

kansas  
working  
papers  
in  
linguistics

---

volume 2  
1977

P

1

.K36

v. 2

1977

Laurel Watkins and Ginny Gathercole

Editors

Cover design by Jeanette Gunn

Funded by Student Activity Fees  
University of Kansas  
Lawrence, Kansas  
1977

R00002 22246

The editors are pleased to present this second collection of papers from the Linguistics Department at the University of Kansas. In preparing this issue, we have been aided in many ways by members of the faculty and by our department secretary, Ruth Hillers. We wish to express our appreciation for their kind assistance. We are also grateful to Jeanette Gunn for her work on the cover page.

## CONTENTS

Agent, Instrument and Intention Ronald P. Schaefer	1
Speech Style Shifting in Young Children's Speech Linda Paul	37
A Study of the Comings and Goings of the Speakers of Four Languages? Spanish, Japanese, English, and Turkish Ginny Gathercole	61
Some Common Elements of Muskogean Verb Morphology Karen M. Booker	95
A Closer Look at Sundanese Phonology Geoffrey Gathercole	134
A Study of Speaker Sex Identification Ronald P. Schaefer	144
A Linguistic Identification for Kansas Volga German Gerald L. Denning	165
Second Language Acrolect Replacement in Limon Creole Anita Herzfeld	193

Some Common Elements of  
Muskogean Verb Morphology

Karen M. Booker

Introduction

0. Initial work in comparative reconstruction begins with an attempt to reconstruct the phonological system of the proto-language. The justification of this procedure as the first step in the reconstruction process is readily apparent. The linguist can hardly hope to reconstruct higher levels of the language without first knowing at least reasonably accurately the segmental elements with which he has to work, as well as the major phonological processes that have been at work in the language. Naturally, morphological evidence often aids the analysis of the phonological system, so I do not intend to imply that the proto-phonological system must be entirely analyzed before higher level reconstruction can be attempted. But one cannot overlook a basic fact of the reconstruction process--the phonological correspondences among daughter languages show remarkable regularity. If this were not the case, comparative reconstruction would be impossible.

Attempts at using the comparative method to reconstruct the higher levels of the proto-language lead to additional difficulties. Whereas phonological systems of daughter languages are generally characterized by

regularity, their morphological systems may be somewhat less systematic. Where one language may simplify the proto-system, another may elaborate. Not only is the morphological system subject to the regular phonological changes from mother to daughter languages, but also to additional analogic leveling, so that languages shown to be closely related on the basis of phonological evidence may look only remotely related when their morphological systems are examined.<sup>1</sup>

The tribes speaking the Muskogean languages (Choctaw/Chickasaw, Alabama/Koasati, Hitchiti/Mikasuki, Creek/Seminole) inhabited the southeastern portion of the United States at the time of the first white contact.<sup>2</sup> These languages have been studied most recently and most extensively by Mary R. Haas. Primarily on the basis of her own field work, she has reconfirmed the genetic relationship of the languages and has done some work on the phonological reconstruction of Proto-Muskogean (henceforth PM) (1941, 1947, 1949, 1951, 1952). She has also reconstructed the active subject affixes of the PM and Pre-PM languages (1946, 1969). To my knowledge, this is the only systematic attempt to reconstruct any of the PM verb morphology. The purpose of this paper is to examine as much as possible of the verb morphology of the Muskogean languages and to note any similarities among them which might be thought to be characteristic of PM.

### Sources<sup>3</sup>

1. The principal sources consulted for this paper are the following:

Creek: Mary R. Haas, Norma Castillo, Mekko Lewis, R. M. Loughridge, Karen M. Booker

Alabama: Karen Lupardus

Koasati: Haas, John R. Swanton

Hitchiti: Swanton

Mikasuki: John David West, Booker

Choctaw: T. Dale Nicklas, Laurel Watkins

Of the extant Muskogean languages, Creek has been the most widely studied. Haas did a considerable amount of field work in the 1930's and has published several articles on the language, but no grammar as yet. Castillo has been working for approximately two years with Mekko Lewis, the Creek language instructor at Haskell Indian Junior College. Occasionally, I have cited items from R. M. Loughridge and David M. Hodge, Dictionary of the Muskokee or Creek Language in Creek and English (1964).

Alabama/Koasati is by far the least studied of the Muskogean branches. Very little has been published on either of the languages. Swanton has from time to time quoted a few forms, as has Haas. The principal source for this paper, however, is data provided by Karen Lupardus from her field notes on the Alabama language.

Swanton's unpublished Sketch of the Hitchiti Language (1921-22) is the only systematic source of grammatical information on the Hitchiti language available at this time. Perhaps the appearance of Hitchiti speakers will add to our knowledge of the language in the near future (see footnote 2).

Data on the Choctaw language are taken from T. Dale Nicklas, who did a PhD dissertation, and from Laurel Watkins, who has done some field

work with the language.

Many of the insights expressed in this paper are based on lecture notes and discussion from Professor James M. Crawford's survey class of the languages of the southeast given at the 1975 Summer Institute, Tampa, Florida.

#### Subjects of Active Verbs

2. The subject affixes of active verbs for PM and Pre-PM, as mentioned previously, have been reconstructed by Haas (1946, 1969). In her treatment, she reconstructs a single number distinction in the first person plural form. Previously it was thought that only Choctaw distinguished number in this person: il- 'we few' and iloh- 'we multiple' (Nicklas 1974, 30). Recently, West (1975, 4) has reported two distinct forms in Mikasuki as well: -iika 'we particular' (includes first and second persons) and -oo 'we, general' (includes first second and third persons). The forms correspond semantically and the temptation arises to look for a common source in PM rather than postulate parallel innovation in the two languages.

An affix ho ~ oh, which pluralizes some stems, is found in both the eastern and western Muskogean languages.

Hitchiti: (Haney, 1931)<sup>4</sup>

- |  |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 1) ic-oksi- <u>ho</u> -ci-k              | 'He killed you (pl.).'      |
| 2) cin-hop <u>o</u> , <u>ho</u> ,na-li-n | 'I will sing to you (pl.).' |

Mikasuki: (West 1975, 3)

- |                               |                               |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1) iliic-ii, <u>hoo</u> ,p-om | 'They (multiple) killed him.' |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|

- 2) ci-hii,hoo,ca-laaka 'They will see you (multiple).'

Alabama: (Lupardus, field notes)

- 1) oobi 'his thigh'  
 2) oh-oobi 'their thighs'  
 3) ca-batap-lo 'He will hit me.'  
 4) ho-ca-batap-lo 'They will hit me.'

Creek: (Brinton 1870, 306)

- 1) laykw-ii 'rotten, sing.'  
 2) layk,ho,w-ii 'rotten, pl.'  
 3) hiy-ii 'hot, sing.'  
 4) hi,ho,y-ii 'hot, pl.'

Choctaw: (Nicklas 1974, 57-8)

- 1) nakni ma-t cito-h 'That man is big. (man-that-big)'  
 2) nakni ma-t ho-cito-h 'Those men are big.'  
 3) himitt-a 'young, sing.'  
 4) himit-ho-wa 'young, pl.'  
 5) acaff-a 'one'  
 6) acaff-oh-a 'a few'

The morpheme is not confined to a single usage in the Muskogean languages. In Hitchiti both direct and indirect objects are pluralized by ho. The affix is used to pluralize some stative verbs as in the Creek and Choctaw examples. In Mikasuki and Alabama ho pluralizes the third person subject. The final Mikasuki example illustrates the use of the affix to pluralize the object as well. No examples of this latter type of use



were found in Alabama, but one might expect to find such a case given a larger corpus, especially considering the fact that the distributive affix in Creek (-ak ~ -aak) is used for both subjects and objects. Finally, the first Alabama example is interesting because it shows the use of the affix to indicate a plural possessor.

The exact position of the affix varies from language to language and, indeed, from use to use. In Hitchiti ho occurs both as a suffix (example 1) and as an infix (example 2). A similar situation is found in Mikasuki. The morpheme appears infixed within the root in the second example, but infixed within a suffix in the first.<sup>5</sup> Alabama appears to retain the affix only as a prefix (at least in the examples available to me). In Choctaw, however, it appears as both a prefix (example 2) and a suffix (examples 4 and 6).

Although the original position of this affix in PM is still unclear, there can be no doubt that such a morpheme did exist in the parent language of the Muskogean languages and that it functioned semantically as a pluralizer.

The two Choctaw prefixes for the first person plural subject pronoun, then, can be analyzed as being derived from \*ili- with the pluralizing affix added for the multiple form.

*il(i)-	>	Ch il-	'we few'
*il(i) + oh	>	Ch iloh-	'we multiple'

The Mikasuki "particular" form is the regular development of Haas' Class III suffixes.

\*(h)ilika > M -iika 'we, particular'

The multiple form, then, can be analyzed as a direct descendent of the pluralizing affix itself.<sup>6</sup>

\*ho > M -oo 'we, general'

There is sufficient evidence to suggest that PM should be reconstructed with a number distinction in the first person plural form. Whether or not this characteristic holds true for the Pre-PM period or whether it was an innovation in PM remains for further investigation.<sup>7</sup>

Moving farther back in time to the Pre-PM period and Haas' reconstructions of the subject affixes for this period, traces of \*ho are still to be found. Haas' reconstructions of the first and second persons plural are as follows (1969, 55).

	Direct Conjugation	Conjugation of Auxiliaries	
		Aux. 1 (LI)	Aux. 2 (KA)
P1	ili	(hi)li	(h)ili
P2	haš	haši	(h)aš

The plural form containing h may be attributed to the plural morpheme.

P1	ili	ho + ili	ho + ili
P2	ho + aš	ho + aši	ho + aš

The exact phonological shape of \*ho is uncertain at this point. The above ho sequence can account for Haas' forms by a simple  $V_1V_2 \rightarrow V_2$  rule, so common in Muskogean at morpheme boundaries. One would expect the

metathesized form oh, however, when followed by a vowel, the normal environment for this alternate in the extant languages. In such a case, an initial vowel deletion rule is necessary to eliminate the o.

### Object Pronouns

3. The object pronouns of the various languages are as follows:

	<u>Choctaw</u> (Nicklas 1974, 31)		<u>Alabama</u> (Lupardus, field notes)	
	D.O.	I.O.	D.O.	I.O.
1	sa-	am-	ca-	am-
2	ci-	cim-	ci-	cim-
3		im-	(i-)	im-
1'	pi-	pim-	po-	pom-
1''	hapi-	hapim-		
2'	haci-	hacim-	haci-	hacim-
3'		im-	$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{ati- (poss)} \\ \text{at- (D.O.)} \end{array} \right\} \text{atim-}$	
	<u>Creek</u> (personal field notes)		<u>Mikasuki</u> (West 1974a, 2-3)	
1	ca-	am-	ca- ~ ac-	am-
2	ci-	cim-	ci- ~ ic-	cim-
3	(i-)	im-	(i-)	im-
1'	po-	pom-	po- ~ ip-	pom-
2'	ci-	cim-	ci- ~ ic-	cim-
3'	(i-)	im-	(i-)	im-

It is apparent from the above sets that PM must have had at least two sets of object pronouns--one for direct objects, subjects of stative



sentence are not identical with either of the two paradigms above. Note the following examples.

Choctaw (Nicklas 1974)

ii-pisa tok	'We saw it.'
k-ii-píís-o tok	'We didn't see it.'

Alabama (Lupardus 1974)

k-il-hiic-o-lo	'We don't see.'
----------------	-----------------

Creek (personal field notes)

kił-ii-ko-s	'We don't know.'
-------------	------------------

It is obvious that the first person plural pronoun used with the negative marker is neither the pi/pim in Choctaw nor the po/pom in Alabama and Creek that one would expect in the a or I.O. series above. The older form of the pronoun was undoubtedly \*ili with loss of l in Choctaw and Creek.<sup>9</sup>

At this point the reader is reminded of the subject affixes of active verbs discussed earlier. The first person plural form of the negative is identical to the first person plural subject of active verbs. Can any other similarities to the active affixes be found?

First Person Singular, Future Tense

3.2 Alabama shows a seemingly idiosyncratic exception to the first person singular active subject marker in the future tense (Lupardus).

isi-li-ci	'I am getting (it).'
is- <u>aa</u> -lo	'I will get (it).'

haalo-li-ci	'I am hearing.'
haal- <u>aa</u> -lo	'I will hear.'

Still another example is found in the equivalent Creek form (personal field notes).

ho+kop-ita	'to steal'
ho+kop-ay-i-s	'I steal.'
ho+kop- <u>a</u> -a <sup>+</sup> -ii-s	'I will steal.'

The first person singular subject marker, future tense, is here analyzed as a + a<sup>+</sup> (future marker), which parallels the Alabama example.

The preceding examples are sufficient to demonstrate that the pronoun series associated with the negative belong to the active subject series rather than the object series. That the a set is found in negative sentences suggests further that what is retained as the k portion of the negative may well have been an old auxiliary which was conjugated with active subject affixes just as \*li and \*ka (see section on the classifying suffixes). The exact form of the auxiliary is uncertain. The most probable candidate is ki, which is preserved in Choctaw kiyoh (ki + o + h) 'not'. The PM negative sentence, then, would have been formed using the negative auxiliary \*ki preceded by the subject pronoun, with the negative suffix \*-o.<sup>10</sup>

#### Proto-Muskogean Object Pronouns

3.3 Having assigned the pronoun paradigm associated with the negative to the active subject pronouns, we are now in a position to recon-

construct two object series which differ only in the first person singular form. With further investigation, the two may be shown to be related. At the moment, however, Set II is necessary to account for the indirect pronouns and the independent or emphatic pronouns.

Set I:            \*ca-, \*č<sup>ˇ</sup>i-, \*i-, \*ipa-ho-, \*ho-ač<sup>ˇ</sup>i- \*i-

Set II:           \*a-, \*č<sup>ˇ</sup>i-, \*i-, \*ipa-ho-, \*ho-ač<sup>ˇ</sup>i- \*i-

Indirect Object: \*-m

Again, Set I is associated with direct objects, subjects of stative verbs, and inalienable possession. When Set II is combined with the indirect object marker \*-m, it is used for indirect objects and alienable possession. Set II without \*-m is found in the independent or emphatic pronouns of the extant languages.

	<u>Choctaw</u> (Nicklas 1974, 29)	<u>Mikasuki</u> (personal field notes)	<u>Creek</u> (Buckner 1860, 62-3)
1	a-no	aan-i	a-ni
2	ci-šno	ci-hn-i	ci-mi
1'	pi-šno	po-hn-i	po-mi
1''	hapi-šno		
2'	haci-šno	ci-hn-i	ci-mi-t-ak-i

The form to be reconstructed for the first person plural is not readily apparent. If one considers the two Choctaw first person plural forms, pi- and hapi-, it appears that the pre-Choctaw form may have been \*api with \*ho prefixed for the plural. The  $V_1V_2 \rightarrow V_2$  vowel simplification

rule would then produce the hapi- form. The initial a of the pronoun is subsequently lost in the paucal, but since \*ho is prefixed in the multiple, the a is retained.

The Mikasuki alternation ip- ~ po- is interesting because it suggests a pre-Mikasuki form \*ipo from which such an alternation can easily be derived. The pertinent question is whether or not the two intermediate forms \*api and \*ipo can be derived from a common ancestral form.

Nicklas discusses a historical change in the eastern Muskogean languages:  $V_1XV_2 > V_2$  in words of more than two syllables (1973, 28-29).<sup>11</sup> In Choctaw only the final vowel was lost. Word final h and f in modern Choctaw are lost in many words. If one were to reconstruct \*ipa-ho as the first person plural marker, the aforementioned rule would yield the appropriate intermediate form, \*ipo, in the eastern languages. In Choctaw the pronoun must have undergone metathesis to arrive at the form \*api-ho. This type of metathesis has been documented for Choctaw by Haas (1951): \*ix<sup>w</sup>a > \*ix<sup>w</sup>o > \*ifo > ofi 'dog'. The truncation rule would then yield \*api-h. The final h is subsequently lost giving \*api. When the last vestige of the pluralizer disappeared, \*ho was re-applied in the form of a prefix for the multiple.<sup>12</sup> Finally, the initial a was lost.

The derivations for Choctaw and Mikasuki are as follows:<sup>13</sup>

Choctaw: \*ipa-ho > \*api-ho > \*api-h > \*api > <sup>pi-</sup>\*ho-api → hapi-

Mikasuki: \*ipa-ho > \*ipo > ip- ~ po-



Tenses

4. An extensive study of the tense system of the Muskogean languages has not yet been undertaken primarily because of the lack of available synchronic analyses of the languages. In this section, then, I endeavor merely to point out some of the salient correspondences among the languages which may serve as the basis for further investigation.

In all of the Muskogean languages, the unmarked form of the verb may be considered the present or very recent past.<sup>14</sup> The marked forms seem to indicate future and past time in varying degrees.

The Future

4.1 There appear to be two separate morphemes used to indicate a future event in each of the Muskogean languages.

Creek (personal field notes)<sup>15</sup>

Type I: -aʔ hoʔkop-ick-aʔ-ii-s 'He will steal.'

Type II: -ahaan homp-ahaan-ay-i-s 'I'm gonna eat.'

Hitchiti (Swanton 1921-22, 33, 62)

Type I: -la<sup>16</sup> iti-pi-lá-li-s 'I will fight him.'

Type II: -ah(i) is-aʔa-c-ah-omm-ika-s 'We are going to take her along with us.'

Mikasuki (West 1975, 3)

Type I: -laa(ka) imp-iika-ti-laaka 'He will not eat.'

Type II: -aah(i) way-l-ip-oos-aah-om 'He is about to have sold them.'

Alabama (Lupardus, field notes)

Type I: -lo hofna-lo 'He will smell.'

Type II: -la saffi-la 'He's going to dig.'

Choctaw (Nicklas 1974, 199, 192)

Type I: -aahi ahoc-a hila-h ok ma-t, 'If he could find it,  
ap-aahi tok he would eat it.'

Type II: -aaci mala,h,t-aaci-h 'It's gonna lightning.'

The semantic distinction involved here seems to be one of immediate vs. remote future, the remote being the Type I forms and the immediate, the Type II forms. This fact is substantiated by Byington for Choctaw (1870, 349) and by the consistent use of the Type I form for the English 'will' form of the verb and the Type II form for the 'going to' translations.

Besides a time distinction, there appears to be an additional semantic distinction between the two forms. Castillo and Lewis (personal communication) pointed out that in Creek, an action taking the Type II ending is more of a certainty than one with the Type I ending. The following Choctaw examples bear this out (Nicklas 1974, 192).

ahoca hila-h ok mat, apaahi tok 'If he could find it, he  
would eat it.'

ahocih ok mat, apaacih 'If he finds it, he will  
eat it.'

Buckner (1860, 84) lists another future, -alaan, for Creek:  
caawalaaniis 'I will take (very soon).' Apparently -aan is a separate morpheme which could be combined with both al and ahi in the language.

al + aan → alaan

ahi + aan → ahaan

This means that in Creek, future time was indicated by -aan (possibly the -N- grade of -aa) with -ahi and -a± indicating the inevitability of the action and the uncertainty of the action, respectively. In the speech of my informant, the future time marker is retained only in the inevitable future, -ahaan. The uncertain future has lost the time marker, and -a± carries a dual significance.<sup>17</sup>

Mikasuki and Choctaw retain the \*a to mark future time, but Alabama seems to have lost the time marker in favor of an aspect marker in both forms.

The aspect marker signifying the inevitability of the action can be reconstructed as \*ahi, or as \*hi with the \*a marking future time. Choctaw, Creek, and Mikasuki all contain reflexes of this morpheme with identical meanings. Choctaw ahila-h 'potential' may also be cognate to \*ahi, with the -N- ablaut grade added.

The aspect marker indicating an uncertain action appears to reconstruct as \*-la. If the analysis of the Choctaw ahila presented in the preceding paragraph is correct and the word segments to ahi-N-la-h, then the la must be cognate to the future markers in Alabama and Hitchiti/Mikasuki.

The etymology of the Choctaw Type II form, -aaci, is unclear. Perhaps -ci is the -N- grade of Alabama -ci, which is glossed as 'present continuative' by Lupardus.

### The Past

4.2 There is a form -ti meaning 'recent past' in Alabama and 'very recent past and immediate future' in Hitchiti, although it is not found

among West's examples for Mikasuki. A remote past form -kta is found in Hitchiti and Mikasuki and -kha in Alabama.

Hitchiti (Swanton 1921-22, 31-2)

Recent past: -ti hica-tí 'He had just seen.'

Remote past: -kta hica-lí-kta-s 'I saw many years ago.'

Mikasuki (West 1975, 5)

Remote past: -kta o,m,m-iika-kta-s 'We made (it) long ago.'

Alabama (Lupardus, field notes)

Recent past: -ti haalo-ti 'He heard (yesterday).'

Remote past: -kha haalo-kha 'He heard (a long time ago).'

It is clear that the t and k in these two tenses should be considered two separate morphemes. Perhaps \*t is a past marker and \*k some kind of a perfective.

One point of interest concerning the remote past is that in Natchez, there is a recent past -di and a remote past -kdi. Swanton (1924-5, 58) hypothesizes that the latter form arises from a combination of the neuter suffix -ga plus -di.<sup>18</sup> A process of the same sort may have occurred in Hitchiti/Mikasuki: \*k plus -ta (a past morpheme found in isolation in its metathesized form in Creek as -at 'indefinite past,' and in compounds as -ta (Loughridge, 1964)) yielding -kta in Hitchiti/Mikasuki and -kha in Alabama. This, of course, is very speculative.

Haas (1940) and Loughridge (1964) seem to agree that Creek has four past tenses. I shall not dwell on what they call the first past tense, since it may be analyzed as consisting of two aspect markers

which will be discussed later. The other forms are as follows:

Past II: -ank Past III: -(i)mata (Haas: -(i)mac) Past IV: -anta

Examples (Loughridge 1964, 225-26)

Past II: náfk-ank-s 'He struck (yesterday or last week).'

Past III: náfk-imáta-s 'He struck (a year or so ago).'

Past IV: náfk-ánta-s 'He struck (many years ago).'

Haas' form for Past III clearly arose from -(i)mata + s (the declarative marker). These forms are probably polymorphemic. Past II may have arisen from -an + ka, Past III from -(i)ma + ta (the indefinite past), and Past IV from -an + ta. But again, this is speculation at this point.

What Loughridge calls the pluperfect, -ip + at, is of interest because it may be the combination of a completive aspect marker (-ipa in Mikasuki) and the indefinite past.

Creek (Loughridge 1964, 227)

náfk-ip-at-i-n 'He had struck.'

Mikasuki (West 1975, 3)

yaw-li-ic-iip-om 'They (mult.) had been around.'

Choctaw has only two past tense forms: tok 'recent past' and ttook 'remote past' (Nicklas 1974, 194).

haklo-li tok 'I heard (yesterday).'

haklo-li ttook 'I heard (long ago).'

The 'remote past' form is obviously the intensive ablaut grade (see sec-

tion following on internal modification) of tok.

A probable cognate for these forms exists in Hitchiti -took (Swanton 1921-22) and later recorded as -too (Swanton 1924-25) with the meaning of indefinite past. The discrepancy between the two forms suggest the derivation \*too-k.

The k of Choctaw to-k is almost certainly the same morpheme associated with the k of the Hitchiti and Alabama remote past tense. The Choctaw and Hitchiti forms, then, are cognate with the Creek verb too-ita 'to be', which Loughridge records as tooy-ita.<sup>19</sup> Loughridge lists an additional form, oom-ita, meaning 'to be', also. In Creek, these forms are dialectal variations today. oom-ita is undoubtedly cognate to the Hitchiti/Mikasuki -om(i) found in the conjugation of some active verbs: hacaa-l-om 'He stands.' PM was, in all likelihood, characterized by at least two verbs for 'to be,' \*too and \*omi, but their precise use is undetermined at this time. Perhaps with further investigation these forms can be related.

#### Internal Modification

5. Internal modification of the stem has been discussed by Haas for Creek (1940) and by Nicklas for Choctaw (1974). Information on Hitchiti/Mikasuki is scanty but some reference is made to this type of change by both Swanton (1921-22) and West (1975). There are three types of modification involved--vowel lengthening, infixation, and tone change. The charts on the following pages compare Choctaw, Creek, Mikasuki, and Hitchiti ablaut forms indicating the most likely cognates. Only the basic

Comparison of Choctaw, Creek, Mikasuki, and Hitchiti Ablaut Forms:  
Terminology, Form, Meaning

Choctaw: Nicklas Form Meaning		Creek: Haas Form Meaning		Mikasuki: West	Hitchiti: Swanton
No change	<u>Plain</u>	No change	<u>Completive I</u> Tenseless stem Future Certain negative & modal suffixes	Plain	Plain
VL unless / _CC HP	<u>Lengthened</u> "plain form...in certain contexts" (p. 73-4)	VL	<u>Incompletive</u> Incomplete action in all tenses		VL
-n- HP	<u>Incompletive</u> St: comparative Ac: prolonga- tion; focus	VL -n- RP	<u>Continuative/Intensive</u> Continuative Intensive	-n- VL	-n-
-h-; HP Epepthetic V / hCC VV → V / _hC	<u>Instantaneous</u> St: increase in quality Ac: sudden action	-h- HP	<u>Completive II</u> Immediate past completive Certain modal suffixes	<u>Completive/</u> <u>Imperative</u> -h-	-hayh-
-n-; -h-; HP Epepthetic V / hCC	<u>Iterative</u> Repeated action	/			
VL; FP VCV → √CCVV / _C VCV → √CCV / _CC or _#	<u>Intensive</u> St: intensive Ac: completion after pro- longed attempt	VL FP	<u>Completive III</u> 3 remote past forms Immutabile dura- tive aspect		

## Comparison of Choctaw, Creek, Mikasuki, and Hitchiti Ablaut Forms:

## Examples

Ablaut Grade	Choctaw		St	Creek	Mikasuki	Hitchiti
	TA	IA				
Plain	'tie'	'return'	'big'	'buy'	'see'	'catch'
	takci	falama	cito	nis-	hic-	afa-
Lengthened	tákci	faláama	cíto	niis-		aafa-
Incompletive	tákci	faláama	cíto	nís-	híic-	afa-
Instantaneous	tahákci	falaháama	cíhto	níhs-	hihc-	lok-tolop- hayh-ka-k 'jumped up'
Iterative	tahákci	falaháama	cihíto			
Intensive	táyakci	fállaama	cíto	nís-		



changes of the stem have been noted. Detailed phonological conditioning factors have been omitted. The terminology is that of Haas and Nicklas for Creek and Choctaw, respectively, and mine for Hitchiti and Mikasuki.<sup>20</sup>

Once again, the common elements of the ablauting process include infixation of -h- and -n-, pitch change, and vowel lengthening. The meanings of the forms correspond well. The combination of the -h- and -n- infixes in the Choctaw iterative may not be cognate to Haas' Completive III. The languages share the elements of vowel lengthening and falling pitch, but the semantics are uncertain. The status of pitch as cognate in the languages, too, is uncertain. Until pitch has been fully analyzed in all the languages, it will be impossible to speculate as to its status in PM.

One point concerning Haas' Completive II stems is worth special mention. For this stem, she treats -h- and -ey- as if they were in complementary distribution, and, indeed, they seem to be in her data. Mekko Lewis, however, has volunteered forms which have both -h- and -ey- in them. This then leads to the hypothesis that these forms are separate morphemes. Indeed, they are different enough phonologically so that one would assume separate status at an earlier stage. This is an important point to keep in mind when we attempt to find cognates in the other languages.

In Swanton's Sketch (1921-22), it is apparent that ablaut existed in the language, but Swanton did not analyze the system thoroughly. The continuative is listed as the suffix -n which "sometimes appears to be reduced to mere nasalization of the final vowel or even a lengthening of the vowel" (p. 27). The exact translations as listed by Swanton of the

examples in the chart are as follows:

<u>á</u> fa-li-s		'I caught.'
<u>aa</u> fa-li-s	or	<u>a</u> fa-li-s
		'I catch, I am catching.'

What might actually be illustrated here is two separate ablaut grades-- vowel lengthening and -n- infixation with two variations in meaning which Swanton failed to capture. These two grades are easily confused. Both Haas and Nicklas list an 'incompletive' among their respective forms. Yet the term is applied to two different grades.

Besides the -n-, West also lists a suffix -h alternating with -hayh which is "used for building intermediate past tense, one type of imperative, and perhaps other forms" (1975, 9). As a tentative conditioning factor, he suggests that -hayh occurs between consonants and -h elsewhere, but adds that such a rule needs additional refinement. Possibly the rule fails because these are separate morphemes which can co-occur. His examples include:

hak-l-om		'He hears.'
hak- <u>hayh</u> -li-k		'to have heard (some time ago)'
hak-l-i, <u>h</u> ,pa-k		'to have heard (completive)'
hak-l-o, <u>h</u> ,mi		'He heard (some time ago).'
hi, <u>h</u> ,c-i		'Look!'

Obviously the -h- form is cognate to Nicklas' instantaneous which seems to fit semantically as well as syntactically with the above examples. Again, -hayh may be a combination of aspect marker (-h + ay plus

an h increment) or a completely different morpheme.

A parallel to the -hayh form can be found in Swanton's Hitchiti material (1921-22, 28) although he does not mention -h as a possible alternation. He is unable to define its meaning, however.

lok-tolop-hayh-ka-k 'She jumped up, he also jumped up.'

lok-is-tolop-hayh-ka-k 'He jumped up with it.'

The most likely analysis at this point is to attribute the h<sup>21</sup> portion of the morpheme as cognate to Nicklas' instantaneous. The ay, then, would be cognate to the completive ey in Creek. This is assuming, of course, that Haas' Completive II consists of two distinct morphemes.

One interesting tonal ablaut, not reflected in the charts, is cited by West to indicate a past tense (1975, 9). A mid tone becomes high on short vowels and a downglide on long vowels.

ō,m,m-ōmī	'She is making (it). (material going through sewing machine)'
ó,m,m-ōmī	'She made (it). (completed skirt displayed on hanger)'
ō,m,m-ómī	'She has made (it). (implication of repetition, habit, or knowledge)'

The status of ablaut in Alabama/Koasati is unknown. There is some indication of a fossilized -n- infix in Alabama (Lupardus, personal communication), but the process of -n- infixation is no longer productive.

From a comparison of the Choctaw and Creek ablaut systems and the few but convincing examples in Hitchiti and Mikasuki, it is apparent that aspectual nuances of meaning are reflected by similar stem modifications

in these Muskogean languages. Three distinct grades are reconstructable at this time: \*-N-, \*-H-, and vowel lengthening. Perhaps more will surface with additional data. More information on Alabama/Koasati and Mikasuki is needed before the details of the PM aspectual system can be accurately worked out.

#### Miscellaneous Affixes

6. Some other affixes which show some possibility of being characteristic of all the Muskogean languages are the classifiers -ka and -li, the causative, the instrumental, locatives, and prefixed verb stems.

#### The Classifying Suffixes -ka, -li

6.1 No comparison of Muskogean verb morphology can possibly ignore the numerous occurrences of the verbal suffixes -ka and -li. They are preserved in fossilized form in the subject pronouns of Hitchiti/Mikasuki and Creek and in the verb stems of all the languages.

In her analysis of the PM subject pronouns, Haas discusses quite thoroughly the amalgamation of the -ka classifying suffix with the regular pronouns in Hitchiti and Creek, her PM Class II paradigm (1969, 52-4).

	<u>Hitchiti</u> (and Mikasuki)	<u>Creek</u>
1	-li	-ey ~ -ay < *ayi < *ali < *kali
2	-icka	-ick
1'	-iika < *iyika < *ilika	-ii < *iy < *ili
2'	-aacka	-aack

Choctaw retains the Pre-PM \*ka as -a and \*li as -li. According to Nicklas (1974, 55), -a is used as a "passive" suffix while -li imparts an active significance. Note that either suffix may be attached to at least some verb roots.

kol- <u>a</u>	'be dug'	kol- <u>li</u>	'to dig'
baš- <u>a</u>	'be gashed'	baš- <u>li</u>	'to gash'
koo- <u>a</u>	'be boiling'	koo- <u>li</u>	'to boil (trans.)'

These suffixes are also reported by Swanton. He describes -li as indicating "greater active participation in the action on the part of the subject of the verb" than does -ka (1921-22, 29).

mó <sup>h</sup> - <u>ka</u> -s	'It is boiling.'
batáp- <u>li</u> -s	'He strikes.'

West notes that "in some cases, -li has transitive implications while -ka has intransitive or mediopassive implications" in Mikasuki (1975, 1). His examples are especially interesting since they illustrate that the two suffixes may be used with the same verb root, just as the Choctaw examples.

talaa- <u>ka</u> -k	'to lie down, sing., (intrans.)'
talaa- <u>li</u> -k	'to lay down, sing., (trans.)'

Not all instances of these suffixes, however, can be explained in this manner. Other occurrences seem to be fossilized with no apparent meaning.

No examples of the same verb root used with both suffixes were

available for Alabama. Rather, the suffixes are fossilized as an integral part of the verb stem. Both the first and third persons singular are given in the examples below to avoid confusing the classifier with the first person singular active subject marker. The forms are from Lupardus.

balaa- <u>ka</u> -li-ci	'I am lying down.'
balaa- <u>ka</u> -ci	'He is lying down.'
stinyo- <u>li</u> -li-ci	'I am tying (it).'
stinyo- <u>li</u> -ci	'He is tying (it).'

Haas (1969, 55) states that Creek preserves \*ka as -k and \*li as -y. Evidently she arrives at this conclusion by assuming a parallel derivation with the first person singular subject pronoun (ka + li > ayi > ay) so that V + li > Vyi in stem final position as well. Looking through the Loughridge dictionary, I was able to find numerous verb stems ending in -k but few in -y. Only one clear-cut illustration was found in the three translations of the English verb 'to divide.'

- 1) tikapá-k-ita < \*tikapá-ka-ita 'to be divided'
- 2) tikapaa-y-ita < \*tikapaa-li-ita 'to divide something'
- 3) tikapay-c-ita < \*tikapa-ic-ita 'to cause to divide'

The first translation is the derivative using the -ka classifier, the second using -li. Number three is the causative translation.

Another possible pair of verbs which fits Haas' description is:

láv- <u>k</u> -ita	'to be deep'
--------------------	--------------

láv-w-ita < \*láv-y-ita 'to dig'

Other examples include:<sup>22</sup>

sóm-k-ita 'to be lost'

kafáá-y-ita 'to beat up a liquid'

Numerous other verbs are found with stem final k and y.

hál-k-ita 'to crawl'

hós-k-ita 'to scratch'

aaptakkáá-y-ita to be hitched up'

These are probably root final k and y rather than remnants of the PM classifiers. They certainly do not correspond semantically to the preceding examples.

Before leaving the topic of the PM classifiers and the Pre-PM auxiliaries, it is appropriate to recall the discussion of the negative, where it was demonstrated that PM or Pre-PM undoubtedly had a negative auxiliary which I have reconstructed as \*ki. Evidence was drawn from the pronouns with which it was used and their similarity to the subject pronouns of active verbs.

Some evidence also exists to suggest the existence of still other auxiliaries. The verb for 'to be,' \*too, has already been discussed. Choctaw uses too as part of the past tense marker to-k: haklo-li tok 'I heard (yesterday).' Creek retains the form in its auxiliary capacity: ci-hópoo-too-ay-i-s 'I am watching you.'

In the discussion of the internal modification of the Muskogean verb stem, it was pointed out that an infix -h- was found in Choctaw, Creek, and Hitchiti/Mikasuki. Recall West's Mikasuki examples (1975, 9).

hak-l-om	'He hears.'
hak-l-o, <u>h</u> ,mi	'He heard (some time ago).'
hak-l-i, <u>h</u> ,pa-k	'to have heard (completive).'

Not only can the -h- be inserted in the root, but also in what is synchronically analyzed as suffixes: -omi and -ipa. The placement of -h- in these cases strongly suggests that omi and ipa enjoyed the status of auxiliary verbs at an earlier stage and could be conjugated independently.

In Creek the -h- is sometimes inserted in the distributive marker -ak: slafka-n s-il-ic-a,h,k-i-s 'They killed him with a knife.' Although it is possible, it is unlikely that ak was at one time a free morpheme. Examples such as this one remind us that the above evidence in itself is not sufficient to establish the suffixes as earlier auxiliaries.

### The Causative

6.2 The causative -ci appears in all the Muskogean languages and can readily be reconstructed as PM \*-ǰi with metathesis in Creek.

Creek (Castillo & Loughridge) Mikasuki (West 1975, 2)

il-ita	'to die'	impa-k	'to eat'
il- <u>ic</u> -ita	'to kill'	impaa- <u>ci</u> -k	'to feed'
hayy- <u>ic</u> -ita	'to heat'	ilii- <u>ci</u> -k	'to kill'
mół-ita	'to boil (IT)'	tala-lii- <u>ci</u> -k	'cause to lie down'



Creek

moł-ic-ita 'to boil (T)'

Hitchiti (Swanton 1921-22, 30)    Choctaw (Nicklas 1974, 56)óks-ipa-k 'They died.'    pisa 'to see'oksi-ci-k 'They killed them.'    pisa-ci 'to show'

ólá-li-s 'I reach.'    iško 'to drink'

olá-ci-li-s 'I made it reach.'    iško-ci 'to water'Alabama (Lupardus, field notes)    Koasati (Haas 1946, 328)imaaba-ci-lo 'He will teach.'    bok-li-ci-li 'I threshed.'małat-li-ci-lo 'He will scare (it).'The Instrumental

6.3 The instrumental prefix is found in all the Muskogean languages and is probably derived from the verb meaning 'to take, hold.'

Hitchiti (Swanton 1921-22, 23)is- < ísi-k 'to take'    is-ca-náp-li-li-s 'I shoot with it'Mikasuki (West 1974a, 3)is- < íís-om 'He takes.'    s-ayy-om 'He goes around by means of (ride, drive)'Creek (personal field notes)s-            s-laafka-n s-il-ic-a,h,k-i-s 'They killed him with a knife.'Choctaw (Nicklas 1974, 180)iṣ-t < iṣi 'to take hold of'    tali iṣ-t i-sso-li tok 'I hit it with a rock.'

No information was available for Alabama/Koasati, but the above examples should provide sufficient evidence for the reconstruction of this morpheme as \*is in PM. One cannot be certain at this time, however, whether or not this morpheme existed as an affix or as a free morpheme (or both).

#### Locative Prefixes

6.4 Another characteristic of Muskogean verb morphology is the existence of locative prefixes in many of the languages. The following is a selective list from Hitchiti (Swanton actually lists several more) and examples from Mikasuki and Creek from my own field notes.

#### Hitchiti (Swanton 1921-22, 20-21)

on-	'on'	<u>on</u> -cokóó-l-icka-n	'You can sit on it (obj.)'
ka-	'in the water'	<u>ka</u> -pííba-li-s	'I threw into the water.'
ta-	'at, there, down'	<u>tá</u> -bi-li-k	'He beat (him) down there'
a-	'at, to'	baná-li-li-s	'I tie.'
		<u>a</u> -baná-li-li-s	'I tie to'
lok-	'up'	<u>lok</u> -tolóp-ka-k	'He jumped up.'
sap-	'toward'	<u>sap</u> -is-cin-takahoí-li-s	'I send to you with...'

#### Mikasuki

ta-	'on the ground'	<u>ta</u> -cokóó-l-om-li	'I sit down.'
lok-	'up'	<u>lok</u> -hacáá-l-om-li	'I stand up.'
on-	'on'	ah-on <u>on</u> -folóó-k-om	'It's in the tree (on a branch)'
ka-	'in the water'	laal-ot <u>ka</u> -yaw-líi-c-om	'There must be fish (moving around) there in the water.'

Mikasuki

sap- 'down'            sap-hacáá-l-om            'He's stepping down.'

Creek

tak- 'on the ground'    tootka timpi-n tak-apoo-k-i-s 'They're sitting on  
the ground around the fire.'

oh- 'on'                hasiakiiika-t asea-n oh-lay-k-i-s 'The clock's sit-  
ting (on something) over  
there.'

nak- 'under'            sampa-t oh-homp-ita layca-n nak-lay-k-i-s 'The bas-  
ket's under the table.'

ah- 'against'            asea-n s-paaska-t ah-wiil-ii-s 'The broom's over  
there (against the wall).'

sok- 'inside'            talaako-t asa-n sok-lay-k-i-s 'The beans are there  
(in a container on the  
table).'

ak- 'in the water' (Loughridge) ak-lôh-ita 'to lie in the water'

Data from Alabama/Koasati are very scarce, but on occasion one runs across a cognate. For example, in the article, The Muskogean Connection of the Natchez Language (1924-25) Swanton cites the Koasati form ita- 'down there' (p. 56). This same form is found in the Alabama verb ita-bat-li 'to crawl (on the ground).' Swanton also lists the Koasati form ak- as being cognate to Hitchiti ka- 'in the water' (1921-22).

Choctaw would provide the crucial cognates in this situation since it is the lone representative of the western branch of the family for which we have any documentation. Although Nicklas does not treat these elements in a category of their own, a few instances can be found scattered throughout his grammar (1974).

q-	'on'	is-q bini-li tok	'You sat on it.'
		q-tocciina	'eight (lit. 'on three'))'
		q-toklo	'seven (lit. 'on two'))'

The notion of location in the water is expressed in Choctaw as oka hika. Indeed, where the eastern Muskogean languages have a prefix, Choctaw has a free morpheme (note previous discussion of the instrumental). Perhaps these forms existed as free morphemes in PM and were grammaticalized in the eastern languages. Certainly the locative prefixes existed at a post-PM period as characteristic of the eastern Muskogean language.

#### Prefixes Verb Stems

6.5 There is some evidence to indicate that the roots of the verbs 'to arrive coming' and 'to arrive going' can be prefixed to other verb roots in at least some of the Muskogean languages. Swanton was the first to point this out in Hitchiti (1921-22, 24).

#### Hitchiti

oɬ-	'arrive there'	oɬ-hic-oo	'Let's go and see.'
il-	'arrive here'	il-hííca-k	'He came and saw her.'

Swanton undoubtedly missed vowel length. West cites the following examples in Mikasuki (1974a, 3-4)

ooɬ-	'arrive there'	ooɬ-iil-om	'He arrived there and then here. (i.e. He made a round trip beginning here)'
iil-	'arrive here'	iil-ooɬ-wa	'He arrived here and there. (i.e. He made a round trip beginning there)'

In Choctaw a similar system seems to occur. The following example is from Nicklas (1974, 190), but again, as with the instrumental and locatives, the prefix is realized as a free morpheme.

#### Choctaw

ona 'arrive there'    on-t apila    'Go help him.'

No information is available from Alabama/Koasati, but Swanton does verify the occurrence of such prefixes in the languages with a trace of a connective preserved in certain situations (1921-22, 24).<sup>23</sup>

This topic is not well documented in Creek, but I have noted one interesting example in my notes.

#### Creek

ca-coosi-n is-hic-ahaan-t ahhiy-ay-i-s    'I am going to see my sister.'

In the Loughridge Dictionary there are numerous examples of verbs with the prefix is- 'go' besides is-hic-ita 'to go see.'

<u>is-aal-ita</u>	'to return'
<u>is-k-ita</u> <sup>24</sup>	'to go and drink'
<u>is-ci-y-ita</u>	'to go into, at a distance'

As with the case of the locative prefixes, prefixed verb stems of motion may have been characteristic of eastern Muskogean at the time of the split between the eastern and the western branches. In PM these were probably autonomous verbs.

Final Remarks

7. The preceding discussion was intended to outline some of the more obvious similarities of verb morphology among the Muskogean languages. Undoubtedly many correspondences have gone unnoticed and some may later prove to be incorrect.

Because of the scope of the topic, it was impossible to do more than skim the surface of each characteristic feature. Indeed, each topic could easily be expanded into a paper of considerable length. It is hoped that as more language data become available, further research will elaborate and illuminate the foregoing discussion. What is outlined in this paper must be considered no more than a beginning.

## Footnotes

1. The reconstruction of most Native American languages has proceeded in the aforementioned fashion essentially because of the fact that most are unwritten languages. It is true, however, that other language families, Indo-European for example, have been established first on the basis of grammatical similarities. But it is not necessarily the case that morphology is more conservative than phonology.
2. Hitchiti is generally thought to be extinct, although T. Dale Nicklas has reported a Hitchiti speaker in Henryetta, Oklahoma. In addition to these languages, Apalachee was shown by Haas (1949) to be a member of this family, but it became extinct shortly after the first white contact.
3. A preliminary draft of this paper was presented in a seminar given by Professor Robert L. Rankin, University of Kansas. This revised version has benefited greatly from the class discussion and his personal direction.
4. The segmentation of examples other than the Mikasuki data taken from West is mine. Dashes indicate morpheme boundaries and commas set off infixes.

5. This point will be referred to again in the section on auxiliaries.
6. For an alternative analysis see Booker (1977).
7. Of course the possibility of parallel innovation in Choctaw and Mikasuki should not be totally discarded. But the fact that the multiple form is found in a language of both the eastern and western branches of the family cannot be ignored either.
8. The Mikasuki negative marker is -ti. It may or may not be cognate to the other Muskogean forms. The answer must await further synchronic analysis.
9. There appears to be some variation in the Choctaw first person plural form. Nicklas (1974, 239) lists k-il- alternating with k-ii- and the form k-ili-tháán-o 'We don't know.' is reported by Robert L. Rankin (field notes).
10. Alternatively, the auxiliary might be reconstructed as \*kio, incorporating the -o. This hypothesis is the weaker of the two since it cannot adequately explain how the auxiliary came to be split in Choctaw and Alabama.
11. The X stands for \*x and \*x<sup>w</sup>, which are h and f respectively in the extant languages.
12. If this was, indeed, the case, it would mean that PM did not have a number distinction in the first person plural in the object pronouns. This would be unusual if the number distinction did exist in the active affixes as I have claimed, especially considering the fact that the object pronouns are used as subjects of stative verbs. For this reason I am favoring the parallel development hypothesis. Both Choctaw and Mikasuki developed a "multiple" first person plural pronoun using \*ho.
13. For a more thorough treatment of this topic see Booker (1977).
14. See Haas (1946) on the Koasati aorist.
15. A long vowel appears in the first person singular future tense: hoḥkopaatiis 'I will steal.' But as mentioned before, the conglomerate is analyzed as the person marker plus the future: a + aḥ. A long vowel also appears in the so-called compound tenses: nafkíckatitáátiis 'you will have struck' (Loughridge 1964, 227). But again, the long vowel arises from the combination of the future marker and another morpheme: nafk-íck-ati-tá-aḥ-i-s.
16. Although not recorded as such, length is likely in this morpheme because of the stressed vowel.

17. The future marker -aɫ has the same phonological shape as the root of the verb aɫ-ita 'to be around (moving), sing.' Perhaps the similarity is not accidental since verbs of motion commonly provide a source for innovated future markers, e.g., English, French.
18. I prefer to analyze the k here as an aspect marker, but this fact does not detract from the parallel to be drawn with the Muskogean languages.
19. The y in Loughridge's form is undoubtedly epenthetic.
20. For convenience the following abbreviations are used: Ac = active verbs, FP = falling pitch, HP = high pitch, IA = intransitive active verbs, RP = rising pitch, St = stative verbs, TA = transitive active verbs, VL = vowel lengthening.
21. I assume it is the first h of hayh which is the Choctaw cognate. The second would then be an h increment (Nicklas, 1974).
22. I am still not convinced that all the y stems are derived from -li. They are all preceded by vowels and followed by the high front vowel of the infinitive suffix. I see no reason why these y's cannot be epenthetic. To make any conclusive statements, the conjugated forms of the verbs are needed and/or comparative evidence from the other languages.
23. PM probably had a system similar to Choctaw where the motion verb existed as an independent, probably embedded, form rather than an affix. If Alabama/Koasati does have a "connective" attached, this may be the likely hypothesis.
24. This form is the result of haplology: \*ɫis-is-k-itā > ɫ-is-k-ita.

#### References

- Booker, Karen M. 1977. Proto-Muskogean \*ho and some implications for the reconstruction of certain pronominals. To appear in the proceedings of the Mid-America Linguistics Conference. Minneapolis, Minnesota.
- Brinton, D. G. 1970. Contributions to a grammar of the Muskokee language. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 11: 301-309.
- Buckner, H. F. 1860. A Grammar of the Maskoke, or Creek Language. Marion, Alabama: The Domestic and Indian Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Convention.



- Byington, Cyrus. 1870. Grammar of the Choctaw language, ed. D. G. Brinton. Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society 11: 317-67.
- Haas, Mary R. 1940. Ablaut and its function in Muskogee. Language 16: 141-50.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1941. The classification of the Muskogean languages. In Language, Culture and Personality, Essays in Memory of Edward Sapir, ed. Leslie Spier et al., 41-56. Menasha, Wisconsin.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Dialects of the Muskogee language. IJAL 11: 69-74.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1946. A Proto-Muskogean paradigm. Language 22: 326-32.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1947. Development of Proto-Muskogean \*k<sup>w</sup>. IJAL 13:131-37.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1949. The position of Apalachee in the Muskogean family. IJAL 15: 121-27.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1951. The Proto-Gulf word for Water (with notes on Siouan-Yuchi). IJAL 17: 71-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1952. The Proto-Gulf word for Land (with a note on Proto-Siouan). IJAL 18: 236-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. The Prehistory of Languages. Janua Linguarum, Series Minor, 57. The Hague: Mouton.
- Haney, Willie. 1931. Hitchiti texts. Collected by John R. Swanton. Unpublished manuscript. BAE Archives. Washington D. C.
- Loughridge, R. M., and David M. Hodge. 1964. English and Muskokee Dictionary (and, beginning on p. 95) Dictionary of the Muskokee or Creek Language in Creek and English. Okmulgee, Oklahoma: B. Frank Belvin, General Missionary to Creek and Seminole Indians, Baptist Home Mission Board.
- Lupardus, Karen J. 1974. Negation in Alabama. Unpublished manuscript.
- Nicklas, T. Dale. 1973. The genetic relationships of Choctaw. Unpublished manuscript.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. The Elements of Choctaw. PhD Dissertation, University Michigan. Ann Arbor: Xerox University Microfilms.
- Swanton, John R. 1921-22. A sketch of the Hitchiti language. Unpublished manuscript. BAE Archives. Washington D. C.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1924-25. The Muskogean connection of the Natchez language.

IJAL 3: 46-75.

West, John David. 1974a. Mikasuki verb prefixes. Paper presented at SECOL XI.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1974b. Number in the Mikasuki verb stem. Summer Institute of Linguistics, University of North Dakota. Work Papers 18: 133-38.

\_\_\_\_\_. 1975. Mikasuki verb suffixes. Unpublished manuscript.