

## A MARKER OF FOCUS IN MANDAN DISCOURSE\*

Arok Wolvengrey

University of Manitoba

1.0 Mandan possesses a morpheme, represented here as /-eną/, that is most commonly suffixed to a nominal. Neither the exact form of this morpheme nor its function have been sufficiently investigated to date. An analysis of /-eną/ is complicated by many factors, not the least of which is the possibility that /-eną/ is not a unitary morpheme at all, but rather a complex of two morphemes. Despite the problematical nature of a morphemic characterization of /-eną/, it appears that one particular unitary function can be found for the number of forms in which /-eną/ can occur. This in turn suggests that a unitary analysis of /-eną/, despite its surface variations, is desirable. The surface form variation itself deserves a thorough investigation for its overall contribution to Mandan phonology. However, this is only a secondary goal of the current paper, and therefore such an investigation will be pursued only in so far as it adds to an understanding of the function of /-eną/ in Mandan discourse.

Four traditional Mandan narrative texts have been utilized in the current study. These are: "Coyote and Whirlwind Woman" (CWW), "Coyote and the Wild Potato" (CWP), "Coyote and Porcupine" (CP), and the "Speckled Arrow" (SA) text.<sup>1</sup> SA is taken directly from Kennard (1936:33-43). The other three texts, though originally collected by Kennard, have been edited by Hollow to fit his own analysis of the language (cf. Hollow 1965).<sup>2</sup>

2.0 Kennard (1936:26) isolated a suffix -ną as an "emphatic" marker. His separation of an emphatic -ną from /-eną/ was apparently facilitated by forms in which no vowel [e] occurs between the stem and -ną. The distribution of /-eną/ in the texts must be investigated to determine the environment in which [e] may be absent and thereby contribute to an understanding of the source of this [e].

Coberly (1979:57) suggested that Kennard analyzed /-eną/ as the combination of -ną with an indefinite -e. However, Kennard's (1936: 26 & 33 *passim*) textual analysis indicates that he believed this [e] could be either the indefinite marker or a homophonous general demonstrative. It is clear in many cases that the [e] in /-eną/ can not be a marker of indefiniteness, as /-eną/ often co-occurs with the definite marker -s. Thus, a general demonstrative in Mandan may be considered as a possible source of the [e] in /-eną/. Though rare, a general demonstrative [e] is attested in Mandan (Kennard 1936:27) and it compares to general demonstratives found in other Siouan languages and reconstructible for Proto-Siouan (Carter: personal communication).<sup>3</sup>

A further problem encountered in the analysis of /-eŋə/ is its status as a bound or free morpheme. Coberly (1979:57) pointed out that Kennard treated it as an enclitic which could optionally appear as a free word with independent word stress, but that Hollow treated it as a suffix at all times. Part of Hollow's work on Mandan, as has already been mentioned, included the regularization of texts collected by Kennard to reflect Hollow's own analysis. This is particularly true of Hollow's phonological analysis, but it is also possible that instances of /-eŋə/ represented as an independent word in Kennard's original texts were regularized to suffixes by Hollow. This is very important with respect to the four texts under scrutiny here. The three which were edited by Hollow have /-eŋə/ regularly represented as a suffix, while the lone text taken directly from Kennard (1936:33-43) exhibits a mixture of free and bound morphology.

As a result of these conditions, /-eŋə/ occurs in several surface forms in Mandan. In the four texts analyzed, 111 occurrences of this morpheme in one form or another were found. An initial survey of these examples yields the data in Table I on the occurrence of /-eŋə/ with and without the [e]. For the purposes of this table, occurrences of /-eŋə/ as a free-floating word have been omitted, leaving 103 examples.

Table I

Text	no [e]		[e]				
	StemV	-ŋə	Stem	-eŋə	+ Def -s	-eŋə	- total
CWW	6		6	+	22	-	28
CWP	4		1	+	9	-	10
CP	11		7	+	10	-	17
SA	12		13	+	2	-	15
Totals	33		27	+	43	-	70

The figures alone would be meaningless if they were not combined with the observation that the [e]-less forms occur only with vowel-final stems (StemV). Whenever a stem ends in a consonant or has the definite -s suffixed to it, the form with [e] occurs.<sup>4</sup>

This correlation of [e]-less forms of /-eŋə/ with vowel-final stems suggests that a morphophonemic process may be responsible for the absence or presence of [e]. Whether [e] is deleted following a vowel or epenthesized following a consonant is a question that can not be decided without reference to the actual function of /-eŋə/ in Mandan discourse. A survey of the function of -ŋə.

-eŋa and free-floating eŋa will perhaps serve to resolve this question, as well as contributing to the overall analysis of the function of /-eŋa/.

3.0 The figures in Table II illustrate the occurrence of various forms of /-eŋa/ on transitive subjects (agents or A), intransitive subjects (S), direct objects (DO), and other arguments of Mandan sentences. Those marked with the definite -s will obviously be definite, referential, given, etc. It is therefore not at all surprising to find that nearly all instances of /-eŋa/ in conjunction with the definite suffix occur on transitive subjects, which tend to be given and referential.<sup>5</sup>

Table II

role	StemV <u>-ŋa</u>	Stem <u>-eŋa</u>	Def <u>-s -eŋa</u>	<u>eŋa</u>	Totals
A	20	15	39	5	79
S	4	4	2	1	11
DO	5	5	1	-	11
OPost	2 (Loc)	2 (Inst&Loc)	-	-	4
OComp	-	1	-	1	2
Poss	1	-	1	-	2
Adv	1	-	-	1	2
Totals	33	27	43	8	111

More interesting are the numbers associated with -ŋa and -eŋa. When these are compared, there appears to be little or no functional difference whatsoever in the variation between -ŋa and -eŋa. Everything one can mark, the other can as well. This again suggests that the determining factor is indeed the preceding segment, vowel or consonant, to which /-eŋa/ is suffixed. The [e] is either an integral part of the suffix lost following a vowel, or a semantically empty vowel inserted for the purposes of syllabification. The key to determining the choice of one or the other might be found in the status of /-eŋa/ as an enclitic which can occur as an independent word.

3.1 If the [e] in the free form of /-eŋa/ differs from the [e] which appears in /-eŋa/ as a suffix (e.g. one is the general demonstrative while the other a mere epenthetic vowel), there should be some functional difference in the way the two forms are uti-

ilized. Though the limited number of occurrences of free /-eṅə/. only eight in all, will hinder the attempt at comparison, these preliminary examples can be examined.

3.1.1 An interesting example can be seen in (1), where /-eṅə/ follows an apparently vowel-final noun.

- (1) SA:70 "manakini eṅə epesoʔš tihuroʔš."  
 (manakinir)(-eṅə)  
 OComp(Focus) VTr; VAc  
 "Embankment !! I spoke of; something is approaching."

The postulation of an underlying /r/ in the stem follows from another example of this noun in the same text, (1'), in which /-eṅə/ appears as a suffix and an [r] connects it to the stem.<sup>6</sup>

- (1') SA:68 "manakinireṅə epesoʔš. . . ."  
 (manakinir -eṅə)  
 OComp(Focus) VTr  
 embankment!! I spoke of, . . . ."

Both examples function identically in the narrative from which they are taken, so the only differences are the presence of the [r] and the status, free or bound, of /-eṅə/. There appears to be no semantic difference involved in the difference in morphology.

3.1.2 Two further examples (2 and 3) show a nominal being modified by free /-eṅə/, but similar examples can be found (2', 3') which show that the suffixed form can also occur in the same context.<sup>7</sup>

- (2) SA:119b " . . . " ehekaʔ<sup>əhə</sup> sukmihs eṅə.  
 (suk-mi:h -s) (-eṅə)  
 OComp VTr A(EP-F/diff/spkr)  
 " . . . " said the young woman.
- (2') CWW:44 " . . . " eheromakoʔš mihs<sup>əhə</sup>.  
 (mi:h -s -eṅə)  
 OComp VTr A(EP-F/spkr)  
 " . . . " said the woman.
- (3) SA:131 kotawaratos eṅə ehekaʔ<sup>əhə</sup>.  
 (-eṅə)  
 A(spkr/F) VTr  
 the elder brother (was the one who) said it.
- (3') SA:137 " . . . " ehekaʔ<sup>əhə</sup> natos<sup>əhə</sup>.  
 (natos -eṅə)  
 OComp VTr A(EP-F/diff/spkr)  
 " . . . " said the elder brother.

Again there does not appear to be a significant difference in role or meaning. The gloss given to eṅə in (3) is interesting as it

suggests a cleft-focus construction. As will be seen, this is not an isolated phenomenon and, given the identity of the forms just examined, it may not be restricted to /-eṇə/ as a free word.

3.1.3 Two additional examples, (4 and 5), exhibit the double marking of /-eṇə/. (4) is paralleled by (4') where the same stem takes only the single marking of /-eṇə/, and a corresponding example, (5'), can also be found for (5).

- (4) SA:61 *haktek tepasirahkaṇə eṇə* " . . . ".  
 (tepasirahka -eṇə) (-eṇə)  
 DC A(new/spkr) OComp  
 Then Meadowlark (it was who) " . . . ".
- (4') SA:67 *inak tepasirahkaṇə hiṇiṅ inak ehekaʔeṇə.*  
 (tepasirahka -eṇə)  
 Adv A(diff/spkr) VAc; Adv VTr  
 Again Meadowlark arrived, again said.
- (5) SA:87 *omapapirak si:reṇə eṇə naṭka dukšiškaʔeṇə.*  
 (si:r -eṇə) (-eṇə)  
 Nser- A(new) !! O(idiom)- VTr  
 Weasel - Yellow (that one) heart - bothered him.
- (5') SA:94 *oʔharaniṅ mapapiraksenaṅ manaxtet akihkaʔeṇə napuse.*  
 (mapapirak -s- -eṇə)  
 DC A(diff) Loc VTr DO  
 Then Weasel woods-to took Napuse.

The only difference apparent in these examples is that the double marking of /-eṇə/ occurs on the nominal when it is first introduced, while only single marking occurs on the same nominal subsequent to its introduction into the discourse. It is as if /-eṇə/ is used once to introduce the new protagonist and a second time to mark its role as a transitive subject and speaker. It will be seen that /-eṇə/ is used to mark both of these roles in discourse, and the double-marking of the two in combination is highly interesting. There is a possibility that the second /-eṇə/ in the doubly marked forms is functioning as a marker of cleft focus upon introducing the new protagonist. This is suggested by the gloss of "it was who" given to /-eṇə/ in (4) by Kennard. In this case, the gloss could be paraphrased as "There was this Meadowlark and it was he who . . .". Thus, another example of this type of focus-marking is apparent with free-floating /-eṇə/.

3.1.4 The most puzzling of the examples of free /-eṇə/ are those found in Hollow's edition of CWP, given below as (6) and (7).

- (6) CWP:50 *maṅka ikašesaka "hu:ta" eṇə* " . . . " eheromakoʔš.  
 (-eṇə)  
 DC/Adv A(new/spkr) OComp- -OComp VTr  
 There was a buckbrush "Come," then " . . . " said.

In (6), /-eṅə/ is most likely a marker of the transitive subject (A-new/spkr) rather than the imperative verb which forms part of the object complement (OComp), but this is merely a suggestion based on the general pattern of the usage of /-eṅə/ elsewhere. Alternatives can not be ruled out of hand.

- (7) CWP:70 "eṅə maṅakikarahō?š."  
 (-eṅə)  
 Adv?/F? VTr  
 "Then you're afraid of me."

(7) is even more difficult to fit into the general pattern as no nominal whatsoever occurs in the sentence. The function of /-eṅə/ in this example is therefore quite obscure, if /-eṅə/ is limited to a role as noun-modifier. However, if /-eṅə/ is functioning as a cleft-focus marker in this case, a more appropriate gloss could be "It is that you are afraid of me." This, in fact, fits the context of the discourse very well.

To these puzzling examples can be added another, (8), which also appears to deviate from the general pattern.

- (8) SA:136 suk datax eṅə.  
 (-eṅə)  
 S(new) Adv? !!  
 child crying (it was)

The problem arises in the analysis of datax. This may be built on a verb root, but verbal inflection is entirely absent. If, however, this can be analyzed as an instance of a serial noun construction, as in (8'), or of a possessor and nominalized verb, as in (8''), then /-eṅə/ is simply modifying the entire noun phrase and this fits the general pattern.

- |      |                |          |                |       |                  |          |                |
|------|----------------|----------|----------------|-------|------------------|----------|----------------|
| (8') | suk            | datax    | eṅə.<br>(-eṅə) | (8'') | suk              | datax    | eṅə.<br>(-eṅə) |
|      | Nser-(new) Adj |          |                |       | Poss-            | S(new)   |                |
|      | a crying child | (it was) |                |       | a child's crying | (it was) |                |

The gloss given to /-eṅə/ by Kennard in this example again suggests that /-eṅə/ is functioning as an existential verb or copular in a construction similar to a cleft-focus.

3.2 Thus far, a "general pattern" of the usage of /-eṅə/ has been mentioned with only hints at what this might be. From the preceding discussion, it appears that /-eṅə/ in all its forms maintains a similar function. The suggestion that /-eṅə/ as a free word has taken on some form of focus-marking role does not distance the free form from the suffix. On the contrary, as several examples have shown, the suffixed and free forms of /-eṅə/ appear to function identically. If this is so, /-eṅə/ is most likely the same

morpheme in all occurrences and the [e] is therefore also the same in all instances of /-eŋə/. Hence, it appears that [e] is simply deleted when directly following a stem vowel. For further support of the hypothesis that this [e] can be equated with a general demonstrative, it should be possible to link the function of such a demonstrative with the apparent role of /-eŋə/ as a focus-marker.

Luo (1990) has suggested that just such a relationship can be found within the functional domain of "Identification". He presents data from a variety of languages to illustrate a common formal and functional relationship between demonstratives, copulars and contrastive focus markers. The function of a demonstrative is to identify its referent, regardless of focus; a copular functions to provide focus identification, perhaps as in example (8) above; a contrastive focus marker (CFM) identifies a referent in contrast to some other possible referent. Luo (1990) argues further that, in many cases, the similarity (or indeed, homophony) of demonstratives, copulars and CFMs in many languages can be traced to diachronic changes which have extended the original demonstrative to the function of a copular and/or CFM.

In this light, it is quite plausible that the general demonstrative in Mandan, augmented by a suffix -ŋə, has been extended from its original function as a demonstrative to become a marker of focus. Furthermore, this marker has been grammaticalized to the point where it now occurs almost exclusively as a suffix on a nominal. To support this hypothesis, as well as to discover the type of focus which /-eŋə/ appears to provide, the actual occurrence of /-eŋə/ in conjunction with specific roles in discourse must be investigated.

4.0 Table II above suggests the usage of /-eŋə/ in marking various semantactic roles in discourse. Table III below indicates the percentage of main semantactic roles actually marked by /-eŋə/. The remaining roles indicated in Table II have not been included in Table III as the percentage of occurrence of /-eŋə/ on these oblique cases is extremely low. However, these roles will not be ignored in the following discussion.

Table III

role	total lexical occurrences	# marked by /-eŋə/	% of total with /-eŋə/
DO	118	11	9.3 %
S	102	11	10.8 %
A	107	77 <sup>a</sup>	72.0 %





The verb root nak- appears literally to mean 'sit', but it is nevertheless translated as an existential by Hollow and Kennard in certain contexts.

The final three marked S's are subjects of active verbs of arriving, thereby introducing a new argument, as in (14).

- (14) SA:17 oreṅa / tinī; napupušerekaʔehə.  
 (o:r -eṅa) S(new) VAc; VTr  
 A prairie fire arrived and burned him in streaks.

Unlike the other four 'existential' intransitive subjects, the three "arriving" subjects can also be taken as examples, like the remaining four /-eṅa/-marked S's, of the second pattern of intransitive subject marking. In each of these cases, as in example (15), the nominal marked by /-eṅa/ is a different subject from that in the previous clause and it takes an active verb.

- (15) CW:127 wahunixak o?haranī ṡe?seṅa puxahomako?š.  
 VAc; Adv (še? -s- -eṅa) S(diff) VAc  
 When he didn't come out, the wind blew.

This latter type also represents the pattern found among /-eṅa/-marked A's discussed below. Hence, two apparently disparate patterns of marking appear to converge among the intransitive subjects, which may thus serve as a bridge between the function of /-eṅa/ when marking DO's as opposed to when it marks A's.

4.3 A survey of the large number of A's marked by /-eṅa/ produces several interesting tendencies which are summarized in Table IV.

Table IV

Text	new A	diff A in +preceding cl+	diff lex O in preceding cl +	F	total	of
CW	2	16	3	4	25	25
CWP	1	8	2	1	12	12
CP	-	15	6	-	21	22
SA	2	15	-	-	17	18
totals	5	54	11	5	75	77

4.3.1 There are 5 instances, exemplified by (16) below, of a new protagonist being introduced as an A which immediately takes an

active part in the narrative (usually as a speaker). These new A's are thus quite similar in context to the /-eṅə/-marked DO's.

- (16) CW:112 kaki maxtopkəṅə "a:huta iruteta." eheroməko?š.  
 (maxtopka -eṅə)  
 DC A(new/spkr) OComp VTr  
 Then a mole "bring it this way," said.

4.3.2 The tendency of A's to be marked when they are different from the subjects of the preceding clause or sentence has already been alluded to above. Table IV shows just how common this is with 70.1% (54/77) of /-eṅə/-marked A's in this category. (17) is just one of the many examples to be found in the four texts.

- (17) CWW:69 kaki kinuṃə?kšis itexteroməko?š.  
 DC S(same) VSt  
 Then Coyote was very tired.
- CWW:70 kaki mihseṅə worute kṅikoməko?š.  
 (mī:h -s- -eṅə)  
 DC A(diff) DO VTr  
 And the woman food finished/prepared.

Combining the new and different A's, 59 of 77 or just over 3/4 of the total have already been accounted for.

4.3.3 Another 14.2% (11/77), are A's which have the same subject as the preceding clause or sentence, but which are different from the lexicalized argument in that preceding clause. This can be shown by the contrast of the /-eṅə/-marked A in the second clause of example (18) with the lexical DO in the preceding clause, even though the subject is the same in both sentences.

- (18) CP:49 o?haranṅi heroməko?š ptitkuš.  
 DC VTr DO  
 From there he saw (it) the buffalo.
- CP:50 kanṅi kinuṃə?kšieṅə " . . . " eheroməko?š.  
 (kinuṃə?kšieṅə -? -eṅə)  
 DC A(same A/diff from DO) OComp VTr  
 And Old Man Coyote " . . . " said.

If /-eṅə/ is marking a contrast of new or different information, this category is also important in switching focus from the preceding lexical arguments (which may or may not have been marked by /-eṅə/) to the newly lexicalized and emphasized A.

4.3.4 The final category (F) marks a few stray occurrences when /-eṅə/ marks an A which has been part of a group that has been the subject of the immediately preceding narrative, but which is then given primary focus. This is clearly another instance of singling out one particular argument in contrast to other possible ones.

The total of all these types of contrastive focus accounts for 97.4% (75/77) of the A's marked by /-eną/.

4.3.5 As for the two A's left unaccounted for in Table IV, both are virtual repetitions of the A(spl̄r) and verb of the immediately preceding sentence. Hence, these constructions re-emphasize the speaker A in both cases (i.e. "it was Coyote who said it."). This is again reminiscent of the cleft-focus constructions utilized by Kennard to translate several instances of /-eną/ as a free word. Luo (1990) notes the use of cleft-focus constructions as one manner of marking contrastive focus. Thus, in translation, English cleft focus constructions have been utilized to best express the function of contrastive focus performed by /-eną/.

4.3.6 Another extremely common pattern which cross-cuts the categories of Table IV is that 59 of 77 /-eną/-marked A's represent quoted speakers within the four texts. Given the strong possibility that two or more participants would need to be disambiguated in a reported speech act between the participants in a narrative, it should not be surprising to find a marker of contrastive focus associated with the subject of verbs of speech and thought. This is exactly the role which /-eną/ plays in Mandan narrative. Every /-eną/-marked speaker is also a new or different A, or is in contrast with some other lexicalized argument.

5.0 It takes but a small step to reconcile the pattern of /-eną/-marking on DO's as opposed to A's. Both "new" and "different" are really two sides of the same functional coin. The marking of /-eną/ either introduces new information or reintroduces old protagonists in the course of disambiguating the possible arguments involved. In essence, /-eną/ on DO's is providing focus and /-eną/ on A's is providing contrastive focus.

One possible competing hypothesis for the function of /-eną/ involves the noted prevalence of the marking of constituents moved out of the usual SOV word order of Mandan and into post-verbal position. However, examples of the end-position focus (EP-F) always conform to the general pattern of A marking. 17 of the 77 A's (22.1%) marked by /-eną/ were in this end-position, but they all conform to the pattern already distinguished for /-eną/ of marking different or focussed subjects/speakers. Furthermore, examples of A's can be found in end-position which are not marked by /-eną/, as in (19).

(19) CWW:105	" . . . "	erehonąko?š	kinųmą?kši.
	OComp	VTr	A(same)
		thought	Coyote.

This sentence followed several others in which Coyote was also the subject. Though in post-verbal position, *kinųmą?kši* is not marked by /-eną/. When the characterization of /-eną/ as a

marker of contrastive focus is considered, the reason for the absence of the marker is obvious. No contrast is present. Coyote is the topic of discourse, the subject of the verb, and no change has taken place in the narrative that would call for a marker of contrastive focus. The post-verbal position is not specially marked by /-eną/ and is most likely best treated as a stylistic variant as suggested by Coberly (1979:36). Additionally, /-eną/ as a marker of contrastive focus is given additional support by this negative example.

It has been suggested, though far from proven conclusively, that /-eną/ is derived both formally and functionally from an original general demonstrative in Mandan. Such a diachronic development would fit well with the cross-linguistic evidence collected by Luo (1990). Be that as it may, the synchronic evidence of Mandan narrative suggests that whatever the morphemic make-up of /-eną/, its function is one of focus and contrastive focus marking.

## NOTES

\*A previous version of this paper was delivered at the University of Manitoba Linguistics Colloquium, March 30, 1990. My thanks are extended to David Pentland, Luo Cheng, and especially to Richard Carter for their helpful comments and suggestions, which have contributed to the revision and improvement of this paper. The responsibility for any remaining fault is my own.

<sup>1</sup>Further abbreviations utilized within this paper are as follows: **A** (agent; transitive subject); **Adj** (adjectival); **Adv** (adverbial); **cl** (clause); **DC** (discourse connector - begins a sentence); **Def** (definite marker); **diff** (different argument than in preceding clause); **DO** (direct object); **EP-F** (focus on end or post-verbal position); **F** (focus on a subject in contrast to preceding lexicalized arguments); **Inst** (instrumental); **lex** (lexicalized); **Loc** (locative); **Nser** (serial noun construction); **O** (object); **OComp** (object complement); **OPost** (oblique object with a postposition); **Poss** (possessor noun); **Post** (postposition); **S** (intransitive subject; subject); **spkr** (speaker); **VAc** (active, intransitive verb); **VEx** (existential verb); **VSt** (stative verb); **VTr** (transitive verb).

Textual examples cited in the paper are presented in a four line analysis as follows:

Line 1: Mandan text.

Line 2: Indication of the occurrence of /-eną/.

Line 3: Indication of semantactic role or "part of speech".

Line 4: Gloss.

When examples without /-eną/ are cited, Line 2 is omitted.

<sup>2</sup>The three texts were made available by Richard Carter who has added his own analysis to the CWV text. The phonemic representation in examples from CWV, as well as from the other texts to

a lesser extent, reflects aspects of Carter's phonemic analysis of Mandan. This includes a more consistent representation of glottal stop [ʔ] and, at least for CWV, of long, short and nasalized vowels. However, inconsistencies undoubtedly remain, due in part to the discrepancies between Kennard's and Hollow's analyses. This is especially true in the case of accents, which have, for better or worse, been omitted in all cases. Kennard's conventions are followed only insofar as phonemic /r/ is always represented as [d] word initially, unless nasalized to [n].

<sup>3</sup>Lak'ota, for example, has a reflex of this general demonstrative which, though it regularly occurs as a free word, appears to exhibit behaviour very similar to /-enə/ in Mandan.

<sup>4</sup>There are actually three examples of vowel-final stems which take /-enə/ with [e] present, but the vowels of stem and suffix are separated by [ʔ]-epenthesis. These examples are exclusively from Hollow's editions of the texts. It is therefore possible that Hollow attached instances of free-floating /-enə/ to stems via the editorial use of the [ʔ]-epenthesis rule. Such examples have been included under the "Stem -enə" category in Table I.

<sup>5</sup>Du Bois (1987) has found that, in discourse, transitive subjects tend to be given or old information, while new information and arguments are most commonly introduced as transitive objects or intransitive subjects.

<sup>6</sup>The notion of an underlying /r/ as a stem-final element in many verb stems was appealed to by Hollow (1965). Carter (personal communication) believes that this /r/, if present underlyingly, would only appear on the surface when it could be prosodically licensed by syllabification. It would be so licensed when an empty syllable onset is present and must be filled, just as with [ʔ]-epenthesis. An alternate analysis suggests that /r/ is epenthetic. In either case, something prevents the direct suffixation of /-enə/ to the stem.

<sup>7</sup>The two forms for 'elder brother' shown here are derivationally related. kotawaratos includes atos as its final element. Kennard (1936) does not provide an analysis of these different forms. In fact, atos is not even the form Kennard (ibid.: 27-28) provides for 'elder brother'. Rather, kotawaratos is given the gloss 'his mother's brother', derived from a stem nato-. Thus, whatever the gloss, kotawaratos appears to be the third person possessive form of atos. The stem is the same, just as with the derivation of sukmj:h 'young woman' from suk 'child' plus mj:h 'woman' in the comparison of "sukmihs enə" with "mihsenə"

<sup>8</sup>The discrepancy between the total A's in Table II (79) and in Table III (as well as IV below) (77) is due to the fact that two A's were double-marked. Hence, /-enə/ occurs on A's 79 times but only on 77 different A's.





This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).