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Abstract

In this paper we attempt to give a concise description of some aspects of verb morphology in Newfoundland Micmac, showing, where such exist, differences between them and those of mainland Micmac.

To begin with we have given a brief account of the Micmacs in Newfoundland, deeming such an account a necessary prelude to the study of their language. Thereafter we have discussed the personal and inflexional endings of intransitive and transitive verbs.

These determined we proceed to an analysis of the intransitive and transitive verbs per se, summing our conclusions with respect to these verb categories and including lists of intransitives and transitives which we obtained in researching this paper.

The following chapter is then devoted to a brief study of the formation of the past and future tenses of the indicative mood.

The final chapter contains our conclusions with respect to the verb morphology of Newfoundland Micmac. We have also suggested another area of research which could be undertaken with the utmost urgency because of the rapid depletion of our sources of linguistic information.
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Phonological Considerations

Before launching into the main text of our study we should like to list the following as the phonemes of Newfoundland Micmac:

Vowels: short: /a/ /e/ /i/ /o/ /u/ /\i/

long: /a:/ /e:/ /i:/ /o:/ /u: /

Consonants: /p/ /t/ /k/ /\/ /n/ /w/ /y/

The consonants are usually voiced in intervocalic position; initially, they may be either voiced or voiceless.

/k/ produces [γ] in the following contexts:

o, a — a, o

o, a — 0

o, a — #, or morpheme boundary,

elsewhere it is [k] or [g].

[nd] appears to contrast with [nt], and we have followed the suggestion of Mr. A.D. DeBlois that [nd] < /nVtV/ while [nt] < /nt/ (for example, see page 10: /num:ti:kw/ is heard as [mundi:kw]).
I. A Brief Account of the Micmac Indians in Newfoundland

The Micmacs, we are told, represent the most easterly branch of the Algonkian family of Indians which, after the separation into three major groups, migrated or were driven by the press of other tribes along the northeastern coasts of America to inhabit areas at the mouth of the river St. Lawrence and, in particular, the Maritime provinces of Canada.

When this division into western, central, and eastern tribes occurred has not yet been determined. Nor has any significant progress been made toward establishing the approximate date of the origin of the Micmacs in the Maritime provinces. If we can rely with any surety on the archaeological findings of J.S. Erskine we may assume that the Micmacs were descendant from a race of people called the "Blue-whin" which appears to have inhabited the area at least some 10,000 years ago. Nevertheless, these seem not to be the immediate ancestors of our Micmacs for they expired and were succeeded by a more recent people, the Archaics of approximately 2000 B.C.

The discovery of America by Europeans led ultimately to the discovery of her native children, but it is only with the attempt to expand the reaches of Christianity that we discover that these native sons represent distinct
tribes one of which proves to be Micmac. Once the race to colonize the west began the Micmacs had frequent contact with both French and British newcomers. Of the French they became steadfast friends, possibly because they were the first to attempt organized settlement of the new world, possibly because they were the first to show any interest in the native peoples even though it should only be for the sake of converting them and exploiting them the more fully. For the British the Micmacs had no use. This, of course, may have been due partly to the rivalry between the French and British, subsequently between French allies and the British, and, partly, to the manner in which the ignorant British colonists and governing authorities treated the Indians.

During the British-American wars between the years 1775 and 1782 a suitable treaty was effected between one of the British commanders on Cape Breton Island and the chief of one of the Micmac tribes granting him a sterile tract of land at Bay St. George, Newfoundland, if he should succeed in persuading the remaining tribes to cease their vehement attacks upon the British. This was achieved and the chief, with as many of his tribesmen as were willing to venture the perilous journey, subsequently set sail across the gulf to establish a community in Bay St. George. Thus it is thought that the first Micmacs to arrive and establish themselves with any degree of
permanency on our island must have done so during the latter part of the eighteenth century.

However, Newfoundland was not an unknown territory to the Micmacs or to any other of the closer tribes on the mainland. To the north, only a ten-mile stretch of water separated the island from those who cared to hunt in its forests or to fish in its rivers. To the south, the sixty-five miles of water between Cape North, Cape Breton Island, and Cape Ray, Newfoundland, were traversed by large parties of Indians who made the trip by canoe chiefly at night when the water was calmer and they could be guided to the island's shores by the huge fires lit by scouting parties sent ahead for this purpose. We suspect, therefore, that the Micmacs were acquainted with this island at least as long ago as 1600, although permanent settlement does not appear to have been considered at that time.

One factor which may have militated against this may have been that the island had its own tribe of Indians, the Beothuk, and that as long as the two groups were evenly matched with regard to weapons the Micmacs could never feel sufficiently secure in small numbers to warrant settlement. However, as they came in closer contact with the white man their mode of warfare altered. They, too, began to use guns, a weapon which the Beothuk seem never to have been able to obtain. With guns the Micmacs made
greater advances into the island and began more seriously
to think it safe for them to settle.

On the other hand, the attitude of the British
settlers, and of the governors in charge of the island
colony, may well have presented an added deterrent to the
settlement of the Micmacs in Newfoundland. Certainly,
government documents of the 1700s do imply an innate fear
of these "maurading devils", cleverly disguised under the
threat which the Micmacs would pose to the island's native
Indians. But the irony of the situation was that, at the
same time, British settlers were hunting the native
Beothuk as callously as sportsmen today hunt moose or any
other animal, but this, as a necessary step in the
"civilizing" of the island, might have been considered a
justifiable and excusable measure which the British
colonists could take to protect themselves from possible
injury from the defenceless, less devious Indians. The
Micmacs, then, whose presence in the island was becoming
more obvious, became the scapegoat for the British
atrocities.

First settlement, as we have seen, was on the island's
west coast. Toward the middle of the nineteenth century
the Micmacs began to move overland to attempt settlement
in the Bay D'Espoir region. At first, it seems, they
settled at Bay du Nord but, finding the encroaching
English settlers not to their liking, they ultimately
withdrew to the eastern bank of the Conne River. There, they obtained the quiet isolation which they sought. Unfortunately, it did not last. Before long the English were again forging their way into the Indian community, establishing saw-mills and exploiting the Indian's resources without the least consideration for the Indians themselves.

In 1872 a "reservation" was laid off for the Micmacs at Conne River by Mr. Murray, Geological Surveyor for the Newfoundland Colony. It contained twenty-four blocks of about thirty acres each, with a water frontage of ten chains, each block "to form the subject of a personal grant to the individual whose name is on the allotment. The right then conferred was in each case a 'licence to occupy,' ...". However, the minor technicalities of legal procedure which could have made the "reservation" a reality were not pursued by the Micmacs. Hence, today, this "reservation" exists only on paper and in the memory of the community's oldest Micmac-descendant residents.

There being no treaty reservations in Newfoundland the Europeans were able to infiltrate the Indian community without any difficulty. One result of this was the inter-marriage of individuals from the two races. As early as 1908 MacGregor suggested that there was not a single full-blooded Micmac remaining in the island. That certainly seems to be a legitimate assumption. Though we do find in
some of the children Indian characteristics more prominent than in others, they are ethnically the products of mixed ancestry: Micmac, Montagnais, French, English, and any other group which imposed itself upon the original Micmacs.

Culturally, they may be said to be non-existent today, though this was not true of their earlier days in the island nor as long as they were able to maintain themselves in isolation. From wigwams and skin clothing they moved through log cabins and white men's rags to the houses and clothing typical of the twentieth century white man. Their customary assembling to elect their chief when the need for a new one arose continued on into the first quarter of this century when, it appears, the zeal of the priests was successful in putting an end to this, as well as to all other native customs. Thereafter anything which was Micmac and counter to the establishment, religious, cultural, linguistic or otherwise, was buried in the heart of this marvelous race of people. Perhaps the only thing remaining of their earlier customs is the celebration of the feast of St. Anne, which takes place each year on July twenty-sixth. But even that, we fear, is a trapping imposed upon them by the white man's church.

Populationwise, their numbers seem to have decreased. Chappell, during his visit to the west coast community in 1813, estimated the Micmac population there to be ninety-
seven, but with the progress of civilized man, the building of the trans-island railway, and the advent of the paper mill to Corner Brook, the Indian community dwindled and passed into insignificance. At Conne River the Indian population was estimated at 123 on the "reservation" in 1908 and fifteen others near or removed from it. The Reverend Stanley St. Croix, writing for the Book of Newfoundland in 1937, said there were about 100 Micmacs at Conne River and approximately the same number scattered throughout the rest of the island at that time. That number has steadily decreased and though there may still be as many persons of distant Micmac descent we would be obliged to make tremendous allowances to find even a half dozen individuals who are more Micmac than white today.

However, interesting as the history of the Micmacs may be, this is not the subject of the paper to follow. Our concern in fact is with one aspect of their language, the verb, which Rand said "is emphatically the word in Micmac." Like the people themselves, their language in Newfoundland has never been studied. Hence we are ever conscious of establishing a precedent which may in fact be too late, for to our knowledge there remain but two individuals old enough to remember the language and at the same time capable of speaking it, Matthew Jeddore and Peter Jeddore, one at each end of the Conne community.
Though we have been successful in obtaining some information from the latter individual our chief success has been with the former and his brother, Paul Nicholas, since deceased, who have done us no mean favor in spending long hours with us recording their language before it should be forever lost. Some groundwork has been done but more organized projects are required since the amount of work yet to be accomplished is simply astounding. Saddest of all, though, is the thought that even now we are too late to preserve a first-rate specimen of the language of our second natives.

Time and again we have been asked why, in our study of the Micmac verb, we do not go to Nova Scotia where better educated individuals, speaking better Micmac, can give us the information we want. The answer is simply that despite their better education and so forth they cannot speak Newfoundland Micmac. Moreover, a great deal of work has already been done on the Micmac language in Nova Scotia and Restigouche, Quebec. These are our texts for comparison to determine what, if any, are the differences between the Micmac of Newfoundland and that of the mainland.

It is obvious, for instance, that a new environment will have introduced new words into the vocabulary at the expense of others; that distance and isolation will have caused some words to assume meanings slightly different
from those in the larger, more integrated communities, and that this same isolation will have produced some phonetic variations, on the one hand, and preserved sounds not normally heard elsewhere in present-day Micmac, on the other. But is this the extent of the differences? This is precisely what we do not know and one of the things we are hoping to discover from our description of some aspects of the verb morphology of Newfoundland Micmac. Just what we intend by "verb morphology" we will allow the reader to conclude from the following pages. Suffice it only to say here that we are concerned with the structure of the verb in Newfoundland Micmac, the way its various components are put together and relate to one another, and, in some measure, with the extent to which it conforms to the morphology of the Proto-Algonkian (PA) verb.
II. Personal and Inflexional Endings of Micmac Intransitive Verbs

We begin our study with a consideration of the subject pronouns and the endings associated with the intransitive verbs of Newfoundland Micmac. As examples we choose nemitay "I can see" and nuney "I suckle" for which we have the following paradigms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Pronoun</th>
<th>Intransitive Verb</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni:n</td>
<td>nemitay</td>
<td>nuney</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki:l</td>
<td>nemitan</td>
<td>nunen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekem</td>
<td>nemitat</td>
<td>nunet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekem</td>
<td>nemitak</td>
<td>nunek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Pronoun</th>
<th>Intransitive Verb</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ki:nu</td>
<td>nemitayikw</td>
<td>nuneyikw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni:len</td>
<td>nemitayek</td>
<td>nuneyek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki:law</td>
<td>nemitayok</td>
<td>nuneyok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>nemita:tik</td>
<td>nueta:zik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>nemitakel</td>
<td>nueta:kel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Pronoun</th>
<th>Intransitive Verb</th>
<th>Endings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ni:len</td>
<td>nemita:tiyek</td>
<td>nueta:tiyek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ki:law</td>
<td>nemita:tiyok</td>
<td>nueta:tiyok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>nemita:ti:zik</td>
<td>nueta:ti:zik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>nemita:ti:kel</td>
<td>nueta:ti:kel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is evident from the above paradigms that the subject pronouns of Newfoundland Micmac are not prefixed to the verb. This, it seems, is an indication that Micmac is becoming more analytic, a feature which could be accounted for if we accept Micmac as a very early offshoot of the Algonkian family of languages. However, it is also a feature which is peculiar only to the Micmac indicative which derives from the PA conjunct. At the same time, like the Algonkian verb, its personal and inflexional endings follow the verb and still form an integral part of its structure.

It is also apparent that the intransitive verbs of Micmac have three numbers: singular, dual, and plural. The singular shows three persons: first, second, and a third which may be of either animate or inanimate gender. The dual and the plural also indicate three persons: first, which may be inclusive (thou (you) and I), or exclusive (he (they) and I), second, and a third which again may be either animate or inanimate.

It was suggested above that the paradigms given indicated gender in the verb. Since we are here concerned with the intransitives we should note that gender, when indicated, relates to the verb subject, there being no object of the verb to which it can refer. In the third person singular this is denoted by the opposition of the animate singular morpheme -t to the inanimate singular -k.
In the third person dual and plural, it is denoted not only by the contrast of -č- (historically from *-t-) and -k-, but also by that of animate plural -ik to inanimate plural -el. This analysis can be confirmed, particularly in the case of the plurals, by comparison with the plural endings of animate and inanimate nouns, for example, peču(k) "fish(es)" and tuwopudit(i) "window(s)".

At this point we should like to list the following as the subject pronouns and the personal and inflexional endings of Micmac intransitive verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Inflexional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st sg.</td>
<td>ní:n</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd sg.</td>
<td>kí:l</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg. an.</td>
<td>nekem</td>
<td>-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd sg. inan.</td>
<td>nekem</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st dual (I)</td>
<td>kí:nu</td>
<td>-yikw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st dual (E)</td>
<td>ní:nen</td>
<td>-yek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd dual</td>
<td>kí:law</td>
<td>-yok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd dual an.</td>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>-čik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd dual inan.</td>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>-kel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl. (I)</td>
<td>kí:nu</td>
<td>-ti:kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pl. (E)</td>
<td>ní:nen</td>
<td>-tiyek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd pl.</td>
<td>kí:law</td>
<td>-tiyok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd pl. an.</td>
<td>nekemo</td>
<td>-tičik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of the stems from which these endings have been separated shows the intransitives to have thematic vowels /a/ and /e/ which require a linking yod before the endings beginning with a vowel: nemita-y-ek, nune-y-ek, but not before consonants: nemita-kel, nune-kel. Note that these thematic vowels have or may have morphophonemic variants: /a/∽/aː/, /e/∽/e/. We assume that V: is equal to VV (ie. geminated V) and with that in mind analyse the first dual (I) ending as -y-ikw (elsewhere -i-ikw). The dual endings then appear as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dual Form</th>
<th>Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st dual (I)</td>
<td>-y-ikw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st dual (E)</td>
<td>-y-ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd dual</td>
<td>-y-ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd dual an.</td>
<td>-e-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd dual inan.</td>
<td>-k-ol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the plural forms the element -ti- which alone distinguishes the plural forms from the dual is assumed to be the plural morpheme.

Summarizing our observations concerning the subject pronouns and the personal and inflexional endings we note:

1) The pattern of the intransitive verb endings
is:

-(plural morpheme)-person marker-(plural marker)

in which the plural morpheme is present if we are considering the plural verb forms; the plural marker is present if we are considering the third person dual or plural; and both plural marker and person marker indicate gender.

2) The personal pronoun for the inanimate singular, dual, and plural is the same as that for their animate counterparts.

3) The animate plural marker, -ik, and the inanimate plural marker, -el, follow the person markers of the third person dual and plural verb forms, -t- (an.) and -k- (inan.). In the case of the animate ending, this causes a morphophonemic change of -t- to -č-.

4) The element -y- of the first and second person dual forms is the connective between the theme vowel of the verb and the vowel of the personal and inflexional ending. It is unnecessary in the third person forms because the endings, beginning with a consonant, are added directly to the verb stem.

5) The plural morpheme /ti/ immediately follows the verb and precedes all other endings.

6) The first and second person endings in the dual and plural are: -ilcw, -ek, -ok, for first person inclusive, first person exclusive, and second person,
respectively.

7) The thematic vowels have or may have morphophonemic alternants: /a/ ~ /aː/, /e/ ~ /aː/. 
Middle Voice: Reflexives

Certain intransitives, while sharing many features in common with those discussed above, are distinct in that they possess AI, II final -s-. This group is composed of two main types: a) reflexive verbs, and b) "verbs of undergoing" or of resultant state (i.e. having some notion of passivity). We propose, therefore, to use the term Middle Voice to indicate a group of verbs whose sense suggests a mid range between the extremes of transitivity and intransitivity.

Micmac, as we have just noted, solves the problem of reflexivity by treating the reflexive verbs as intransitives. Therefore, the following is presented as our analysis of sample reflexives: kekina:ma:si "I teach myself, I learn" and kesispa:le:si "I wash myself, I get washed":

kekina:ma:-s-i
kekina:ma:-s-i-n
kekina:ma:-s-i-t
kekina:ma:-s-i-k
kekina:ma:-s-i-ikw
kekina:ma:-s-i-y-ek
kekina:ma:-s-i-y-ok

kesispa:le:-s-i
kesispa:le:-s-i-n
kesispa:le:-s-i-t
kesispa:le:-s-i-k
kesispa:le:-s-i-ikw
kesispa:le:-s-i-y-ek
kesispa:le:-s-i-y-ok
If we put aside the known elements in the above paradigms we are left with three elements which we have not yet met: _-s-, _-i-, and _-ul_. The element _-s_, which is common to singular, dual and plural forms and which precedes all other endings, we conclude to be the Micmac morpheme of reflexivity, derived from the Proto-Algonkian AI final *-_eso_, etc., by which reflexive AI verbs are formed from TA stems. Note, however, that in Micmac it also forms the II reflexives.

The segment _-_i_ which is common to all the dual reflexive forms and the element _-_ul_ which parallels it in the plural forms and which precedes the normal plural morpheme are peculiar to the reflexive and other Middle Voice verbs of Micmac.

Finally, if we compare the singular endings of the reflexive verbs with those of the other intransitives, we observe that the Middle Voice verbs form the only
intransitive conjugation with consistent /i/ before the personal endings.

The class of verbs represented by kelusi "I speak", though conjugated in precisely the same manner as the regular reflexives is not reflexive in the sense we have used the term above. It would therefore seem more reasonable to relegate it to that section of Middle Voice in which we have the verbs of undergoing and of resultant state, and point out that both the reflexives and some of the verbs of resultant state and of undergoing possess a thematic vowel /i/ which deletes before the plural morpheme. While this leaves us again with the dual forms unmarked for duality it nevertheless suggests two possibilities for the segment -ul- in the plural forms. These are:

1) that it replaces the thematic vowel -i-, common to the singular and dual, in the plural forms.

2) that it is an extension of the regular plural morpheme, -ti-, for simple AIs, giving /ulti/ as the plural morpheme for Middle Voice verbs.

This latter is the more obvious choice if we accept that thematic vowel /i/ invariably deletes before the plural morpheme.
Middle Voice: Verbs of Undergoing

The analysis above holds for the true reflexives and Middle Voice verbs which follow the pattern of kelusi, but we are confronted with a different problem altogether when we attempt to deal with verbs such as ninka:si "I stop" and pemiyey "I walk". Though it is obvious that the subject of the action is also the object affected by the action it is not so in the same manner as it would be were it subject and object of the true reflexives. Indeed, we are perhaps more correct in identifying these Middle Voice verbs as "verbs of undergoing", a proposal which Bloomfield would seem to accept. But having accomplished this much there still exists the question concerning the basis on which we would group under the verbs of undergoing two apparently different verbs as ninka:si and pemiyey. Perhaps the paradigms of these verbs will permit us to see the reason for it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ninka:si</th>
<th>pemiyey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ninka:si</td>
<td>pemiyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninka:si</td>
<td>pemiyet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninka:si</td>
<td>pemiyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninka:ti:kw</td>
<td>pemati:kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ninka:tiyek</td>
<td>pematiyek</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is immediately clear from these paradigms that there exists an inconsistency between the singular and dual forms and furthermore between these and the plural forms. Our analysis of the endings of *ninka:si* shows them to be consistent with our expectations for intransitives. At the same time we observe the element `-a:s-` which would seem to come from the PA AI final `*-a:so`, a middle reflexive denoting verbs of undergoing. This, of course, pertains only to the singular forms for as soon as we contemplate the dual forms we notice that `-a:s-` has become `-a:t-`. These forms may be from the PA II final `*-a:te:`, but why the singular forms should use the animate final and the dual forms the inanimate we are at a loss to explain, just as we are at a loss to explain the complete disappearance of the final from the plural forms of *ninka:si*. It may be that the introduction of the plural

| ninka:tiyok | pema:tiyok |
| ninka:tiçik | pema:tiçik |
| ninka:tikel | pema:tikel |
| ninkita:yikw | pemita:yikw |
| ninkita:yek | pemita:yek |
| ninkita:yok | pemita:yok |
| ninkita:çik | pemita:çik |
| ninkita:kel | pemita:kel |
morpheme has had an effect on the final, but if such be the case it is also true that in the plural forms the final has had an effect on the plural morpheme for, as our analysis shows, the normal plural morpheme is not only extended but has also been subject to a measure of change in its form. Fidelholtz explains this as a-metathesis, and in this case, we are inclined to agree with him.

The segment -i- which follows the final in the dual forms could be either the thematic vowel of the verb or the dual morpheme. Since it is improbable that it should represent both notions simultaneously or alternatively, and since it appears that in general the dual forms are unmarked for duality, it is more probable that it is the thematic vowel of this particular verb.

Finals and endings for verbs such as ninka:si would then appear as follows:

\[-a:s-i \quad -a:t-i-ikw \quad -ita:-y-ikw\]
\[-a:s-i-n \quad -a:t-i-y-ek \quad -ita:-y-ek\]
\[-a:s-i-t \quad -a:t-i-y-ok \quad -ita:-y-ok\]
\[-a:s-i-t \quad -a:t-i-y-ok \quad -ita:-y-ok\]
\[-a:s-i-k \quad -a:t-i-x-el \quad -ita:-k-el\]

The verb pemiyey, while incorporating a number of features common to ninka:si, also has certain features which are peculiar to itself.
Closer analysis of the singular forms shows the following:

\[ \text{pem-i-y-e-y} \]
\[ \text{pem-i-y-e-n} \]
\[ \text{pem-i-y-e-t} \]
\[ \text{pem-i-y-a-k} \]

in which are found:

1) a root, \text{pem-}
2) a final, \text{-i-}
3) a linking yod between vowels
4) an AI thematic vowel, \text{-e-}
5) an II thematic vowel, \text{-a-}, and
6) the regular intransitive singular personal endings: \text{-y, -n, -t, -k}.

We note the presence of an II thematic vowel which was not observable in any of the other intransitive verbs dealt with.

In the dual forms we can only presume that the elements \text{-a:t-i-} come about by analogy with verbs such as \text{ninka:si}.

In the plural forms we have again the plural allomorph \text{-ita:-}.

In brief, we note the following:

1) The personal and inflexional endings listed
earlier, and the restrictions there stated, remain unchanged.

2) Preceding these endings, in the singular, are the AI finals -aːs- and -i- (see nemivey). In the dual, they are preceded by the II final -aːt-, and in the plural, by the plural allomorph, -itaː-. 

3) ñ-metathesis seems to occur in the plural morpheme.
Subjunctive

This leaves us to consider the pronominal prefixes which in Micmac occur only in the subjunctive (that is, of course, in our consideration of the Micmac verb), where the notion implied is that "someone wants me (you, him, etc.) to do something." In this connection we have restricted ourselves to the forms for "I want to ..." and "I want you, him, etc., to ..." Thus:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{ni:n} & \text{kikin} & \text{npuwan} & \text{ntalasutaman} \\
\text{ni:n} & \text{kikin} & \text{kpuwan} & \text{ktalasutaman} \\
\text{ni:n} & \text{ukikin} & \text{upuwan} & \text{utalasutaman} \\
\text{ni:n} & \text{kikininu} & \text{kpuwaninu} & \text{ktalasutamaninu} \\
\text{ni:n} & \text{nikixin} & \text{npuwanin} & \text{ntalasutamanin} \\
\text{ni:n} & \text{kikinii} & \text{kpuwani} & \text{ktalasutaminiw} \\
\text{ni:n} & \text{ukikinii} & \text{upuwni} & \text{utalasutaminiw} \\
\end{array}
\]

Abstracting from this the various roots (-kikin- "count", -puwa- "dream", and -alasutama- "pray", respectively) we are left with the following prefixes and endings:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{n-...-n} & \text{nt-...-n} \\
\text{k-...-n} & \text{kt-...-n} \\
\end{array}
\]
We notice, with reference to -kilğı- and -puwa-, that in other instances we have as the stem ekilğı- and pepuwa-, respectively. The addition of the pronominal prefix to the verb stem seems to have caused a shift in its normal stress pattern. Consequently we have here instances of stem contraction affecting the initial vowel of the verb stem.

An interesting phenomenon in the second set of prefixes and endings is the occurrence of the consonant $t$ between the prefix and the initial vowel of the verb stem. Fidelholz explains this by creating a system of rules for inserting this consonant in contexts where the prefix would otherwise precede a stem beginning with a grave vowel or with a syllabic consonant. Another system of rules would delete the $t$ in all other contexts. We, however, will content ourselves with pointing out that 1) this consonant does in fact occur in the above-mentioned contexts and is noticeably absent from all others, and that 2) PA used the connective $-t-$ between prefixes and all
initial vowels. It obviously has been lost in some cases, for example, nkilki- < n(ə)tki- < net(ə)ki- < *netaki-.

Being homorganic with a it would be lost in this form and the loss may have spread analogically to the rest.

We therefore proceed to list the following as the pronominal prefixes and endings of the subjunctive "I want to ..., I want you, him, etc., to....":

\[
\begin{align*}
I--me & \quad n--\cdot-n \\
I--thou & \quad k--\cdot-n \\
I--him & \quad u--\cdot-n \\
I--us (I) & \quad k--\cdot-ninu \\
I--us (E) & \quad n--\cdot-nin \\
I--you & \quad k--\cdot-niw \\
I--them & \quad u--\cdot-niw
\end{align*}
\]

to which we add that when the pronominal prefixes precede a stem beginning with a grave vowel or with a syllabic consonant, the consonant \( \ddagger \) is inserted between the prefix and the verb stem, this \( \ddagger \) being an historical remnant of a PA connective between the vowel of the prefix and the initial vowel of the stem.
III. Personal and Inflexional Endings of Micmac Transitive Verbs

A. Transitive Animate

We have seen that the personal and inflexional endings associated with intransitive verbs are directly related to the subject of the verb, indicating its person, number and gender. But when we come to consider the endings of transitive verbs we perceive that they denote a subject-object relationship. Therefore, as the basis of the discussion which is to follow we give the paradigms for the verbs **nuːtaːk** "I hear him" and **nemiːk** "I see him".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nuːtaːk</th>
<th>nuːtaːkik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hear him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtaːk</td>
<td>nuːtaːkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou hearest him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtaːk</td>
<td>nuːtaːkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he hears him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtuwaːčel</td>
<td>nuːtuwaːči</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we hear him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtaːkw</td>
<td>nuːtaːkwik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we hear him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtaːket</td>
<td>nuːtaːketik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you hear him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtuwoːkw</td>
<td>nuːtuwoːkwik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they hear him (them)</td>
<td>nuːtuwaːtičel</td>
<td>nuːtuwaːtiči</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nemiːk</th>
<th>nemiːkik</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see him (them)</td>
<td>nemiːk</td>
<td>nemiːkik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou seest him (them)</td>
<td>nemiːt</td>
<td>nemiːtik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he sees him (them)</td>
<td>nemiyaːčel</td>
<td>nemiyaːči</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
we see him (them) nemi:kw nemi:kwik
we see him (them) nemi:ket nemi:kečik
you see him (them) nemi:yokw nemi:yokwik
they see him (them) nemi:ya:tičel nemi:ya:tiči

The endings of the verb forms cited here can be traced back to the personal endings of the PA conjunct order. For example, the form nuita:k would have come from *no:ntaw-ak-. In this verb, the -aw- of the stem and the -a- of the personal ending would have been reduced to -a:- (→awa- → -a:-) and the form nuita:k is therefore historically regular. In the "he—him" form, however, the personal ending contains a long vowel and the group *-awa:- is reduced to -uwa:-, so that the form nui:tuwa:čel is also historically regular if one discounts the final obviative morpheme (-el).

This has led to a certain amount of morphophonemic variation in the Micmac TA personal endings in which the following themes can be found: -a:-, -a:, -uwa:-, -uwo:-, -i:-, -iya:-, -iyo:-.

The major difference between the first and second persons singular and plural is that the plural forms have added the animate plural marker to the singular. In the case of the second person singular and the first person exclusive forms this has resulted in a minor change of the personal endings -t and -ket to -č- and -keč- under the
influence of the vowel \( i \) of the following plural morpheme.

The third singular forms which we have already mentioned are historically regular but singular and plural obviative morphemes have been added to them. The same singular and plural obviative morphemes have been added to the third person plural but the personal ending of this latter form is not historically regular and has obviously been reshaped. (The PA form would have been *noiintaw-a:wait-\( -a \).)

Our analysis of the third person forms does indicate the presence of an obviative singular ending -el and an obviative plural ending -i. This, in a way, is a little disconcerting since we note that Fidelholtz, in his observation of the Micmac of Restigouche, does not distinguish an obviative plural ending for his third person forms; Pacifique does. To add to the already existing confusion, we would point out that when first making notes of the third person forms to be later recorded our informant gave all forms such as "he hits them" with an obviative plural ending -i. But when we came to record the information the first few expressions elicited definitely showed the regular plural ending -ik, the remainder then conforming to the earlier pattern. Do we explain this as a lapse due perhaps to our having overworked our informant by having asked for so many different forms that he was momentarily confused? On the basis of
our present information we would prefer to accept an obviative plural ending -i until it can be reasonably shown that the TA third person forms with plural ending -ik are the rule and are not due to momentary confusion.

Therefore, before proceeding to a discussion of the first and second person object endings, we list here the animate personal and inflexional endings dealt with up to this point:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Object Ending</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I--him</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou--him</td>
<td>-a (〜-i:)-t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he--him</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iya:)-č-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--him</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)-kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--him</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)-ket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you--him</td>
<td>-uwo (〜-iyö)-kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they--him</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iya:)-tič-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I--them</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)-k-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou--them</td>
<td>-a (〜-i:)-č-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he--them</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iya:)-č-ı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--them</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)-kw-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--them</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)-keč-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you--them</td>
<td>-uwo (〜-iyö)-kw-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they--them</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iya:)-tič-ı</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first and second person object forms of the two
verbs given above show the following pattern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Nu:tuwin</th>
<th>Nu:twiyek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thou hearest me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td>Nu:twit</td>
<td>Nu:tuwinamit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He hears me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td>Nu:twiyok</td>
<td>Nu:twiyek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You hear me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td>Nu:tu:ci:k</td>
<td>Nu:tuwinami:ci:k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They hear me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Nemi:n</th>
<th>Nemi:yaek</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thou seest me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td>Nemi:t</td>
<td>Nemi:namit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td>Nemi:yaok</td>
<td>Nemi:yaek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You see me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td>Nemi:ci:k</td>
<td>Nemi:nami:ci:k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They see me (us, Excl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Nu:tu:l</th>
<th>Nu:tu:lok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I hear you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td>Nu:task</td>
<td>Nu:tu:lok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He hears you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nu:tu:lkw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He hears us (Incl.)</td>
<td>Nu:tu:lek</td>
<td>Nu:tu:lek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We hear you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td>Nu:taskik</td>
<td>Nu:tu:lok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They hear you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nu:tu:lkw:ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They hear us (Incl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Nemu:l</th>
<th>Nemu:lok</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I see you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td>Nemi:ak</td>
<td>Nemu:lok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nemu:lkw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He sees us (Incl.)</td>
<td>Nemu:lek</td>
<td>Nemu:lek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We see you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They see you (sg., pl.)</td>
<td>Nemi:skik</td>
<td>Nemu:lok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They see us (Incl.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nemu:lkw:ik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is readily discernable from (a) that the morpheme -i-, which is common to all forms, denotes a first person object. It does not, however, represent the notion of action by the third person upon the first person inclusive (since the inclusive includes the second person). This, as shown in (b), is denoted by the theme -u:l-, presumably from PA *-eG- (vowel backed by influence of following y, a regularly occurring phenomenon). It is also to be noted that theme -u:l- (~-as-~i:s-) generally denotes a second person object, singular or plural.

Comparison of the third person plural forms with third person singular shows the addition of the regular plural ending -ik to the singular and, in the case of (a), resultant morphophonemic change of person marker -t- to -5- in the context of this ending.

In the forms "he (they)--us (Excl.)" the segment -nami~nami5- marks the first person plural exclusive object. The morpheme is naturally plural, therefore -ik distinguishes the plural subject. The third person forms of (b) show the regular plural ending -ik to distinguish between "he (they)--thee", but does not indicate any distinction between "he (they)--you". "He (They)--us (Incl.)" evidence the regular plural marker.

In the forms "he (they)--you" we find a repetition of the ending for "I--you". This, it has been pointed out to us, is an instance of syncretism which has resulted
from the reduction of the PA morphology.

Thus we can now summarize the endings for first and second person objects as follows:

a) thou--me
   he--me
   you--me
   they--me

thou--us (Excl.)
he--us (Excl.)
you--us (Excl.)
they--us (Excl.)

b) I--thee
   he--thee
   we--thee
   they--thee
   I--you
   he--you
   he--us (Incl.)
   we--you
   they--you
   they--us (Incl.)
B. Transitive Inanimate

Representative of the class of true transitive inanimate verbs we have the verb nu:tem "to hear it", for which the TI paradigm follows:

I hear it nu:tem
thou hearest it nu:temen
he hears it nu:tk

thou and I hear it nu:temuwikw
he and I hear it nu:temek
you two hear it nu:temok
they two hear it nu:temi:ti:

you and I hear it nu:temu:ti:kw
they and I hear it nu:temu:tiyek
you all hear it nu:temu:tiyok
they all hear it nu:temu:ti:di:

The most significant feature of the TI forms in comparison with the TAs is that they show dual and plural forms, similar in this respect to the intransitives, distinguishing between the two sets of forms by means of the special plural marker -u:ti-. Beside this we note also the recurrent element -em- which appears to be the
reflex of PA TI theme *-am-. This theme is not found in the PA third person singular form and is likewise missing from the Micmac third person singular. The dual has the PA plural morphology and the plural has -em- plus AI endings. The endings, then, and the PA forms for which they are Newfoundland Micmac reflexes are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>PA Form</th>
<th>Micmac Reflex</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I--it</td>
<td>*-ama:n-</td>
<td>-em</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou--it</td>
<td>*-aman-</td>
<td>-em-en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he--it</td>
<td>*-ank</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--it</td>
<td>*-amankw-</td>
<td>-em-uwikw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--it</td>
<td>*-amank-</td>
<td>-em-ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you--it</td>
<td>*-ame:kw-</td>
<td>-em-ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they--it</td>
<td>*-amowa:t-</td>
<td>-em-iti-ɔ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Apart from this we have also found numerous examples of pseudo-TIs. Representative of them are the verbs

kekina:ma:tu "I teach it" and kelutu "I speak to it".

kekina:ma:tu               kelutu
The segment -tu-\~\~-tu-\~ appears to be the Micmac form of the PA TI final *-to:~*-hto:~. This being noted, we list our pseudo-TI endings as follows:

I--it -tu
thou--it -tu:-n
he--it -to-k

we--it -tu-w-ikw
we--it -tu-w-ok
you--it -tu-w-ok
they--it -tu:-ti:č
we--it - tu:ti-ikw
we--it - tu:ti-y-ek
you--it - tu:ti-y-ok
they--it - tu:ti-çi-ik

he--them - to-k-el
they--them - tu:ti-çi-el

In this case no theme sign intervenes between the final and the personal or inflexional endings. They are therefore added directly to the verb.
IV. Intransitivity and Transitivity

We are now in a position to define the morphology of the verb in Newfoundland Micmac. In general it conforms remarkably well to the morphology of the Proto-Algonkian verb as defined by Bloomfield and Goddard, that is:

(prefix)-root-(medial)-final-endings.

The elements enclosed by parentheses may or may not be in any particular verb but all verbs appear to have a root and endings, and most, if not all, have a final.

Verbs, as we have noted, fit into two broad categories in Algonkian and in Newfoundland Micmac: they may be intransitive, that is, they have a subject but no object, or, in the case of the reflexive intransitives, an object which is at one and the same time the subject; or, they may be transitive, in which case they have an object which is definitely distinct from the subject.

Each category is further divided on the basis of gender, that is, in the case of the intransitives, whether the subject is animate or inanimate; in the case of the transitives, whether the object of the verb is animate or inanimate.

Each verb category also has person and number. For intransitives this means first, second and third persons.
singular; first person inclusive, first person exclusive, second and third persons, dual and plural. The transitives have the same persons but differ internally in that TAs have only singular and plural number while TIs also have dual. Both these aspects, in addition to those noted above, are marked in the morphology of the verb ending.

The distinction between the intransitive and the transitive verbs is seen, on the one hand, in the finals which each use, but more clearly, on the other, in their endings. Thus we may describe the morphology of the endings of the intransitive verbs as follows:

- thematic vowel-(pl. morph.)-pers. mkr.-(pl. mkr.).

and its operation in accordance with the following guidelines:

1) The plural morpheme is dispensed with when the persons singular or dual are under consideration; in this respect the dual is not a plural but stands in contrast to the marked plurals. It may also be noted that the plural marker -ik is added to the third person dual forms in the AI (but omitted from the TI).

2) Since first and second persons are considered naturally animate, the first distinction between animate and inanimate subjects occurs in the third person singular forms in the normal opposition of the personal ending -t
(animate) to -k (inanimate). In this regard it was found that the animate ending was -k after sonorants (that is, nasals, liquids, and glides).

3) In the dual forms of the verb animateness of the subject in the third person is denoted by the animate person marker -x- (or -k- after sonorants) and the plural ending -ik, inanimateness by the inanimate person marker -k- and the plural ending -el.

4) All segments of the morphology function in the plural forms of the verb—the thematic vowel (when it does not delete in the context of following plural morpheme), the plural morpheme, the person marker and the plural endings.

The morphology of the transitive endings is a little more complex. Whereas the endings of the intransitives tell us the status of the acting subject, those of the transitives tell us both the status of the subject and of the object being acted upon. Thus we observe the following morphological pattern for the endings of transitive verbs:

- (theme) - person marker - plural marker

the distinction between TA and TI being denoted by the type of final used and generally by the theme sign, -em-, in the TI forms.
The theme sign is a significant feature of the TA forms since it indicates the nature of the relationship existing between the subject and the object of the verb: theme -a:- denotes action by the first, second and third persons upon a third person object; theme -i- denotes action by second person upon first person object, and by third person upon a first person singular and first person exclusive plural object; and, theme -u:- denotes action by first person upon second person objects, and of third person upon second person singular and plural objects, as well as third person upon first person inclusive plural objects.

In the case of a third person subject acting upon a third person object the person marker following the theme, -a:-, is itself followed by an obviative marker, -el, if the object is singular; -i, if plural. This obviative marker relates to the third person object marker and indicates that it is considered as spatially and temporally at one remove from the subject or third person proximate.

In addition to this we also find a number of pseudo-TIs in which, since they have no theme sign, the endings are added directly to the TI final, or to the stem if there is no recognizable final.

These, then, are the main features of transitive and intransitive verbs. In the pages following we will list
examples of the two categories, analyzed as best we have been able to do, with any appropriate comments we feel we can make about them with reasonable certainty.
Intransitives

We will deal first with the intransitive verbs. In order to simplify and clarify what we intend in listing the verbs available to us at the moment, we present the following schematic representation of the third person forms of a sample verb, atkite:m- "cry, weep", showing our analysis of third person singular, dual and plural forms, animate and inanimate.

nekem atkite:m-i-t
   he cries
   : : : third person animate personal ending, denoting an animate singular subject
   : : : AI thematic vowel
   : : : stem
   : : : third person singular personal pronoun

nekemo atkite:m-i-č-ik
   they (two) cry
   : : : : : : third person animate marker, morphological variant of -t-

nekemo atkite:m-ulti-č-ik
   they all cry
nekem atkite:m-i-k it cries, there is crying

third person inanimate

personal ending, denoting an inanimate subject

nekemo atkite:m-i-k-el they (two) cry

nekemo atkite:m-ulti-k-el they all cry

II plural ending

Needless to say, though this covers all six possible third person forms, we do not always have all forms available or listed. The reader, however, on the basis of the above sketches can determine for himself the forms we have given and use them to construct with reasonable accuracy those which are not included.

The lists are divided into three sections: a) the regular intransitives, b) the reflexive and middle voice verbs, and c) the "verbs of undergoing". In section (a) we would call attention to the verbs nemikwit "he grows up" and kisikwit "he grows up, matures", which seem to illustrate AI, II finals -k- from the PA AI, II finals *-ki, *-kene, wherein we find the prefinal -k- denoting "growth and shape". Though this may be but a fanciful conjecture on our part, the meanings of the verbs in question do tend to verify it.
a) Regular intransitives

elukw-i-t work
elukw-uti-č-ik
elukw-i-k
elukw-i-k-el
wekoy-i-t get angry
wekoy-uti-č-ik
wekoy-i-k
wekoy-i-k-cl

wacu:p-i-t be full (of water)
wacu:p-iti-č-ik
wacu:p-i-k
wacu:p-i-k-el

ekwitam-i-t fish
ekwitam-iti-č-ik
ekwitam-i-k
ekwitam-i-k-el

kemu:ten-i-t steal
kemu:ten-ati-č-ik
kemu:ten-i-k
kemu:ten-i-k-el
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kekeka: Mw-i-t</th>
<th>Teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kekeka: Mw-a:ti-c-ik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekeka: Mw-i-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekeka: Mw-i-k-el</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekeu: Kisuw-i-t</td>
<td>Climb up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekeu: Kisuw-a:ti-c-ik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekeu: Kisuw-i-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekeu: Kisuw-i-k-el</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakani: K-i-t</td>
<td>Bail (water out of boat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakani: K-a:ti-c-ik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakani: K-i-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakani: K-i-k-el</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesal-i-t</td>
<td>Stink</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesal-a:ti-c-ik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesal-i-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kesal-i-k-el</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eki: Li-c-i-t</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eki: Li-a:ti-c-ik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eki: Li-i-k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eki: Li-i-k-el</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun-e-t</td>
<td>Suckle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nun-o:ti-c-ik</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
num-e-k
num-e-k-el

pemikw-i-t grow up
pemiku-ti-č-ik
pemikw-i-k
pemiku-ti-k-el

kisikw-i-t grow up, mature
kisiku-ti-č-ik
kisikw-i-k
kisikw-i-k-el

ne:p-a-t sleep
ne:p-a:-ti-č-ik
ne:p-a-k sleeping
ne:p-a-k-el

alpulkuw-a-t stagger about
alpulkuw-a:-ti-č-ik
alpulkuw-a-k
alpulkuw-a-k-el

pe:w-a-t dream
pe:w-a:-ti-č-ik
pe:w-a-k
pe:w-a-k-el

kisamkw-a-t        drink
kisamkw-a:-ti-č-ik
kisamkw-a-k
kisamkw-a-k-el

kwitam-a-t         smoke
kwitam-a:-ti-č-ik
kwitam-a-k
kwitam-a-k-el

wisimkw-a-t        run away, flee
wisimkw-a:-ti-č-ik
wisimkw-a-k
wisimkw-a-k-el

amalk-a-t          dance
amalk-a:-ti-č-ik
amalk-a-k
amalk-a-k-el

mesenu-t           be caught
mesenu-č-ik
mesenu-k
mesenu-k-el
mekwe:-k  be red
mekwe:-k-ik
mekwe:-k
mekwe:-k-el

wičakam-i-y-e-t  boil
wičakam-i-y-a:-č-ik
wičakam-i-y-a:ti-č-ik
wičakam-i-y-a-k
wičakam-i-y-a-k-el

etokt-e-t  cook
etokt-a:ti-č-ik
etokt-e-k
etokt-e-k-el

b) Mid voice and reflexive intransitives

kelus-i-t  speak
kelus-i-č-ik
kelus-ulti-č-ik
kelus-i-k
kelus-i-k-el

atalasam-i-t  rest
atalasam-i-č-ik
atalasam-ulti-č-ik
atalasam-i-k
atalasam-i-k-el

pap-i-t play, rompse
pap-i-č-ik
pap-ulti-č-ik
pap-i-k
pap-i-k-el

mima:č-i-t be alive
mima:č-i-č-ik
mima:č-ulti-č-ik
mima:č-i-k as of a growing stick
mima:č-i-k-el

mekw-i-t be swollen
mekw-ulti-č-ik
mekw-i-k
mekw-i-k-el

meskil-k be big
meskil-ulti-č-ik
meski: k
meski: k-el
telkil-k be that size
telkil-ulti-č-ik
telki:-k
telki:-k-el

pit:s-i-t be inside
pit:s-ulti-č-ik
pit:t-e-k
pit:t-e-k-el

c) Verbs of undergoing

wuntak:a:s-i-t get quiet
wuntak-ita:-č-ik
wuntak:a:s-i-k
wuntak-ita:-k-el

siptak:a:s-i-t stretch
siptak-ita:-č-ik
siptak:a:s-i-k
siptak-ita:-k-el

nink:a:s-i-t stop
nink-ita:-č-ik
nink:a:s-i-k
nink-ita:-k-el
se:wisk-a:s-i-t break
se:wisk-it:a:-t-ik
se:wisk-a:s-i-k
se:wisk-a:it-a:-k-el

ma:č-a:s-i-t move
ma:č-it:a:-č-ik
ma:č-a:s-i-k
ma:č-it:a:-k-el

mil-a:s-i-t play
mil-it:a:-č-ik
mil-a:s-i-k
mil-it:a:-k-el

ketap-a:s-i-t dive, sink
ketap-it:a:-č-ik
ketap-a:s-i-k
ketap-it:a:-k-el

pem-i-y-e-t walk around
pem-it:a:-č-ik
pem-i-y-a-k
pem-it:a:-k-el

tse:w-i-y-e-t kwičimuk go outdoors
te:w-its:č-ik kwidišimuk

(te:w-i-y-a-k kwidišimuk)

te:w-its:-k-el kwidišimuk

el-i-y-e-t
go

el-its:č-ik

el-i-y-a-k

el-i-y-a-k-el
Transitives

Although a clear example of a true TI verb (see nu:tem, above) was obtained, most verbs for which TI forms were elicited revealed pseudo-TI forms as a counterpart to their regular TA forms. We therefore present the following schematic representation of a sample verb showing the various aspects of the TA and pseudo-TI cum TI forms.

ne kem wiš-kwa:-l-a:-y-el (-1) he brings him, them, along

- TA obviative plural ending, replaces -el
- TA obviative singular ending, indicating animate object
- third person marker, indicating that subject is animate
- TA theme, denoting action by third person proximate on third person obviative
- TA abstract final from PA *-Q-
- root, suggesting movement from one place to another
- prefix "along with"
- third person proximate singular pronoun, initiator of the action
The transitive verbs which follow have been grouped largely on the basis of the final which each employs. The first, and by far the largest, group consists of those verbs which have TA final -l- and TI final -to- or -t- from PA TA, TI abstract finals *-Q and *-to:*-t. The second group includes those verbs whose stem ends a) with a vowel, b) with a consonant, and which in the TA forms do not indicate the presence of a recognizable final. The verb wiče:uwa:čel also shows a TI form devoid of a final (wiče:ivokw). The remaining groups we will class under a third group and comment upon them along the way.

1) mimkwa:-l-a:č-el (-i) hide away
   mimkwa:-to-k (-el)

apkwa:-l-a:č-el (-i) untie
apkwa:-to-k (-el)

čikwa:-l-a:č-el bring
čikwa:-to-k (-el)
e:puska:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  look
e:puska:-to-k (-el)

ninka:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  stop
ninka:-to-k (-el)

set:wiska:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  break s.o., sth.
set:wiska:-to-k (-el)

mačya:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  move
mačya:-to-k (-el)

kesispa:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  wash
kesispa:-to-k (-el)

tema:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  break s.o., sth., off
tema:-to-k (-el)

wičakama:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  bring s.o., sth., to a boil
wičakama:-to-k (-el)

sama:-l-a:-č-el (-i)  touch
sama:-to-k (-el)

pekisu-l-a:-č-el (-i)  bring
pekisu-to-k (-el)
amipu-1-a:-č-el (-i) smear s.o., sth., up
amipu-t-k (-el)

eskima:-l-a:-č-el (-i) wait for
eskima:-to-k (-el)

kesa:-l-a:-č-el (-i) like
kesa:-to-k (-el)

čipa:-l-a:-č-el (-i) care for
čipa:-to-k (-el)

pe:wa:-l-a:-č-el (-i) dream about
pe:wa:-to-k (-el)

nuna:-l-a:-č-el (-i) suckle
nuna:-to-k (-el)

2. a) nemiy-a:-č-el (-i) see
     nemi-to-k (-el)

kečiy-a:-č-el (-i) know
keči-to-k (-el)

wičiy-a:-č-el (-i) find
wiči-to-k (-el)
This third group consists of a heterogeneous collection of a number of smaller groups from our corpus.

pe:wi:y-a: -el (-i)  dream about
pe:wi-to-k (-el)

elukow-a: -el (-i)  work for
elukow-at-k (-el)  fix

punače:yiw-a: -el (-i)  leave alone
punače:yo-t-k (-el)

wiče:w-a: -el (-i)  go with
wiče:yo-kw (-el)

2. b) či:m-at- -el (-i)  scull
či:m-a:to-k (-el)

ne:p-a: -el (-i)  kill
ne:p-a:to-k (-el)

ankun-a: -el (-i)  cover
ankun-o:t-k (-el)

kekin-amow-a: -el (-i)  teach
kekin-am-o-k (-el)
of transitive verbs.

a) We have here verbs which show TA, TI finals -m-, -t-, derived from PA TA, TI *-am, *-ant "by mouth, eat, bite."

muskwa-m-ːː-el (-i)      lick
muskwa-t-k (-el)

wesku-m-ːː-el (-i)      talk to
wesku-t-k (-el)

eki-m-ːː-el (-i)      count
eki-t-k (-el)

b) TA, TI finals -ːːilm-, -ːːt-, from PA TA, TI *-ːːlem, *-ːːlent "by thought."

mikwit-ːːilm-a:-ːː-el (-i)  think about
mikwit-ːːt-k (-el)

ankit-ːːilm-a:-ːː-el (-i)  think of
ankit-ːːt-k (-el)

pepsit-ːːilm-a:-ːː-el (-i)  mistreat
pepsit-ːːt-k (-el)
powašit-e:lim-a:-č-el (-i)  
  hate
powašit-e:š-k (-el)

c) TA, TI finals -(V)n-, from PA TA, TI *-en "by hand."
The last example also has the TA final -amow-, from PA TA
  *-amaw, added to TI stems to form double-goal verbs.

  keku-n-a:-č-el (-i)  
  have
  keku-n-k (-ek)

  kel-n-a:-č-el (-i)  
  hold
  kel-no-k (-el)

  melk-en-a:-č-el (-i)  
  hold on tight
  melk-en-k (-el)

  apok-on-amow-a:-č-el (-i)  
  help
  apok-on-k (-el)

d) TA, TI finals -t-, from PA TA, TI finals *-?taw, *-?t
  or *-?to:, which when added to Al stems denote action
  relative to an object. In the first two examples we
  appear to have a TI theme -e:-.

  peskona-t-a:-č-el (-i)  
  knock down with hand
  peskona-t-e:-š-k (-el)
nes-t-a:-č-el (-el)  knock down, over
nes-t-e:-k (-el)

pekisi-t-a:-č-el (-el)  carry a lot of s.o., sth.
pekisi-to-k (-el)

e) TA, TI finals -a:l-, -a:t-, from PA TA, TI *a?-l-, *a?-to: "place."

kemu:ten-a:l-a:-č-el (-el)  steal
kemu:ten-a:t-k (-el)

pem-nik-a:l-a:-č-el (-el)  carry on one's back
pem-nik-a:t-k (-el)

f) Verbs which appear to have TA, TI finals -(V)k-, from PA TA, TI *-ehkw, *ehk "by foot or body movement," but which otherwise do not seem to fit into our scheme of object endings.

nis-i:k-i:-č-el (-el)  heave down
nis-i:k-i:-č (-el)

tem-ek-i:-č-el (-el)  smash off
tem-e:k-i:-č (-el)
etšikel-ek-i-č-el (-i) throw over
etšikel-e: k-i-č (-el)

kismokč-ik-i-č-el (-i) push
kismokč-i:k-i-č (-el)

g) nut-uwa:č-el (-i) hear
nut-k (-el)
nest-uwa:č-el (-i) understand
nesto-k (-el)

etele:west-uwa:č-el (-i) talk to
etele:westo-k (-el)

ketelams-ét-uwa:č-el (-i) believe
ketelams-ét-k (-el)

"TA, TI finals -et-, from PA TA, TI *-ehtaw, *eht
"hear."

kw-il-uwa:č-el (-i) look for
kw-il-k (-el)

kel takp-íl-a:č-el (-i) tie up
kel takp-íl-k (-el)
kell takp-it-k-el
ela:ki-pu-l-a:-č-el (-i) saw
ela:ki-to-k (-el)

tema:ki-pu-l-a:-č-el (-i) saw off
tema:ki-to-k (-el)

ketan-a:-č-el (-i) hunt for
ketan-to-k (-el)

wi:pi-m-a:-č-el (-i) sleep with
wi:pi-to-k (-el)

TA final -m- from PA TA *-m, added to AI stems containing root wi-: "along with," making verbs of accompaniment.

tak-am-a:-č-el (-i) hit
tak-to-k (-el)

men-isk-uwa:-č-el (-i) go to get
men-isko-k (-el)

TA, TI finals -isk(o)-, probably from PA TA, TI *-eškaw, *-ešk "by foot or body movement."
V. Tense and Mood

In our discussion of the past and future tenses of the Micmac verb we will confine ourselves to the indicative mood while at the same time considering the verbs *ekil*ę- "count" and *peiwa-* "dream" as being representative and the conclusions holding for these two as valid for all other verbs. Thus we present now the paradigms of these two verbs in the past tense "I was ...ing."

- **ekilčiyap**  
  **peiwayap**

- **ekilčîp**  
  **peiwa:p**

- **ekilčip**  
  **peiwap**

- **ekilčikus**  
  **peiwayikus**

- **ekilčiyeksep**  
  **peiwayeksep**

- **ekilčiyoksep**  
  **peiwayoksep**

- **ekilčipenik**  
  **peiwapenik**

- **ekilča:ti:kus**  
  **pe:wa:ti:kus**

- **ekilča:tiyeksep**  
  **pe:wa:tiyeksep**

- **ekilča:tiyoksep**  
  **pe:wa:tiyoksep**

- **ekilča:tipenik**  
  **pe:wa:tipenik**

On the basis of our earlier analyses we suggest that the past tense endings are:
In the first, second and third persons singular we would be hard pressed to find an ending which in any way corresponds to these same persons in the present. However, we do notice some familiar features in the dual and plural first and second person forms. It appears, for instance, that the plural morpheme and the person markers are intact and that for these persons the past tense marker follows the person marker. In the third person dual and plural we are unable to observe the original third person marker, but we do note that the segment which appears to denote past tense precedes the animate plural marker.

In general the past tense marker appears to include the segment -p. However, when we consider the first person dual and plural inclusive we find only an -s. Aware that Fidelholtz shows this ending to be -i:kap, we may at first be a little disturbed by its absence from our data. But we notice that Pacifique suggests three possible and alternant endings for the first person dual and plural inclusive past tense: -i:kus, -i:kup, and -i:kusp. Of the three it would seem that Newfoundland Micmac has kept the first alive, as well as Pacifique's

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Ending</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-y-ap</td>
<td>-iku-s</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-iku-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-y-ek-sep</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-y-ek-sep</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ip ~ -ap</td>
<td>-y-ok-sep</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-y-ok-sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-p</td>
<td>-pen-ik</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-pen-ik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Fidelholtz -i:kap
- Pacifique -i:kus, -i:kup, and -i:kusp
-itp as opposed to Fidelholtz's -itep for the second person singular form.

From the verb paradigms below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ekilę-i-te:s</th>
<th>puw-a-i-te:s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-i-tesk</td>
<td>puw-a-i-tesk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-i-te:w</td>
<td>puw-a-i-te:w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-i-tuksemi</td>
<td>puw-a-i-tuksemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-i-tesenin</td>
<td>puw-a-i-tesenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-i-toksep</td>
<td>puw-a-i-toksep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-i-tak</td>
<td>puw-a-i-tak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-a:ti-tuksemi</td>
<td>puw-a:ti-tuksemi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-a:ti-tesenin</td>
<td>puw-a:ti-tesenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-a:ti-toksep</td>
<td>puw-a:ti-toksep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ekilę-a:ti-tak</td>
<td>puw-a:ti-tak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We abstract the following future endings of the Micmac verbs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-te:s</th>
<th>-tuksenu</th>
<th>-(a:)ti-tuksenu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tesk</td>
<td>-tesenin</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-tesenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-te:w</td>
<td>-toksep</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-toksep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tak</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-tak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Beyond pointing out the presence of the segment -t- in all the future endings there appears to be no other general statement we can make about them. Thus we ought perhaps to content ourselves with a mere listing of the endings as they are and of the basic guidelines for the formation of the future tense of other verbs.

In addition to these we could note that the tenses given above and the present tense as well can be made to denote a perfective notion merely by placing the morpheme kis(i) "finish" before the tense in question. Thus kisi alasutamayap "I had been praying," kisi alasutamay "I have prayed," and kisi alasutamattiea "I shall have prayed."
Conclusion

What, then, are our conclusions? Have we found any differences, and, if so, may they be considered to be significant?

We must say that we have found the verb in Newfoundland Micmac to be fundamentally the same as that of mainland Micmac. This, of course, may be due to the fact that, its being the word in Micmac, its much use does not allow it to undergo any drastic morphological changes. We have noted, however, that some of the personal and inflexional endings are not identical to those which have been found elsewhere.

The other area in which major differences may possibly occur is with the transitive and intransitive verbs perse, especially with the transitives, in which the finals used by these verbs in Newfoundland Micmac may not be identical to those used in the Micmac of Nova Scotia or of Restigouche. However, in this area we are at a disadvantage inasmuch as we do not have a satisfactory corpus of such verbs with which to compare our findings. The reader of this paper may have access to such materials. If so, it would seem to be to our mutual advantage if he were to take upon himself the task of pursuing this matter further in an attempt to draw more pertinent and more definite conclusions with respect to the transitive verbs,
the finals which they use, and a comparison of such verbs for the Micmac of Restigouche, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.
Footnotes

Chapter I


8. How rapidly our sources are depleting! Since the first draft of this paper was written Peter Jeddore has also departed for the Indian "Happy-hunting ground."

Chapter II

1. John Hewson. Historically this /i/ seems to be a
relic of the marker of the indicative mode, preserved here between two consonants (See Bloomfield, p. 100, par. 45).
(Personal correspondence.)


Chapter III


2 Note that where the *鸥 gave 1, the preceding vowel has been generalized as /u:/.
Where *鸥 gave /s/ (in the cluster *鸥k → sk) the reflex of /a/ occurs as preceding vowel. (It's the endings *-akkw and *-akkw that gave preceding /u:1/ which became generalized.) (J. Hewson, personal correspondence.)

Chapter IV

1 Rule formulated by Fidelholtz, "Micmac Intransitive Verb Morphology" (forthcoming).
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Appendix I

1. personal pronouns
2. personal endings
3. AI thematic vowels
4. connective between theme vowel or vowel of the stem and the initial vowel of the personal ending
5. AI, II plural markers
6. plural morpheme
Appendix II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kekina:ma:-s-i</td>
<td>morpheme of reflexivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kekina:ma:-s-i-n</td>
<td>thematic vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kekina:ma:-s-i-t</td>
<td>thematic vowel /i/ deleted before plural morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kekina:ma:-s-i-k</td>
<td>plural morpheme for Middle Voice verbs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. morpheme of reflexivity
2. thematic vowel
3. thematic vowel /i/ deleted before plural morpheme
4. plural morpheme for Middle Voice verbs
Appendix III

nink-a:s-i  
nink-a:s-i-n  
nink-a:s-i-t  
nink-a:s-i-k

\[ \text{1) nink-a:t-i-ikw} \]
\[ \text{pem-a:t-i-ikw} \]
\[ \text{nink-a:t-i-y-ek} \]
\[ \text{pem-a:t-i-y-ek} \]
\[ \text{nink-a:t-i-y-ok} \]
\[ \text{pem-a:t-i-y-ok} \]
\[ \text{nink-a:t-i-ik} \]
\[ \text{pem-a:t-i-\check{c}-ik} \]
\[ \text{nink-a:t-i-k-el} \]
\[ \text{pem-a:t-i-k-el} \]

\[ \text{nink-ita:-y-ikw} \]
\[ \text{pem-ita:-y-ikw} \]
\[ \text{nink-ita:-y-ek} \]
\[ \text{pem-ita:-y-ek} \]
\[ \text{nink-ita:-y-ok} \]
\[ \text{pem-ita:-y-ok} \]
\[ \text{nink-ita:-\check{c}-ik} \]
\[ \text{pem-ita:-\check{c}-ik} \]
\[ \text{nink-ita:-k-el} \]
\[ \text{pem-ita:-k-el} \]

1. middle reflexive finals  
2. final  
3. II thematic vowel  
4. final and thematic vowel, presumably by analogy with \text{ninka:si}  
5. metathesized plural morpheme
### Appendix IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ni:n</th>
<th>n-kilchi-n</th>
<th>n-t-alasutama-n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k-kilchi-n</td>
<td>k-t-alasutama-n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u-kilchi-n</td>
<td>u-t-alasutama-n</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>k-kilchi-nimu</td>
<td>k-t-alasutama-nimu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>n-kilchi-nin</td>
<td>n-t-alasutama-nin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>k-kilchi-niw</td>
<td>k-t-alasutama-niw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>u-kilchi-niw</td>
<td>u-t-alasutama-niw</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. pronominal prefixes
2. subjunctive inflexional endings
3. connective
Appendix V (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Infinitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I--him</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou--him</td>
<td>-a (〜-i:)t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he--him</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iyat):c-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--him</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--him</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)ket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you--him</td>
<td>-uwo (〜-iyo):kw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they--him</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iyat):tiĉ-el</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I--them</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)k-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou--them</td>
<td>-a (〜-i:)ĉ-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he--them</td>
<td>uwa: (〜-iyat):ĉ-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--them</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)kw-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we--them</td>
<td>-a: (〜-i:)kĉ-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you--them</td>
<td>-uwo (〜-iyo):kw-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they--them</td>
<td>-uwa: (〜-iyat):tiĉ-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix V (b)

a) thou--me  -i-n
   he--me    -i-t
   you--me   -i-y-ok
   they--me  -i-i-ik

   thou--us (Excl.) -i-y-ek
   he--us (Excl.)  -i-namit
   you--us (Excl.) -i-y-ek
   they--us (Excl.) -i-namic-ik

b) I--thee    -u:l
   he--thee  -as (∼ -i:s)-k
   we--thee  -u:l-ek
   they--thee -as (∼ -i:s)-k-ik

   I--you     -u:l-ok
   he--you   -u:l-ok
   he--us (Incl.) -u:l-kw
   we--you   -u:l-ek
   they--you  -u:l-ok
   they--us (Incl.) -u:l-kw-ik
Appendix V (c)

I--it  -em
thou--it  -em-en
he--it  -ek

we--it  -em-uwikw
we--it  -em-ek
you--it  -em-ok
they--it  -em-i:ti-ɔ

we--it  -em-u:ti-ikw
we--it  -em-u:ti-y-ek
you--it  -em-u:ti-y-ok
they--it  -em-u:ti-ɔ-ik
## Appendix V (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thou</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-to:k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:w-ikw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:w-ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:w-ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:i-ti-(\cdot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:i-ti-ikw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:i-ti-y-ek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:i-ti-y-ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>-tu:i-ti-(\cdot)-ik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>-them</td>
<td>-to:k-(\cdot)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>-them</td>
<td>-tu:i-ti-(\cdot)-(\cdot)-cl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix VI

**Past tense**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Future Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-y-ap</td>
<td>-iku-s</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-iku-s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-y-ek-sep</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-y-ek-sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ip - ap</td>
<td>-y-ok-sep</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-y-ok-sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-p</td>
<td>-pen-ik</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-pen-ik</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Future**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Future Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-tcs</td>
<td>-tuksenu</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-tuksenu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-tesenin</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-tesenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tesk</td>
<td>-toksep</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-toksep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tew</td>
<td>-tak</td>
<td>-(a:)ti-tak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>