

# Two Imperatives in Cheyenne: Some Preliminary Distinctions<sup>1</sup>

Sarah E. Murray

*Cornell University*

(Draft: 1 Aug 2013; to appear in PAC44, Papers of the Forty-Fourth Algonquian Conference)

## 1 Introduction

This paper presents various restrictions on the use and interpretation of imperatives in Cheyenne (Plains Algonquian). Cheyenne has two kinds of imperatives: immediate and delayed, illustrated below in (1) for an intransitive verb with an implicit singular second-person subject.<sup>2</sup>

(1)	<u>Immediate imperative</u>	<u>Delayed imperative</u>	(Leman 2012, p.41)
	Néméné- <b>stse</b> !	Némene- <b>o'o</b> !	
	sing-IM.IMP.2SG	sing-DEL.IMP.2SG	
	'Sing (now)!'	'Sing (later)!'	

Immediate imperatives typically indicate that the commanded action should be done at once, directly after the utterance. With delayed imperatives, the commanded action should be done at a later time, which could be relatively soon after the utterance or significantly later, depending on the context. For delayed imperatives, the time of action can be specified or it can be left open, interpreted as sometime in the future.

This temporal generalization, that immediate imperatives are present-oriented and delayed imperatives are future-oriented, seems to account for a range of facts about the distribution of imperatives in Cheyenne. For example, immediate imperatives cannot occur in certain constructions, discussed in Section 3, a fact potentially explained by a strong present orientation. However, there are several potential counterexamples to this simple generalization, including habitual imperatives and imperatives in advertisements. These potential counterexamples might be explainable under the above generalization, but raise important questions for future fieldwork (see Section 5).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides background on the Cheyenne language and its verbal morphology. The basic temporal orientation of Cheyenne imperatives is discussed in Section 3, supporting the temporal generalization discussed above. In Section 4, potential counterexamples to this generalization are given and discussed in detail, to determine if they can be seen as consistent with the temporal generalization. Section 5 is a discussion of questions for future fieldwork on Cheyenne imperatives and other ways of encoding commands.

## 2 Background on Cheyenne

Cheyenne is a Plains Algonquian language spoken in Montana and Oklahoma. The data presented in this paper was collected by the author during several fieldwork trips to Montana during summers since 2006 and draws on a Cheyenne grammar (Leman 2012), collections of texts (Leman 1980a, 1987), and a dictionary (Fisher et al. 2006). For all included Cheyenne examples, the morphological analysis, glossing, and translation is my own.

Like other Algonquian languages, Cheyenne verbs can be categorized into three orders, distinguished by differing patterns of verbal morphology – independent, conjunct (dependent), and imperative – and each order can be subdivided into modes (Leman 2012). The independent order includes both declarative and interrogative sentences. Declarative sentences can be further divided by evidentiality into four modes: direct evidence or witness (called ‘indicative’ in Leman (2012)), reportative (attributive), conjectural (dubitative), and narrative (mediate).<sup>3</sup> The imperative order includes hortatives, immediate imperatives, and delayed imperatives. The conjunct order includes a wide variety of dependent clause types. An excerpt of this mode paradigm is given below in (2).

(2) Excerpt of Cheyenne Mode (Illocutionary Mood) Paradigm (Leman 2012)

### Independent Order:

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| a. <u>Witness evidential</u><br>Né-némene-Ø.<br>2-sing-WTN<br>‘You sang, I witnessed’ | b. <u>Reportative evidential</u><br>Né-néméné- <b>máse</b> .<br>2-sing-RPT.2SG<br>‘You sang, they say’ | c. <u>Interrogative</u><br>Né-némene- <b>he?</b><br>2-sing-INT<br>‘Did you sing?’ |
|---|--|---|

### Imperative Order:

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| d. <u>Hortative</u><br>Némene- <b>ha!</b><br>sing-HRT.3SG<br>‘Let him sing!’ | e. <u>Immediate imperative</u><br>Néméné- <b>stse!</b><br>sing-IM.IMP.2SG<br>‘Sing (now)!’ | f. <u>Delayed imperative</u><br>Némene- <b>o'o!</b><br>sing-DEL.IMP.2SG<br>‘Sing (later)!’ |
|--|--|--|

All verbs in Cheyenne have a templatic structure, with dedicated slots in a fixed order. This includes a final suffix slot for mode, or ‘illocutionary mood’, markers, which distinguish sentence type, e.g., declarative, interrogative, and imperative (Leman 2012, Murray 2010). These mode suffixes occur in the independent and imperative orders and are bolded above in (2). In the conjunct order, verbs are marked with a prefix indicating mode and a suffix marking person, number, and animacy (see Leman 2012).

Unlike other Cheyenne verb forms, imperatives do not occur with a person prefix. However, they are always restricted to having (implicit) second person subjects. Hortatives have third person subjects but are oriented toward a second person, e.g., ‘Let him sing’ in (2d) is a request to the addressee to let a third person sing.

As shown in (2), Cheyenne has two kinds of imperatives: immediate and delayed.<sup>4</sup> Each kind has both singular and plural forms for animate intransitive (AI) verbs, as in (3), and various forms for transitive verbs (see Leman 2012). The singular immediate form is *-htse*, but often appears as *-stse* due to assimilation (h assimilates to s after an e before a t (Leman 2012, p.214)).

(3)	Cheyenne Imperative Forms	(Leman 2012, p.41)
	<u>Immediate imperative</u>	<u>Delayed imperative</u>
	a. Néméné- <b>stse</b> !	b. Némene- <b>o'o</b> !
	sing-IM.IMP.2SG	sing-DEL.IMP.2SG
	‘(You (sg.)) sing (now)!’	‘(You (sg.)) sing (later)!’
	c. Néméne- <b>Ø</b> !	d. Némené- <b>héne</b> !
	sing-IM.IMP.2PL	sing-DEL.IMP.2PL
	‘(You (pl.)) sing (now)!’	‘(You (pl.)) sing (later)!’

The plural and singular variants of the imperatives seem unrelated to singular and plural marking in the other modes, at least for animate intransitive verbs: the second person plural suffix for the independent order is *-me*, as in *Né-némené-me* ‘you (pl.) sang’.

Other ways of expressing commands in Cheyenne do involve the independent order. For example, the preverb *me'* ‘should’ can be used for indirect commands, as in (4), and can be combined with the impersonal suffix *-htove*, as in (5). Example (4) is adapted from a plural version in Leman (2012, p.142), to facilitate comparison with the forms in (2).

- (4) Né-me'-néméne.  
2-should-sing

‘You should sing.’

- (5) É-me'-némené-stove. (Leman 2012)  
 3-should-sing-IMPERS  
 ‘There should be singing.’ or ‘You should sing.’

Both (4) and (5) are declarative sentences, in contrast to the imperative sentences in (3). When used indirectly as commands, Cheyenne (4) and (5) are considered to be more deferential or polite (Leman 2012). Unlike the imperatives in (3), Cheyenne (4) and (5) do not seem to be temporally restricted.

In Cheyenne, negative imperatives, or prohibitives, are not morphologically part of the imperative order. Instead, they are also part of the independent order. Examples are given in (6), which contain the second person prefix, like the independent order in (2) above, but unlike the imperative order.

- |     |                                |   |
|-----|--------------------------------|---|
| (6) | a. <u>Singular prohibitive</u> | b. <u>Plural prohibitive</u> (Fisher et al. 2006) |
|     | Né-vé'-néméne!                 | Né-vé'-némené-me!                                 |
|     | 2-PROH-sing                    | 2-PROH-sing-2PL                                   |
|     | ‘Don’t (you (sg.)) sing!’      | ‘Don’t (you (pl.)) sing!’                         |

Given the focus of this paper on the distinction between immediate and delayed imperatives, I will not discuss prohibitives or indirect commands further. Future work on Cheyenne imperatives should explore their temporal orientation as well as their interaction with the other modes and the full range of morphology of the independent order.

On a final introductory note, there are many prefixes that can occur in verbs of all orders, including imperatives. Examples are the directionals, such as the cislocative *néh-* in (7), and the habitual preverb *ohke-* in (8). From example (7) on, I will use only the singular form of the imperatives, so I will no longer include ‘(you (sg.))’ in the English translation.

- (7) Nés-tséhe'ohtsè-**stse**! (Fisher et al. 2006)  
 CIS-go.there-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Come here!’
- (8) Ohke-péhéve-mé'éstò-**htse**! (Fisher et al. 2006)  
 HAB-good-tell-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Try to tell it right!’

Several other prefixes can only occur in imperatives (Fisher et al. 2006). These include *nená-* ‘come on and’, *sá’-* ‘now’, and *vená-* ‘now/be at it’, as in (9).

- (9) Vená-he-mèsee-**stse!** (Fisher et al. 2006)  
 be.at.it-PURP-eat-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Come on now and eat!’

I return to the use and interpretation of habitual imperatives and imperative prefixes in Section 4 below.

### 3 Temporal Orientation of Cheyenne Imperatives

The typical use of immediate imperatives is for actions that are to take place directly after the utterance, as in (10). Delayed imperatives are typically used for actions that are to take place sometime in the future, as in (11). Exactly when can be specified by the context or an additional modifier, as discussed below.

- (10) [Context: the speaker is sitting down to eat and the addressee is in the next room doing something else]  
 Hé-mèsee-**stse!**  
 PURP-eat-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Come eat (now)!’
- (11) [Context: the addressee is leaving the speaker’s house after a visit]  
 Né’-évà-hósè-ho’èhne-**o’o!**  
 CIS-back-again-arrive-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Come back again (sometime)!’

These typical uses support the preliminary temporal generalization given in (12). Additional support comes from other descriptions of imperatives in Algonquian languages, which refer to this type of imperative as a ‘future imperative’ (e.g., Goddard 1979).

- (12) **Temporal orientation of Cheyenne imperatives:**

Immediate imperatives are present-oriented and delayed imperatives are future-oriented

Generalization (12) essentially states that for immediate imperatives, the action should start directly after the utterance, while for delayed imperatives, the action should take place sometime later, in the future. This generalization is simple, but it seems to account for various restrictions on Cheyenne immediate and delayed imperatives, including how a particular time for the action can be specified and which imperatives can occur in what kinds of conditionals and conjunctions. The remainder of this section will explore data that support generalization (12). Various challenges to the generalization will be presented in Section 4.

Supporting the generalization in (12), the two kinds of Cheyenne imperatives allow different kinds of temporal specifications. Consider examples (13) and (14), which include the word *hétsetseha* ‘now’.

- (13) Ho'soo'è-**stse**      hétsetseha!  
 dance-IM.IMP.2SG now  
 ‘Dance now!’

- (14) \*Ho'sóe-**o'o**      hétsetseha!  
 dance-DEL.IMP.2SG now  
 (Intended: ‘Dance now!’)

The immediate imperative can occur with ‘now’, as in (13), (further) specifying that the action should start directly after the utterance. However, as (14) shows, the delayed imperative cannot occur with *hétsetseha*: the delayed imperative is not compatible with a present temporal specification.

A future time of action, such as ‘tomorrow’, can be specified for delayed imperatives (16), but not immediate imperatives (15).

- (15) \*Ho'soo'è-**stse**      mäh-vóona'o!  
 dance-IM.IMP.2SG CNJ-be.morning  
 (Intended: ‘Dance tomorrow!’)

- (16) Ho'sóe-**o'o**      mäh-vóona'o!  
 dance-DEL.IMP.2SG CNJ-be.morning  
 ‘Dance tomorrow!’

Like (13) and (14), examples (15) and (16) are compatible with the generalization in (12). The immediate imperative in (15) cannot occur with a future temporal specification such as ‘tomorrow’

because of its present orientation. The delayed imperative is future-oriented, so it is compatible with such specification.

Similarly, immediate imperatives cannot occur in the consequent of most conditional constructions, e.g., (17), though the delayed can (18).

(17) \*Máh-vé'-némené-to, ho'soo'è-**stse**!  
 CNJ-CND-sing-CNJ.1SG dance-IM.IMP.2SG  
 (Intended: 'If I sing, dance (then)!')

(18) Máh-vé'-némené-to, ho'sóe-**o'o**!  
 CNJ-CND-sing-CNJ.1SG dance-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 'If I sing, dance (then)!'

Cheyenne (17) and (18) can again be seen as consistent with generalization (12) if these conditionals are interpreted as future-oriented: the antecedent action is understood to be in the future, if realized at all. The intended interpretation of (17) and (18) is 'If I sing, dance then (at that time)', but only (18) allows this.

However, immediate imperatives can occur in present-oriented conditionals, where the antecedent condition can hold at the utterance time. For example, in (19) the antecedent condition of being from Lame Deer could hold at the utterance time, and so the consequent action of dancing could take place immediately after the utterance. The parallel version with the delayed imperative is also acceptable, in (20), with consequent action taking place sometime in the future, perhaps an event being discussed.

(19) Máh-vé'-héstáhe-to Méave'ho'éno, ho'soo'è-**stse**!  
 CNJ-CND-sing-CNJ.2SG Lame.Deer dance-IM.IMP.2SG  
 'If you are from Lame Deer, dance (now)!'

(20) Máh-vé'-héstáhe-to Méave'ho'éno, ho'sóe-**o'o**!  
 CNJ-CND-sing-CNJ.2SG Lame.Deer dance-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 'If you are from Lame Deer, dance (later)!'

In addition to restrictions on temporal specification and occurrence in conditionals, immediate imperatives cannot occur in simple conjunctions, as in (21). I use the term "simple conjunction" to mean conjunctions that contain only two simple imperative verbs and the conjunction *naa* 'and'.

Two immediate imperatives can be conjoined, but it requires the addition of a prefix to the second imperative, e.g., *no'*- ‘also’, as in (22).

- (21) \*Néméné-**stse**    naa ho'soo'è-**stse**!  
 sing-IM.IMP.2SG and dance-IM.IMP.2SG  
 (Intended: ‘Sing (now) and dance (now)!’)
- (22) Néméné-**stse**    naa no'-ho'soo'è-**stse**!  
 sing-IM.IMP.2SG and also-dance-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Sing (now) and also dance (now)!’

Example (21) is consistent with the temporal generalization in (12): if the immediate imperative requires an action to start directly after the utterance, (21) requires two separate actions to start immediately, which is inconsistent. If the actions are to take place simultaneously, the form in (22) is used. The conjunction in (22) is acceptable because the prefix *no'*- on the second conjunct allows the second action to overlap with the first action: the singing and dancing should be done at the same time. Thus, both of the actions can start ‘now’, directly after the utterance. So (22) is also consistent with the temporal generalization in (12).

Two delayed imperatives can be conjoined alone, as in (23), and an immediate imperative can be conjoined with a delayed imperative, as in (24).

- (23) Némene-**o'o**    naa ho'sóe-**o'o**!  
 sing-DEL.IMP.2SG and dance-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Sing (later) and dance (later)!’
- (24) Néméné-**stse**    naa ho'sóe-**o'o**!  
 sing-IM.IMP.2SG and dance-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Sing (now) and dance (later)!’

For (23), the singing and dancing can be at the same time or at different times. A sample context for (24) is if you are wondering which action to do now and which to do later, say tomorrow, I can say (24). A delayed imperative can also be conjoined with a declarative sentence, as in (25).

- (25) Ná-to'se-néméne naa ho'sóe-**o'o**!  
 I-going.to-sing and dance-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 ‘I am going to sing and (you) dance (then)!’

A sample context for Cheyenne (25) would be if we often perform together and sometimes I sing and you dance, and sometimes I dance and you sing. We are planning for our performance later and I decide that I want to sing, I could say (25).

So far, various facts support the preliminary temporal generalization given in (12). These facts include the typical use of immediate and delayed imperatives as well as the restrictions on temporal specification, occurrence in the consequents of conditionals, and occurrence in conjunctions. Up to this point, the generalization seems appropriate: the immediate requires the action to take place in the present, directly after the imperative is uttered, and the delayed requires the action to take place in the future.

#### 4 Potential Counterexamples

Above, future temporal specification was shown to be compatible with delayed imperatives but not with immediate imperatives. Conversely, specifying the present is possible with immediate but not delayed imperatives, as shown in (13) and (14) with *hétsetseha* ‘now’. There is also a special imperative prefix meaning ‘now’, which can occur in immediate imperatives, as in (26).

- (26) Sá'-néméné-**stse**! (Fisher et al. 2006)  
 now-sing-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Sing now!’

This supports the above temporal generalization (12). Data have not yet been collected on the combination of this prefix *sá’-* and the delayed imperative (see Section 5). A potentially related example is (27), from the text “A Prayer at a Meeting” by Ted Risingsun.<sup>5</sup>

- (27) Vovéstomev-e-meno-**o’o** hétsetseha tséhéóhe! (Leman 1980a, p.79)  
 teach-2:1-1PL.EXCL-DEL.IMP.2SG now here  
 ‘Teach us, now here!’

In example (27), part of a prayer, the delayed imperative *-o’o* occurs with the word *hétsetseha* ‘now’, a combination otherwise reported to not be allowed (see (14)). I have kept the original translation from Leman (1980a), as I have not yet worked with consultants to investigate this example. If the interpretation is for God to help the speaker and others at the prayer meeting ‘now’, directly after the speaker’s utterance, then example (27) contradicts temporal generalization (12). But other

interpretations may be possible. The delayed imperative could be used deferentially in prayers. Alternatively, *hétsetseha tséhéóhe* could be something other than a temporal specification. It could refer to the people present at the meeting, ‘those who are here now’. Under this interpretation, example (27) is not a counterexample to (12). Which interpretation is correct will need to be explored in future fieldwork on Cheyenne (see also Section 5).

A second type of potential counterexample is the occurrence of the habitual prefix in immediate imperatives. Since commanded habits are typically realized in the future, the delayed imperative would seem to be the one to use with the habitual prefix. However, it is immediate imperatives that typically occur with the habitual prefix, resulting in a present and future-oriented habitual interpretation. For example, tips for living a good life might include (28).

(28) [Context: tips for living a good life]

Ohke-péhéve-mésee-stse!  
 HAB-good-eat-IM.IMP.2SG  
 ‘Eat well!’

Initially, this example seems like it might be a counterexample to the temporal generalization in (12). But I think the way to interpret habitual immediate imperative examples like (28) is as requiring the habit (or attitude) to start immediately, regardless of when the first actual event of instantiation of the habit is.

Strikingly, it is the delayed imperative that sounds odd with the habitual, as in (29). Cheyenne (29) is infelicitous (#) in the context of tips for living a good life, sounding more like advice to put off starting a habit of eating well.

(29) [Context: tips for living a good life]

# Ohke-péhéve-méséhe-o'ó!  
 HAB-good-eat-DEL.IMP.2SG  
 (Intended: ‘Eat well!’)

However, habitual delayed imperatives as in (29) are felicitous in some contexts. For example, if your granddaughter was going away to college and you wanted to tell her to eat well then, when she was away at college, (29) would be felicitous. Crucially this is a context where the habit would start in the future, not immediately. In general it seems that the typical form for a habitual imperative is an

immediate imperative, as typically the habit should start immediately. There are several examples of the habitual prefix with the immediate imperative in Cheyenne texts and in the dictionary, including example (8) above.

The third and final type of potential counterexample I consider is advertisement imperatives. In advertisement imperatives, such as *Win a drum!* in English, the action of winning is in the future. You enter a contest now, and (potentially) win something later. So, it might be expected that Cheyenne advertisement imperatives would be formed with the delayed imperative. However, in advertisements and announcements, the immediate imperative is used, as in (30).

- (30) [Context: the speaker is selling tickets for a raffle that will occur tomorrow. The speaker says the following and also has a sign that says the following]  
 Hó'táhéva-**htse** onéhavo'e!  
 win-IM.IMP.2SG drum  
 'Win a drum!'

A possible interpretation of this kind of imperative is that the addressee should do something immediately (say, purchase a raffle ticket) to have a chance at winning a drum in the future. Interestingly, the corresponding delayed imperative in (31) sounds more like wishing someone luck after they have purchased a ticket.

- (31) [Context: the addressee has just purchased a ticket for a raffle that will take place tomorrow]  
 Hó'táheva-**o'o** onéhavo'e!  
 win-DEL.IMP.2SG drum  
 'Win a drum (later)!'

Example (30) is the only advertisement imperative example that I currently have for Cheyenne, and it is independently somewhat strange. The verb *-hó'táhevá* is an animate intransitive verb, e.g., *É-hó'táhevá* 'He won', so I am not sure why it can occur with the noun 'drum' in these examples.<sup>6</sup> A complete study of Cheyenne imperatives would have to include many more examples of this type to arrive at a better understanding of imperatives in advertising contexts.

## 5 Questions for Future Work

This paper has presented some preliminary distinctions between the two kinds of imperatives found in Cheyenne: immediate and delayed. A simple generalization can be made about their interpre-

tation and use: immediate imperatives request present action while delayed imperatives request future action, to take place at a specified or contextually salient time. This temporal generalization is supported by a number of facts (see Section 3), but is also potentially challenged by the examples discussed in the previous section. These potential counterexamples might be able to be explained under the above temporal generalization, but they raise important questions for future fieldwork.

First, the kinds of temporal specifications that are compatible with each imperative should be fully explored. This should include an investigation of the imperative prefixes as well as example (27), which might otherwise have been assumed to be ungrammatical. It could be a special form for a prayer, or it could have more to do with how *hétsetseha* ‘here’ and *tséhéóhe* ‘now’ are used. A complete investigation of this sort would shed light both on imperatives as well as on the interpretation of different kinds of temporal specifications. It is possible, for instance, that words like ‘here’ can be interpreted more relatively or broadly.

Second, there is much work to do on habitual imperatives. Both immediate and delayed imperatives can occur with the habitual preverb, but their combinations have importantly different meanings, commanding different actions. They are felicitous in different contexts (see (28) and (29)), which tells us something about the temporal orientation of the imperatives. In general, combining imperatives with various modifiers can aid investigating the meaning of the imperatives themselves.

Third, advertising imperatives are of interest in general in semantics because they can lack directive force. In such cases, e.g., (30) ‘Win a drum!’, the addressee does not have control over the outcome of the action. Since the imperative is morphologically marked in Cheyenne, we can tell whether these cases actually involve an imperative. Cheyenne (30) suggests that they do, but many more examples are needed for a definite conclusion.

There are also other ways of expressing commands in Cheyenne, including indirect commands and prohibitives (see (4) – (6)), which are both part of the independent order. Comparing imperatives with these forms could help shed light on the semantic restrictions of all of the various constructions used to express commands.

Lastly, this paper has made no attempt to analyze the Cheyenne imperatives, beyond discussing the temporal generalization and how various data bear on it. Future work on this topic should include a formal semantic analysis, which can make specific predictions that can be tested in the field. What at first seems like a simple temporal pattern for the Cheyenne imperatives is potentially much more

complicated. For example, a satisfactory analysis must explain why a future time cannot be specified for the immediate imperative, but yet this form is used in habitual imperatives and advertising imperatives. A semantic analysis, and insights from the semantic literature on imperatives and tense in other language, can aid in uncovering further details about the semantic restrictions on Cheyenne imperatives and thus improve our documentation and understanding of the language. In addition, because Cheyenne morphologically marks two kinds of imperatives, an understanding of Cheyenne imperatives could improve our understanding of the semantics of imperatives crosslinguistically.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup>I would like to thank my Cheyenne consultants and others I have talked with about Cheyenne for their collaboration and discussion of Cheyenne data. I would also like to thank Chris Barker, Andrew Cowell, Wayne Leman, Monica Macaulay, William Starr, Matthew Stone, audiences at the 44th Algonquian Conference in Chicago, and two anonymous PAC44 reviewers for comments and helpful discussion. Any errors are my own.

<sup>2</sup>Orthography and Abbreviations:  $\acute{V}$  high pitch vowel,  $\check{V}$  silent vowel (all final vowels are silent, but not marked), 1 first person, 2 second person, 2:1 second person acting on first person (voice suffix), 3 third person, CIS cislocative, CND conditional, CNJ conjunct (dependent) clause marking, DEL.IMP delayed imperative, EXCL exclusive, HAB habitual, HRT hortative, IM.IMP immediate imperative, IMPERS impersonal, INT interrogative, PL plural, PROH prohibitive, PURP purposive, RPT reportative, SG singular, WTN witness (direct) evidential.

<sup>3</sup>The witness evidential is a direct evidential, indicating that the speaker has direct evidence, usually visual or other sensory evidence. Though I have often just called this the ‘direct evidential’, I am using the term ‘witness’ here to avoid confusion with the Algonquianist term ‘direct voice’ for a type of voice marking on transitive verbs. It is the unmarked member of the evidential/mood paradigm, and though I indicate it in this example with  $-\emptyset$ , I will omit it from the remainder of the declarative examples.

<sup>4</sup>In the closely related Plains Algonquian language Arapaho, there are also multiple kinds of imperatives. The Arapaho imperative order contains the direct imperative, indirect imperative, and hortative. Though this seems similar to the Cheyenne system, the Arapaho indirect imperative is not parallel to the delayed imperative in Cheyenne. Instead, in Arapaho the delayed, or ‘future’, imperative is part of the independent order (Cowell 2007). According to Goddard (1979), several Algonquian languages have a ‘future’ imperative; however, morphologically they are diverse, ranging from part of the imperative order, as in Cheyenne, to part of the independent order, as in Arapaho.

<sup>5</sup>According to Wayne Leman (personal communication, 2013), Mr. Risingsun was praying for a series of meetings that were about to take place, and so was praying for the present as well as the immediate future.

<sup>6</sup>Cheyenne *-hó'táhevá* ‘win’ may actually be a AI+O verb, an animate intransitive verb with an optional object (see e.g. Rhodes (1990)). Initial support for this comes from the declarative counterpart of (30): according to one Cheyenne consultant, the form is *É-hó'táhéva onéhavo'e* ‘He won a drum’.

## References

- COWELL, ANDREW. 2007. Arapaho imperatives: Indirectness, politeness and communal “face”. *Journal of Linguistic Anthropology*, 17(1):44—60.
- FISHER, LOUISE, WAYNE LEMAN, LEROY PINE SR., AND MARIE SANCHEZ. 2006. *Cheyenne Dictionary*. Chief Dull Knife College. <http://www.cdkc.edu/cheyennedictionary/index.html>.
- GODDARD, IVES. 1979. Comparative algonquian. In Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun (eds.), *The Languages of the Americas: Historical and Comparative Assessment*, pp. 70–132. Austin: University of Texas Press.
- LEMAN, WAYNE (ed.). 1980a. *Cheyenne Texts: An Introduction to Cheyenne Literature*. Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Series No. 6. Greeley, Colorado: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.
- LEMAN, WAYNE. 1980b. *A Reference Grammar of the Cheyenne Language*. Occasional Publications in Anthropology, Series No. 5. Greeley, Colorado: Museum of Anthropology, University of Northern Colorado.
- LEMAN, WAYNE (ed.). 1987. *Náéváhóó’óhtséme / We Are Going Back Home: Cheyenne History and Stories Told by James Shoulderblade and Others*. Memoir 4. Winnipeg: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.
- LEMAN, WAYNE. 2012. *A Reference Grammar of the Cheyenne Language*. Raleigh, North Carolina: Lulu Press. Updated version of Leman (1980b).
- MURRAY, SARAH E. 2010. *Evidentiality and the Structure of Speech Acts*. Ph.D. thesis, Rutgers University.
- RHODES, RICHARD. 1990. Ojibwa secondary objects. In Katarzyna Dziwirek, Patrcik Farrell, and Errapel Mejías-Bikandi (eds.), *Grammatical Relations: A Cross Theoretical Perspective*, pp. 401–414. Stanford: CSLI.