My son sat upon it.'

(74) Nohkowa, ithohkitopiia-istsi.
  'My son sat upon them (inan).'
6. Multiple Pronouns

As of this writing, we have found the following examples in which more than one enclitic is attached to a single verb. In (76) the pronoun -aawa is final DO and the pronoun -(a)yi is DO chomeur. In all such cases, the higher ranking pronoun precedes the DTP pronoun. (77) and (78) involve plural DO chomeurs:

(76) Kots-is-aawa-yi. 'Give it to them.'
   give-3sg(imper)-PRO-PRO

(77) Kotsis-aawa-istsi 'Give them (inan) to them.'

(78) Kotsis-aawa-iksi 'Give them (anim) to them.'

(79) and (80) involve the pronoun -aawa as SU followed by a pronoun as Goal:

(79) Itap-sskonaki-y-aawa-yi 'They shot at it.'
   toward-shoot-3pl-PRO-PRO

(80) Itapsskonakiy-aawa-istsi. 'They shot at them (inan).'

Example (81) is similar, but involves Source rather than Goal:

(81) Iihtaiistooy-aawa-istsi. 'They came from them (inan).'

Examples (82)-(84) involve pronouns as DO of a TI verb followed by DTP pronouns for the Goal:

(82) Nits-itap-a'piksii'p-i-aawa-yi.
   I-toward-throw-3pl-PRO-PRO
   'I threw them at it.'

(83) Nitsitapa'piksii'pi-aawa-istsi.
   'I threw them at them (inan).'

(84) Nitsitapa'piksii'pi-aawa-iksi.
   'I threw them at them (anim).'

We have found no cases where two identical pronouns were attached to the same verb. Some speakers allow two different DTP pronouns on a single verb. Such an occurrence might be expected on the embedded verb of (85), because both SU and Goal of the embedded verb are distinct from the matrix SU; and although this is unacceptable to author Fox, we have found fluent speakers who accept it.
(85) Koko'siksi, you:kids
nohkowa my:son
'Your kids, my son wants them to shoot at it.'

Similarly, many speakers accept sentences such as (86) and (87), in which there are DTP pronouns for each of the underlined pronouns in the English translation.

(86) Itap-a'piksimm-a-y-aiksi.
toward-throw-3sg-PRO-PRO
'He threw it at them.'

(87) Itapa'piksimma-ists-ayi.
'He threw them at it.'

But no speakers allow more than two enclitics on a given verb, and as we have said, these two clitics must be different. This is illustrated in (88)-(91):

(88) Itapa'piksimmi-aawa-y-*aiksi
'They threw it at them.'

(89) Itapa'piksimmi-aawa-iks-*ayi
'They threw them at it.'

(90) Itapa'piksimma-iks-*aiksi
'He threw them at them.'

(91) Itapa'piksimma-y-*ayi
'He threw it at it.'

In all of the examples we have found, the first of the two enclitics will bear a term relation (subject or DO).

The order of pronouns in TA inverse clauses is straightforwardly accounted for if their initial subject is not the final subject, as (92) and (93) show:

(92) Ots-iino-ok-i-aawa-iksi.
3-saw-inverse-3pl-PRO-PRO
'They (obv) saw them.'

(93) Ots-iino-ok-i-aawa-yi.
'He (obv) saw them.'

(94) Ots-iino-ok-a-iksi.
'They (obv) saw him.'

(95) Ots-iino-ok-a-yi.
'He (obv) saw him.'

In all of (92)-(95), the DTP enclitic is for the obviative third person, as pointed out for examples similar to (94) and (95) in section 4. But the fact that in (92) and (93)
the enclitic for the initial DO precedes that for the initial SU would need no special statement if the initial SU is not final SU; for in that case it would be a non-term (chomeur) and hence would follow the initial DO pronoun which is a final term.11

7. Summary, and ad hoc constraint

Blackfoot has four enclitic pronouns, defined in section 3 according to number and a new notion for Blackfoot grammar, 'distinct third person'. These pronouns can bear any of the several grammatical relations we tested. No more than two pronouns may be attached to a given verb. The relative order of these pronouns is determined by ranking of grammatical relation (term before non-term).

There is one additional constraint involving clitics which we can account for only by an ad hoc rule. Consider sentences (96)-(103):

(96) *Iino-yii-y {[-ayi] amoksi ninaiksi. saw-direct-3pl-PRO these men 'These men saw {him} .'

(97) Iinoyii-yaawa {[-yi] amoksi ninaiksi. 'These men saw {him} .'

(98) *Ots-iino-ok-i {[-ayi] amoksi ninaiksi. 3-saw-inverse-3pl-PRO these men 'These men were seen by {him} .'

(99) Otsiinook-iaawa {[-yi] amoksi ninaiksi. 'These men were seen by {him} .'

(100) *Itap-sskonaki-y {[-ayi] amoksi saahkoamaapiiksi. -aiksi these boys 'These boys shot at {it them (anim) } .'

(101) Itapsskonaki-yaawa {[-yi] amoksi saahkoamaapiiksi. -iksi -istsi 'These boys shot at {it them (anim) } .'}
The constraint seems to be that DTP suffixes cannot follow the third person plural agreement suffix directly, as in the unacceptable even numbered examples above; rather the enclitic -aawa must intervene as in the odd-numbered examples even though the presence of the controlling plural nominal following the verb would seem to preclude use of this pronoun.

NOTES

* We are indebted to a number of people in the Native American Studies Department at the University of Lethbridge for judgements and insights regarding the acceptability of various Blackfoot sentences, but we received the most extensive help from Martin HeavyHead. Others who should be named are Keith Chiefmoon, and Leroy Little Bear.

Author Frantz takes primary responsibility for the form of this paper. Co-author Fox contributed first of all by correcting Frantz' classroom examples in such a way that the pronominal status of the suffixes we discuss here became apparent, and then by participating in the research which a paper such as this entails.

Abbreviations used in this paper include: 1,2,3 = first, second, and third person, respectively; ben = benefactive; da = daughter; DO = direct object; DTP = distinct third person; dur = durative; instr = instrumental, intrans = intransitive; obv = obviative; pl = plural; PRO = pronoun; sg = singular; SU = Subject; sub = subordinate mode marker; subjunct = subjunctive inflection; TA = verb or clause with animate gender DO; TI = verb or clause with inanimate gender DO; trans = transitive.

Morphophonemic rules particularly relevant to examples used in this paper include:

a. \( i \rightarrow \emptyset /y+V \)
b. \( \{y,w\} \rightarrow \emptyset /c \) (bleeds rule a.)
c. \( V' \rightarrow V/\_+V \)
This phenomenon ("left-dislocation" in transformational terminology) was first pointed out by Greg Thomson (unpublished note) in 1973. He also noted that the rule is "unbounded", as seen in (13).

See Perlmutter and Postal (1977), and Perlmutter (to appear).

Leroy LittleBear, (personal communication), points out that (23) could occur in a context which includes reference to noko'siksi, such as the question 'How do your kids work?' But then the use of noko'siksi in (23) would be excessively redundant. It should also be noted that the facts stated here regarding (21)-(23) do not hold for all speakers. Some, perhaps influenced by the pronominalization constraints of English, actually prefer (23) over (22).

Although it seems to us that the -aawa of this form is the same -aawa we are calling a pronoun, we must admit that a longer portion of the non-affirmative ending behaves like a unit with regard to complementation with a noun phrase. Thus in (i) ılıksaawa, rather than just -aawa, is absent:

(i) Nimatainoawa noko'siksi.
'I don't see my kids.'

Alternatively, we could say that the a is always present and a preceding a is dropped. This latter alternative might simplify provision for the fact that the a of -ayi is always stressed.

We suspect that something like our DTP may account for so-called obviation of inanimate gender nouns in other Algonquian languages.

Following up a suggestion by Greg Thomson, we elicited the following sentences:

(i) Oma ninaa-wa nits-itap-ssko-a-yini otan-i.
That man-3sg 1-toward-send-direct-obv his:da-obv
'I sent the man's daughter to him.'

(ii) Nitsitapsskoayin-ayi otani.
'I sent his (own) daughter to him.'

(iii) Nitsitapsskoayin-ayi oma ninaawa.
'I sent her to the man.'

Sentence (ii) supports our contention that obviation and DTP are distinct phenomena, for the obviation governor is the DTP target, and vice-versa. But (iii) seems to indicate that DTP is not entirely independent of obviation, for here 'his daughter' is represented by a DTP suffix -ayi even though 'daughter' (as DO) outranks 'man' (as GOAL). If it is the fact that 'man' governs obviation of 'daughter' which permits the governing of a DTP by a lower ranked nominal in
(iii), then this virtually eliminates the relevance of the DTP phenomenon to discernment of final grammatical relations in inverse forms such as (49) and (50).

10 For co-author Fox, there seems to be the additional constraint that of two enclitics on a given verb, the first must be -aawa.

11 This leaves open the question of whether or not the initial DO is final SU.
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