

The Noun Substitute in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd
Indiana University

[*Essays in Algonquian and Siouan Linguistics in Memory of Frank T. Siebert, Jr.*, edited by Blair A. Rudes and David C. Costa, pp. 141–63. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press, 2003.]

Abstract. Speakers of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, an Eastern Algonquian language of Maine and New Brunswick, make extensive use of a pronoun known as the *noun substitute* as a signal of hesitation. Previous analyses have taken this use of the noun substitute to represent its exclusive or basic function. I argue here on the basis of data drawn from Maliseet texts that this pronoun (actually a semantically empty noun) in fact has a range of uses. It serves to provide or to introduce clarifications of grammatical gender or pronominal reference and to indicate that a speaker realizes that he or she has misspoken. It also functions as a generalizing nominal modifier meaning roughly ‘this or these N of some kind’, where N is the sense of the modified noun. The last of these functions is appropriately viewed as basic.

1. Introduction

A striking feature of discourse in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, an Eastern Algonquian language of Maine and New Brunswick, is the frequent use of forms a pronoun known as the *noun substitute*, distinct from the demonstratives, personal pronouns, and interrogative-indefinite pronouns of the language, as a signal of hesitation. A comparable pronoun has been reported in other Algonquian languages, including Micmac (Proulx 1978:73–5; DeBlois 1987) and Cree (Wolfart 1996:422).¹ Proulx (1988) proposes a reconstruction for Proto-Algonquian.

As a hesitation form, the noun substitute serves as a place-holder in a utterance as a speaker pauses to recall a momentarily elusive noun or to select the best noun to use in designating some entity or entities. A nominal derivative is employed as a more general hesitation marker. There are also verbal derivatives, both transitive and intransitive, which are used as hesitation signals in anticipation of verbs.

When a speaker employs the noun substitute in anticipation of a *target noun*, he or she chooses an inflected form of the pronoun that prefigures this noun by specifying the inflectional categories to which it may be expected to belong in the current syntactic and discourse context, as illustrated in the following Maliseet examples. Forms of the noun substitute and the target nouns that they serve to anticipate are given in boldface.²

- (1) On=yaka pet-apasi-nĩ-ya, yùkt ’t-utene-hs-is-ũwa
and=later.on hither-pl.walk-SUB-PROX.PL these.PROX 3-town-DIM-DIM-3PL
yùkt **íy-ok**, **Meqíy-ok** kòsõna=al wén-ik.
those.PROX NS-PROX.PL Mohawk-PROX.PL or=PART someone-PROX.PL
‘Then at last they arrived at their village, these, oh, Mohawks, or whoever they
were.’ [22:4]

(2) Psi=cel pecì mecim-sok-h-àsŭ-w-ol **íy-ol**, **khàkǒn-ol**
 all =moreover even remain-board-TA-II-3-IN.PL NS-IN.PL door-IN.PL

weci skàt wèn kisi=nutá-ha-h-q.
 from not someone be.able=out-go-NEG-3AN

‘Moreover, all of the, oh, doors were battened up so that no one could get out.’ [27:6]

As in other Algonquian languages, each noun belongs to one of two grammatical genders, conventionally termed *animate* and *inanimate*. Moreover, a distinction is made between the primary or *proximate* third person referent within a context, and all other third persons within the context, which are treated as secondary or *obviative*. This distinction is overtly marked in the inflection of animate nouns and pronouns, but not in inanimate forms.³ In (1), the noun substitute appears in its proximate animate plural form *íyok* in anticipation of the proximate animate plural target noun *Meqíyok* ‘Mohawks’. In (2), the inanimate plural form *íyol* is used instead, since the target here is the inanimate plural noun *khàkǒnol* ‘doors’.

Previous discussions of the noun substitute in Micmac and Cree, as well as in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy (Teeter 1967:162), have focused primarily on this function of the pronoun as a hesitation signal. At least in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, however, many occurrences of the noun substitute do not appear to be of this character. Often the pronoun is used to introduce a common word that one might expect a speaker to find easy to recall. A speaker will sometimes employ the noun substitute to introduce a noun that he or she has already used several times in a given discourse. Not surprisingly, there is often no appreciable pause in such cases before the speaker provides the target noun. We are accordingly faced with a puzzle. Why do speakers apparently use a hesitation form even when they seem to feel no need to hesitate?

As a fully inflected word, the noun substitute presents us with another puzzle as well. Why is so much grammatical machinery deployed in a hesitation form? More often than not, in fact, the noun substitute is preceded by a demonstrative that is inflected for all of the same grammatical categories. Thus the information provided by inflecting the noun substitute itself often seems to be entirely redundant. This is true in (1) above, for example. Here the speaker first uses the proximate animate plural demonstrative *yùkt* ‘these’, then informs his listeners all over again about these properties of the target noun by employing the noun substitute in the form *íyok*. These considerations suggest that a reexamination of the functions of the noun substitute is in order.

I argue here that the noun substitute is not simply a hesitation form, at least in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. First, it often serves a more general function as a signal that the speaker feels that a clarification of one kind or another is in order. In particular, it is used to provide or introduce clarifications of grammatical gender or pronominal reference at points in discourse when a listener might otherwise find the speaker confusing. A pronoun inflected for the same grammatical categories as other nominals in the language is perfectly adapted for this function.

The noun substitute also serves as an attributive modifier of nouns with a force that may often be paraphrased as ‘this or these N of some kind’, where N is the sense of the modified noun. The inflection of the noun substitute is comparable to that of other modifiers with similar

syntactic distributions. Moreover, the use of the noun substitute as a hesitation form is plausibly seen as derivative from this function as an generalizing modifier.

While the noun substitute functions both as a modifier and as a pronoun, I argue that it is best analyzed, both from a morphological and from a syntactic point of view, as a noun. It differs from an ordinary noun, however, in that its stem carries no lexical meaning.

The data for this study are drawn largely from a collection of Maliseet narratives that were recorded by Karl V. Teeter in New Brunswick in 1963, with the addition of one collected by the present author in 1977. Examples from these sources are cited here by text and paragraph number from an edition of this material that is currently being prepared for publication (Teeter and LeSourd 2000). Supplementary data, including information concerning the Passamaquoddy dialect, spoken in Maine, are taken from my own field notes.

The notation used here for Maliseet and Passamaquoddy examples is a modified version of a practical orthography that is now widely used by native speakers of both dialects. In this notation, “o” is used for /ə/, while “u” represents /o/, a vowel intermediate in height between [u] and [o]; “c” is /č/; and “q” is /kʷ/. Phonemic /h/ before a consonant at the beginning of a word is indicated by an apostrophe. Thus phonemic /hpíson/ ‘medicine’, for example, is written here as *'písun*. (The consonant that follows /h/ in an initial cluster is always an obstruent, and /h/ is frequently realized in this context only as tenseness and aspiration of this obstruent, tenseness without aspiration in the case of /s/.) Other characters have their expected values.

Maliseet-Passamaquoddy is a pitch accent language. Although the pitch contour of a word may be fairly complex, it can be mechanically determined, for the most part, on the basis of the pitch associated with the rightmost stressed vowel of the word. This vowel is marked here with an acute accent if the associated pitch is high and with a grave accent if the associated pitch is low: *ktopípa* ‘you (du.) sit’, *mílan* ‘he, she gives it to him, her, them’, *ktopipon* ‘we (du., inc.) sit’, *milàn* ‘give it to him, her, them (you sg.)’. A word-final syllable that bears the grave accent is often pronounced with rising pitch in utterance-final forms, regularly so in Passamaquoddy.

To determine the overall pitch contour and stress pattern of a word, we need to distinguish between “weak” and “strong” variants of *o* (schwa). The weak allophones, typically very short and often phonetically elided, are written here with a breve. All other vowels in surface phonemic forms are strong. By convention, weak schwa is written as *ĩ* before *y* (in Passamaquoddy, also before *hi*), as *ũ* before *w*, and elsewhere as *õ*.

The distinctively accented vowel in a word bears main stress when the word is spoken in isolation or occurs in utterance-final position, which ordinarily corresponds to sentence-final position. Secondary stress then falls on even-numbered syllables, counting leftward from the accented syllable but skipping over all syllables with a weak vowel. The first syllable of the word that contains a strong vowel also bears secondary stress, regardless of its position in the syllable count.

When a word is pronounced in non-final position in a sentence in connected speech, the main stress of the word is usually shifted leftward from the distinctively accented syllable onto the next preceding stressed syllable, which is then associated with the highest pitch in the overall “melody” of a word. The distinctively accented syllable in such non-final forms is only weakly stressed and is associated with a correspondingly less salient rise or fall in pitch. Since the location of a shifted main stress is not distinctive, however, I do not indicate it here. (See

LeSourd 1993:62–8 for additional discussion and some remarks concerning accentual differences between Maliseet and Passamaquoddy.)

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. The inflected forms of the noun substitute are described in section 2. Section 3 then provides examples of the use of these forms as signals of hesitation. Derivatives of the stem of the noun substitute, including forms used in anticipation of verbs, are discussed in section 4. The next two sections introduce evidence that the noun substitute also serves the additional functions suggested above: examples in which this pronominal is used to introduce clarifications of gender or reference are given in sections 5, while section 6 describes the use of the noun substitute as a generalizing modifier. Evidence that bears on the syntactic status of the noun substitute is reviewed in section 7. The conclusions of this study are summarized in section 8.

2. The inflection of the noun substitute

Nouns in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy are inflected for *gender*, *number*, *obviation*, *absentativity*, and *locative case*. Gender, as noted above, is *animate* or *inanimate*. Number is *singular* or *plural*.⁴ Obviation is a matter of the relative discourse prominence of third-person expressions. Roughly speaking, a third-person expression that refers to the most prominent individual or group within a particular span of discourse is *proximate*. Third-person expressions that differ in reference from the current proximate are *obviative*. *Absentative* marking tags a noun as referring to an entity that was formerly present but is now absent, was formerly living but has now died, or was formerly possessed. *Non-absentative* forms are simply vague with respect to any of these states of affairs. Nouns of either grammatical gender may be inflected for locative case; but only those grammatically animate nouns that refer to semantically inanimate entities ordinarily take locative inflection.

The noun substitute may apparently be inflected for all of the same grammatical categories as ordinary nouns, although not all of the logically possible forms are attested. The basic paradigm of the noun substitute in Maliseet is given in Table 1.

TABLE 1

	PARADIGM OF THE NOUN SUBSTITUTE IN MALISEET			
	Proximate	Obviative	Inanimate	Locative
Singular	<i>ĩyá ~ yá ~ íya</i>	<i>íyol</i>	<i>ĩyé ~ yé</i>	<i>íyok</i>
Plural	<i>íyok</i>	<i>íhi</i>	<i>íyol</i>	

The inanimate singular forms listed above are only sparsely attested in the texts consulted for this study; a derivative of the stem of the noun substitute typically appears instead, as discussed below. Moreover, only a single absentative form occurs in the texts: proximate singular absentative *ĩyàw*.⁵

The stem of the noun substitute is historically **ay-*, with a short vowel (Proulx 1988). While vowel length is not contrastive in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy today, the contemporary distinction between strong and weak vowels reflects the former presence of contrastive length. In particular, the usual reflex of a short, word-initial **a* is a phonologically weak schwa. Word-initial weak vowels are ordinarily deleted before non-syllabic sonorants, including *y*; but such

vowels are occasionally retained in short words. The proximate animate singular forms *ǎá* and *yá*, the corresponding inanimate singular forms *ǎé* and *yé*, and absentative *ǎàw* may accordingly be understood as reflecting the historically expected stem *ǎ-*, with optionally retained weak schwa (orthographic *ǎ*).

The alternative proximate and inanimate singular forms *íya* and *íye*, on the other hand, as well as the obviative singular, proximate plural, and inanimate plural forms, are based on a stem *iy-*. These forms appear to represent a reanalysis of the initial weak vowel of *ǎ-* as phonologically strong, since strong schwa is regularly replaced by *i* before *y*. In the forms with proximate plural and locative suffix *-ok* or the obviative singular and inanimate plural suffix *-ol*, this development may reflect regular phonological developments in the language. The vowels of both suffixes are historically short and would therefore be expected to be basically weak. A recent change in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, still in progress at the end of the nineteenth century, has resulted in a reassignment of the strong and weak status of historically short vowels in word-initial sequences of syllables in which all vowels are basically weak and a sonorant consonant stands between the first two vowels of the word (LeSourd 2000:473–4). Prior to this change, the first vowel in a word of the appropriate form counted as weak and the second as strong; the change consisted in a reversal of the status of these vowels.⁶ This development would have transformed earlier **ǎók* and **ǎól* to the attested forms *íyok* and *íyol*. On this account, the alternate proximate animate singular form *íya* may be seen as reflecting the generalization of the new stem *iy-* to an unoriginal context.⁷

The obviative plural form *íhi* appears to stand apart from the rest of the paradigm of the noun substitute, but this is in fact the expected reflex of **ǎíhi*, with the obviative plural suffix *-ihi*; cf. *kotǎk-íhi* ‘others (obv.)’. The loss of the initial weak vowel of this form would have yielded **yíhi*, but *y* is deleted in word-initial position before *i*. (Compare *yahàn* ‘tell him, her, or them (you sg.)’ and *ihìn* ‘tell me (you sg.)’, both with the stem */yoh-/*. The vowel */o/* is subject to assimilation to a following vowel across */h/*; */y/* is dropped when assimilation gives rise to a word-initial sequence of the form */yi/*.) The result is an obviative plural for the noun substitute in the contemporary language that consists only of the inflectional suffix that marks this category. The attested forms of the noun substitute in the Passamaquoddy dialect are given in Table 2.⁸

TABLE 2
PARADIGM OF THE NOUN SUBSTITUTE IN PASSAMAQUODDY

	Proximate	Obviative	Inanimate	Locative
Singular	<i>ǎá ~ yá</i>	<i>ǎíl ~ íhíl</i>		<i>ǎík ~ íhík</i>
Plural	<i>ǎík ~ íhík</i>	<i>ǎì ~ íhì</i>	<i>ǎíl ~ íhíl</i>	

Differences between the forms listed here and the corresponding Maliseet forms reflect partly different phonological developments in the two dialects. The reassignment of the weak and strong status of the vowels in sequences of word-initial syllables with weak vowels described above for Maliseet took place in Passamaquoddy as well. Forms of the noun substitute were apparently exempt from these developments in Passamaquoddy, however, perhaps because the suffix vowels in the relevant set of forms had been reanalyzed as basically strong in this

dialect before the change took place, so that the conditions for the change were no longer met.⁹ Furthermore, the schwa vowels of the suffixes *-ok* (proximate plural and locative) and *-ol* (proximate singular and inanimate plural) have been raised and fronted to *i* following *y*. Many speakers replace *y* with *h* in the sequences *ǰyi* and *iyi*. The resulting alternation between *y* and *h* has evidently been extended to the obviative plural form *ǰyi ~ ǰhi* as well. The accentuation of this form reflects a general change in the accentual treatment of obviative plurals by which a low-pitched accent on the final syllable of a word has come to function as a sign of this inflectional category. Thus, for example, Passamaquoddy *kotǫkǰhi* corresponds to Maliseet *kotǫkǰhi* ‘others (obv.)’.

Fronting and raising of suffix schwa after *y* is also reflected, at least allophonically, in occasional pronunciations of forms of the noun substitute that Teeter’s consultants employed. Indeed, at least some occurrences of proximate plural or locative *ǰyok* and obviative singular or inanimate plural *ǰyol* could probably be appropriately transcribed as *ǰyik* or *ǰyil*. Pronunciations like *ǰhik* and *ǰhil* occasionally occur as well. An example is given in (3).

- (3) Wǫt=ǫlu mec-apǣw-i-t wisǫki yǰhtol kotǰwi=nisu-kám-a-l
 this.AN=CONT bad-man-be-3AN very this.OBV want=two-dance.with-DIR-OBV.SG

yǰhtol **ǰh-il**, **Wolastoq-kewi-sǰehs-ǰs-ol**.
 this.OBV NS-OBV.SG St.John.River-resident-woman-DIM-OBV.SG

‘This homely fellow wanted very badly to dance with her, the St. John River girl.’ [17:2]

3. The noun substitute as a hesitation form

Although I argue below that the noun substitute does not function exclusively as a hesitation form in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, the majority of occurrences of forms of this pronoun in the texts examined for this study are indeed of precisely this character. Consider, in this connection, the exchange in (4). Here speaker A, who is telling a traditional story, finds himself unable, for the moment, to recall the word *’kikamkuhǰnol* ‘his canoe pole’. He hesitates, using a form of the noun substitute to hold the place of the word he is trying to remember, which speaker B then supplies. In Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, as in other Algonquian languages, a grammatically animate noun with a third-person possessor is obligatorily obviative in form. Anticipating both that the noun he is trying to recall (*kǰhkamhǰhun* ‘canoe pole’) is animate and that the context will require him to use this noun with a third-person possessor, speaker A employs the noun substitute twice here in its obviative singular form *ǰyol*. As in example (1), however, the information supplied by this choice of a form is redundant, since both occurrences of the noun substitute are preceded by the demonstrative *yǰhtol*, also an obviative singular form.

- (4) A: ’Qolǫp-ensk-ǣhl-a-n yǰhtol **ǰy-ol**, yǰhtol **ǰy-ol**...
 (3)-turn-long.object-TA-DIR-SUB this.OBV NS-OBV.SG this.OBV NS-3.OBV
 ‘End-for-end he turned this thing...’

B: 'Kihkamkuhún-ol.
 (3)-canoe.pole-OBV.SG
 'His canoe pole.'

A: 'Kihkamkuhún-ol.
 (3)-canoe.pole-OBV.SG
 'His canoe pole.' [9:5]

The one attested absentative form of the noun substitute is also clearly employed as a hesitation form, as shown in (5). Here again the speaker uses this pronoun as a place holder, then abandons his sentence altogether, commenting explicitly (in English) that he cannot think of the name of the man he wants to mention. Once he recalls the name, he starts over again. The speaker employs an absentative form in this case because the man he has in mind has died since the events he is about to describe took place. This information is indicated not only by his choice of a form for the noun substitute, however, but by the use of an absentative demonstrative, *nakàt* 'that deceased one (prox.)'.

(5) Níta tóké ktat... kt-atkuhkew-öl-òñi-ya nakàt **iyàw**, **iyàw**, iya...
 well now 2-tell.story-1/2-OBJ-2PL that.ABS NS.ABS.SG NS.ABS.SG

Forget what he was called... Níta tóké kt-atkuhkew-öl-òñi-ya
 well now 2-tell.story-1/2-OBJ-2PL

nakàt **Kci=Pölanis**...
 that.PROX.ABS old=Francis-(ABS.SG)

'Well, now I'm going to tell you a story about the late, oh... I forget what he was called...
 Now I'm going to tell you a story about the late Old Man Francis...' [36:1]

Naturally, the use the noun substitute as a marker of hesitation is not ordinarily indicated as explicitly as it is in (5) and (6). Frequently, however, the pronoun is repeated, as in (6), or followed by a notable pause, as in (7)–(9). Occasionally, a speaker will start a noun phrase over again, as in (10), so that a demonstrative follows the noun substitute before the target noun is provided.

(6) 'Tom-ehl-a-söpon-i wèn **íhi**, **íhi**, **kakskàtöku**.
 (3)-in.two-TA-DIR-DUB-OBV.PL someone NS.OBV.PL NS.OBV.PL cedar-(OBV.PL)
 'Someone had broken up some of those, oh, cedar boughs.' [16:12]

(7) Akí nòt, mecimi mace-ph-à nìsu 'qòss
 PART that.AN always (3)-start-carry-DIR-(OBV.PL) two-(OBV.PL) (3)-son-(OBV.PL)

kcíhk-uk, Pahtǒlík=Ber naka **yá**, *Newell Bear*, l-iwísu.
 woods-LOC Patrick=Bear and NS.PROX.SG thus-be.named-(3)

‘You see, he always took his two sons into the woods, Patrick Bear and, oh, Newell Bear, he was called’ [37:2]

- (8) *Pete*, nekèt n-míhtaqs naka n-ikūwoss, qeni=pōmawsí-hti-t,
 then 1-father and 1-mother so.long=live-PROX.PL-3AN

nt-iy-ukù-pǒn-ik yúktok **íy-ok**, **motewǒlǒnūw-ok**.
 1-tell-INV-PRET-PROX.PL these.PROX NS-PROX.PL shaman-PROX.PL

‘Pete, back when my father and my mother were still living, they told me about these, oh, shamans.’ [9:1]

- (9) Malom=yaq=te wòt skitǎp, etuci=ksinúhka-t el-óssi-k sǒlahkì=yaq
 finally=QUOT=EMPH this.PROX man extreme=be.sick-3AN thus-lie-3AN suddenly=QUOT

apqot-éssi-k ĭy-èy, yùt kpot-ek-ǒpol-íkon
 open-move-3IN NS-NF this.IN close-sheetlike-tie-NOM

íy-ok, **masqew-ihkán-ok**.
 NS-LOC birchbark-house-LOC

‘Finally, they say, as this man was lying down, very sick, the door flap in this, oh, birchbark house suddenly opened.’ [3:6]

- (10) ’T-íy-a-l=yaq wòt **íyá**, nòt **ktaqhomúhs-is...**
 3-tell-DIR-OBV.SG=QUOT this.AN NS.PROX.SG that.AN old.man-DIM
 ‘This, oh, that little old man told him, they say...’ [2:24]

The speaker quoted in (11) first hesitates in trying to recall the word for ‘rag’, then forges ahead with a form that in fact appears to be incorrect: other consultants give this word as *ahtulhewékon* or *ahtulhawékon* and reject the form *altuhewékon* that appears here.

- (11) On=yaq wòt=ǒlu, qosqéhsuhs ’sakh-ípt-u-n ĭyé, altuhewékon.
 and=QUOT this.AN=CONT old.woman (3)-into.view-carry-TH-SUB NS.IN.SG rag
 ‘And then the old woman brought out, oh, a rag.’ [34:42]

4. Derivatives of the noun substitute

Several derivatives of the noun substitute provide additional types of hesitation markers. The most common of these is *ĭyèy* ~ *yèy*. This is the hesitation form that is ordinarily used in anticipation of inanimate singular nouns, as shown in (12) and (13). (In this function, it appears to have replaced the inanimate singular form of the noun substitute in Passamaquoddy.) It is

also used in anticipation of verbs and phrasal expressions of various types, as in (14) and (15), but virtually never occurs in anticipation of an animate or plural target noun. Not surprisingly, then, no forms with inflectional suffixes are attested.

- (12) On wòt, n-múhsums míl-a-n nakà *Digbyw-kòl* **ǎy-èy**,
and this.AN 1-grandfather (3)-give-DIR-SUB that.ABS Digby-OBV.ABS.SG NS-NF

peskuwàt.
gun

‘Then my grandfather gave the late Digby, oh, a gun.’ [38:6]

- (13) N-kisi=’t-ek-s-om-ón=*steak*. Kakeh... Wahkehs-èk-òñ-ul,
1-past=from-sheetlike-cut-TH-IN=steak (many) few-sheetlike-II-(3)-IN.PL

’c-ì **y-èy wákon.**
from-PF NS-NF bait

‘I cut a steak off him. A few slices, for bait.’¹⁰ [21:17]

- (14) Sesölahki=yaq=te **ǎy-èy, mace=ksinuk-hòtö-w-ok**, skicinúw-ok, wasís-ok,
suddenly=QUOT=EMPH NS-NF start=be.sick-PL-3-PROX.PL Indian-PROX.PL child-PROX.PL

kci=pömwawinúw-ok, psi éhta=te wèn.
old=person-PROX.PL all indeed=EMPH someone

‘All of a sudden, they say, the Indians began to take sick, children, old people, everyone.’ [2:4]

- (15) Yùt=yaq=te nékom **y-èy nihkan-ìw ’túl-ok**,
here=QUOT=EMPH he NS-NF ahead-PF (3)-canoe-LOC

’posqole-n-òm-òñ-ya-l níhtol.
(3)-ignite-by.hand-IN-PROX.PL-IN.PL those.IN

‘Here in the bow of his canoe, they lit them.’ [9:8]

At least in origin, *ǎy-èy* ~ *y-èy* consists of the variant *ǎy-* of the stem of the noun substitute plus the common suffix *-èy* (underlying /-eya/) ‘pertaining to, consisting of’, which derives expressions that function both as nouns and as adjective-like modifiers of nouns. These may typically be of either gender, with the choice depending on the usual gender assignment of nouns in the semantic field of the referent. Thus both an animate plural *pilǎwéyak* and an inanimate plural *pilǎwéyal* correspond to *pilǎwèy* ‘a different one’, a derivative of *pilǎw-* ‘different, unusual’. Compare the examples in (16), where forms of *pilǎwèy* are used in reference to human

beings, with (17), where this expression serves as a modifier of the inanimate noun *wikūwam* ‘house, building’.

- (16) a. Pílŭw-èy nòt.
 different-NF that.AN
 ‘That was someone else.’ [35:9]
- b. Nikt=na pilŭw-éya-k=na níktok.
 those.PROX=PART different-NF-PROX.PL=PART those.PROX
 ‘As for them, those people were different.’ [31:2]
- (17) Eci=yaq wōl-ináqo-k w-ik-ūwa kis, kis-íht-a-q pilŭw-èy
 extreme=QUOT good-look-3IN 3-house-3PL already finish-make-TH-3AN different
 tahálu wikūwam.
 like house

‘Beautiful though their house was already, she built a different one of some kind.’ [14:30]

There are also at least two specifically verbal derivatives of the noun substitute, AI *iy-i-* and TA *iy-ŭw-*, both based on the stem variant *iy-*, with a strong initial vowel.¹¹ As one might expect, forms of these verbs serve as hesitation markers for target verbs of the corresponding inflectional classes, as illustrated in (18)–(22). Note, however, that these hesitation forms are ordinary verbs from a morphological and syntactic point of view. Thus, for example, they may be modified by preverbs, as shown in (19) and (20).

- (18) Wáht pithàw, nòt=ōlu, pèsq íya *Gabe Saulis* l-iwísu,
 far upriver that.AN=PART one.PROX NS.PROX.SG thus-be.named-(3)
 mecimìw, mecimìw **íy-u**, kin... **koti=kin-ōtáhke**.
 always always NS-AI-(3) going.to=big-do-(3)

‘Upriver there, this one guy named, oh, Gabe Saulis was always, oh, going to do something big.’ [38:2]

- (19) Àpc=oc wòt wōli=ptoki... ptoki=**íy-u**, **ptók-ka**.
 again=FUT this.AN good=turn turn=NS-AI-(3) turn-dance-(3)
 ‘Once again he would go right around doing something, dance a turn.’ [17:6]

- (20) Nékom ’t-olōmi=**íy-i-n**, **’kisahqé-wsa-n**.
 he 3-forward=NS-AI-SUB (3)-uphill-walk-SUB
 ‘He did something going forward, walked up the bank.’ [20:10]

(21) On **'t-ìy-w-a-n** **'susqi=pún-a-n.**
 and 3-NS-TA-DIR-SUB (3)-right.side.up=put-DIR-SUB
 'Then he did something with him, turned him face up.' [19:10]

(22) Kámot wòt **iy-w-ùk, wǒli=pun-ùk.**
 be.better-(3) this.AN NS-TA-1/3 good=put-1/3
 'I would be better if I did something with him, turned him right side up.' [18:9]

Forms based on the stem *iy-i-* are sometimes used in anticipation of TI verbs, as in (23). The verb substitutes in such examples are probably best interpreted simply as intransitives, however. Comparable forms are sometimes used to anticipate TA verbs as well, as seen in (24), so there appears to be no special association between *iy-i-* and TI forms.

(23) 'Kisi, 'kisi=**íy-i-n,** **wǒli=pùn-ǒm-on** 'peskuwàt naka,
 (3)-past (3)-past=NS-AI-SUB (3)-good=put-TH-SUB (3)-gun and
 nat-apilǒm-on.
 (3)-go-fetch.water-SUB

'He did something, put his gun away and went to fetch water.' [23:5]

(24) 'Kisi=**íy-i-n,** **yáh-a-n** yúhtol ehpi-lí-c-il.
 (3)-past=NS-AI-SUB tell-DIR-SUB this.OBV woman-OBV-3AN-OBV.SG
 'He did something, spoke to the woman.' [20:9]

5. The use of the noun substitute to clarify gender or reference

While many occurrences of the noun substitute and its derivatives in the texts examined for this study are appropriately analyzed as hesitation markers, some cannot readily be accounted for in these terms. Consider, for example, sentence (25), which occurs in a traditional narrative. The tale provides an account of how calamus (*kiwhòsǔwasq*) came to be used as a medicine, explaining how the plant appeared in human form, at one time in the distant past, to instruct a sick man in the use of its root as a cure for a deadly disease that was sweeping through the Maliseet population.

(25) On nít 't-ol-aqǒs-óm-on yùt **ǐy-èy kiwhòsǔwasq.**
 and then 3-thus-cook-TH-SUB this.IN NS-NF calamus
 'So then he steeped the calamus root.' [2:22]

Here *ǐy-èy* is used in lieu of the inanimate singular form of noun substitute, in agreement with the inanimate target noun *kiwhòsǔwasq*. In this case, however, no appreciable pause follows *ǐy-èy*. This is hardly surprising, since at this point in the text the speaker has already used this noun three times, having introduced the term at the beginning of her tale, following a brief introductory sentence that asserts that the tale is true. Indeed, it seems highly unlikely that the word *kiwhòsǔwasq* would have slipped the speaker's mind as she was telling her story, since

calamus root is the focus of the narrative. It seems clear, then, that the speaker has not used *ǰèy* here as a hesitation form. What other function might we take *ǰèy* to serve in this case?

The sentence in which the term *kiwhòsũwasq* first appears in this text is (26).

- (26) Nòt kiwhòsũwasq tòn el-apék-si-t.
 that.AN calamus how thus-stringlike-AI-3AN
 ‘This is how the story of Calamus goes.’ [2:1]

Although *kiwhòsũwasq* is ordinarily a grammatically inanimate noun, it is treated here as grammatically animate. This is revealed first by the use of the animate demonstrative *nòt* ‘that’, rather than the corresponding inanimate form *nìt*, and again by the choice of the verb *elapéksit* ‘the way his story goes’, which requires a grammatically animate subject. The speaker’s motive for shifting *kiwhòsũwasq* into the animate gender here is straightforward: at this point in her account, calamus is personified; the noun functions essentially as a name.

In its next two occurrences, *kiwhòsũwasq* is again treated as animate, as the narrator describes how Calamus showed the sick man where to find him (that is, calamus plants) and how to brew medicinal tea from his roots. At the point in the story where (25) occurs, however, the noun *kiwhòsũwasq* reverts to its usual gender, since it is used here and in following lines to refer not to the personified plant but to the root of the plant as it is ordinarily encountered. The inanimate form *ǰèy* occurs just where the speaker returns to treating *kiwhòsũwasq* as inanimate. It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that the speaker has used *ǰèy* in this case precisely in recognition of this gender shift.

An example from another text shows a similar use of the same derivative of the noun substitute, here in the form *yèy*, as an explicit marker of inanimate gender. This case does not involve a shift in the gender of a particular noun, however, but a change of plans on the part of the speaker, one that requires the use of an inanimate noun in place of an animate one.

- (27) Yùt pask-ós-a-t yúhtol íy-ol... Pasko... Pask-ós-o-k
 now burst-cut-DIR-3AN this.OBV NS-OBV.SG burst-cut-TH-3AN

 yùt y-èy màsq.
 this.IN NS-NF birchbark

‘Now he slashed open this, oh... He slashed open this birchbark, rather.’ [9:16]

Here the speaker describes an event in which the protagonist of his tale slashes open the bark of a birch tree, causing the tree, which an adversary has rigged as a trap, to fall and pin him. He sets out to describe this situation with the verb *paskósat* ‘he slashes it (an.) open’, which requires a grammatically animate object. Then he hesitates, using *íyol*, the obviative singular form of the noun substitute. A likely target form at this point would be the grammatically animate noun *masqemusíyol* ‘birch tree (obv.)’, although the narrator has already used this term in an earlier line in his tale, so that it seems odd that the word would have slipped his mind.

As it turns out, in fact, the speaker’s hesitation here is not due to any difficulty he is having in recalling the word for ‘birch tree’. He is considering, instead, whether he should rephrase his

sentence to focus on the bark of the tree, which will require him to use the inanimate noun *màsq* ‘birchbark’, and therefore an inanimate-object verb. He hesitates briefly as he introduces his new choice of a verb, then commits himself to using an inanimate object by employing the transitive inanimate form *paskósok* ‘he slashes it open’. At this point, he has clearly made a decision to use *màsq* ‘birchbark’, rather than *masqemusíyol* ‘birch tree’, as the object of the verb he has selected. He nonetheless introduces the noun *màsq* with *yèy*, although without any appreciable pause, since the word has already occurred to him. The speaker’s use of *yèy* in (27) apparently does not, then, reflect any uncertainty on his part about the noun that he now intends to use. Rather, *yèy* appears to function here as an explicit marker of the gender of this noun, serving as a signal that the speaker has corrected himself in this respect.

Other examples suggest a more general role for the noun substitute as a signal of self-correction. The principal character in the tale from which (28) is taken is named *Epölehsepísit*. At the point in the story at which this sentence appears, the narrator has already spoken this name many times. Here, though, he slips up. Just prior to telling this story, he had told one in which the main character is named *Súsehp* ‘Joseph’. He inadvertently uses the wrong name here, then corrects himself. Note that the correct name is introduced with the proximate singular form of the noun substitute, again with no appreciable pause before the target noun is supplied.

(28) *Kiwõnasq-éhl-a-t, on wòt Súsehp uci=macáha-n,*
 drunken-TA-DIR-3AN and this.AN Joseph (3)-from=leave-SUB

wòt íya Epölehsepísit uci=macáha-n.
 this.AN NS.PROX.SG (3)-from=leave-SUB

‘When she had gotten him drunk, Joseph set out from there again; or rather, *Epölehsepísit* set out from there again.’ [34:55]

Once again, there is no plausible account under which the noun substitute functions here as a signal of hesitation. On the contrary, it serves here to indicate that the speaker has now chosen his words correctly.

Even in some cases in which a pause follows the noun substitute before the speaker provides a target noun, an account of this pronoun as a place holder for a momentarily elusive word seems questionable. Consider in this connection the following lines from another traditional tale, one that describes a potentially murderous rivalry between two men with shamanistic power.

(29) *Well, nit ’pec-íya-n àpc nòt íya.*
 then (3)-hither-go-SUB again that.PROX NS.PROX.SG

Nis-ukõn-óho-k àpc ’pec-íya-n wòt íya, kci=mtewõlòn.
 two-day-II-3IN again (3)-hither-go-SUB this.PROX. NS.PROX.SG old=shaman

‘Well, then he came again, this one. Two days later he came again, this one, the old shaman.’ [11:31]

Throughout the text, the narrator uses the term *kci=mtewǎlòn* ‘old shaman’ as a tag for one of the two leading figures in his tale; this expression occurs for the fifth time in (29). By this point, however, both of the principal characters of the narrative have arrived on the scene several times. Thus it is not immediately obvious which of the two shamans the narrator has in mind as he speaks the first sentence in (29). His use of a proximate verb form is uninformative, since he has referred to both men with proximate expressions in preceding lines. Recognizing this fact, the speaker supplies his tag for the character in question in the second sentence, after adding additional information about the situation. Both occurrences of the noun substitute here may be seen, then, as reflecting the speaker’s realization that he will need to provide his listeners with explicit information about the identity of the character whose actions he is describing at this point in his tale.

Another example of the same type is given in (30). The protagonist in the story from which these lines are drawn is Rabbit. She inadvertently kills Lynx’s baby, and the latter chases after her to exact revenge. After a series of incidents, Rabbit realizes that her only hope of escape lies in employing her power as a shaman to call up a storm that will cover the ground with big flakes of snow and thus obscure her tracks. In the passage in (30), the narrator summarizes this incident in preparation for the end of his tale, which he began by announcing that he wanted to explain why a spring snowstorm with big flakes is called *mahtǒqèhsǔwí=psan* ‘rabbit snow’.

(30) Nít weci=kis-iphúwe-t. Ma=na kis-apt-ahsì-w wòt, wòt
 that.IN from=be.able-flee-3AN not=PART be.able-track-AI-NEG this.PROX this.PROX

apiqǒsíkon. Nít weci=kis-iphúwe-t wòt ǐyá, mahtǒqèhs.
 lynx that.IN from=be.able-flee-3AN this.PROX NS.PROX.SG rabbit

‘That’s how she was able to get away. She couldn’t track (her) any further, this lynx.
 That’s how she was able to get away, this rabbit.’ [4:17]

By this point in the story, both Lynx and Rabbit have been mentioned repeatedly. The noun *mahtǒqèhs* ‘rabbit’ has in fact appeared seven times. Clearly, then, the narrator has not employed the noun substitute because this word has slipped his mind. Since he has used proximate expressions in reference to both characters, however, he must now make explicit reference to these figures in order to make his meaning clear. Thus both characters are represented here by overt noun phrases. The second of these, *mahtǒqèhs* ‘rabbit’, is introduced by the proximate singular form of the noun substitute, *ǐyá*, perhaps in part to remind the listener of the status of Rabbit as the protagonist of the story and thus to set the stage for the speaker’s concluding remarks about the term ‘rabbit snow’.

6. The noun substitute as a generalizing modifier

At a number of points in the texts, the noun substitute appears to function neither as a hesitation marker nor as an indicator that the speaker feels that clarification is in order, but rather as a noun modifier with a generalizing force. It also serves in some cases as an independent pronoun with either contextually determined or non-specific reference. In these functions of the noun substitute we can see the logical basis for the use of this pronoun as a hesitation marker.

The basic meaning of forms of this kind as noun modifiers appears to be ‘this or these N of some kind’ where N is the sense of the modified noun. As pronouns, they mean ‘some person or persons’, ‘some thing or things’, or ‘some place’. In essence, this is the force of the noun substitute as a hesitation form as well.

To see how the noun substitute functions as a generalizing modifier, consider example (31). Here the main character of the story discovers the body of a sailor washed up on the shore. The subject is a delicate one, since the tale revolves around an inadvertent act of cannibalism to which the protagonist’s actions lead. He has been unable to kill any small game to use in baiting his traps, so he cuts a few slices of flesh off the dead sailor’s body to use for this purpose. Unexpected visitors, mistaking several of these slices of flesh for moose meat, cook it and eat it.

(31) Elöm-íya-t sōpayì supék-uk sōlahkiw yùt,
 forward-go-3AN alongshore sea-LOC suddenly here

eli=nattoka-htu-h-ukè-t-s=al íya pòkūwoss,
 thus=ashore-strike-TA-PASS-3AN-DUB=PART NS.PROX.SG sailor

wen-i=pòkūwoss=àl cù=al=lu, wén-ik
 someone-PF=sailor=PART surely=PART=CONT someone-PROX.PL

wap-eyí-c-ik.
 white-AI-3AN-PROX.PL

‘As he was walking along the shore by the sea, here, suddenly, apparently washed up on the shore, was (the body of) some sort of sailor, some sailor; it must have been one of the white ones.’ [21:3]

The speaker exhibits no hesitation here in employing the term *pòkūwoss* ‘sailor’ to refer to the dead man, but he clearly wants to avoid being too specific about this man’s identity. To this end, he employs a variety of devices in order to remain vague about who the sailor might have been. He tells us only that the man was *weni=pòkūwoss* ‘some sailor’, further modifying this expression with the enclitic particle *-al*, which indicates uncertainty or approximation. He goes on to add that the sailor must have been a white man, rather than an Indian. In this context, we can understand why he chooses to introduce *pòkūwoss* ‘sailor’ with the noun substitute. This pronoun functions as yet another device to allow him to avoid specifying just what kind of man it was whose body the leading figure in the tale has discovered: he is *some sort* of sailor.

In (32), the speaker is quoting himself, telling about a series of trades that he once made, including the trade of a goose for a calf. Forms of the noun *wapikilahq* ‘goose’ have already occurred several times, but he nonetheless introduces the term *wapikiláhqok* ‘geese’ with *íyok*, the proximate plural form of noun substitute. The force of the phrase *nìsūwok íyok wapikiláhqok* in this context would appear to be essentially ‘two geese of some description’, namely, ones that would satisfy the owner of the cow.

(32) Nt-íy-oq wòt, skitàp papkiw-òss, eli=yaq=op wesűw-on-òt
 1-tell-INV this.PROX man down.road-DIM thus=QUOT=COND back-by.hand-2/3

kuhús-is 'c-ì nisűw-ok **íy-ok** **wapikiláhq-ok**,
 cow-DIM from-PF two-PROX.PL NS-PROX.PL goose-PROX.PL

on pèsq=te=lu wapikiláhq èyw-uk nìl.
 and one.AN=EMPH=CONT goose have-1/3 I

‘This man down the road tells me that you would trade a calf for two geese, but I only have one goose.’ [42:16]

In the passage given in (33), the speaker is listing various types of foods that people used to dry as they were getting ready for the winter.

(33) 'Kis-pahs-òm-òñ-ya **íy-ol** **sahtí-yol**, naka nòmèhs
 (3)-past-dry-TH-SUB-PROX.PL NS-IN.PL blueberry-IN.PL and fish-(OBV.PL)

huli=pun-à-nĩ-ya, wíyuhš, 'c-ì pun-ìw.
 (3)-good=put-DIR-SUB-PROX.PL meat from-PF winter-PF

‘They dried blueberries (and the like) and put up fish and meat for the winter.’ [29:8]

The precise food items in question here are not to the point of the story, which concerns a man who is sent on an expedition to gather sea salt. Thus while the speaker’s list includes *sahtíyol* ‘blueberries’, the particular kind of berries that people put up for the winter is of no more concern to him than are the particular types of meat and fish that he alludes to here only in general terms. His use of the noun substitute in the phrase *íyol sahtíyol* does not seem to involve any sort of hesitation over this common word. We can readily understand why he uses *íyol* at this point, however, if we suppose that this form functions here as a generalizing modifier, so that *íyol sahtíyol* has essentially the force in this passage of ‘blueberries and the like’, as I have indicated in my translation. On this account, *íyol sahtíyol* is semantically parallel in this example to *wíyuhš* ‘meat’ and *nòmèhs* ‘fish (obv. pl.)’: all of these terms name *types* of foods.

The locative form of the noun substitute, *íyok*, is frequently used in a similar fashion to indicate an unspecified place, as shown in (34) and (35). In some examples of this type, however, *íyok* appears to be neither a hesitation form nor a noun modifier. In (34), *íyok* precedes a noun in locative form, *Metáqtek* ‘Meductic’, the name of a well-known place on the St. John River, which would have been familiar to the speaker. In (35), on the other hand, it is followed by a particle derived from the noun *súpeq* ‘ocean’, rather than by a noun as such.¹²

(34) Am=te yùt **íy-ok** **Metáqtek** táma nít mecimì
 finally=EMPH here NS-LOC Meductic somewhere there always

'toli=nokōt-om-ón='tul.
 (3)-there=leave-TH-IN=(3)-canoe

‘Finally, here by Meductic somewhere, somewhere there he left his canoe as usual.’ [29:13]

(35) 'T-olōmi=te milaw-iph-ukù-nǐ-ya íy-ok milawi=supèq,
 3-forward=EMPH offshore-carry-INV-SUB-PROX.PL NS-LOC offshore-ocean-(PF)

nakàt Atōle=Lahpùt naka wèn kótok skicìn.
 that.PROX.ABS Andrew=Laporte-(ABS.SG) and someone other Indian

‘They were swept out to sea somewhere, Andrew Laporte and some other Indian.’
 [30:6]

While we might analyze *íyok* as a modifier of *Metáqtek* in *yùt íyok Metáqtek* ‘here by Meductic somewhere’ in (34), we will probably do better to take *milawi=supèq* ‘out in the ocean’ to be a modifier of *íyok* in *íyok milawi=supèq* ‘somewhere out in the ocean’ in (35). The noun substitute appears to function in the latter case essentially as a locative pronoun with non-specific reference.

It is just this function of locative *íyok* that makes this form appropriate for use as a hesitation marker. Indeed, *íyok* apparently serves in both capacities in (36). Here the speaker is trying to decide on some specific setting for his story, but abandons the attempt and settles for a vague ‘somewhere’, noting only that the events in question took place on the St. John River, that is, in Maliseet territory.

(36) Táma=al íy-ok papkiw, kòsōna=al íy-ok, táma=al íy-ok.
 somewhere=PART NS-LOC down.river or=PART NS-LOC somewhere=PART NS-LOC

Wolastok-ùk=kàhk.
 St.John.River-LOC=PART

‘It was somewhere down river, or somewhere, somewhere or other. On the St. John River, anyway.’ [9:1]

Other forms of the noun substitute are occasionally used without further specification as well. In (37), this pronoun appears twice, first in its proximate singular form *íya*, then as obviative singular *íyol*. The story describes how a Mohawk man won the affection of a Maliseet woman by using a love medicine of some sort. The proximate referent in (37) is this Mohawk man, while the obviative referent is the Maliseet woman, now his wife. Note that no overt specification of the referent of *íya* is provided, presumably because the Mohawk and his activities are in fact the central topic of the narrative, and he is thus the expected referent of an otherwise unspecified proximate pronoun.

(37) 'T-íy-a-l=yaq wòt íya, yúhtol íy-ol
 (3)-tell-DIR-OBV.SG=QUOT this.PROX NS.PROX.SG this.OBV.SG NS-OBV.SG

't-ehpité-m-ol, “Akì yúta. Yùt nít, kil k-nopísun.”
 3-woman-POSS-OBV.SG look this.IN this.IN that.IN you.SG 2-medicine

‘Then this one told her, this wife of his, “Look at this. This is your medicine.”’ [17:8]

The sentence in (37) occurs near the end of the narrative from which this example is taken. By this point, the speaker has used proximate expressions in reference to both of the characters in his story. His use of the noun substitute in (37) is apparently intended, then, to make it clear that the quoted material represents the words of the Mohawk character.

A fully inflected pronominal is perfectly suited for the task of clarifying reference, since it permits a speaker to specify all of the grammatical categories in terms of which nominal referents are sorted out in discourse. On the other hand, an intrinsically vague expression like the noun substitute is also a natural candidate for use as a hesitation form. Here, then, we can see why the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy language should appear to devote so many grammatical resources to the expression of hesitation. The properties of the noun substitute reflect the function of this item as a generalizing modifier and a pronoun without any special deictic force, rather than its common role in discourse as a hesitation marker.

7. The syntax of the noun substitute

When the noun substitute is used as a place holder as a speaker hesitates, it is often not clear what syntactic relationship, if any, holds between the hesitation form and a following noun. If the arguments presented in sections 5 and 6 are accepted, however, then we are justified in taking at least some occurrences of the noun substitute to be noun modifiers within syntactically coherent noun phrases.

In clear cases of this kind, the noun substitute consistently follows a demonstrative, if one is used, and precedes the noun that it modifies. Thus we find *íya pòkǎwoss* ‘some sort of sailor’ in (31) and *íyol sahtíyol* ‘blueberries and the like’ in (33), with no demonstratives; with demonstratives we have *wòt íya Epǒlehsepísit* ‘this *Epǒlehsepísit*, rather’ in (28) and *yúhtol íyol 'tehpitémol* ‘this wife of his’ in (37). The noun substitute may itself be preceded by other modifiers, as in (38) and (39). (See also examples (18) and (32), where a numerical modifier precedes the noun substitute.) No examples have been found, however, in which the noun substitute precedes another modifier, apart from cases in which a speaker apparently starts a noun phrase over again after hesitating, as in example (10) in section 3.

(38) Yùkt=yaq=ǒlu, nis-insk=cel=nàn táma mayél-ok
 these.PROX=QUOT=CONT two-ten=and=five somewhere be.miles-3IN

tut-kawōt-ultú-w-ok **kotōk-íhi** **íhi** **kōtun-ke-winù.**
 extreme-du.walk-PL-3-PROX.PL other-OBV.PL NS.OBV.PL hunt-AI-NOM-(OBV.PL)

‘These two (men), they say, were walking (their trap lines) about twenty-five miles away, with *some other hunters*.’ [25:3]

(39) Wòt nakà n-muhsùms wihq-éhl-a-n yúhtol
 this.PROX that.PROX.ABS 1-grandfather-(ABS.SG) (3)-take-TA-DIR-SUB this.OBV.SG

íy-ol, **masqi-yéya-l** **íy-ol,** ahàlōn-ol
 NS-OBV.SG birchbark-NF-OBV.SG NS-OBV.SG horn-OBV.SG

weci=wihq-ím-a-t mús-ul.
 from=take-by.voice-DIR-3AN moose-OBV.SG

‘My late grandfather picked up this thing, *this birchbark thing*, a horn to call a moose with.’¹³ [38:4]

The syntactic distribution of the noun substitute is comparable, for the most part, to that of other attributive modifiers of nouns. Compare the position occupied by *kotōkíhi* ‘others (obv.)’ in (40), *wisawimanĩyéyal* ‘golden (obv. sg.)’ in (41), or *nihkanèy* ‘foremost (in. sg.)’ in (42).

(40) “Á,” ’t-iy-à **yuhùht** **kotōkíhi** **skicinù.**
 ah (3)-tell-DIR-(OBV.PL) these.OBV other-OBV.PL Indian-(OBV.PL)
 ‘“Ah!” he said to *these other Indians*.’ [26:5]

(41) Cèl=yaq nospi=monihqosí-n-ol **wisawi-manĩ-yéya-l** **cikōní-yol.**
 moreover=QUOT (3)-with=be.born-OBJ-OBV.SG yellow-money-NF-OBV.SG apple-OBV.SG
 ‘Moreover, it (a baby) was born with *a golden apple*.’ [34:74]

(42) ...nanakiw-òss olōmi=apuckol-ĩ-yà wakàt skitàpi,
 soon-DIM forward=upside.down-AI-(3)-ABS.SG this.ABS.SG man-(ABS.SG)

esehké-t-pon **yùt** **nihkan-èy sölúhp** sakhi=peskh-iké-wi-k.
 stand-3AN-PRET this.IN ahead-NF ship into.view=shoot-AI-II-3IN

‘...a moment later he fell over backwards, this man who had been standing on *the lead ship*, from which shots had been coming.’ [29:20]

In its independent use as a pronominal, the distribution of the noun substitute also parallels that of *kótok* ‘other’ and nominals in -èy, since these, too, may be used without a following noun, as shown in (43) and (44).

(43) Qenóss naci=kikcahk-ùhs qilűw-áh-a-n **kótok**.
 grandson go=downhill-walk (2)-seek-TA-DIR-SUB other
 ‘Grandson, walk down the hill and look for *another one* (here, a birch tree).’ [9:16]

(44) Kèq=al=na nìt mehs-ekhut-űw-àn-s nìt **pǎmawsuwinuw-èy**
 what=PART=PART that.IN why-hang-TH-1SG-DUB that.IN person-NF

yùt eli=ksa-há-mok?
 here thus=in-go-UNSPEC

‘Why did I ever hang up that human flesh here at the entrance?’ [21:13]

A nominal modifier formed with the noun final *-èy* may follow the noun with which it is construed, rather than preceding it, as illustrated in (45). The distribution of such forms appears to diverge in this respect from that of the noun substitute, for which this use is not attested.

(45) Mèc=te nìt ekhút-e-k yúhtol, nis-ek-s-ón-ul yúhtol íy-ol,
 still=EMPH there hang-II-3IN these.IN two-sheetlike-cut-II-(3)-IN.PL these.IN NS-IN.PL

wàkǒn-ol pǎmawsuwinuw-éya-l.
 bait-IN.PL person-NF-IN.PL

‘Two slices were still hanging there, of these *pieces of human-flesh bait*.’ [21:6]

Note once again, however, that nominals in *-èy*, like other noun modifiers, agree in gender, number, and obviation with the nouns with which they are construed. In (45), for example, *pǎmawsuwinuwéyal* ‘of human flesh’ is an inanimate plural form because it agrees with the inanimate plural noun *wàkǒnol* ‘pieces of bait’. Given the largely parallel syntax of the noun substitute and forms in *-èy*, it is easy to see how *ǰyèy* ~ *yèy*, as a derivative of the noun substitute, should have come to compete with *ǰyé* as an inanimate singular form.

Finally, a word is in order about the categorial status of the noun substitute. From a morphological point of view, it is simply a noun. This status is revealed most clearly by the fact that the locative form *íyok* includes the locative case ending *-ok*. Here again, the noun substitute patterns with nominals in *-èy*, since these too form ordinary locatives, at least when they are used as independently referential expressions, rather than modifiers: corresponding to *kuhus-èy* ‘beef’, for example, there is the locative *kuhus-éya-k*. Other noun modifiers generally do not take the locative suffix, however. Inanimate singular forms of the demonstratives are used with locative force, rather than forms with locative inflection: *yùt* ‘this (in.), here’, *nìt* ‘that (in.), there’, *yèt* ‘that (in., remote), there (remote)’. No locative forms are attested for *kótok* ‘other’ or for the numerals. Moreover, the syntactic distribution of the noun substitute is consistent with an analysis of this item as a noun, since ordinary nouns may also occur as modifiers. Thus, for example, *napáha* ‘rooster’ serves to modify *oqìm* ‘loon’ in *napáha oqìm* ‘male loon’.¹⁴

The noun substitute is unlike ordinary nouns in two respects, however. First, like nominals in *-èy*, it has forms for both genders, with the choice of an animate or inanimate form determined by

context. Secondly, and more fundamentally, its stem *ǫ-* ~ *iy-* is semantically empty: the semantic content of an inflected form of the noun substitute consists solely of the information contributed by the inflectional ending. It is for this reason that the noun substitute may function as a generalizing modifier and as a pronoun. Lacking any intrinsic semantic content, its force is solely that which is determined by the context in which it occurs. When it is used as a modifier, it invites the listener to consider other items from the semantic field of the modified noun. When it stands alone, its reference is restricted only by the grammatical categories for which it is inflected. In particular, proximate forms may pick up the reference of the current discourse topic, as in example (29), or that of the overall discourse topic, as in (30) and (37). The status of the noun substitute as semantically empty form with contextually determined reference makes it an effective device for directing a listener's attention to clarifications and corrections. When the noun substitute functions as a hesitation form, it has essentially the same force as it does as a modifier: it indicates that a speaker is seeking out a word from the general category indicated by the inflectional ending of the form that he or she has selected.

8. Conclusion

In section 1, we observed that the noun substitute, when viewed exclusively as a hesitation form, presents us with two puzzles. First, we noted that speakers sometimes employ forms of this word even when they apparently feel no need to hesitate, using it without a following pause or in introducing a familiar expression. Moreover, as a fully inflected form, the noun substitute seems to provide a surprising amount of information for a hesitation marker, especially when the occurrence of a preceding demonstrative makes this information redundant, as it often does. We are now in a position to offer solutions to these puzzles.

As we have seen, the noun substitute serves a variety of functions in discourse in addition to acting as a place holder for a noun that has momentarily eluded a speaker. In particular, it may be used to call a listener's attention to the gender of a noun or to introduce information that serves to clarify the speaker's intentions about the reference of other expressions. The inflection of the noun substitute is well suited for these functions, since it allows the speaker to manipulate the full set of inflectional categories in terms of which reference is tracked in discourse.

From a formal perspective, the noun substitute is inflected like a noun for the simple reason that it is one. Unlike other nouns, however, the noun substitute is essentially semantically empty. It is precisely this fact that makes the word useful, however. Lacking its own intrinsic semantic content, it functions as a modifier to call upon the listener to generalize from the specific meaning of the modified noun to a larger contextually relevant class. It also serves as a pronominal, either picking up its reference from context or remaining non-specific in reference.

As a semantically empty noun, the noun substitute is available to speakers as a place holder when they hesitate over the choice of a word. Indeed, this is the function that the noun substitute is most often called upon to serve. The use of the noun substitute as a hesitation form is appropriately viewed, however, as derivative from its use as a generalizing modifier, in which it functions to invite the listener to think of a noun from a contextually appropriate semantic field. Indeed, listeners will sometimes suggest an appropriate expression to a speaker as a possible instantiation of the reference of the noun substitute. More often, however, it is the speaker who will think of an appropriate way to continue his or her discourse.

Notes

1. The term *noun substitute* is taken from Proulx 1978:15, where it is applied to the Micmac cognates of the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy forms in question here.
2. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy examples are given here in a practical orthography, as discussed below. The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; 1/2 etc., first person subject with second person object, etc.; ABS absentative; AN, an. animate (grammatical gender); COND conditional; CONT contrast; DIM diminutive; DIR direct; du. dual; EMPH emphatic; DUB dubitative; FUT future; IN, in. inanimate (grammatical gender): inc. inclusive; INV inverse; LOC locative; NEG negative; NOM nominalizing suffix; NF noun final (noun-forming suffix); NS noun substitute; OBJ suffix indexing the occurrence of a secondary object; OBV, obv. obviative; PART particle; PF particle final (particle-forming suffix); PL, pl. plural (= non-dual plural in the case of subjects of AI verbs with plural stems; see note 3); PRET preterite; PROX, prox. proximate; QUOT quotative; SG, sg. singular; SUB Subordinative; TH thematic suffix of TI verb; UNSPEC unspecified subject. Verb-forming suffixes with little or no concrete meaning are glossed only by the abbreviation for the transitivity and gender-selection class of the stems that they form. There are four such classes: Animate Intransitive (AI) verbs require animate subjects; Inanimate Intransitive (II) verbs require inanimate subjects; Transitive Animate (TA) verbs require animate objects; Transitive Inanimate (TI) verbs require inanimate objects. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape and for the third-person prefix /w-/ where it is realized only as a word-initial /h/ that is written as an apostrophe. The double hyphen indicates cliticization: it joins an enclitic particle to its host and connects a preverb or prounoun to a following verb or noun, respectively.
3. The obviative status of inanimate subjects is marked in agreement in some little-used verb forms of the Conjunct type (used primarily in various types of subordinate clauses).
4. Dual and plural number are distinguished just for the subjects of AI verbs through the use of plural verb stems. Non-singular forms of stems that are not inherently plural in meaning or explicitly marked for plurality are ordinarily construed as duals. Explicit plurals are based on derived forms of stems. Often several plural stems correspond to a single unmarked stem. Corresponding to *wikūwok* ‘they (du.) dwell’, for example, I have recorded three explicitly plural forms: *wikihtúwok* ~ *wikuhtúwok* ~ *wikultúwok* ‘they (three or more) dwell’.
5. The contemporary singular forms *ǰá* (animate) and *ǰé* (inanimate) appear to be absentative forms in origin, continuing earlier **aya:* and **aye:*, the proximate singular and inanimate singular absentative forms of the noun substitute, respectively, rather than the corresponding non-absentative forms **aya* and **ayi* (Proulx 1988:316–7). The additional *-w* that appears in the absentative form *ǰàw* is found in absentative forms of a number of other pronouns as well, and may reflect an old enclitic (Proulx 1988:323).
6. Weak vowels are promoted to strong status in even-numbered positions (counting from left to right) within a sequence of syllables with weak vowels. Reversing the weak and strong status of the first two vowels in such a sequence accordingly has an effect that propagates

through the remainder of the sequence, sometimes for several syllables (LeSourd 1993).

7. This change from **ǰók* and **ǰól* to *íyok* and *íyol* has also had the effect of bringing the accentuation of these forms into conformity with that of nouns which end with sequences of syllables with comparable shapes in their corresponding inflected forms, e.g., *skitapíyok* ‘men (prox.)’ (sg. *skitáp*), *sahtíyol* ‘blueberries’ (sg. *sàht*).
8. Since this paper was written, I have also heard the proximate absentative singular form *ǰàw* in a taped interview with a recently deceased Passamaquoddy elder.
9. As in Maliseet, phonological developments affecting the noun substitute in Passamaquoddy have yielded forms that parallel the corresponding forms of nouns. Thus Passamaquoddy has *skitápǰyik* ~ *skitápǰhik* ‘men (prox.)’ for Maliseet *skitapíyok*, *sáhtǰyil* ~ *sáhtǰhil* ‘blueberries’ for Maliseet *sahtíyol*. This situation is consistent with the conclusion reached in LeSourd 2000 that analogical pressure, rather than sound change in the narrow sense, provided the impetus for change in the accentual treatment of word-initial syllables with weak vowels in nineteenth-century Maliseet and Passamaquoddy.
10. When a monosyllabic noun occurs in sentence-final position, it is optionally treated as part of the same prosodic word as the immediately preceding syntactic word. Here the speaker has treated the English word *steak* in this fashion, and I have accordingly written it as an enclitic.
11. In the third-person singular of the Independent Indicative, the intransitive hesitation verb is homophonous with *íyu* ‘he, she, or it is located’; but the stem of the latter is *ihí-* (compare Subordinative *’t-íhi-n* ‘he or she is located’).
12. The expression *milawi=supèq* ‘out in the ocean’ is marked as a particle by the grave accent that is assigned here to the last syllable of the noun on which it is based. The accentuation of such forms reflects the loss of a vocalic suffix *-e. Compare Penobscot *amilisópek^we* ‘at sea, on the high sea, way out in the ocean’ (Siebert 1996:62).
13. The initial noun phrase in this sentence, *wòt nakà nmuhsùms*, literally ‘this late grandfather of mine’, formally includes two demonstratives, the proximate animate singular form *wòt* ‘this’ and the proximate animate absentative singular form *nakà* ‘that’. Such sequences of two demonstratives always involve an absentative form, which functions only to carry absentative marking and lacks demonstrative force. The form with true demonstrative force apparently always precedes the form that serves as a marker of absentativity.
14. Nouns other than those formed with -èy are only occasionally used as modifiers, however. Prenouns are freely derived from noun stems and are ordinarily used as modifiers in place of the corresponding nouns. Thus, for example, the prenoun *pǎlecǎmoni-* ‘French’, rather than the noun *pǎlecǎmon* ‘Frenchman’ serves to modify *pahtǎlíyas* ‘priest’ in *pǎlecǎmoni=pahtǎlíyas* ‘French priest’.

References

- DeBlois, Albert D.
1987 Micmac *ayej* — Particle, Noun, Verb...? *In Papers of the Eighteenth Algonquian Conference*, edited by William Cowan, 103–12. Ottawa: Carleton University.
- LeSourd, Philip S.
1993 *Accent and Syllable Structure in Passamaquoddy*. New York: Garland Publishing.
2000 The Passamaquoddy “Witchcraft Tales” of Newell S. Francis. *Anthropological Linguistics* 42:441–98.
- Proulx, Paul
1978 *Micmac Inflection*. Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.
1988 The Demonstrative Pronouns of Proto-Algonquian. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 54:309-30.
- Siebert, Frank T., Jr.
1996 *Penobscot Dictionary*. MS, Old Town, Me.
- Teeter, Karl V.
1967 Preliminary Report on Malecite-Passamaquoddy. *In Contributions to Anthropology: Linguistics I (Algonquian)*, 157–62. National Museum of Canada Bulletin 214. Anthropological Series 78. Ottawa: National Museum of Canada.
- Teeter, Karl V., and Philip S. LeSourd.
2000 *Tales from Maliseet Country*. MS, Indiana University, Bloomington.
- Wolfart, H.C.
1996 Sketch of Cree, an Algonquian language. *In Handbook of North American Indians*, vol. 17 (Languages), edited by Ives Goddard, 390–439. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.