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FOREWORD

It is indeed gratifying to recognize the degree of acceptance the Kansas Working Papers in Linguistics has come to enjoy, and this is especially true for the series of Studies in Native American Languages. Even before the call for papers went out in the fall, we had received inquiries from prospective contributors, and the response to the call itself was remarkable in quality as well as diversity.

This year the KWPL marks its first decade of existence, and we are publishing two numbers. Number one is devoted to theoretical issues, general linguistics and old-world languages, while number two is the fourth in the Studies in Native American Languages series. This number includes articles representing seven different language families from all over North America (Uto-Aztecan, Muskogean, Yuman, Siouan, Ocmanguan, Athabaskan and Algonkian), and a great deal of original scholarship.

We wish to thank the contributors, both those whose papers appear in this volume, and those whose papers we did not include. We also wish to thank the faculty of the Linguistics department of the University of Kansas for their support and encouragement for the KWPL throughout the year.
DEFINITENESS SUBCATEGORYED IN DISCOURSE: Lakota k’yu

David S. Rood

Abstract: In Lakota texts we find two definite articles, one of which regularly occurs only in discourse contexts. This one, k’yu, usually means 'the aforementioned' or 'the past', but it does not always occur when those meanings are appropriate. This paper concludes from the examination of several texts that while the conditions necessary for k’yu can be stated succinctly, predicting it is another matter. Several plausible hypotheses are disproved, and a request for additional ideas is extended.

For several years now I have been trying to figure out exactly the meanings of the articles in Lakota. For indefinite NPs, the articles mark a clear distinction between specific and non-specific in what are often called "opaque" contexts, namely in questions, imperatives, potential aspect sentences, and as the objects of verbs such as 'look for' and "want". In these contexts Lakota must mark whether the referent or an indefinite NP is a particular individual or any member of a class. So for example, in a sentence like "I'm looking for a horse," you must indicate whether any horse will do, or whether you're seeking a specific horse. Of course neither of these is quite the same as the articleless, "incorporated-object" construction meaning something more like "I'm horse-seeking."

Once I had figured out that distinction, I began to look for the difference between two particles which both seem to be definite articles. One of them, k’u, is the usual translation of the English definite article; but instead of that, in texts, one sometimes finds the other, k’yu (k’yu after some verbs in -g in the dialect used in this paper).

I originally hypothesized that specificity would play a role in explaining this distinction as well, but such has not proven to be the case. Consequently, the question I want to begin answering in this paper is essentially: "When does one use k’yu in Lakota?"

We should note at the outset that both k’u and k’yu can terminate clauses or sentences as well as NPs. It is not always clear whether one should call the material preceding
one of these particles an S or an NP, and in the following
discussion I do not try to make a distinction. This of
course rests on the presupposition that we are dealing with
only one morpheme in each case, a position that I believe is
right, but which I will not defend in this paper.

Kay is described variously in Boas and Deloria (1941).
In one place (p. 107) they call it the "past article", and
also remark (p. 109, p. 136) that it ends a direct
declarative quotation in the past tense, giving examples
such as: (note: I have changed slightly some of Deloria's
spelling and punctuation to conform to my preferred
orthography and my analysis of constituent boundaries.)

(1a) "Iyaye ɔ̀ųy, eye.
he-depart he-said
"He has gone," he said.'

(1b) "Kákhit snif kte ɔ̀ųy, eye,
to-yonder I-go fut. k he-said
"I was about to go there," he said.'

Later (p. 133) they state, "There are three articles,
Kay...definite article; Kay...definite past, previously
referred to or already known; and a certain one"; their
examples are like those we will see below. Finally there is
a remark (p. 158) that "Kay as a terminal implies that the
person addressed is familiar with the contents of the
statement," giving examples like:

(2) Meché ɔ̀ųyu thehá ọ̀f
he-does-that whenever long-time he-comes-home
not
"Whenever he does so, he stays away a long time,
as you know."

Some of the usual meanings said to be associated with
definite articles are definiteness, specificity, old
information, and non-topicality. Having both a 'definite
article' and an article that marks 'previously referred to
or already known', two of the usual meanings of the
"definite article", thus seems redundant. If it were
obligatory to mark 'aforementioned' nouns with Kay, there
would be very few text examples of any other article, but in
fact there are many instances of 'aforementioned' nouns
which are marked by \( \text{k}_1 \) rather than \( \text{k}_2 \). Moreover, when I started to work on this problem briefly several years ago, the few sentences that I generated myself using \( \text{k}_2 \) were all rejected, though replacing \( \text{k}_2 \) by \( \text{k}_1 \) made most of them acceptable. I now realize that most of that problem probably resulted from having too little context, so I have taken up the question again.

I have chosen to approach the problem by assuming that \( \text{k}_1 \), the more frequent article, is probably unmarked in comparison with \( \text{k}_2 \) and is therefore the "default" choice. So I have begun by examining \( \text{k}_2 \) first, seeking to discover both the necessary and the sufficient conditions for its use. The necessary conditions -- i.e. when you can use it -- can be stated quite clearly, but the sufficient conditions remain much more elusive. My principles require me to search for answers first within the language I'm analyzing, so at this point I have not looked at the literature to see whether there are other languages that have similar patterns which I might rediscover here.

It is clear that the determination of the use of \( \text{k}_2 \) requires contexts larger than single sentences. So I have set out to examine discourse contexts in which the form is found, and compare them with contexts in which \( \text{k}_1 \) appears instead. Essentially I have been "tracking" nouns through texts, trying to discover when they are marked by one rather than the other of the particles.

At this point I have examined only the first ten texts in Deloria's (1934) collection. They are all traditional stories, either about Iktomi (the Lakota equivalent of Coyote, though the word means 'spider') or about adventures with other supernatural beings. These texts amount to some 685 printed lines, divided by Deloria into 302 numbered "sentences". A Deloria "sentence" often includes several clauses, both coordinate and subordinate, and often translates into several English sentences. It is not at all clear to me how she decided where to mark the boundaries, but the divisions are nevertheless convenient ones to use.

This corpus is small, but it yielded 120 examples of either \( \text{k}_2 \) or \( \text{k}_2 \) with the meanings I was interested in; I excluded instances of another particle that is sometimes homophonous with this one, but which is a postposition meaning 'with' using on account of because' and is easily distinguished semantically (and often syntactically, since it may follow an article).
In working through these texts I have usually been satisfied with one of Deloria's explanations for k'yu her definitions account for at least 111 of the 120 examples. In 91 cases, the concept of 'the aforementioned' seems to be primary, though the examples include nouns, nominalized verbs, and relative clauses. Moreover, in several instances we find that it is the referent, rather than the noun per se, which accounts for "prior mention"; this establishes that the basis for selecting k'yu is semantic rather than syntactic.

Thirteen examples describe events completed prior to the current moment in the narration, illustrating the "past tense" meaning of the particle, and eight mark statements in which the speaker assumes the hearer already knows the content of the statement — a meaning very similar to that of the German particle "ja" in sentences such as "Das ist ja unwahrscheinlich" 'That's improbable, and you know it'. That leaves nine out of 120 instances that don't quite fit, and which are interesting for that reason.

Let us look first at some "normal" examples, and then think about the exceptions.

Example (3) illustrates aforementioned nouns, one literally repeated, and one only conceptually repeated:

13. ēhkē ēhēkē k'yu
And so (children) the-aforementioned

iyúna okkā ēhēya pi
all around-him crying continued pl.

ke? ... 14. Yk̕hē hyu̯pi k'yu...
quot. Then (their-mother the-aforementioned)

'So all the (aforementioned) children were crying around him. ... Then their (aforementioned) mother...'

The children were introduced in sentence 1 and the wife in sentence 3; but this is the first time that the woman is referred to as 'their mother', though she has been
on the scene continuously and referred to as 'his wife' several times.

Example (4) illustrates nominalized verbs. Many examples like this are difficult to classify as 'aforementioned' rather than 'past completed action', and are in fact both; I have used the 'aforementioned' category whenever it can apply, and reserved the 'past' designation for events without prior mention.

(4) (Text 5) Iktomi has killed and butchered a deer and started cooking part of it; then he climbs a nearby tree to try to stop it from rubbing against its neighbor and making an annoying noise. His hand gets caught fast between the two rubbing trees, and while he's trapped there he sees some foxes wandering nearby. He calls to them to leave his meat alone.

9. Wícháño iyéchel heyá
he-invite-them as-if he-said-that
Chahéchó optaye kį́ átaya kawéh hiyú pi
so pack the all turning came pi.
na thaló kų́jį́ aśkášíí s’e
and meat the-aforem. in-no-time it-seemed
thebyá iyéya pi ke’ìí wačhókį́
eat-up finished pi. quot. he-roasted-it
kų́jį́ hen’i na naky kąq
the-aforem. those it-was and also he-cook-it
Sini iyéya kų́jį́ iyúnéla
not pi. lie the-aforem.
all.

'He said that as if he had issued them an invitation, so of course the pack, turning around, came and in seemingly no time they finished off the [aforementioned] meat; all of it, the [aforementioned] roasted parts as well as the [aforementioned] uncooked parts lying around.'

Wačhókį́ and kąq will iyéya are both nominalized verbals; the former could as well be translated 'what he had roasted,' emphasizing the tense meaning of kų́jį́, but 'what had been lying around uncooked' does not make sense here (the "lying around" was simultaneous with, rather than
completed before the time of, the eating), so I prefer to count these as examples of 'aforementioned' rather than 'past'; but I grant that there is room for argument. Nevertheless, we have here three examples of k*yu, all relying at least in part on the "aforementioned" nature of the killing of the deer, butchering, and partial cooking of the meat.

These nominalized verbs are not relative clauses; in the relative construction, the head of the clause comes first in the clause and is always marked indefinite, while the article that marks the clause closes the whole clause. We will see some examples below. As might be expected, when k*yu closes such clauses it frequently marks both the 'aforementioned' and the 'past tense' features simultaneously, but sometimes one of those features is absent. Example (5) has two relative clauses:

(5) (Text 7) Iktomi was traveling around wearing a raccoon skin robe with the tail attached. He hitched a ride on the back of a hawk, but insulted him so that he angrily dumped Iktomi into a hollow tree. Along came two women with axes, and Iktomi convinced them that he was a fat raccoon whom they could use for grease for tanning hides if they cut him out.

17. Cháke wani na*yu sápe iki*ku  pi
So now ax take-one's-own pl.
na  ká*yu   ka*yu  pi  vúkhé
and  tree-the-aforem. knocked-down pl. then
wi*chá  ná  kí*nu  wá  kí*yu
raccoon skin robe a he-wore-it the-aforem.
né síté  kí  lošóka  wá
that its-tail the hole a
ka*wi*chá*bi  kí*yu  netá*ha
he-ordered-them-to-make the-aforem; from
pathákal  hi*vyí  na  akhé*ma
pushing he-make-come and again-and-again
yúmehel  i*yu  he,
pulling-in he-took-it progressive

'So they took their axes and knocked down the [aforementioned] tree; then he kept pushing the
tail of the [aforementioned] raccoon-skin robe
he was wearing out from the [aforementioned]
hole he had ordered them to make and pulling it
back in again.'

The first clause, 'the raccoon-skin robe he was
wearing', clearly refers to an 'aforementioned' entity but
not a completed event; the second clause, 'the hole he had
ordered them to make' refers to an 'aforementioned' entity,
but also an action that is complete at this point in the
story.

Examples in which the tense meaning is the only
possible one are fewer, but cf. (6):

(6) (Text 1). Iktomi is traveling with Iya, a
people-eating giant; when Iya sleeps, Iktomi
looks in his mouth:

16. ...yukhá thezi' mahéí oyáte
then his-stomach inside people
then his-stomach inside people
thebewichaye čiyú hená oyás?!
he-ate-them-up the-past those all
hóchokathuyá oșyökipišya wíčnóthi węyáka
in-camp-circles happily camped he-saw
škheč. 11. Makhá akálí ñ pi kʔu
when Earth on lived pl. past

Thus "Then in his stomach he saw all the people he
had devoured happily camped in camp circles.
They were conducting themselves just as they had
when they had lived on earth.'

Although Iya admitted in Sentence 7 that he was
heading for a particular village in order to eat the people,
these sentences are the first mention of people having been
eaten in the past. Thus the 'aforementioned' feature seems
only remotely likely here, unless one invokes cultural
presuppositions about the habits of Iya, a possible but not
a necessary explanation instead, this meaning of kʔu
seems clearly similar to that of English 'had'.

Example (7) illustrates the "assumed knowledge" usage
of kʔu:
(7a) Iktoni has broken a taboo:
13...Tuwemî hëchî ëni wasûnîyë pi këñ, no-one do-that not we-have-rule pi.

këîtakse ló.
he-break-it decl.

'He has broken the rule [I assume you know about it] that no one should do that.'

(7b) Wiĉha kî lîa
raccoon the very

wiĉhâkipiñî këñ.
they-are-tricky

'Raccoons are [as you know] very tricky.'

Of the nine examples that do not quite fit these categories, five (all reproduced in example (8)) use këñ to mark temporal adverbial clauses describing events simultaneous with or immediately preceding those of the main clause, but not always past with respect to the time in the story. However, they are all past with respect to the time the story is being told.

(8a) Iktoni asks Iya when he was born:

6. Yûkhì, "Eyé mëthpëya na makhë këñ lenâ

Then, well, sky and earth these

mëthpë ló, ...

I-was-born decl.

'Then, 'Well, I was born at the time this earth and sky were first made.'

(8b) Iktoni is crying when a buffalo comes along and says:

2. ..."Tókha yûkhì le yaĉhëya he huwë?

why then this you-cry progr. quest.

[far-off l-come past than] [l-heard-you decl.]
"Why are you crying this way? I heard you while I was coming far away."

(8c) (Text 6) Iktomi is crossing a stream by having had himself swallowed by a buffalo which agreed to cough him up again when they got across:

10. Ho, k?iya{k̕e} echiyatáh?i 4?u
Well, however other side he-arrived
k?u hehæl inhal kte 4?u he
kast when cough-up fut. the-aforem. that
átya{k̕e} étu{n̍a} na...
totally he-forgot and
Well, however, when he got to the other side he completely forgot that he had been going to cough him up.

(8d) (Text 6) Iktomi is temporarily blind, sitting and crying.

22. l?ndla y?ká kech?í k?u, tumá alone he-sit he-think past. someone
lechelá?ák, "..." echiyas ke?
very-close he-say-to-him quot.
He thought he was sitting alone. [when] someone very close to him said, "..."

(8e) (Text 7) Iktomi is riding on the hawk's back:

8. na wanemí kí ópta y?e 4?u heh?í and now water the above he-go past when
echál pte?ó phesiáte kí just-then hawk his-head-top the
oká?at?ap y?ká s?khe? he-gesture-insultingly-at he-sit quot
'Just as they went over the river [Iktomi] made insulting gestures at the top of the hawk's head.'

Note that in all the examples except (8d), a form containing the postposition éh?á 'at a time' follows k?u. I suspect that k?u is a syntactically conditioned part of this
"when"-clause construction, but I do not know the rest of the grammar involved.

The other four "exceptions" to Deloria's categories are in items (9a-9c):

(9a) (Text 3) Iktomi has announced that he will die.

7. "Makhá'ęza ọta pi kṣų [children] many pl. then[you] harshly
omči'awatikṣų kte ld." 1-treat-them fut. decl.

"I will be doing the [aforementioned] numerous children a great disservice."

This usage is exceptional only because 'the children' occurs inside the quotation here. They are 'aforementioned' in the text as a whole, but if the narrator is really quoting Iktomi directly, there is no context to justify the kṣų. There are thus two possible rationalizations for this kṣų: either the narrator has gotten the contexts confused and allowed the fact that we know about these children to intrude on the quote; or Iktomi is relying on the fact that his wife knows about the children, and using the 'assumed knowledge by hearer' meaning of kṣų. The trouble with the second hypothesis is that this meaning usually occurs with clauses, not NPs, but the fact is that this NP is formally a clause -- so it could still be explained away as "normal" usage.

(9b) (Text 10):

21. . . Igáštā na hehgi wikhóninalaka he-finished-his and then young-women

kį wóyaye cṣų the left-over-food the-aforem. hená those

wóčákṣų Xkwet, he-gave-them quot.

"He finished eating and then gave the leftovers to the young women."

Although the food (stew of haughty maiden) has been described earlier, as well as the man's eating, this is the first (and only) mention of "leftovers" in the text.
Nevertheless, I think one could rationalize it as a 'conceptually afermentioned' example.

(9c) (Text 10) An ogre with a face on both sides of his head (called Double-Face in Deloria's translations) carries off maidens who have haughtily rejected too many suitors, and eats them. He has brought a maiden home and told his grandmother to cook her while he goes off again. But this time grandmother tells our heroine and two others already at the house to kill her instead and run away. Then grandmother continues:

29. "Lechýotha
in-this-direction
Chámáhel
in-the-woods
čhawáaksé s?á k?y
l-cut-wood habit. the-
hečhiya nazýspe
thither axe
čisíala mitháwala k?y
little my-little the-
hé maphá na
that my-head and
mi?stó išléyatáh kí héné lỳáustak
my-arm right the those together
iŋpéya pi na . . . .
throw-away pl. and . . . .

"Throw my right arm, my head, and my [k?y]
little axe are here in the woods where I always chop(ped) wood and . . . ."

(Later the arm, head, and axe cooperate to deceive the returning Double-Face into thinking his grandmother is out there chopping in the woods, and thus delay his discovery of the escape a little longer.)

This is the first time in the story that either the wood-cutting place or the axe have been mentioned, so I cannot think of an excuse for considering either of them 'afermentioned' or 'presumed knowledge', even in the quotation, and the 'past tense' meaning makes no sense either. The only explanation I have thought of for these two examples is that the grandmother is giving instructions for the period after her death, and thus speaking as if she were already dead, using k?y in its 'past' meaning ('where I used to chop wood; what used to be my little axe'). In fact, however, these two instances are the only genuine exceptions I have found to Deloria's description.
It thus seems that at least one of four conditions is necessary if k7u is to appear:

(1) the referent of a noun or nominalization must be 'aforementioned' in the text;

(2) the verb marked by k7u must describe an event prior to the current state of the narrative;

(3) the clause ending with k7u must be something the hearer might be expected to know already;

(4) the clause ending with k7u must be a time adverb describing an event that is semantically 'past', relative either to the time of speaking or to the current state of the story.

Conditions (1) and (2) frequently combine, and if the examples in (9c) are not totally isolated, the event can be 'prior' in the speaker's mind-set, rather than objectively 'past'.

However, if we examine other nouns and nominalizations in the stories we find a good many examples which meet one of these conditions but which are marked by k7 rather than k7u. Why?

So far the only firm rule I can state is that only one NP in a clause can be marked by k7u, and that immediately makes me suspect that some sort of topicalization is involved, since clauses presumably never have more than one topic.

Otherwise I have only a number of disproofed hypotheses: nothing I have thought of quite works. In the appendix to the paper I have reproduced good-sized chunks of two texts, with "tracings" of particular nominals marked on them. You have both the Lakhota and the literal translation, since it may be easier to follow the discussion on the basis of the translation in a language you don't know.

The first example traces two characters, the Double-Face and the little beaver. The Double-Face is introduced as such in Sentence 10, and mentioned by name twice more, once with k7u and the second time with k7. The beaver, on the other hand, is introduced in Sentence 6 and reappears several times, all but one of them marked by k7u. Note that for both characters, the k7 example occurs in a clause containing another noun marked by k7u, thus both of these...
may be consequences of the "one k2u per clause" rule. The use of k2u for these terms is thus the simplest and most straightforward possible: the aforementioned nouns are marked by k2u when possible, and there is no need for further explanations. This is even true of the bridge in sentences 19 and 21 and the original, successful suitor in sentences 2 and 23, but not for the young woman or the man (who is going to be the Double-Face) in 8, the rocks in 15 (the second and third times they're mentioned), the man in 17, nor the parents in 4 and 23. If an intuitively natural notion of "topic" is involved, it is strange to me that the man and the woman would not be topics in 8. Similarly, "distance from last mention" seems to be unable to explain k2u, if the beaver is always k2u but the parents are not.

The second example traces the buffalo through this part of the story. He arrives in sentence 2, introduced as indefinite (with way) as is befitting new information, but then he is referred to by k1 and k2u without any obvious reason for the variations. Two hypotheses that don't work are:

--- choose according to syntactic case-role (he is always subject, and in all but the last example also always agent);

--- choose according to relative distance from last mention (contrast sentence 9 with 12, where both are k2u but 12 is much further from the previous mention than is 9).

This oscillation between k1 and k2u is even more striking in a test I have not supplied here. The last page of the appendix records the sentence numbers and articles used with eleven nouns through about 40 sentences. Let me call your attention especially to the cat, bear, snake and buffalo. These four guard the house of the man who rescues the maiden from the Double-Face. They are all introduced at the same time, yet when they are called on at a time in sentences 64-66 to doctor the sick maiden, two are brought up with k2u, while two are reintroduced with k1. Because these four characters are so completely parallel, I am particularly puzzled as to why they should have different syntactic treatments.

I want to conclude now with two additional observations. First, I am strongly resistant to any explanation for this phenomenon which relies on probability statistics. It seems to me that saying that k2u occurs in 1% of situations that have something or other in common is saying nothing more than what Detorria already said in 19411
I am satisfied that I know what k7y means when it occurs, and my investigation is an attempt to find ways to predict it rather than explain it. So far I have not succeeded, however.

Finally, I would like to speculate a little about the "core" meaning of these two particles. What do "past time", "aforementioned," and "presupposed to be known to the hearer" have in common that would allow the same particle to serve all three situations? I would contend that the unifying element here is factuality: when the speaker can be absolutely sure of the existence of something in the world established by the discourse, k7y is appropriate. In contrast, k j may be a kind of assertion of existence, rather than presupposition of it; it is somewhat less definite for this reason. Note that as a clause-final particle, k j often means 'if' when (in the future); perhaps ultimately the answer to the k j/k7y distinction will be found tied up with these notions of greater and lesser degrees of speaker confidence in the factuality of the entities marked.

And just to confirm any suspicions that the author has lost all sense of reality at this point, I'll point out that in North Caddoan, a sub-family of a family that has sometimes been asserted (but never proven, despite several attempts) to be related to Siouan, and thus to Lakhota, there is a future tense morpheme k j and a past tense morpheme k 7u. Might this be more than coincidence?
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Double-Face</strong></th>
<th><strong>woman</strong></th>
<th><strong>house</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33 - ki (returns)</td>
<td>30 - ehake-aglipi kʔu</td>
<td>45 - wa (cha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 - ki</td>
<td>40 - ehake-aglipi kʔu</td>
<td>47 - kʔu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - ki</td>
<td>41 - ehake-hi kʔu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - kʔu</td>
<td>42 - ka wiya kʔu</td>
<td>man on island</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 - kʔu</td>
<td>42 - wiya kʔu</td>
<td>44 - wa (cha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53 - kʔu</td>
<td>44 - wiya kʔu</td>
<td>55 - wa (kʔu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 - ki</td>
<td>54 - wiya ki (in quote)</td>
<td>62 - atkuku ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - ki</td>
<td>60 - wiya kʔu</td>
<td>68 - wichasa ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 - wichasa ki</td>
<td>61 - wiya ki</td>
<td>68 - atkuku ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(in quote)</td>
<td>66 - wiya kʔu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 - wiya ki</td>
<td>67 - wiya kʔu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - wiya kʔu (twice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>cat</strong></th>
<th><strong>bear</strong></th>
<th><strong>snake</strong></th>
<th><strong>buffalo</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 - wa</td>
<td>49 - wa</td>
<td>49 - wa</td>
<td>49 - wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 - ki</td>
<td>56 - ki</td>
<td>51 - wa...ki</td>
<td>51 - wa...ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 - kʔu</td>
<td>64 - ki</td>
<td>66 - kʔu</td>
<td>65 - ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 - kʔu</td>
<td>69 - kʔu</td>
<td>66 - ki</td>
<td>66 - kʔu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 0</td>
<td>70 - 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>knife</strong></th>
<th><strong>owl</strong></th>
<th><strong>armpit</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39 - wa</td>
<td>61 - (kʔaya...kʔu) wa</td>
<td>59 - 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 - 0</td>
<td>62 - kʔu</td>
<td>66 - kʔu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54 - kʔu</td>
<td>63 - wa (in quote)</td>
<td>67 - ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67 - kʔu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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