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Abstract. In the Eastern Algonquian languages Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot, evaluative forms of verbs are derived by inserting one of several morphemes, not meaningful in themselves, within the verb stem. Corresponding derivatives of nouns and particles are formed by suffixation. This article documents the shapes that these derivatives take and the ways in which they are used to express anger, scorn, impatience, or intensity. Comparative evidence suggests that the source of these formations is an old process by which morphemes making reference to intimate body parts and other off-color concepts were added to verbs and nouns.

1. Introduction. The Eastern Algonquian languages Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot employ a system of morphological modifications of nouns, verbs, and particles to indicate anger, scorn, impatience, or intensity—and sometimes to show approval or to signal closeness.1 Forms of the type in question were noted in Penobscot by Speck (1918), who referred to them as “objurgatives,” from the verb objurgate ‘reproach or denounce vehemently’, and we adopt Speck’s term here. The objurgative forms of verbs raise particularly interesting issues, since they are derived (descriptively speaking) by inserting one of several morphemes, not meaningful in themselves, within the verb stem. This article provides an analysis of the objurgative forms of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot and illustrates their use.

Maliseet and Passamaquoddy are mutually intelligible dialects of a single language. Maliseet is spoken today primarily in several communities along the Saint John River in New Brunswick and in the area around Houlton in Aroostook County, Maine. Passamaquoddy is spoken in two communities in the St. Croix Valley in Washington County, Maine. The total number of fluent speakers of the two dialects was estimated in the mid-1990s to be around five hundred (Leavitt 1996:1). Most contemporary speakers are in their forties or older. Penobscot, spoken into the 1990s at Indian Island in the Penobscot Valley of Maine, is a dialect of Eastern Abenaki. The two languages were long in contact and share a large proportion of their vocabulary.

One of the textual examples of an objurgative verb form pointed out by Speck in his Penobscot work is presented in (1), while three Maliseet-Passamaquoddy examples are given in (2a)–(2c). The objurgative morphemes
are in boldface. Corresponding nonobjurgative forms are provided for comparison. It will be observed that the other components of the stems are subject to different modifications in the two types of forms. These are the result of regular morphophonological processes, to which we return below.

\[(1) \text{n-ôhkâm-i, nat-ålåm-åcê-hте-law-å} \quad \text{wap-sk".}
\]

1-grandmother-VOC 1-away-OBJURG-strike-by.projectile-DIR white-bear

‘Grandmother, I have shot that damn White Bear dead.’ (Pen., Speck 1918:240, our translation)


\[(2a) \text{Naka nít=te=hc=ônà qen-ålkittìtye-hpônol-t-ulti-hti-t.}
\]

and then=EMPH=FUT=too length-OBJURG-fight-RECIP-MPL-PROX.PL-3.AN

‘And then they (pl.) would go on fighting like hell with each other, too.’ (Mal.)

cf. qen-hpônol-tí-mok (length-fight-RECIP-UNSPEC) ‘during the war (i.e., while people are fighting)’ (MPD)

\[(2b) \text{Wòt=kahk skàt meht=åligë-nè-w.}
\]

this.PROX=CONTRAST not finish-OBJURG-die-(3)-NEG

‘This damn thing (a bear) isn’t dead after all!’ (Pass.)

cf. mehe-îne (finish-die-(3)) ‘he dies, is dead’ (Pass.)

\[(2c) \text{Téhpu=qen=ålåkê-hti-t òtûhk-ol naka}
\]

only=REPORT length=thus-throw-PROX.PL-3.AN deer-OBV.SG and

\text{mace-łuttiye-phuwà-nî-ya.}

(3)-away-OBJURG-flee-N-PROX.PL

‘They (du.) just dropped the deer and ran the hell away.’ (Pass.; Newell 1974:5, retranscribed)

cf. \text{mace-phúwe (away-flee-(3)) ‘he runs away’ (Pass.)}

The way objurgative morphemes are inserted into verb stems may remind readers of the process of Expletive Insertion in English, discussed by McCarthy (1982), which gives rise to forms such as \text{fan-fuckin-tastic}. McCarthy proposed a morphological rule of Expletive Insertion for English that operates in terms of the prosodic structure of the word, inserting the expletive at the edge of a foot. The distribution of the objurgative morphemes of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot is not prosodically conditioned, however, but is entirely a matter of morphology: the position that an objurgative morpheme occupies within a stem is a function of a tightly organized system of stem structure. Moreover, we will see that the process by which objurgative forms are derived may not, in the end, involve insertion. It should be noted as well that Zonneveld (1984) has argued that English Expletive Insertion may better be analyzed as a language game rather than a rule of grammar. However this may be, the Algonquian process that concerns us here is unquestionably a grammatical phenomenon.
The stems of Algonquian verbs typically have either a bipartite or a tripartite structure: they consist either of an initial component plus a final component, or of an initial, a medial, and a final component (Bloomfield 1946; Goddard 1990). (The situation is complicated, however, by the fact that components of any of these position classes may be internally complex.) The objurgative elements that appear within verb stems may be understood in these terms as belonging to the class of medials.

When we look a little more carefully at the properties of objurgative formations, however, it turns out that things are not quite as simple as this. First, there can ordinarily be at most one medial in a verb stem (apart from cases involving compound medials or other internally complex components). But at least one of the objurgative morphemes of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy can freely cooccur with another medial, suggesting that these elements are not ordinary members of this class of components. Second, some objurgative formations (so far attested only in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy) appear to be derived not from simplex verb stems, but rather from compound stems consisting of a preverb plus a formally complete stem. The prevers in question (like most prevers) are themselves derivatives of components that may also appear as initials within verb stems. In a derived objurgative form of this type, the initial component of the preverb from the underlying compound functions as an initial, and the stem of the head verb of the compound functions as a complex final. Thus, these objurgative formations effectively masquerade as ordinary verb stems, even though they are based on compounds rather than on stems. This appears to be a unique morphological construction, quite unlike anything else in the language.

Objurgative forms of nouns are common in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, but are not securely attested in Penobscot. The Maliseet-Passamaquoddy examples are interesting, since they appear to be derived not from the phonological underlying forms of nouns, but rather from their surface forms. In general, however, the nominal forms are much less varied than the corresponding verbal forms, and only one objurgative morpheme is attested in such derivatives. Objurgative particles are also relatively restricted, but are known from both languages.

The objurgative forms of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy are used by both men and women. Their characteristic morphemes are regarded by contemporary speakers as having no literal meanings; but as we demonstrate, at least some of them have their origins in off-color expressions. Presumably as a function of this etymology, objurgative forms are still regarded as potentially offensive language and, in the days when the language was still actively used by children, such forms were regarded as inappropriate for their use.

In contemporary Maliseet and Passamaquoddy, objurgatives continue to serve a variety of functions. They are often used to express anger or annoyance, but frequently it is not the speaker’s attitude but that of one of the participants in the situation that the speaker describes that an objurgative serves to signal. As verbal intensifiers, these morphemes may also be used to indicate that the
action or state named by the verb is itself intense or extreme. For this reason, objurgative forms are a useful device in story-telling. Finally, objurgative forms can be used in a humorous way to signal approval, or they can function to show that two individuals have a particularly close relationship.

Below we first analyze the formation of objurgatives of various categories, focusing on their morphologically interesting properties. We then turn to the question of the functions that these forms serve. Finally, we consider objurgative formations from a comparative point of view, showing that the semantically empty character of the objurgative morphemes is the result of bleaching.

2. **Objurgative verb forms in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy.** The objurgative verb forms of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, as we have already noted, may usually be described as being derived from the corresponding nonobjurgative form by inserting one of several specialized morphemes into the stem of the verb as a medial. The most frequently encountered objurgative morphemes are \textit{a-lōkittiye─} and \textit{a-ōliqe─.} These are illustrated in (3a)–(4b).²

\begin{align*}
(3a) & \text{`tawi\=/}wol\text{-ihpúksu} \\
& \text{know.how\=/good-taste-(3)} \\
& \text{`it (an.) is good eating (tastes good)’ (MPD)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(3b) & \text{`tawi\=/}wol\text{-a-lōkiti}t\text{ye─hpúksu} \\
& \text{know.how\=/good-OBJURG-taste-(3)} \\
& \text{`it (an.) is damn good eating’ (MPD)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(4a) & \text{n-ma}t\text{-ôn-ôku-n} (< /n-ma}t\text{-ôn-ôku-n/)} \\
& \text{1-fight-by.hand-INV-N} \\
& \text{`he attacked me’ (Pass.)}
\end{align*}

\begin{align*}
(4b) & \text{n-ma}t\text{-ôliqe─n-ku-n} (< /n-ma}t\text{-ôliqe─ôn-ôku-n/)} \\
& \text{1-fight-OBJURG-by.hand-INV-N} \\
& \text{`the damn thing (a bee) attacked me’ (Pass.)}
\end{align*}

Note that the final \textit{-ihpúksu} in (3a) (underlying \textit{-hpúksi--) plus the third-person suffix \textit{-w/--}) begins with \textit{i}. This is actually an epenthetic vowel, added to a consonant-initial final component after a nonsyllabic.² This vowel is accordingly absent after the vowel-final objurgative morpheme in (3b). The weak vowel of the final \textit{-ôn/--} ‘by hand’ in (4a) and (4b) drops by a general rule after the strong vowel of the objurgative element \textit{-ôliqe--) in (4b). The presence of the latter morpheme also leads to a different pattern of syncope of weak schwa in (4a) and (4b). There are, in fact, several processes of syncope in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy that target weak vowels for deletion under distinct sets of conditions (see LeSourd [1993] for discussion).
The loss of a weak vowel after a strong vowel affects the shape of the objurgative morpheme /- öl̓iqe-/ in (5b), where this medial follows a vowel-final initial: here /- öl̓iqe-/ is reduced to /- liqe-/. 

(5a) nokka-hte-lūw-ā
    (3)-all-strike-by-projectile-DIR-(OBV.PL)
    'he shoots all of them' (Pass.)

(5b) nokka-liqe-hte-lūw-ā-nnu-k
    (1)-all-OBJURG-strike-by.projectile-1.PL-PROX.PL
    'we (exc.) shot all of the damn things (an., bears)' (Pass.)

Other phonological processes lead to alternations in the initial components of (6a)–(7b). The underlying form of the initial ‘hither, arrive’ in (6a) and (6b) is /pet/-. The /t/ of this morpheme undergoes affrication to c before /i/ in (6a), but remains unchanged before the objurgative element /-öl̓ikitiiye/- in (6b). In (7b), the initial /mace-/'start’ is followed by /-öl̓ikitiiye-/, so there is an underlying sequence of /e/ and /a/. This is broken up by a rule that inserts /y/ between two strong vowels: the preceding /e/ then surfaces as a weak /i/ before the epenthetic /y/. Compare Pass. ál̓omu ‘he tells a story’, maci̊y-ál̓omu ‘he starts to tell a story’, with the same treatment of /mace-/'start’.

(6a) 'pec-iphoqál-a-l
    (3)-hither-follow-DIR-OBV.SG
    'he follows him here’ (Pass.)

(6b) n-pet-öl̓ikitiiye-phoqal-ku-nnu-ss
    1-hither-OBJURG-follow-INV-1.PL-DUBIT
    'the damn thing (a bear) must have followed us (exc.) here’ (Pass.)

(7a) macè-pt (< /mace-pt-u/)
    start-carry-(TH)
    'take (sg.) it away!’ (Pass.)

(7b) maci̊y-öl̓ikitiiye- pt
    start-OBJURG-carry-(TH)
    'get it the hell out of here!’ (MPD)

In addition to -öl̓ikitiiye- and -öl̓iqe-, three other objurgative morphemes are attested for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy: -ce- (underlying /-oče-/), -önoqe-, and -öl̓uitiiye-. Examples of the first two are given in (8b) and (9b); for the third, see (2c) above and (10b) below. None of these elements seems to be commonly used, however, and not all speakers are familiar with all of them.
(8a) *wol-ihpükot*
   good-taste-(3)
   'it tastes good' (Pass.)

(8b) *wol-ce-hpükot* (< /wol-oce-hpukot-w/)
   good-OBJURG-taste-(3)
   'it tastes damn good' (Pass.)

(9a) *wicu-hkêm-s*
   help-TA-REFLEX
   'help yourself' (Pass.)

(9b) *wicu-noqe-hkêm-s*
   help-OBJURG-TA-REFLEX
   'help yourself, damn it!' (Mal.)

The various objurgative morphemes also differ in force. Francis and Leavitt (2006) describe *-oluttiiye-, -ñoqe-,* and *-ôliqe-* as "mild" expletives. Example (2c), given above to illustrate the use of *-oluttiiye-*, is taken from a small book that was intended for use in the Passamaquoddy bilingual education program at a time (1974) when significant numbers of children were still coming to school with a good command of the language. Although a mild expletive may have been intended in this context to strike the reader as slightly salacious, it is clear that forms with *-oluttiiye-* cannot have been regarded as unacceptable for use with children. Thus, this morpheme appears to be a particularly mild curseword. Francis and Leavitt (2006) also note that *-ñoqe-* is milder than *-ôliqe-.*4 On the other hand, our consultants agree that *alôkittiye-* is distinctly stronger than any of the other forms. The various objurgative forms given above can accordingly be arranged in order of increasing strength, as shown for the form of 'be quiet!' in (10a)–(10e).5

(10a) *cos-tâqs*
   'be quiet!' (basic form, without an objurgative medial; Pass.)

(10b) *cos-oluttiiye-htàqs*
   'shut up!' (MPD)

(10c) *cos-ñoqe-htàqs*
   'shut up!' (MPD)

(10d) *cos-ôliqe-htàqs*
   'shut up!' (MPD)

(10e) *cos-alôkittiye-htàqs*
   'shut the hell up!' (MPD)
Additional degrees of expletive force may be indicated by inserting an intensifier -alökittis- before -alökittyè-, as shown in (11c). To make an even more forceful expression, -alökittis- may then be repeated, reportedly at will, although in practice only forms with one or two repetitions of -alökittis- are ordinarily used. David A. Francis, Passamaquoddy elder and language expert, has indicated that sequences of three objurgatives, as in (11d), are (or were) typical of women’s speech, but not of men’s.

(11a) mace-ws (< /mace-wse/)  
start-walk  
‘go (sg.) away!’ (Pass.)

(11b) maciy-alökittyè-ws  
start-OBJURG-walk  
‘go (sg.) away, damn it!’ (Pass.)

(11c) maciy-alökittis-alökittyè-ws  
start-OBJURG-OBJURG-walk  
‘go (sg.) away, damn it!’ (Pass.)

(11d) maciy-alökittis-alökittis-alökittyè-ws  
start-OBJURG-OBJURG-OBJURG-walk  
‘go (sg.) away, damn it!’ (Pass.)

We return below to the principles that govern the derivation of objurgative verb forms in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, but first we turn to comparable formations in Penobscot.

3. Objurgative verb forms in Penobscot. Three objurgative medials are attested for Penobscot, all corresponding to Maliseet-Passamaquoddy forms: -oče-, -alik’e-, and -alakittyè-. Examples are given in (12a)–(13c). In addition, the intensifier -alakohkis- may be added before -alakittyè-, yielding a fourth type of objurgative formation; see (14d) below.

(12a) nat-alam-öhte-law-α  
1-away-strike-by.projectile-DIR  
‘I shoot him dead’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:155)

(12b) nat-апоčокал-oče-hte-law-α  
1-upside.down-OBJURG-strike-by.projectile-DIR  
‘I shot him so confoundedly hard he somersaulted in air (as by using a double charge of powder)’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:118)

(13a) wanatám-ine  
lose.mind-ail-(3)  
‘he lost his memory’; ‘he is out of his mind, he is crazy’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:475)
(13b) \textit{wanatam-ali}k\textsuperscript{e}-\textit{ne}  
lose.mind-OBJURG-ail-(3)  
‘he is crazy as hell’ (Pen.; Siebert 1996a:475, our translation)

(13c) \textit{wanatam-\textit{alakittaye}-ne\grave{e}}  
lose.mind-OBJURG-ail-(3)  
‘he is crazy as hell’ (Pen.; Siebert 1996a:475, our translation)

Siebert notes that these various “expletive” formations differ in force (1988:758). He identifies four “degrees” of expletives, as illustrated in (14). Note that the initial \(\partial\) of \(-\text{o}\partial\)e- and the initial \(a\) of \(-\text{ali}k\textsuperscript{e}-\) are deleted after the \(e\) of \(\text{ma}\partial\)e- ‘start off’, while the \(e\) of the latter morpheme is deleted before the initial \(\alpha\) of \(-\text{alakittaye}-\) and \(-\text{alakohkis}-\). There is also an alternation in the form of \(-\text{alakittaye}-\); we find \(i\) for \(\partial\) when stress falls on this vowel.

(14) Four degrees of expletive force (Pen., Siebert 1988:758):\textsuperscript{7}

a. first degree expletive:
\[\text{ma}\partial\text{e-\textit{ce}-sse}\]  
\[\text{start.off-OBJURG-walk}\]  
‘Be off!, Off with you!, Get the hell away!’\textsuperscript{8}

b. second degree expletive: \(\text{ma}\partial\text{e-\textit{lik}e\textsuperscript{e}-sse}\)

c. third degree expletive: \(\text{ma}\partial\text{-\textit{alakiti}ye\textsuperscript{-sse}}\)

d. fourth degree expletive: \(\text{ma}\partial\text{-\textit{alakohkis-alakitti}ye\textsuperscript{-sse}}\)

It is not known whether \(-\text{alakohkis}-\) could be repeated like its analogue in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. Siebert describes only four levels of intensity for objurjgative verb forms in Penobsot.

4. The structure of verb stems. Before we can evaluate the role of objurgative elements in the stems of verbs in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot, we must consider how verb stems are derived. We illustrate stem structure here with Maliseet-Passamaquoddy examples. Two types of formations may be distinguished: primary stems and secondary stems (Goddard 1990). A few primary stems are unanalyzable, but most may be analyzed into components: initials, medials, and finals. The stem then consists either of an initial plus a final, as in (15a), or of one component of each position class, as in (15b).

(15a) \textit{\textit{kol-\textit{on-a-l}}}  
(3)-hold.fast-by.hand-DIR-OBV.SG  
‘he holds him’ (Pass.)

(15b) \textit{\textit{kol-iptin\textbar{e}-n-a-l}}  
(3)-hold.fast-hand-by.hand-DIR-OBV.SG  
‘he holds him by the hand(s)’ (MPD)
Secondary stems are derived from stems (or sometimes from themes, stems to which certain further suffixes have been added) by the addition of secondary finals. These formations are distinguished from primary stems by the fact that secondary stems are not formed with medials, although a secondary stem may, of course, be derived from a primary stem that happens to include a medial.

Examples of secondary formations are given in (16a)–(17b). The transitive stem in (16b) is formed from the intransitive stem in (16a) by adding the causative final /-kh-/a/, while the intransitive stem in (17b) is derived from the transitive stem in (17a) by adding the reciprocal final /-ōti-/a/. Many secondary finals have comparable valence-changing effects.

(16a)  
\textit{ehq-ōlūhke}  
\text{cease-work-(3)}  
\text{‘he stops working’ (Pass.)}

(16b)  
\textit{t-ehq-ōlūhkē-ka-l}  
\text{3-cease-work-cause-DIR-OBV.SG}  
\text{‘he fires him (from a job)’ (MPD)}

(17a)  
\textit{māt-ōn-a-l}  
\text{3-fight-by.hand-DIR-OBV.SG}  
\text{‘he fights him, attacks him physically’ (Pass.)}

(17b)  
\textit{mat-ōn-ōtū-w-ōk}  
\text{fight-by.hand-RECIP-3-PROX.PL}  
\text{‘they (du.) fight each other, clash physically’ (Pass.)}

This system of stem formation allows for the creation of stems of considerable complexity, even in the case of primary derivatives, since the components of primary stems may be internally complex. An example illustrating some of the possibilities is given in (18).

(18)  
\textit{mokōse-w-alōk-īqe-htā-h-a-l}  
\text{3-dead.coal-W-hole-face-strike-TA-DIR-OBV.SG}  
\text{‘he hits the other, giving him a black eye’ (Pass.)}

The initial here is \textit{mokōse-w-}, consisting of the noun stem \textit{mokōse-} ‘dead coal (from a fire)’ (\textit{mokōs} ‘dead coal’) plus the affix \textit{-w-}, which is often used to derive initials from stems. This combination has been lexicalized as ‘black’. The medial is \textit{-alōk-īqe-} ‘eye’, a compound of the simple medials \textit{-alōk-} ‘hole’ and \textit{-īqe-} ‘face’; compare the forms in (19a) and (19b). Again the combination has been lexicalized and functions synchronically as a single unit.

(19a)  
\textit{olōq-ālōk-ot}  
\text{direction-hole-II-(3)}  
\text{‘the hole runs in (that) direction’ (Pass.)}
\[(19b) \quad 'koss-\textit{iqé-
-a-l}\]
\[(3)-wash-face-by.hand-DIR-OBV.SG\]
\[\text{‘he washes the other’s face’} \ (\text{Pass.})\]

The third component of the stem in (18) is the complex final \(-hta-h-,\) underlying \(-/\text{iht}-\text{oè}/.\) This consists of a prefinal element \(-/\text{iht}-/ \ ‘strike’\) that appears only in combination with a small number of finals; it is combined here with a suffix \(-/\text{oè}/\) that forms transitive animate (TA) stems, i.e., transitive stems that select grammatically animate objects. Compare (20), where the same prefinal occurs with the homophonous transitive inanimate (TI) final \(-/\text{oè}/; \text{see also examples}\ (5a) \text{and}\ (5b).^9

\[(20) \quad 't-\textit{aps-ıhté-h-m-on}\]
\[3\text{-small-strike-TI-TH-N}\]
\[\text{‘he chops it into small pieces’} \ (\text{Pass.})\]

As we see in (18), the medial component of a stem may be a compound of two simple medials. There are also cases where other components of stems have incorporated material that formerly represented medials. So, for example, the combination of the initial plus the medial in the stem of the verb ‘be dirty’ in (21a) has apparently been reanalyzed as a single initial meaning ‘dirty’, which now appears as a unit in verbs like that in (21b).

\[(21a) \quad \textit{moc-\textit{cök-e}}\]
\[\text{bad-messy.substance-II-(3)}\]
\[\text{‘it is dirty’} \ (\text{Pass.})\]

\[(21b) \quad \textit{moccok-ıptiné-hl-a-l}\]
\[(3)-dirty-hand-TA-DIR-OBV.SG\]
\[\text{‘he gets the other’s hand(s) dirty’} \ (\text{Pass.})\]

Similar examples could be given showing the reanalysis of medials as prefinal elements (i.e., as the initial parts of complex finals). It is clear, however, that neither such cases of reanalysis nor examples of compound medials provide true exceptions to the generalization that only a single medial component may appear in a stem. As discussed in the following section, however, some objurgative formations in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy do appear to violate this generalization.

Primary stems of some complexity arise from the use of initials or finals that are themselves based on stems. For example, the initial in (22b), given in boldface, is derived from the stem of the verb in (22a), while the boldfaced final in (23b) is derived from the stem of the verb in (23a). Note that the derived initial in (22b) itself includes all three components of a primary stem, while the derived final in (23b) consists of an initial plus a final.\[10]
In both Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot, a variety of semantic ends require combining an initial with a stem. In some cases, as we have seen, a final based on the stem exists, so the effect of combining the initial with the stem may be achieved by joining the initial with the final corresponding to that stem through the usual process of stem formation. As it happens, however, finals are not productively derived from verb stems. Some vowel-initial stems are matched by homophonous finals, but others are not. Consonant-initial stems are not typically matched by finals. When no final is available to stand in for a given stem, another construction must be used to achieve the effect of combining an initial with that verb stem: in such cases, a preverb is derived from the initial and used as a verbal modifier. (See Goddard [1990:478] for a discussion of the corresponding situation in Meskwaki.)

An example will serve to make the situation clearer. In (23a) and (23b), we see that the effect of combining the initial kis- ‘past’ with the stem amik-ötókki- ‘jump up’ can be achieved by suffixing the derived final amik-ötókki- to kis-. No final corresponds to the stem ankew-ácomo- ‘relay a message, interpret’ in (24a), however, so it is not possible in this case to derive a stem from kis- that would parallel (23b). Instead, a preverb kisi is derived from kis- and used to modify a verb form based on ankew-ácomo-. 

(24a) ankew-ácomo
extend-tell-(3)
‘he relays a message, he interprets’ (Pass.)

(24b) kisi=ankew-ácomo
past=extend-tell-(3)
‘he relayed a message, he interpreted’ (Pass.)
Further modification of preverb-verb complexes is also by preverbs, as illustrated in (25), where the preverbs are given in boldface. In fact, strings of several preverbs may be generated in this manner.

(25) Wōt=ōlu pēsq skičin, 'kisi=kōmucı=mace-ŋt-u-ŋe:ss
tomhikōn-ōssis.
this.AN=but one.AN Indian (3)-past=secretly=start-carry-TH-N-DUBIT
‘But this one Indian had secretly brought a hatchet.’ (Mal.; LeSourd 2007:120, para. 15)

Preverb-verb complexes are fundamentally a type of compound. They are inflected as units, for example, so that the inflectional prefixes of the verb go on the first preverb of the preverb-verb complex, if there is one, and otherwise on the verb. Thus, the first person prefix n~ is attached to the verb stem in (26a), but to the preverb kisi ‘past’ in (26b).

(26a) Wikkinaq=ōte n-tökōm-oq.
without.cause=EMPH 1-hit-INV
‘He hit me for no reason.’ (MPD)

(26b) N-kisi=pok-ēhl-oq kci=āmūwes.
1-past=bite-TA-INV big=bee
‘A big bee stung (lit., bit) me.’ (MPD)

Preverbs nonetheless function as syntactic words independent of the verbs they modify. To see this, consider the following examples. In (27a), the preverb kisi ‘be able’ (homophonous with kisi ‘past’), directly precedes the verb that it modifies, bearing the first person prefix n~, the verbal inflection. In (27b), however, the same preverb (still inflected) is separated from the associated verb by the future enclitic =hc and by wōt ‘this (an.),’ the primary object of the verb. In fact, a wide range of material, including adjuncts as well as verbal arguments, may be placed between a preverb and the verb it modifies.14

(27a) Tān=te ecı=koti=nutá-hā-ŋ, n-kisi=nutá-ha.
such=EMPH extreme=want=out-go-1.SG 1-be.able=out-go
‘Whenever I want to go out, I can go out.’ (Mal.; LeSourd 2007:46, para. 7)

(27b) Êpocıl n-kisi=hc wōt pluk-ōn-ŋa yuhāht
because 1-be.able=FUT this.AN deprive-by.hand-DIR-N these.OBV
pōnawsuwinų ecı=kısı-tahā-m-iht.
person-(OBV.PL) extreme=intense-thought-TA-OBV/PROX
‘Because of this, I will now be able to take these people away from him, who think so highly of him.’ (Mal.; LeSourd 2007:18, para. 3)
The syntactic independence of preverbs in other Algonquian languages has led to debate about the role of syntactic and lexical processes in the derivation of preverb-verb complexes (Goddard 1988, 1990; LeSourd 2009). Maliseet-Passamaquoddy objurgatives may shed light on this question, since one type of objurgative verb form in this language appears to be derived not from stems but from preverb-verb complexes. We take up this question in section 6 below.

5. The role of objurgative formatives in stem formation. As we have already observed, the objurgative morphemes of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot function like medials in the formation of verb stems. It should be noted in particular that the initial in an objurgative verb form may be derived from a stem, as in the Penobscot example given in (28b) below. The initial in this case is based on the stem of the verb in (28a). This is a so-called objectless transitive inanimate verb, that is, one that has the form of a transitive verb taking an inanimate object (so that it is suffixed with -am, the theme-forming suffix for one class of such verbs), but that is not in fact used with an object.

(28a) wán-at-am
lose-TI-TH-(3)
‘he loses his mind, memory’ (Pen.; Siebert 1996a:475)

(28b) wan-at-áam-óé-ne
lose-TI-TH-OBJURG-ail-(3)
‘he is crazy as hell’ (Pen.; Siebert 1996a:475, our translation)

Here we see that the objurgative element truly occupies the medial slot in the verb stem and is not simply inserted after the first initial in the stem, that is, after wan- ‘lose’.

Objurgative morphemes also differ from medials in certain respects, however. First, there appear to be some differences in morphophonological treatment. The reader may have noticed that all of the objurgative elements of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy end in the vowel e: the two common ones are -alòkittye- and -ólìqe-; less frequently encountered are -óé-, -ónoqe-, and -ólittye-. The same is true of Penobscot -óé-, -alike-, and -älakittye-. In this respect, these morphemes resemble medials of the class that refer to body parts: Maliseet-Passamaquoddy -alòkosse- ‘ear’, -alòtoqe- ‘hair’, -apite- ‘tooth’, -atpe- ‘head’, -ötune- ‘mouth’, -iptine- ‘hand’, -iqe- ‘face’, etc. The final -e- of these body-part medials may be analyzed as a formative in its own right, a “post-medial extension” in Algonquianist terminology (Goddard 1990:467).¹⁵

This postmedial vowel alternates with zero. The -e- is retained before a consonant, as shown in (29a). For the most part, vowel sequences that arise when -e- is followed by a vowel-initial element are resolved like those that arise in combinations involving initials. If the second vowel is strong, y is inserted between the two vowels and the final -e- of the medial is transformed to a weak
If the second vowel is weak, it is simply elided, as in (29c); compare (15a)–(15b) and (17a)–(17b). Before the abstract final element -a-, however, body-part medials occur without the postmedial extension -e-, as illustrated in (29d). This final, glossed here simply as AI for the class of stems that it derives (animate intransitives), appears to be used only in construction with body-part medials.

(29a) 't-epôle-orienté-pt-u-n
(3)-one.of.pair-hand-carry-TH-N
‘he catches it with one hand’ (MPD)

(29b) apq-otunîy-ápu (< /apq-ôtune-api-w/)
open-mouth-look-(3)
‘he stares open-mouthed, gapes’ (MPD)

(29c) ’koss-orienté-n-a-l (< /w-koss-pine-òn-a-ol/)
(3)-wash-hand-by.hand-DIR-OBV.SG
‘he washes the other’s hand(s)’ (Pass.)

(29d) eci=kskek-orienté-a-t
extreme=wide-hand-AI-3AN
‘he has very wide hands’ (MPD)

The analysis just outlined represents one possible interpretation of the forms in question. Since body-part medials apparently lack the postmedial extension -e- only before the abstract final -a-, however, and since this -a- seems to occur only after body-part medials, a possible alternative analysis would take these two elements to be alternate realizations of the same formative. That is, we might suppose that body-part medials occur without a final (or with a zero final) in stems like that in (29d), and that the -e- of the medial is realized as -a- when the medial appears in stem-final position. We will not attempt to settle this issue here, but will continue to gloss the element -a- as AI (for animate intransitive) where it appears in our examples. (See Rhodes [1980] for discussion of the corresponding forms in Ojibwe, and Goddard [1990:467] for a comparative perspective on the formations in question.)

Returning to the objurgative morphemes, we find a different pattern of alternation that may have originated in part in the treatment of the postmedial extension -e- of body-part medials before abstract finals, but now seems disconnected from this phenomenon. At least in the case of -alôktîtiye-, final e is retained before consonants and before weak vowels (which are elided), but is dropped before any strong vowel (not just before a).17 Examples are given in (30a)–(30e): in (30a) -alôktîtiye- is followed by a consonant-initial morpheme; in (30b) it is followed by -ôn- ‘by hand’, which loses its weak vowel; (30c)–(30e) show the loss of final e in -alôktîtiye- before strong vowels.18
We see, then, that objurgative morphemes may occupy the medial position in verb stems, but at least -alokittiye- appears to have morphophonological properties in the contemporary language that distinguish it from the otherwise similar body-part medials. The comparison is somewhat difficult to evaluate, however, since -alokittiye- appears in a much wider range of environments than body-part medials.

Another and more striking difference between objurgative formations and those involving ordinary medials is that an objurgative element can cooccur with other medials. We observed in the preceding section that only one medial may ordinarily occur in a verb stem, apart from cases involving compounds or the incorporation of medials into initials or finals. Objurgative formations are not constrained in this fashion, however, as the examples in (31a)–(31c) may serve to illustrate. Again, however, examples of this type are attested only for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, and all of the attested examples involve the objurgative element -alokittiye(e)-.

(31a) Nit=al 'qon-alokittiya-ahqaluw-a-n.
that.IN=UNCERTAIN (3)-length-OBJURG-tail-AI-N
'It (a rat) had a tail about that damn long.' (Pass.)

(31b) . . . nit=al 'tut-alokittiya-aq-si-li-n nihiiht.
that.IN=UNCERTAIN (3)-degree-OBJURG-sticklike-AI-OBV-N those.OBV
' . . . they (trees) were about that damn big around.' (Pass.)
Cèl *kes-ālōkittyi-y-altoqé-ph-i-t.*  
and even intense-OBJURG-hair-take.hold-3/1-3.AN

‘And it (a ghost) even grabbed me by the hair so hard that it hurt.’ (Pass.; Newell 1979:11, retranscribed)

In all of the naturally occurring examples of this type that we have encountered, *-ālōkittyii(e)* precedes the other medial in the form. Thus, the overall generalization governing the formation of objurgative verb forms appears to be that the objurgative morpheme is inserted immediately after the initial component of the stem.20

A somewhat different view of objurgative formations emerges, however, when we consider the way in which objurgative forms of secondary stems are handled. Take the stem of the objurgative form in (32b) as an example. The corresponding nonobjurgative stem, illustrated in (32a), is *mat-ōn-ot-ulti-*, a multiplural derivative of the reciprocal stem *mat-ōn-oti-* ‘fight each other’; compare (17b). In terms of its components, this stem consists of *mat-ōn-oti-* as an initial plus *-ulti-*, one of several finals that make explicitly plural (i.e., nondual) stems from animate intransitives.21 The initial *mat-ōn-oti-* in turn consists of *mat-ōn-* ‘fight’ plus the final *-oti-* ‘reciprocal’. The objurgative morpheme *-ōliqe-* is not positioned with respect to either of these analyses of the stem into components, however; it is instead stationed immediately after *mat-* ‘fight’, the initial component of the primary stem on which the two layers of secondary derivation in this form are based.

(32a) *mat-ōn-ot-ultí-i-w-ok* (< /mat-ōn-óti-ulti-w-ok/)  
fight-by.hand-RECIP-MPL-3-PROX.PL

‘they (more than two) fight each other (physically)’ (MPD)

(32b) *nit=te=hc*  
mat-ōliqe-n-t-ulti-ní-ya qócóm-ok . . .

then=EMPH=FUT (3)-fight-OBJURG-by.hand-RECIP-MPL-PROX.PL outside-LOC

‘then they (more than two) would fight like hell with each other outside . . .’ (Mal.)

To put the matter another way, what we see here is that the objurgative correspondent to a secondary stem is not derived by inserting an objurgative element into the secondary stem directly. In fact, there is no slot for a medial in a secondary stem. Rather, a corresponding stem is built up from a primary stem that contains an objurgative element as a medial, so that it includes the right ingredients to serve as the objurgative correspondent of the target stem.

It would seem, then, that the relationship between objurgative stems and the corresponding nonobjurgative forms is more complex than we have been assuming. An objurgative form is not simply a transform of the corresponding nonobjurgative form. Rather it is a functionally related form with its own morphological derivation.

Objurgative forms that correspond not to single verbs but to preverb-verb complexes represent another class of formations that cannot be derived simply by inserting an objurgative morpheme into the medial slot in a verbal base. Consider the examples in (33a)–(33c) in this connection. The boldfaced verb stem in these examples is tp-itah-at-, underlying /tôp-itah-at-/ (consider-thought-TI-) ‘think about’; compare Pass. ‘top-itah-at-ôm-on’ ‘he thinks about it’. Like most consonant-initial stems, tp-itah-at- does not ordinarily serve as the base for a deverbal final. It combines instead with preverbs: totôli ‘ongoing’ in (33a) and -ahcûwi, the prefixed form of cuwi ‘should, must’, in (33b). In (33a), where preverb and verb are adjacent, they form a prosodic word together. As we see in (33b), however, a preverb modifying this verb need not form a surface constituent with it.

(33a)  ‘totôli=tp-itah-at-ôm-on
(3)-ongoing=consider-thought-TI-TH-N
‘he is thinking about it’ (MPD)

(33b)  ‘r-ahcûwi wên  psi=te  këq  tp-itah-at-ôm-on
3-must  someone  every=EMPH  something  consider-thought-TI-TH-N

mèq  papehe-ikési-hq . . .
not.yet  find.out-speak-3.NEG
‘one has to think about everything before asking . . .’ (MPD)

(33c)  Këq  e tôl-âlôkîtiye-tp-itah-at-ôm-on?
what  ongoing-OBJURG-consider-thought-TI-TH-2.SG
‘What the hell are you thinking of?’ (MPD)

The surprising example is (33c). Here we have the same preverb and stem as in (33a), but the objurgative element appears between them, and the whole complex has the form of a single complex stem consisting of an initial, a medial, and a (deverbal) final.

The inflection in (33c) is in a different paradigm from that in (33a), one that requires “initial change,” a modification of the first syllable of the complex, provided that this syllable meets certain phonological conditions. Initial change usually involves a vowel shift, but the changed form of totôli is the irregular form etôli. What we find in (33c) is not etôli, however, but etól-. Perhaps the objurgative derivative has been formed not with the preverb itself, but with the initial on which it is based, or perhaps the final i of the preverb has simply been dropped. However this may be, the initial component of the derivative is followed by the objurgative element -âlôkîtiye-, and then by the stem tp-itah-at- ‘think about’. While the result has the right shape to be a stem with a deverbal final, there is a problem. As already noted, no final is ordinarily derived from the stem tp-itah-at-.
Comparable formations seem to be reasonably common. Three additional examples are given in (34a)–(36b). (See also examples (57) and (59) in section 10.) In each case we first illustrate the basic preverb-verb complex, then an objurgative form based on it. Each of the objurgative expressions appears to make use of a final based on a verb stem that does not otherwise serve as the base for such a derivative.22

(34a) n-kis=pok-éhl-oq
   1-past=bit-TA-INV
   ’it (an.) bit me’ (MPD)

(34b) kis-alóktitiye-pok-éhl-i-pa
   (2)-past-OBJJURG-bite-TA-2/1-2.PL
   ’you (ants) damn well bit me’ (Pass.)

(35a) li=mi-n-űw-i-w
   thus=mean-W-II-3
   ’it means that, has that meaning’ (MPD)

(35b) Kèq=al   nit   l-alóktitiye-mi-n-űw-i-w   nit?
   what=UNCERTAIN   that.IN   thus-OBJJURG-mean-W-II-3   that.IN
   ’What the hell does that mean?’ (MPD)

(36a) ehqi=utóme
   cease=smoke-(3)
   ’he stops smoking’ (MPD)

(36b) Ehq-alóktitiye-utóma-c.
   cease-OBJJURG-smoke-3.IMP
   ’Tell her to quit her damn smoking.’ (Pass.)

An alternative analysis is possible, however, that does not face this difficulty. Suppose that each of the objurgative forms in (33c), (34b), (35b), and (36b) is actually a preverb-verb combination, rather than an inflected form of a single complex stem. That is, suppose that -alóktitiye- is not a medial in these forms, but a suffix that has been added to the initial to derive an objurgative preverb. This preverb can then be seen as modifying a verb stem like any other preverb, and there will be no need to assume that finals are derived from stems that do not otherwise serve as bases for such derivatives.

The problem with this analysis is that it predicts the occurrence of structures that have not, so far at least, been attested. Since preverbs may typically be separated from the verbs that they modify, we would expect under this alternative analysis to find examples in which objurgative preverbs prove to be comparably separable. But no examples of discontinuous objurgative preverb-verb complexes have been noted. Similarly, under this analysis we might expect to find objurgative preverbs preceding other preverbs, since two or more
preverbs may occur together in the same preverb-verb complex. This situation, too, is unattested.23

All of the examples of objurgatives based on preverb-verb complexes that we have noted to date conform to the pattern: initial, objurgative element, plus deverbal final. This, as we have already remarked, is an independently existing stem type. Thus, the derivation of these forms clearly involves more than simply inserting an objurgative morpheme between a preverb and the stem that it modifies. It effectively represents a novel type of stem formation process, one in which a preverb-verb complex functions as the base for stem formation. If we take stem formation to be carried out by lexical rules, then it would appear that such rules must have access to preverb-verb complexes, despite their phrasal status.24

7. Derivation from unanalyzable stems. A number of short stems are unanalyzable, or are taken by speakers to be unanalyzable. Here, there is no question of inserting an objurgative element into the base in forming a derivative, but objurgative stems are nevertheless derived using these short stems as initials. Other short stems are given special treatments in deriving objurgative forms.

Take, for example, the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy stem mil- ‘give’. The objurgative correspondent of the command given in (37a) is formed on a stem with an initial based on mil-, followed by -alökittiye-, and then the semantically abstract transitive animate (TA) final -w-.

(37a) mil-i-n
give-2/1-2.SG.IMP
’give (sg.) it to me’ (Pass.)

(37b) mil-alökittiye-w-i-n
give-OBJURG-TA-2/1-2.SG.IMP
’give (sg.) it to me, damn it!’ (Pass.)

This -w- is found in other TA objurgatives as well. The stem tokôm- ‘hit’ of (38a) is apparently regarded as unanalyzable by our consultants, despite the evidence of forms like those in (38c)–(38d), which suggest that there is an independently occurring initial tok- ‘hit’. Presumably this is because any final -ôm- that might be set up for tokôm- would have to be regarded as completely unproductive—there are only a few candidates for comparison with this sequence and little reason to see any of them as synchronically connected.25 The corresponding objurgative form (38b) includes the same TA final -w- as (37b) above.

(38a) ’tokôm-a-l
(3)-hit-DIR-OBV.SG
’he hits him’ (Pass.)
A comparable derivational pattern is found for the intransitive stem $\hat{\text{op}}-\hat{\text{i}}-$ ‘sit’, even though it is arguably complex, including a semantically abstract final. Corresponding to the command in (39a), for example, both of the objurgative forms in (39b) and (39c) are attested. Here, the final $\hat{\text{i}}$ is omitted in the derivative. In its place we find an element $\hat{\text{a}}$ that appears to play much the same role as the abstract final $\hat{\text{w}}$ of TA objurgatives.

(39a) $\hat{\text{op}}-\hat{\text{i}}-\hat{\text{n}}$
sit-AI-2.SG.IMP
‘sit (sg.) down!’

(39b) $\hat{\text{op}}-\hat{\text{o}}\hat{\text{i}}-\hat{\text{q}}-\hat{\text{a}}-\hat{\text{n}}$
sit-OBJURG-AI-2.SG.IMP
‘sit (sg.) down, damn it!’ (Pass.)

(39c) $\hat{\text{op}}-\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{l}}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{k}}\hat{\text{a}}\hat{\text{t}}\hat{\text{t}}\hat{\text{y}}-\hat{\text{a}}-\hat{\text{n}}$
sit-OBJURG-AI-2.SG.IMP
‘sit (sg.) down, damn it!’ (Pass.)

The objurgative forms seen here present essentially the same analytical problem, however, as the verbs with body-part medials that we discussed in section 5, in which the postmedial extension $\hat{\text{e}}$ appears to be replaced by a final $\hat{\text{a}}$ when it occurs in stem-final position. Here, we note only that treating the stem-final $\hat{\text{a}}$ of the forms in (39b) and (39c) as an abstract final has the virtue of bringing the intransitive pattern into line with the transitive type of (38b), since both would then involve the addition of an abstract final after the objurgative element.

The TI (transitive inanimate) stem $\hat{\text{ih}}-\hat{\text{i}}-$ ‘have’, which parallels $\hat{\text{op}}-\hat{\text{i}}-$ in shape, receives comparable treatment in objurgative formation, as shown in (40a) and (40b). Here again, stem-final $\hat{\text{i}}$, which we analyze in this case as an abstract TI final, is dropped. The resulting initial $\hat{\text{ih}}$ is represented by $\hat{\text{i}}\hat{\text{y}}$ in (40b), reflecting the basic form of the stem, which appears to be $/\hat{\text{iy}}-\hat{\text{i}}-\hat{\text{y}}$/. (Compare the corresponding TA stem $/\hat{\text{iy}}-\hat{\text{ow}}-/$, which gives forms like Pass. $\hat{\text{nt}}-\hat{\text{i}}\hat{\text{y}}-\hat{\text{ow}}-\hat{\text{a}}$ ‘I have him’.) Once again, the objurgative morpheme is followed by $\hat{\text{a}}$.28
When we turn to Penobscot, we find many of the same patterns of derivation from short and unanalyzable stems as in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. For example, TA objurgatives formed with an abstract final –w– are attested by derivatives of the stem /nahl–/ 'kill', as shown by the set given in (41b); compare the nonobjurgative form in (41a).

(41a)  n̓ə-nihl–α
       1-kill-DIR
       ‘I kill him’ (Siebert 1996a:311)

(41b)  "expletive" forms of Penobscot /nahl–/ 'kill':
     n̓ə-nihl–ōc–w–α
     n̓ə-nihl–alikʻe–w–α
     n̓ə-nihl–alakittiy–w–α
     1-kill-OBJURG-TA-DIR
     ‘I kill him’ (Siebert 1996a:311)

Short stems ending in –i– form objurgatives by dropping this element and adding an objurgative morpheme plus –α– (cognate with Maliseet-Passamaquoddy –a–). The stem of ap–i– 'sit' is shown by the singular imperative form in (42a), which is made in Penobscot without a suffix. A set of objurgative forms is given in (42b). 29 (Siebert reports that the first of these is "friendly," while the others are “emphatic.”)

(42a)  ãp–i
       sit-AI
       ‘sit (thou) down!’ (Siebert 1996a:72)

(42b)  Objurgative forms of Penobscot /ap–i–/ 'sit'
     ãp–ōc–α–kʷ
     ap–ālikʷ–α–kʷ
     ap–alakittay–α–kʷ
     ap–alakohkis–alakittay–α–kʷ
     sit–OBJURG-AI-2.PL.IMP
     ‘sit ye (2) down!’ (Pen., Siebert 1996b, notebook 72, p. 60)

Finally, the vowel of the element /–α–/ is subject to a (morphologically governed) phonological rule that changes it to a when it occurs in word-final position, as in (43).
Another stem that is treated like \textit{ap-\textipa{i}}\text{-} \textit{sit} is \textit{min\textipa{-aw-i}}\text{-} \textit{be mean}. The initial here is \textit{min\textipa{-aw-}}, derived from English \textit{mean} by the addition of the affix \textit{-(o)w-}, which forms initials from stems. The final is again \textit{-i-}, although this is a different element from the one we have seen above, a productively employed suffix that forms verbs of being. The stem surfaces in its basic form in (44a). Before the third-person suffix \textit{/\textipa{-aw/}}, however, the \textit{/i/} of the final is replaced by \textit{/a/}, and the resulting sequence \textit{/aw-a-w/} contracts into \textit{o}, as shown in (44b). As before, \textit{/-i/-} is dropped in objurgative derivatives. Examples are given in (44c) and (44d). Note that the objurgative morphemes appear in both forms with a final \textbf{-e-}. This is due not to a failure to employ the usual suffix \textit{/-\textipa{a}/}, but rather to a rule by which \textit{/\textipa{a}/} is replaced by \textit{e} before the third-person suffix \textit{/-w/} (which is then deleted).30

(44a) \textit{mín\textipa{-aw-i}}31
\hspace{1em}1\text{-}mean-W-AI
\hspace{1em}‘I am mean’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:281)

(44b) \textit{mín-o (< /min-aw-i-w/)}
\hspace{1em}mean-W-AI-(3)
\hspace{1em}‘he is mean’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:281)

(44c) \textit{mín-aw-\textipa{-ac-\textipa{-e}}}32
\hspace{1em}mean-W-OBJURG-AI-(3)
\hspace{1em}‘he is damn mean’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:281)

(44d) \textit{mín-aw-\textipa{-alik\textsimpleton{-e}}}
\hspace{1em}mean-W-OBJURG-(3)
\hspace{1em}‘he is damn mean’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:281)

Stems that parallel Penobscot \textit{min\textipa{-aw-i-} in structure are found in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, but we have not encountered objurgative derivatives of them, so the properties of these Maliseet-Passamaquoddy formations remain to be determined.32

8. Objurgative forms of nouns. While the preceding sections have concentrated on objurgative forms of verbs, comparable derivatives of nouns exist as well. No secure cases are citable from Penobscot, but such forms are in regular use in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, where they are made by suffixing \textbf{-alōkittis} to the noun in question. Thus, corresponding to \textit{éspons ‘raccoon’}, we find the objurgative form in (45).33
Espons-alôkittis wôt.
'This is a dratted raccoon!' (Pass.; Newell 1973:5, retranscribed)

Now alôkittis can in fact appear as an independent particle, serving as a sort of generalized marker of intense feeling, as illustrated in the following exchange, taken from a longer conversation. (The first speaker is Maliseet, the second Passamaquoddy.)

Psí=te k-nokka=pok-ehl-ôk?
'all=EMPH 2-all=bite-TA-UNSPEC/2
'Did you (sg.) get stung (lit., 'bitten') all over?'

Alôkittis, alôkittis.
'I sure as hell did!

It is not immediately obvious, then, that alôkittis is a suffix in a form like that in (45), and in fact this morpheme is written as a separate word in our source for this example. That alôkittis is truly suffixed to the noun that it follows is clear, however, from examples like that in (47b). Here, an inflectional suffix belonging to cehkînsis ‘buttocks (dim.)’ follows the objurgative element, which must therefore be a suffix as well. The suffix in question is an obviative ending, required of a grammatically animate noun with a third-person possessor.

Cehkin-sís=ol
(3)-buttocks-DIM-OBV.SG
'his little buttocks' (MPD)

Cehkin-sís-alôkittis=ol.
(3)-buttocks-DIM-OBJURG-OBV.SG
'What a cute little bum he (baby) has!' (MPD)

Despite this evidence that alôkittis is a suffix when it follows a noun, this element displays an unusual degree of phonological independence from its host. In particular, it appears to be added not to the stem of the noun to which it is attached, nor to a combining form (a nominal initial) derived from it, but rather to the surface form of this noun. To see this, consider the noun muwín ‘bear’. The stem is /muwine-/, as shown by inflected forms like muwiné-m–ol 'his bear' and the diminutive muwiné-hsis. If alôkittis were added directly to this stem, we would have *muwinîy-alôkittis, which is not attested. The form expected of a derivative based on a derived initial is *muwine–w-alôkittis; compare muwine–w–êy ‘bear meat’, with /–eya/ ‘material, meat’. In the actual form, illustrated in (48), alôkittis directly follows the surface form of the noun.
(48) **Muwin-alōkittis wótta.**

*bear-OBJURG this. EMPH*

‘There’s a damn bear over here!’ (Pass.)

Although the nominal objurgative forms that we have encountered are generally like this, we have noted one exception. Corresponding to *amucalú* ‘fly’ (stem /amucalúwe-/) we have recorded *amuc-alōkittis-ok* ‘damn flies’. Here the noun in question appears to have been truncated before the objurgative element, perhaps through haplology.

Finally, we should note that at least one pronominal has an objurgative form. Corresponding to the interrogative pronoun *kèq* ‘what?’, there is *keq-alōkittis* ‘what the hell?’.

### 9. Other objurgative forms.

Several objurgative particles have been recorded. We have already noted the independent use of *alōkittis* as an interjection in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy (see (46) above). Another common interjection based on an objurgative element is *kin-alōkittiyé-naq*. This appears to contain the initial *kin*– ‘big’ and is perhaps etymologically related to the AI verb *kin-ináq-si*– (big-look-AI-) ‘look big’ (*kin-ináq-su* ‘he looks big’). The shortened form *kin-alōkittiyé-na* is often heard in Passamaquoddy, while Maliseet has *kinalōkitt* (MPD, accent uncertain). Example (49a) shows the Passamaquoddy form in use. As we see in (49b), –*alōkittis-* can be added before –*alōkittiyé-* to indicate additional intensity of feeling.

(49a) **Kin-alōkittiyé-na.** Élúwe=te n-sikt-alōkittiyé-hpáwil-0q.38

*big-OBJURG-PF almost=EMPH 1-to.death-OBJURG-frighten-INV*

‘Holy smokes! The damn thing (a rat) almost scared me to death!’ (Pass.)

(49b) **Kin-alōkittis-alōkittiyé-na.**

*big-OBJURG-OBJURG-PF*

‘Holy smokes!’ (Pass.)

Penobscot has a cognate interjection *kin-alakittiyé-nak* with a shortened variant *kin-alakittiyé-na*. Siebert (1996a) also attests an objurgative particle derived by suffixing –*alakittaye* to a basic form ending in *i*, with loss of this vowel, as shown in (50a) and (50b).

(50a) **kèlopi ni al-álohke.**

*hurry that.IN thus-do*

‘Hurry up and do [that]!’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:181)

(50b) **kelap-alakittaye, ni al-álohke.**

*hurry-OBJURG that.IN thus-do*

‘Hurry the hell up and do that!’ (Pen., Siebert 1996a:181)

It seems likely that other objurgative particles were formed in parallel fashion.
10. The functions of objurgative forms. In the preceding sections we have primarily been concerned with the forms that objurgative expressions can take. Here we would like to add a few notes on the ends that these expressions are used to achieve, drawing once again largely on Maliseet-Passamaquoddy material.

First, as one would expect, objurgatives can be used to indicate a speaker’s anger. Sentence (51), for example, was addressed to a woman in anger by a Passamaqoddy man. It features a form of the noun sqehsömüh ‘female dog, bitch’ to which the objurgative suffix -alökittis has been added. This noun is used with the same derogatory force in Passamaquoddy as in English. Here, the effect is clearly insulting. Example (52) is taken from a story about encounters with ghosts. One of the characters whose adventures are recounted has just discovered that some force has seized his pack sled and will not let go. He shouts out in anger the words quoted here.40

(51) Sqehs-ömüh-alökittis, kegséc ol-luhké-hk-oc.
   female-dog-OBJURG something thus-do-PROHIB-2.SG
   ‘You damn bitch, don’t do anything!’ (Pass.)

(52) Töqc pun-alökittiyē-n-ōm-ün n-utapákon.
   right.away put-OBJURG-by.hand-TH-2.SG.IMP 1-sled
   ‘You let go of my sled right now!’ (Pass.; Newell 1979:10, retranscribed)

Sometimes, however, it is not anger, but scorn or disdain that is signaled by the use of an objurgative form. This would appear to be a fair characterization of the use of the objurgative in (53), for example, while the objurgative expression in (54) has the status of a conventional insult. On the other hand, an objurgative form can be used equally well to express simple annoyance on the part of the speaker, as in (55).

(53) Wòt=ōna sakōl-alökittiyyāt-p-a-t sakh-ïya-t.
   this.AN=too hard-OBJURG-head-AI-3.AN into.view-go-3.AN
   ‘And here comes the dummy (lit., hard-headed one)!’ (MPD); cf. sakōl-āt-p-a-t ‘one who is thick-headed, slow to understand’ (Pass.)

(54) Kt-ahkuhk-is-alökittis.
   2-buttocks-DIM-OBJURG
   ‘You’re a little jerk!’ (MPD); cf. kt-ahkuhk-is ‘your buttocks (dim.)’ (Pass.)

(55) Ma=tahk, ma=tahk, ma nil nt-iy-alökittiyyē-w-ā-w wetôm-āsi-t.
   not=EMPH not=EMPH not I 1-have-OBJURG-TA-DIR-NEG smoke-AI-3.AN
   ‘I don’t have a damn thing (an.) to smoke.’ (Mal.); cf. nt-iy-w-ā ‘I have it (an.).’ (Pass.)

Speakers sometimes use objurgative forms of verbs, however, not to indicate their own feelings, but those of participants in the events they are describing.
The objurgative forms in (56) (one with \(-\text{alöktittye}-\) and one with \(-\text{ölige}-\)) might be described in these terms. These lines are taken from a description (by an elder of Maliseet extraction) of the way events used to unfold when tribal elections were held in the Passamaquoddy community in “the old days” (i.e., some years before 1977, when the remarks were recorded): the supporters of the losing side would start fights with the supporters of the winning side, the consultant reported, outside the hall where festivities celebrating the election were taking place. The speaker in this case was not angry. It was the men initiating the fighting who had been all riled up.

\[(56) \quad \text{Kénuk yúktok peskúw-} \text{ok temh-} \text{úc-ik} \]
\[\text{but these one-PROX.PL defeat-UNSPEC/3-PROX.PL} \]
\[\text{wisök-} \text{alöktittye}-\text{lúwaha-wólútú-w-} \text{ok.} \]
\[\text{extreme-OBJURG-be.angry-MPL-3-PROX.PL} \]
\[\text{Nīt=te=hc } \text{mat-} \text{ölige-n-} \text{ulti-ní-ya } \text{qócóm-} \text{ok} \]
\[\text{then=EMPH=FUT (3)-fight-OBJURG-by.hand-RECIP-MPL-N-PROX.PL outside-LOC} \]
\[\text{on áŋqoc=öte lamikúwám.} \]
\[\text{and.then sometimes=EMPH indoors}\]

‘But some of the ones who were defeated got very damn angry. Then they would fight like hell with each other outside and sometimes inside.’ (Mal.)

This use of objurgative forms to indicate the attitudes of participants in a described event shades off into another type of use, however—to signal that the action or state named by a verb is itself intense or extreme. In fact, the objurgatives in (56) might well be described in these terms, since they indicate not only that the participants in the postelection events in question were highly animated, but that their anger, on the one hand, and their fighting, on the other, were intense.

Example (57) is another case in which an objurgative element is used as an intensifier, here with an active predicate. The objurgative form in this example is based on a preverb-verb complex. The underlying preverb is \(\text{etuci} ‘\text{very’}\), the form that \(\text{tut-} ‘\text{to an extreme’}\) assumes with initial change; the verb stem is \(\text{wtom-} ‘\text{smoke’}\). The preverb \(\text{etuci}\) is a common word, and correspondingly lacks any great force on its own. The effect of adding the objurgative element \(-\text{alöktittye}-\) is to boost the force of the preverb-verb complex so that it becomes clear that we are dealing with a truly unusual situation. The friend in question is really “smoking up a storm.”
(57) \textit{Etut-\textit{alokitiiye}’-ut\textit{onna-t n-m\textit{o}taq}s nut-\textit{o-k}}
\textit{extreme-OBJURG-smoke-3.AN 1-woman.friend hear-TH-3.AN-(PERF)}
\textit{eli=koti=kp-\textit{uh-ut}.}
\textit{thus=future=closed-TA-UNSPEC/3.AN}

‘My older woman friend is smoking up a storm after hearing she’s going to be locked up.’ (MPD)

In sentence (58), we see the same kind of effect at work in the case of a stative predicate. The nonobjurgative correspondent of the verb here is \textit{pahs-\textit{ek-on}} (thick-sheetlike-II-(3)) ‘it (sheetlike) is thick’ (MPD). Adding \textit{-\textit{alokitiiyi(e)}}- signals that the steel in question is thick to an unusually great degree.

(58) ‘\textit{S\text{\text{"a}}mi, iy\text{\text{"e}}, pahs-\textit{alokitiiyi-ek-on n}it wapi=\textit{\text{"o}lonahq.}}
\textit{because HES.PRO thick-OBJURG-sheetlike-II-(3) that.IN white=iron}

‘Because, um, that steel is so damn thick!’ (MPD)

Related to the expression of intensity is the use of objurgative forms to convey a sense of excitement or fear. The lines in (59) are taken from a conversation in which two older men were swapping stories. One of them is telling about a time when he had stepped out of a small boat onto a rotten log while wearing bell-bottom pants, and something (it turned out to be a rat) had crawling up his pants leg. The objurgative form he uses is based on a preverb-verb combination: preverb \textit{ahti\text{\text{"o}}} ‘keep on (doing something)’ plus verb stem \textit{nuk\text{\text{"o}}-k\text{\text{"o}}n-} ‘squeeze something soft with the hand(s)’. The effect of adding an objurgative element in this case is to indicate that he was squeezing the creature in his pants leg with growing apprehension.

(59) \textit{Nt-\textit{aht}l-itah-as\text{\text{"i}}-hpon athus\text{\text{"o}}ss.}
\textit{1-keep.on-thought-AI-PRET snake}

\textit{Nt-\textit{aht}l-\textit{alokitiiyiye-nuk-\text{\text{"o}}k-\text{\text{"o}}n-a-n.}
\textit{1-keep.on-OBJURG-soft-messy.substance-by.hand-DIR-N}

‘I was thinking it was a snake. I kept on squeezing the damn thing.’ (Pass.)

Because of the way they can lend drama and excitement to a narrative, objurgative forms are a favorite of storytellers.

Not all of the uses of objurgative forms are serious, however. In fact, objurgative forms are often used purely out of a sense of fun. In section 7, we noted Siebert’s characterization of the Penobscot objurgative command \textit{\text{"a}p-\text{\text{"o}}\text{\text{"c}-\text{\text{"a}} ‘sit thou down!’ as “friendly.” Passamaquoddy wol-\text{\text{"i}qe-\text{\text{"h}}puh\text{\text{"k}}ot (good-OBJURG-taste-(3)) ‘it tastes damn good’ provides a humorous way to express a positive evaluation of a meal. The use of an objurgative form can also serve to indicate that a speaker feels close to his or her addressee. The conversation from which (59) is taken, in fact, includes a large number of such forms, and it seems likely
that these occur in such numbers in this text partly as an index of the close relationship between the two men involved. Thus, although objurgative forms are subject to a certain level of social stigma, they are nonetheless a part of the language that speakers value.

11. A comparative perspective. A precursor of the one of the objurgative formations of Penobscot was recorded in the colonial period. Laurent (1995:347) reports the occurrence of a form containing a cognate of Penobscot -alik’e-, written <arig8é>, in an eighteenth-century dictionary of an Eastern Abenaki dialect by the Jesuit missionary Joseph Aubery (1673–1756). He also notes Aubery’s comment that employing this objurgative form followed by <da> (an emphatic particle) constituted an insult.

Objurgative forms parallel to those of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot have been reported in Unami, an Eastern Algonquian language of the Delaware group, spoken originally in the Delaware River Valley and New Jersey, and, until recently, in Oklahoma (Miller 1996:236; Silver and Miller 1997:164; Goddard 1997:80–81). Again, the formations in question are not recent innovations; traces of them are reflected in Pidgin Delaware, a contact language that developed on the Middle Atlantic Coast of North America in the seventeenth century (Goddard 1997).

We have already had occasion to note how the objurgative elements of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot share formal features with body-part medials. This situation is immediately explained when we consider how the Delaware objurgatives are formed.

In Delaware more-or-less serious negative opinions can be expressed by adding to otherwise ordinary verbs and nouns morphemes that refer to intimate body parts. These expressions are regarded as off-color and are avoided by most speakers, but some men of earlier generations were recalled in the 1960s as having been especially adept at creating them. [Goddard 1997:80]

Thus, for example, the medial -ś’e’t’iyē()- ‘anus’ has been added to Unami k-pan-ihala (2-downward-go) ‘you (sg.) fall’ in húnti hú k-pan-ś’e’t’iyē-hala ‘Pretty soon you’ll fall the hell off!’, while adding -alak’ay ‘penis’ to mpās ‘bus’ gives mpās’alak’ay ‘the damned bus’ (Miller 1996:236). Another morpheme used to derive objurgative forms of nouns in Unami is -a’lak’i’ti ‘rectum’. Corresponding to xbo’k ‘snake’, for example, there is xko’k-a’lak’i’ti ‘disgusting snake’. This suffix is cognate with Maliseet-Passamaquoddy -alökittis, except that the latter has been extended by adding the diminutive ending -is. These nominal suffixes involve the same original morphemic material as the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy medial -alökittyie- and its Penobscot correspondent -alakittaye-. The latter reflect an earlier compound with two parts, both of which are reconstructed for Proto-Algonquian: *-a’θak- ‘hole’ (Goddard 1990:324).
468) and "-itwiy-e- ‘rump, buttocks’ (Hockett 1957:264). The contemporary forms can be derived by sound law from the combination of these Proto-Algonquian originals, except that the geminate *t* that is found in both languages must reflect expressive lengthening. Clearly, the original meaning must have been ‘rectum’, as reflected by Unami –a’lahk’i. The combination may itself be old, since it occurs outside Eastern Algonquian in Meskwaki (spoken today in Iowa, but originally in Michigan): *meht-a nak-itiye-sim-e-w-a* (exposed-hole-buttocks-place-DIR-3-PROX.SG) ‘he places him with “hindquarters” exposed’. The Meskwaki medial is reportedly used only with a literal sense, however, not with a function like that of the Eastern Algonquian objurgatives.

While most of the other objurgative morphemes of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot are obscure in origin, the common Penobscot element –a’c-e-, also weakly attested in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, can be explained by reference to other forms in these languages. Siebert (1996:252) reports Penobscot *mask-a’c-e* ‘he has malodorous feces’, representing a stem /mask-a’c-a/. This stem includes a medial that reveals the etymological meaning of –a’c-e-, namely, ‘excrement’. This conclusion is supported by the existence of a noun final –a’c-i ‘dung, excrement’: *mosaw-a’c-i* ‘moose dung’ (Siebert 1996:288). Compare also Pass. *ahahs’wuc* ‘horse manure’ and *psuwis-c* ‘cat dung’.

The etymological conclusions that we have reached here, together with the evidence we have noted concerning cognate formations in Delaware, make it clear that the objurgative formations of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot reflect an old process by which a variety of emotionally charged items were inserted into verbs or suffixed to nouns, generally to indicate negative evaluations of various kinds. The morphemes that remain in use have evidently been bleached of their literal meanings, however, becoming essentially formal elements.

Contemporary speakers of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy are unaware of possible etymological meanings for the modern objurgative elements, and the same appears to have been true for Penobscot speakers. All that remains of the historical meanings of these items is their expressive force and a sense on the part of speakers that their use makes for off-color speech. In fact, a number of consultants with whom we have worked insist that objurgative forms are not vulgar at all, and some even express pride in the fact that their language, unlike English, provides them with a way to indicate strong feelings without the use of foul language or blasphemy.

12. Conclusions. Both Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot employ specialized morphemes to derive forms of verbs whose basic function is to express various types of negative evaluations. Comparable forms of nouns are attested for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, and related forms of particles occur in both languages. We have termed forms of all of these types objurgatives, following Speck (1918).
Verb stems in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot, as in other Algonquian languages, have either a bipartite or a tripartite structure. Primary stems consist either of an initial component plus a final component, or of an initial, a medial, and a final. Secondary stems follow only the first of these patterns and thus consist exclusively of an initial plus a final. In these terms, the objurgative morphemes that appear in verbs may be analyzed as medials. The objurgative element -alokittiyę̃ of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy differs from ordinary medials, however, in cooccurring freely with another medial.

From a descriptive point of view, the derivation of many objurgative verb forms might be taken to involve the insertion of one of the objurgative elements into a target stem as a medial. This type of analysis will not work in general, however. As we observed in section 5, the objurgative correspondent to a secondary stem cannot be derived in this fashion, since secondary stems consist only of an initial plus a final. In such cases, a secondary stem is built up to match the desired target by starting from a primary stem that already contains an objurgative medial. In section 6, we saw that a stem containing an objurgative medial may correspond to a preverb-verb combination. Examples of this type appear to involve a novel kind of stem formation process in which a preverb-verb complex, syntactically a phrase, functions as the base from which a stem is formed. Deriving an objurgative form in either case involves more than simply inserting an objurgative element into a target stem.

The objurgative forms of nouns attested in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy are made by adding an objurgative morpheme as a suffix. This suffix appears to be added to the noun in its surface shape in regular cases, rather than to the stem of the noun or to a combining form derived from it, as other nominal derivatives generally are.

Objurgative forms are still in common use in Maliseet and Passamaquoddy. Speakers use them to signal their own anger, scorn, or frustration, or to indicate such feelings on the part of the participants in events that they are describing. Objurgative verb forms may also serve to indicate that an action or state is extreme or intense. This makes them a favorite of storytellers, who use them to add drama to their narratives. Objurgatives can also be used with good humor, however, as a joking way to indicate approval. Their use in conversation provides a way to signal that participants feel close to one another.

Comparative evidence suggests that the source of the objurgative formations of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy and Penobscot is an old process by which terms for intimate body parts and other emotionally charged items were inserted into verbs or suffixed to nouns to indicate negative evaluations. The resulting formations have been grammaticalized and subjected to semantic bleaching in the course of the development of the contemporary constructions, with the result that the remaining objurgative morphemes are no longer perceived to have off-color meanings.
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Transcription. Maliseet-Passamaquoddy examples are cited in a modified version of a widely used standard orthography: o represents phonemic /ɔ/, while u is /ø/ (phonetically intermediate in height between [u] and [o]); c is /c/; q is /kʷ/. Phonemic /h/ before a consonant at the beginning of a word is written as an apostrophe; it is frequently realized in this position only as aspiration of a following stop or affricate, tenseness of a following s. Prosodic distinctions are indicated by diacritics: a stressed vowel pronounced at a higher relative pitch is marked with an acute accent; a stressed vowel pronounced without such a pitch rise is marked with a grave accent; phonologically “weak” vowels are marked with a breve. Weak vowels are ignored in stress assignment, which yields an alternating pattern of nondistinctive stresses to the left of the distinctively accented syllable in a word. All vowels not marked as weak are strong. The symbol = is used to join an enclitic particle to its host and to mark the boundary between preverb and verb.

Penobscot forms are cited in the orthography of Siebert (1988), which has been adopted by the Tribal Council of the Penobscot Nation. Symbols generally have their expected Americanist values, except that a is a tense, mid, back nonround vowel. An acute accent marks a vowel as bearing primary accent with an associated higher relative pitch; a grave accent indicates primary accent without an associated pitch rise.

Abbreviations. The following grammatical abbreviations are used: 1 = first person; 2 = second person; 3 = third person; 2/1, etc. = second person subject with first person object, etc.; AI = animate intransitive; AN, an. = animate (grammatical gender); COND = conditional; DIM, dim. = diminutive; DIR = direct; du. = dual; DUBIT = dubitative; EMPH = emphatic; exc. = exclusive; FUT = future; HES.PRO = hesitation pronoun; II = inanimate intransitive; IMP = imperative; IN = inanimate (grammatical gender); INV = inverse; LOC = locative; MPL = multiplural; N = Maliseet-Passamaquoddy suffix /-ð)n(e)-/ (and its Penobscot cognate), with several functions; NEG = negative; OBJURG = objurgative; OBV = obviative; PERF = perfective; PF = particle final (particle-forming suffix); PL = plural; PRET = preterite; PROHIB = prohibitive; PROX = proximate; RECIP = reciprocal; REFLEX = reflexive; REPORT = reportative; SG = singular; SUBJ = subjunctive; TA = transitive animate; TH = thematic suffix of transitive inanimate verb; TI = transitive inanimate; UNSPEC = unspecified subject, VOC = vocative; W = Maliseet-Passamaquoddy suffix /-ð)w-/ (and its Penobscot cognate) used to derive initial components of stems. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape and for the /w-/ of the third-person prefix in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy where this is realized as a surface h that is written as an apostrophe. No grammatical distinction of sex gender is
made in either Maliseet-Passamaquoddy or Penobscot. In glossing forms that involve reference to a singular animate third person, we generally use appropriate variants of ‘he’ if the form in question is cited without reference to a context, but use pronouns appropriate to the context in examples taken from texts or conversation.

1. Our characterization of the semantics of these intensive formations owes much to commentary in the online Maliseet-Passamaquoddy Dictionary of Francis and Leavitt (2006), and many of our examples are taken from this source as well, although the translations are ours in some cases. These examples are indicated by the notation “MPD.” (An expanded print edition has now appeared: Francis and Leavitt [2008].) Accent is not marked in the dictionary, however. Thus, we have added indications of prosodic features to our transcriptions of these examples, following Passamaquoddy prosodic norms. Maliseet and Passamaquoddy examples not taken from the Maliseet-Passamaquoddy Dictionary are from our field notes, except as indicated. These are marked for their dialect of origin (Mal. for Maliseet, Pass. for Passamaquoddy). Penobscot examples (marked Pen.) are taken either from Speck (1918) or from Siebert (1988, 1996a, 1996b, 1997). Forms taken from Speck have been phonemicized.

2. What are given as underlying forms in (4a) and (4b) actually represent the output of a rule of epenthesis that adds an initial weak schwa here to the inverse morpheme /-ku-/. This vowel is removed again by syncope in (4b); see LeSourd (1993:388–92) for discussion.

3. The status of this “connective i” is a perennial problem in Algonquian phonology. It is, in fact, doubtful that a general phonological analysis of the alternations in question can be maintained, either for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy or for Penobscot. Any rule of epenthesis for Maliseet-Passamaquoddy must, at a minimum, be restricted to stem-internal environments, and certain stem-forming suffixes fail to trigger the rule as expected. See LeSourd (1993:368–72) for discussion.

4. The Maliseet elder Peter Lewis Paul (1902–89), a noted expert on the language, reported the opposite ordering of ꜱliqet and ꜱnoqet to LeSourd in the 1980s, taking ꜱnoqet to be stronger than ꜱliqet. Whether these differing reports reflect true variation is unknown.

5. The verb ꜱcostaqs ‘be quiet!’ is curious. Formally, the stem consists of the initial /cos-/ ‘bothersome’ plus the final /-htaqsi/- ’make vocal noise’. Thus, the literal meaning of the verb is ‘make bothersome vocal noise’. Nonimperative forms, in fact, have this meaning: Pass. ꜱcostaqsu ’he talks constantly, annoyingly’. But the meaning of imperative forms is just the opposite of their literal meaning. Perhaps this usage, which is shared with Penobscot, is ironic or sarcastic in origin.

6. Since the phonological shape of (13d) parallels that of (14c) below in relevant respects, one would expect the accentuation of the two forms to be parallel as well. It seems likely, then, that accent marking in one or the other form reflects an error in transcription. Since (13d) is from an unpublished, and therefore less scrupulously edited, source, this is perhaps the less trustworthy form.

7. Siebert notes that each of these examples is associated with a special intonation that is characteristic of imperative verbs and interjections: “The final syllable rises a variable pitch interval measuring from a third (two whole steps) to a major fourth (three whole steps)” (1988:758).

8. Siebert remarks that example (14a), illustrating the “first degree expletive of vexation,” is “not a malediction, imprecation, or objurgation despite the last English translation” (1988:758).

9. The Penobscot cognate of this morpheme appears in (1) and (12a)–(12b).

10. To see that ꜱinaqsi- ‘look like’ is indeed a primary final, consider the verb ꜱip-alōk-inaqsu ‘he looks scary, said of a wide-eyed person, a lion with his mouth open, etc.’ (MPD). Here ꜱinaqsi- appears in what is clearly a primary formation, in
combination with the nonderived initial cip- ‘hideous, fearsome’ and the medial -alök- ‘hole’.

11. There are at least two examples of homophonous finals that correspond to consonant-initial stems: (i) a final based on pun- ‘put, place’ (Pass. ‘pún-m-om-on [(3)-put-TH-N] ‘he places it’) occurs in such forms as nekka=kis-apek-ipün-o-k (all=past-stringlike-put-TH-3.AN) ‘when he had finished setting out the whole line of them (traps)’ (Mal.; LeSourd 2007:68, para. 3) and mil-ahq-ipün-om-on ((3)-various-sticklike-put-TH-N) ‘he places it (sticklike) in various positions’ (MPD); (ii) a final based on psan- ‘snow’ (Pass. psän [snow-(3)] ‘it snows’, pehsà-k — pessà-k [snow-3.IN-(PERF)] ‘when it snowed’) occurs in stems made with the medial -ek- ‘sheetlike object’ (here, snowflake) in forms such as wisök-ek-ipsän-(extreme-sheetlike-snow-3.IMP) ‘let it snow really big flakes!’ (Mal., LeSourd 2007:10, para. 17) and kin-ek-ipsan (big-sheetlike-snow-(3)) ‘it snows large flakes’ (MPD). There are also nonproductive formations in which a final is derived from a consonant-initial stem by dropping this consonant. Thus, corresponding to Pass. monúhm-m-on ((3)-buy-TH-N) ‘he buys it’, we find ‘kis-núhm-m-on (3-past-buy-TH-N) ‘he bought it’.

12. The form of the preverb here is typical. Preverbs are derived from initials that end in a consonant by adding a suffix -i. If an initial ends in a vowel, the corresponding preverb is identical with the initial; compare the initial nokka- ‘all’ in (5a) and (5b) with the preverb nokka in (45).

13. Preverbs typically form a single prosodic unit with an immediately following verb or preverb-verb complex. The boundary between a clitic and a following preverb or verb is therefore represented here as comparable to a clitic boundary.

14. Some preverbs are much more readily separated from their associated verbs than others, and there may well be restrictions in some cases on the material that may intervene.

15. Most medials that serve a classificatory function, like -ahq- ‘wooden or sticklike object’, do not end in this postmedial extension: pom-ahq-ihke (along-sticklike-abound-(3)) ‘there is a stretch of trees’.

16. For a second example of this type, consider the Pass. form mok-tuniy-aqh-a-l ‘he props the other’s mouth open with a stick’ (< /w-mok-tun-aeq-a-al/ 3-open-mouth-by.stick-OBV.SG) (MPD). Here /-tuniy/ ‘mouth’ is followed by a final /-aqh- ‘act on by sticklike instrument’ that etymologically incorporates the medial -ahq- ‘sticklike object’; compare Pass. wihaq-aqh-a-l ‘he pulls him with a hook’.

17. The treatment of /-ónqye/ appears to be different. In this morpheme, /e/ is apparently retained before a strong vowel; /y/ is then inserted, and /e/ becomes /j/ before the inserted /y/. Compare Mal. oöhm-ónqiy-áp ‘look the hell over that way!’ (< olöhm-ónqye-api/ away-OBJURG-look).

18. Ives Goddard (p.c. 2009) has pointed out that there is a historical explanation for the absence of the final e of -alökittiy(e)- in (30e). From a historical point of view, this vowel is not in fact absent here, but is continued by the a of the following morpheme, the transitivizer -al-, which represents Proto-Algonquian *-l-. Before *-l-, the postmedial extension *-e- of Proto-Algonquian became *-a- by a morphologically conditioned rule; and Proto-Algonquian *a- gives Maliseet-Passamaquoddy a. Goddard also notes that Proto-Algonquian medials used to form initials typically lack the postmedial extension *-e-, so if -alökittiy(e)- had formed part of a complex initial in examples like (30d) and (30e), the absence of the final e of this morpheme would be expected here. There does not appear to be any motivation for a synchronic analysis of -alökittiy(e)- as part of the initial in these forms, however.

19. We could, of course, analyze the objurgative element in examples like these as forming a compound with the medial that follows it, thereby salvaging the generalization that a stem may include only a single medial. There is little to recommend such a move,
however. In particular, it does not make objurgative formations any less exceptional, since compound medials are not otherwise productively formed.

20. When asked to judge constructed objurgative forms for ‘he covers the other’s mouth with his hand’, one Passamaquoddy elder accepted both ‘kop-alokittiyalé-tuné-n-a-l’ (‘(3)-closed-OBJURG-mouth-by-hand-DIR-OBV.SG’) and ‘kop-tun-alokittiyalé-n-a-l’, with the opposite order of the medial and the objurgative element. We are inclined to think, however, that our consultant was being overly cooperative, and that the second of these forms is not, in fact, correct. Note in particular that the medial /-ötune-/ occurs here without its final /e/, which otherwise drops only before the abstract AI final /-a-/.


22. As Ives Goddard (p.c. 2009) has pointed out to us, interesting questions also arise about the range of preverbs that can appear in this construction. In particular, one might wonder whether the construction is restricted to preverbs that are semantically bleached or otherwise show signs of having become essentially “pegs” for adding the objurgative morpheme. Though most of the examples cited in the text involve semantically bland preverbs that one could imagine as targets of grammaticalization, several examples that include more contentful preverbs have come to our attention since this article was submitted for publication. Two of these are given in (i) and (ii) below. The preverb-verb combination underlying the objurgative form in (i) is wewi=qasqì ‘manage to run’, with preverb wewi ‘know, recognize’. (The form in the example is combined with an additional preverb.) The underlying preverb-verb combination in (ii) is psoni=piskiya ‘be fully dark’, with psoni ‘full’.

(i) Tàn=öte=hc eli=wew-alokittiyalé-qasqì.
such=EMPH=FUT thus=know-OBJURG-run-(1.SG)

‘(I’ll run) wherever I can manage to run.’ (Levine and Schultz 2009, program 1, part 1)

(ii) . . . pson-alokittiyalé-piskiya=te nit, naka el-tágah-k

full-OBJURG-be.dark-(3)=EMPH there and thus-make.noise-3.IN

weekuwe=yi-wi-k.
hither-go-II-3.IN

‘. . . it was totally dark there, and it (a boat) made a loud noise as it approached.’

(Levine and Schultz 2009, program 7, part 1)

23. There is an objurgative particle ehq-alokittiyalé ‘(forcefully, urgently) stop it!, oh my goodness!’ (accent uncertain) (MPD) that is indirectly related to the preverb ehqi ‘cease’. Although this form looks like an objurgative derivative of the preverb, it is more closely connected with the interjection ehqi ‘stop it!’ It does not appear in any case to represent a productive process that forms independent objurgative forms of preverbs.

24. On a more abstract account, one that takes the properties of morphological structure to reflect aspects of syntactic configurations, we might suppose that the final-like behavior of underlying stems in the objurgativized preverb-verb construction does not simply reflect a unique type of stem-derived final, but instead shows that the same constraint limiting primary stems to three components (initial-medial-final) also applies at the level of structure at which preverbs are combined with stems, and gives parallel, final-like properties to stems in this particular configuration.

25. Compare the treatment of the clearly analyzable stem kis-öm- ‘(past-by.biting-) TA’ate’ in n-kis-alokittiyalé-m-a (1-past-OBJURG-by.biting-DIR) ‘I ate the damn thing (an., a cake)’. The final –öm- ‘by biting’ appears in at least a dozen stems in Francis and
Leavitt (2006), which undoubtedly provides only a sample of its range of occurrence. To compare with the - tôm- of tokôm- 'hit', on the other hand, there are only the - tôm- of the complex TA final - ap- tôm- 'look at' (\textit{\textsc{kis}}-ap-tôm-a-l (\{3\}-past-look-\textsc{TA}-DIR-OBV.SG) 'he looked at him’ ([MPD]) and one or two other elements that are equally unlikely to be synchronically connected with it.

26. One might wonder why (38b) is formed by adding the objurgative element after the stem of the head of the compound here (with the addition of an abstract final), rather than by employing the construction described in section 6 and effectively inserting the objurgative morpheme between the preverb and the head verb. In this case, the latter construction is not available, because the preverb \textit{koti} 'future' (unlike most preverbs) is not based on an initial: there is no *kot-. Thus, no initial is available to stand in for the preverb in a stem that would correspond to the preverb-verb combination.

27. The prosodic features of these forms are uncertain, but we have the impression that the initial vowel of the objurgative forms here bears secondary stress and is therefore not a weak vowel. (Word-initial syllables with stressable vowels in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy always bear at least secondary stress.)

28. It should be noted that \textit{-alôkitty-e-} would appear as \textit{-alôkitty-a-} in (40b) regardless of the underlying shape of the final \textit{-a-} in this form, since there is a morphologically governed rule by which stem-final \textit{e} is replaced by \textit{a} before the multifunctional suffix \textit{- tôm(e)-}, which occurs in this example as an inanimate-object marker. This rule operates across an intervening morpheme boundary—compare Pass. \textit{wehke-n} (use-2.SG.IMP) ‘use (sg.) it!’; Pass. \textit{ma nt-uwêhka-w-on} (not 1-use-NEG-N) ‘I don’t use it’, both with /\textit{\textsc{u}}wehke-/ ‘use’.

29. Siebert wrote \textit{<a>} in his field notebook for the initial \textit{a} of \textit{-alakittis-} in the forms cited in (42b). We have emended his transcriptions in accordance with his later renderings of these morphemes; compare, for example, the items in (14).


31. The high-pitched accent is unexpected in this form and may represent an error in transcription.

32. Since this article was submitted for publication, we have noted a Passamaquoddy form that confirms that this language forms objurgatives from \textit{min-wi-} ‘be mean’ that parallel the Penobscot forms in (44c) and (44d): \textit{min-wi-}alôkitty-é-hpon (mean-W-OBJURG-AI-(3)-PRET) ‘she was damn mean’.

33. This sentence is uttered by a chicken in a children’s book (from the Passamaquoddy bilingual education program of the 1970s) who has discovered a raccoon trying to sneak into the henhouse. It seems, then, that nominal derivatives in \textit{-alôkittis} do not constitute language from which children have needed to be shielded.

34. There is an alternative stem \textit{/muwinu-/} that gives forms like Pass. \textit{muwinúmol} ‘his bear’ and \textit{muwinúhsis} ‘bear (dim.)’, but the Passamaquoddy speaker who provided the text from which (48) is taken used \textit{e-} stem forms (such as \textit{muwín}¶yik ‘bears’), not \textit{u-} stem forms (like \textit{muwinúwok}).

35. Preliminary investigation suggests that the corresponding animate form *\textit{wen-}alôkittis? who the hell?’ is not acceptable.

36. A parallel formation with a medial \textit{-ahantuw-} ‘devil’ in place of an objurgative element is attested in Maliseet: \textit{kin-ahantuw-inaq} ‘what the devil!’; compare Pass. \textit{wahant} ‘devil’ (stem /\textit{\textsc{wahantu-}/}).

37. A variety of other shortened forms have been recorded as well, including \textit{alôkittiyén(a)}, \textit{kîttiyéna}, and \textit{kîttiyé}.  

38. The nonobjurgative stem for ‘frighten to death’ is \textit{sikte-}hpawol-, with \textit{sikte-} ‘to death (literally or figuratively)’; compare \textit{\textsc{sikte}}-hpawol-a-l (\{3\}-to.death-frighten-DIR-
OBV.SG) ‘he frightens him to death’ (MPD). Irregularly, but consistently, sikte- appears as sikt- before the objurgative elements -alōkittiyē- (as in (49a)) and -ōliqē- (n-sikt-ōliqē-hpāwōl-og ‘he frightens me to death’ MPD).

39. The long form occurs in Siebert’s Penobscot Legends (1997:88, para. 11); the short form is attested by Speck (1918:239). Speck (1970:269) also includes <alagi’tdis> ‘the devil!’ (phonemicization uncertain) in a list of Penobscot exclamations, suggesting Penobscot use of a version of Maliseet-Passamaquoddy alōkittis. Siebert did not include this word in his Penobscot Dictionary (1996a), however, suggesting that he did not regard it as a legitimate Penobscot form.

40. The objurgative form in this example presupposes a TI stem /pun-ōn-/ (put-by.hand-) ‘let go’. This stem is not attested in our Maliseet-Passamaquoddy materials, but compare Penobscot na-pōn-ōn-om-ōn (1-put-by.hand-TH-N) ‘I release it, let it go, omit it, leave it out’ (Siebert 1996a:405).

41. In Laurent’s representation of Aubery’s orthography, <θ> represents a symbol consisting of an <o> written together with a <u> above it.

42. The analyses of the forms here are ours.

43. Ives Goddard (p.c. 2007).

44. Penobscot -alakohkis-, which corresponds to Maliseet-Passamaquoddy -alōkittis- in its use as an intensifier inserted in verbs before -alakittiyē-, probably reflects a modification of an earlier *-alakittis- under the influence of kkohk ‘buttocks’ (Siebert 1996:227), thereby effecting a sort of semantic renewal of the form. Compare also Passamaquoddy alōkuhkis ‘baby’ (accent uncertain), a term of endearment used in speaking to a baby (MPD), which may reflect a related modification of alōkittis under the influence of Pass. kūhk ‘buttocks’.

45. Ives Goddard (p.c. 2007).
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