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HISTORY AND BACKGROUND

The southern tip of South America has been the home of the Mapuche people since pre-Colombian days. The name Mapuche is composed of "Mapu", which means "earth", and "che", which means "people" -- that is, the Mapuche are the "people of the earth" in their own language. There are three groups within the Mapuches: the Huilliche, which means "people of the south", the Pewenche, the "people of the Pine tree", and the Lafkenche, the "people of the sea". All three groups can be considered part of the same people in that they traditionally practice a similar culture and speak the same language, Mapudungun (although with slight regional variations). "Mapudungun" also contains the word "Mapu", plus "dungun", which is the verb "to speak, to talk". Sometimes "Mapudungun" is called "Mapudungu", which is a phonological variation on the same word.

Historically the Mapuche were known to be farmers and warriors. When the Spanish came to the Americas, the Mapuche were the only indigenous group to defend their land for three centuries until technology enabled the Chilean army to conquer them. Today the Mapuche are a marginalized sector of Chilean society. Those that still practice traditional agriculture live in the country in the traditional house called a "ruka". The women practice weaving arts to make heavy wool sweaters and ponchos that are worn daily as well as in religious ceremonies such as the Ngillatun. Another art of the Mapuche is silver-working, some products of which are head and chest adornments or straws and bowls for drinking the mate (tea-like) herb, which can form the center of social interaction as the mate bowl is served by the host and passed from person to person.

Described above is the typical image that people have of the Mapuche. Yet there is a large number of Mapuche who have moved to the city and adopted the customs and culture of the "winka", or non-Mapuche. This migration is no doubt a result of the economic and social discrimination against the Mapuche people. Their way of life, adapted to the large spaces available before the arrival of the Spanish, was severely restricted as they were moved onto reservations and limited, unfertile tracts of land. Such relocation is in fact still happening today. On the map on page 6 Mapuche reductions in the IXth region are illustrated. During the time of investigation for this paper, February-April 1992, a debate was in progress over the construction of seven dams in the river Bio-Bio, which would displace entire Mapuche communities. Ultimately it was decided that the dams would be built.

The discrimination against the Mapuche is not limited to those who lead an agricultural life.
Living in the city the Mapuche are confronted with a pervading sentiment that the Mapuche are by nature stupid, drunk, and generally not as good as the rest of the society. It is not unheard of for someone of partial or full Mapuche descent to deny their roots and change their name to avoid the jokes and trouble in finding a job that come with being Mapuche in the city.

The Mapuche language, Mapudungun, is also being forgotten in favor of Spanish. Many people still speak Mapudungun, especially the older Mapuche and those who live within rural communities. Yet families who live in the cities may have stopped speaking Mapudungun perhaps generations ago. Even the younger people who come from the agricultural communities often speak more Spanish than Mapudungun if they live, study and work within the Chilean society.

The loss of Mapudungun is a result of not only the rejection of anything that is not "winka", but also the fact that public education is conducted only in Spanish. Parents who don't want their children to undergo language shock upon entering kindergarten must make an effort to teach them both Spanish and Mapudungun from the start. And once the children do enter the school system, they begin to use Spanish in the schoolroom and with their friends. They reserve Mapudungun for speaking with their older relatives, which naturally limits their knowledge of Mapudungun. There are a few bilingual schools that are starting in rural areas, but only for elementary education.

This is not to say that Mapudungun is a dead language. Many Mapuche communities still speak it as their principal language, and there is a definite interest in learning Mapudungun among Mapuche and winka who do not speak it. For instance, I met a doctor who has extended contact with Mapuche through her work and for this reason plans to study the language. I also knew Chileans who wished to learn Mapudungun purely because they live in the IXth region where many Mapuche live.

One of the most important things for fostering knowledge and use of Mapudungun within the Mapuche communities is the availability of bilingual public education in all of Chile, but particularly in the regions most heavily populated by Mapuche. In addition to the necessity of bilingual schools, I believe that the study of Mapudungun in an objective way by Mapuche, Chileans, and the academic linguistic community is important. Such study will lead to wider acceptance of the language and of the Mapuche people, and will work against the extinction of yet another indigenous language of the Americas.
The purpose of this work is to provide a systematic study of the verb in Mapudungun, for use by both linguists and learners of the language. The verb in Mapudungun is composed of a root and a plethora of suffixes. The focus of this paper is the meaning and placement of each morpheme. It is not a complete study of every morpheme, but rather a presentation of what information I have gathered on these two themes.

I refer continuously to three works on Mapuche grammar: Mapudunguyu, by María Catrileo (1988), A Mapuche Grammar, by Ineke Smeets (1989), and the first grammar ever written of this language, Gramática Mapuche Bilingue by Fray Felix Jose de Agusta (early 1900's). Mapudunguyu, (which means literally "we two speak Mapudungun, or "Let's speak Mapudungun"), is a course on the language, presenting aspects of the grammar sequentially and supposedly building a knowledge of grammar and vocabulary. The main problem with this book is that it is not systematic. The book by Smeets, on the other hand, is thorough and systematic, but also is written in a technical, linguistic format that renders it unusable to non-linguists. It is also written in English, which makes it inaccessible to the majority of the people in Chile. Agusta's grammar is also systematic, but not modern and not complete. Although my paper is not able to address the range of topics covered in these books and in the same detail, it aims to fill in a gap in the literature: a representative, systematic study of the verb morphology in Mapudungun which doesn't use complex terminology. This paper does not attempt to avoid such linguistic terminology, but a simpler version in Spanish will be made available in Chile.
METHODS

The information used in this paper has been collected from two sources: written texts and native speakers of Mapudungun. I worked principally with two native speakers, Angélica and Armando, although I also conferred with various other speakers. The following is a list of every Mapuche who helped me with learning Mapudungun. On the next page there is a map of the 9th region of Chile, where the home communities of each person is approximately marked. Those that fall in the communities of Temuco and Freire are marked only by comuna.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>HOME COMMUNITY</th>
<th>PRINCIPAL LANGUAGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>María Angélica Relmuan Alvarez</td>
<td>Rengalil (community Temuco)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armando Marileo</td>
<td>Isla Wapi</td>
<td>Mapudungun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubén Sanchez Carihuentro</td>
<td>Huilio (community Freire)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agustina Millache</td>
<td>El Cajón (community Temuco)</td>
<td>Mapudungun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domingo Carilao</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Antolin</td>
<td>Alto Bio Bio</td>
<td>Mapudungun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eduardo, Celinda, and Marcelina Llanquiturf</td>
<td>El Cajón (community Temuco)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>José Carihuentro</td>
<td>Huilio (community Freire)</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juanita Rosa Paillalef Carinao</td>
<td>Maquehue</td>
<td>both</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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THE SOUNDS OF MAPUDUNGAN

Although Phonology will not be a focus of this paper, I will present the basic phonological schema of Mapudungun here. There are a total of 6 vowels, 2 glides, and 18 consonants, which are as follows:

| vowels: | /e/ | /i/ | /o/ | /u/ | /a/ | /o/ |
| glides: | /y/ | /w/ |
| consonants: | /p/ | /t/ | /k/ | /t/ | /s/ | /r/ | /l/ | /m/ | /n/ |

As you might have noticed, there are three consonants which are represented here with a line under them. These are the three interdental consonants of Mapudungun: l, n, and t.

The "r" in Mapudungun, which here is represented as /ɔ/ , is sometimes pronounced /r/, but /ɔ/ and /r/ seem to be two allomorphs rather than phonologically distinct sounds. The variation is probably regional, although this phenomenon was not explicitly investigated.

The sixth vowel in Mapudungun, here presented as /o/, is difficult to identify. It is represented in most transcriptions as either "ü" or "œ", and I will adopt the letter "ü" to refer to it for the moment. It is the only lax vowel in Mapudungun, and can appear epenthetically.

Many of the environments it appears in suggests that it may be merely an orthographic convention to indicate that a following sonorant is syllabic. This could be the case in words and
morphemes such as the following, in which it appears in front of sonorants.

**In front of nasals**

- küle: Stative verbal morpheme
- mülen: be (temporarily), reside
- ürke: Reportative verbal morpheme
- ürpa: verbal morpheme: action realized towards speaker
- ürpu: verbal morpheme: action realized towards elsewhere

**In front of liquids**

- kümë: good
- eymün: pronoun: you plural
- künu: Imposed State verbal morpheme

Yet in some cases "ü" must be functioning as a real vowel, such as when it falls between two stops, or when it is accented. This vowel is seen between stops in words such as "aftükun", which means "abandon", or the verbal morpheme "yeküpa". In both of these cases it is also the case that there are two syllables on either side of the "ü", so it is possible the "ü" is used simply as an epenthetic bridge.

However, in the following words "ü" is the only vowel that there is.

- mütrümün: call (V)
- rügü: path
- tünig: calm, passive
- üngümün: hope (V)

Although accent is not predictable in Mapudungun (as it changes regionally), every word is indeed pronounced with an accent. Therefore in any given word at least one syllable must be accented, so if "ü" is the only vowel, at least one of them must be accented. In addition, I have heard the "ü" accented in the verb "sing" = "ülcantun".

Since "ü" can at least sometimes appear as a real vowel, it is likely that "ü" either /o/, a lax, high, back vowel, or /ɨ/, a lax, high, middle vowel. In choosing between these two vowels, it seems much more probable that this sixth vowel would not be /ɨ/, since none of the other vowels are middle vowels. Therefore I have chosen /o/ to represent this sixth, untensed vowel.
Furthermore, this choice makes sense when considering that "u" can vary with "u", a lax, high, back vowel. I found this variation between two native speakers, Angélica and Armando, with the verbal morpheme "künü". Angélica pronounced this morpheme /könu/, whereas Armando pronounced it /kunu/. If the sixth vowel is really /ø/, then the variation involves changing a single feature on the vowel: rounded versus unrounded.

### Alphabet to be Used

Since Mapudungun is in the beginning stages of becoming a written language, as of yet there is no single standard alphabet to transcribe the aforementioned sounds. The first studies and written records of the language were done using the Spanish alphabet to approximate the sounds of Mapudungun, for example using "hue" for "we", or "chr" for "tr".

More recently alphabets have been developed specifically for Mapudungun. There are a total of six recognized alphabets, which were discussed on March 21 and 22 of this year in a seminar on "An Alphabet for the Mapuche Language". This meeting was intended to work towards deciding on a single standard alphabet. Two of these alphabets have gained wider use and acceptance than the others: the Unified Alphabet, and the Rangileo alphabet, invented by Anselmo Rangileo. These two alphabets are shown below with their phonetic symbol and an example in Mapudungun (written in the Unified Alphabet).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIFIED</th>
<th>RANGILEO</th>
<th>PHONETIC</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vowels:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>amutun</td>
<td>to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>epi</td>
<td>almost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>to eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>konün</td>
<td>to enter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>utun</td>
<td>to go visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ü</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>/ø/</td>
<td>ül</td>
<td>song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glides:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>wentru</td>
<td>man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>/y/</td>
<td>yall</td>
<td>sons (of a man)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consonants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>stops</th>
<th>plosive sounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>/k/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>/p/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>/t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>fricatives</th>
<th>continuant sounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>/d/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>/f/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>/ɡ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>/s/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tr</td>
<td>/tr/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>liquids</th>
<th>liquid sounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>/l/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>/ɾ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>/r/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>nasals</th>
<th>nasal sounds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>/m/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>/n/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ñ</td>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(* According to the Diario Austral, 15 March 1992, the Rangileo alphabet also does not use the letter ñ.)

The polemic between the supporters of each alphabet has yet to be resolved, although texts continue to be printed in both alphabets. The Unified alphabet has the educational advantage of being closer to the Spanish alphabet, and therefore easier to learn for Chileans who are literate in Spanish, whereas the Rangileo alphabet has the practical advantage of not relying on underlined letters such as 1 and ñ or symbols such as ü, making it possible to use conventional printers, typewriters and computers. It is interesting to note that both alphabets consider as a single sound "tr", or "x". These letters in fact represent the conjunction of two sounds, /ʃ/ and /ɾ/, which already exist in the language. This sound is similar to that at the beginning of the English word "train". The two sounds are pronounced nearly simultaneously, which probably accounts for why they are considered one sound.
This paper will use the Unified alphabet, simply because most of the material available today is written in Unified; in fact, none of my written sources used the Rangileo alphabet. Even within the Unified alphabet, however, there are inconsistencies between sources and even within the same source, which I suspect stem from variations in pronunciation. One typical variation is "w" and "o" after vowels. For example, the preposition "mew" is also seen written as "meo". Another variation is between "y" and "i". According to Angélica, who has worked with the Unified alphabet, "y" and "i" is used only when "i" follows or precedes a vowel or semi-vowel (thus marking the glide). However, words such as "küdawy" (he/she/it works) are pronounced /kʊˈdawi/, which doesn't include a glide at the end. I have dispensed with the Unified y–i rule in my own orthography, using "y" only to mark a glide, and using "i" otherwise.

All cited examples will be also translated from the alphabet of the author to Unified. In cases where a citation or translation from a native speaker is in Spanish, I will try to present both the original quote and a translation in English. Where for purposes of clarity this is difficult, only the translation will appear and the original will be footnoted under Appendix B: Original Quotes.

THE VERB

The verb in Mapudungun consists of a root, to which various suffixes can be added to affect the meaning. The Subject of the verb need not be expressed -- that is, Mapudungun exhibits pro-drop just like Spanish and some other Romance languages. There are 9 person/number combinations in Mapudungun, which are listed below in the verb paradigms. The infinitive is homophonous with the first person singular indicative.

The remaining suffixes fall between the root and the person/number suffix (with the exception of Transitive Agent, as will be discussed later). The rest of this paper will be largely devoted to describing a limited number of these suffixes in terms of their meaning and position relative to each other. I will be developing a verb template which includes a slot for every morpheme as it appears in relation to other morphemes. Certain morphemes are mutually exclusive with other morphemes. I will not be marking this on the template, however, unless I can conclude that a given morpheme will never combine with
another given morpheme and the two fall into the same position relative to other morphemes. Other than that, I prefer to leave the template as a guide to the organization of the verb, which can be expanded with future investigations. At any given point I will only present the template as it has thus far been developed, although morphemes that have not yet been presented may appear in the data. For clarity, all new additions to the template will be in boldface the first time they appear. The entire verb template and a number of examples is available for reference at the very end in Appendix A.

Although I will be developing the template based on data from informants and texts, I will refer to the organization given by Smeets. His ordering of verbal morphemes is as follows, where slot 1 is the farthest from the root and slot 32 is the closest. Although Smeets states in his text that certain morphemes cannot combine with other certain morphemes, he did not mark these restrictions on his template either. I have listed only the morphemes that appear in this paper:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SLOT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>SEE SECTION(S)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dative Subject</td>
<td>yu, mew</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>(u)n, imi, i, etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mood and flectional nominalization</td>
<td>l, chi, pe, etc.</td>
<td>2,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Direct Object</td>
<td>fi, e</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Impeditive</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Non-realized situation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Negation</td>
<td>la, ki, nu</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>lle'</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Reportative</td>
<td>(u)rke</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Constant Feature</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>RE</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td>ka</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Hither</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Locative</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Thither</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>nge</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>1st person agent</td>
<td>(u)w</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>2nd person agent</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Beneficiary</td>
<td>lel</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Stative</td>
<td>küle</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Perfect Persistent</td>
<td>künu</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two general phonological processes that should be made note of. When two a's appear next to each other, such as with the conjunction of the morphemes la (negative) and a (future), a "y" gets inserted between the two a's: -laya-:

\[
\emptyset \rightarrow y / a^\# \_ a
\]
When two e's end up next to each other, on the other hand, both e's are pronounced sequentially, according to Angélica. She claims that on occasion one "e" is dropped in the written language, although it seemed to me that in the data that I received, one "e" was sometimes dropped in the spoken language as well.

A. MOODS

There are three moods in Mapudungun: Indicative, Conditional, and Subjunctive. Each of these three moods is marked by a mood morpheme (M). For each mood there is a separate paradigm of person/number suffixes (P/N). I will present each of the moods with its mood morpheme and P/N paradigm.

1. INDICATIVE

The mood morpheme for the Indicative is Ø. Instead, the indicative paradigm is achieved by adding the following P/N paradigm to the verb root. Smeets presents the person and number suffixes separately, in individual slots, yet I will be presenting them as a single paradigm for simplicity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT PRONOUN</th>
<th>REFERENT</th>
<th>P/N SUFFIX</th>
<th>EXAMPLE: kūdawün = to work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inche</td>
<td>1st singular</td>
<td>n / ün</td>
<td>kūdaw-ün</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi</td>
<td>2nd singular</td>
<td>imi</td>
<td>kūdaw-ymi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey</td>
<td>3rd singular</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>kūdaw-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>1st dual</td>
<td>iyu</td>
<td>kūdaw-iyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>2nd dual</td>
<td>imu</td>
<td>kūdaw-imu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey(engu)</td>
<td>3rd dual</td>
<td>i(engu)</td>
<td>kūdaw-i(engu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İńchiiñ</td>
<td>1st plural</td>
<td>iyiñ</td>
<td>kūdaw-iyiñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>2nd plural</td>
<td>imün</td>
<td>kūdaw-imün</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey(engün)</td>
<td>3rd plural</td>
<td>i(ngün)</td>
<td>kūdaw-i(ngün)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the 1s there are two allomorphs: the first occurs after a vowel, the second after a consonant. In other words, an "ü" appears epenthetically after consonants before the 1s ending "n".

In the 3rd person dual and plural forms, there are two alternate forms. Some sources state that there is no distinction made between singular, dual and plural in the 3rd person (such as Salas).
However, Angélica gives two possible endings, one which is the same for all three pronouns, "i", one which adds on "engu" for 3rd dual and "ngün" for 3rd plural.

Whether the 3rd person pronouns are considered to be the same or different by number seems to me to be a descriptive difference only. Morphpologically, the difference between the 3s, d and p is whether "engu" or "engün" is added onto the end of the pronoun and P/N suffixes. What is interesting is that these two words can also be used independently. For instance:

Amupe engün fachianți. May they (all) go today.

(Smeets p. 233).

("Amupe" is the Subjunctive 3s,d,p form of "go". "Fachianți" = today.)

Catrileo defines "engün" and "engu" as "together", dual and plural, although Angélica translated the two words as "them", dual and plural. In any case, when one of these is used together with the 3s pronoun and verbal form, the result is a 3d or 3p verb, even if "engu" or "engün" is not attached directly to the pronoun or P/N. For this reason it seems to me that "feyengu" and "feyengün" are really the 3s pronoun "fey", with the pluralizers "engu" and "engün" directly following. In the Indicative P/N 3d and 3p are realized as "-ingu" and "ingün". I believe that this is also an example of "engu" and "engün" following the 3s Indicative P/N "i", where "e" gets lost by a phonological process. This is believable, especially taking into account the other odd phonological phenomena that happens with "e", as will be discussed in the section on "Further Research". Regardless, I will continue to refer to 3d an 3p as "feyengu" and "feyengün" as a means of distinguishing them from 3s.

2. CONDITIONAL

The conditional is expressed with the mood morpheme "l", which combines with the following conditional verb paradigm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>P/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inche</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(i)mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>iyu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(i)mu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although I am calling this verb form "Conditional" here, (as do other authors, eg Catrileo), it does not have the same meaning as the Conditional form in some romance languages, which is translated with "would". For instance, the 1st person singular Conditional form of "work" in Spanish is "yo trabajarí­a", and in French is "je travaillerais". In both cases the translation is "I would work". In Mapudungun, on the other hand, the equivalent of "Inche kúdawli" means "if I work". Adalberto Salas called the Conditional the "hypothetical mood", which also describes the meaning of this paradigm.

The Conditional can also combine with the Imperfect morpheme, "fu", in which case the meaning is like the past Subjunctive in Spanish, as is described in the section on Subjunctive.

To express negation in Conditional the morpheme "nu" is used, as will be described in the section on the negative.

3. SUBJUNCTIVE

What is called "Subjunctive" in Mapudungun by various authors is in actuality two distinct forms with two separate meanings. One of these forms is also called the "desiderative" (by Catrileo), and the "imperative" (by Smeets and Salas). It is this form that closer resembles what is known as Subjunctive in Spanish, and I believe truly represents the Subjunctive Mood. It will be discussed second.

The other form, which is cited in Martin Alonqueo Piutrin (unpublished) as the Subjunctive, is indicated by the addition of the morpheme "chi" which appears after the normal indicative endings. The following is the paradigm as it appears in Piutrin.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Example with ngen = be</th>
<th>meaning according to Alonqueo Piutrin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inche</td>
<td>nge-n-chi</td>
<td>that I may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi</td>
<td>nge-im-imi-chi</td>
<td>that you may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey</td>
<td>nge-i-chi</td>
<td>that she/he may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>nge-yu-chi</td>
<td>that we two may be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>nge-imu-chi</td>
<td>that you two may be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When Rubén, Angélica and Domingo were initially asked for the equivalent of the Spanish subjunctive, it was this form that they cited:

- amuchi "that I go" (Rubén)
- küdawchi subjunctive 1st person (Angélica and Domingo)
- küdawünchi past subjunctive 1st person (Angélica and Domingo)
- küdawfunchi past subjunctive 3rd person (Angélica and Domingo)

These data are not consistent with either Alonqueo Piutrin's paradigm or subsequent data by Angélica. Later Angelica gave the meaning of "küdawünchi" and "küdawfunchi" as "I might have worked", and the example: "koyla-nge-y-chi -- she/he might be a liar". At the same time she translated the Piutrin paradigm as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Example with ngen = be</th>
<th>meaning according to Alonqueo Piutrin</th>
<th>meaning according to Angelica</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inche</td>
<td>nge-n-chi</td>
<td>that I may be</td>
<td>I might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi</td>
<td>nge-imi-chi</td>
<td>that you may be</td>
<td>you might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey</td>
<td>nge-i-chi</td>
<td>that she/he may be</td>
<td>she/he might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>nge-yu-chi</td>
<td>that you two may be</td>
<td>we two might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>nge-imu-chi</td>
<td>that you two may be</td>
<td>you two might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feyengu</td>
<td>nge-ingu-chi</td>
<td>that they two may be</td>
<td>they two might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lönchín</td>
<td>nge-yín-chi</td>
<td>that we two may be</td>
<td>we all might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymün</td>
<td>nge-imün-chi</td>
<td>that you all may be</td>
<td>you all might be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feyengün</td>
<td>nge-ingün-chi</td>
<td>that they all may be</td>
<td>they all might be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As I mentioned earlier, I don't believe that this paradigm represents the Subjunctive mood in Mapudungun, despite Alonqueo Piutrin's translation. I propose that this "chi" is, in fact, not a part of the verb, but rather a separate word that follows. I propose this partly because Smeets lists "chi" as one of a number of "particles". Smeets says that "chi" expresses doubt, which approximates the gloss given by Angélica. Furthermore, "chi" does not fall into the mood morpheme slot. It follows P/N, which are the regular indicative morphemes rather than the Subjunctive paradigm given below. As I have no
additional data on this topic it will not be discussed any further, yet more investigation on this form would be useful.

The Subjunctive, in the same sense as it is used in Spanish, is best represented by what Catrileo calls the "desiderative" (pp. 172-174). This paradigm uses "chi" as the ending for first person with the P/N endings, just like the first two data above, "amuchi" and "küdawchi". Every additional P/N has its own suffix (although in the case of 1p it is the same as for the Indicative.) The following is the Subjunctive paradigm, followed by examples below:

**Subjunctive P/N paradigm:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Singular Pronoun</th>
<th>Dual Pronoun</th>
<th>Plural Pronoun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inche</td>
<td>chi</td>
<td>chi</td>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>Iñichiñ</td>
<td>Iñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi</td>
<td>nge</td>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>eymung</td>
<td>eymün</td>
<td>mün</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>feyengu</td>
<td>feyengu</td>
<td>feyengün</td>
<td>pe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Examples*

Amu-chi waria mew fachiantü. I better go to the city today. (Catrileo)

Ramtu-ki-l-chi. I better not ask. (Catrileo)

amu-chi may! I'm off! (Smeets)

entu-chi tufa let me take this out (Smeets)

Ulkantu-nge. Sing. (Angelica)

Wirar-ki-l-nge. Don't shout! (Smeets)

Amupe Kuan fachiantü. That Juan may go today. (Catrileo)

chew rume rungkü-pe! let him jump wherever he wants to (Smeets)

küme-le-pe ñi fochüm (Smeets)
may my son be allright

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td>Tripayu fachiantü. Let’s us two leave today. (Catrileo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>Amumu waria mew fachiantü. Go (you two) to the city today. (Catrileo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feyengu</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>Amupe engu fachiantü. May they (two) go today. (Catrileo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiñ</td>
<td>iñ</td>
<td>Amuiñ waria mew fachiantü. Let’s go to the city today. (Catrileo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymün</td>
<td>mün</td>
<td>Amu-ki-l-mün waria mew fachiantü. Don’t you all go to the city today. (Catrileo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feyengün</td>
<td>pe</td>
<td>Amupe engün fachiantü. May they (all) go today. (Catrileo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i-pe mütém engün let them just eat (Smeets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>koyla-tu-ki-l-pe engün! may they not lie (Smeets)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The paradigm presented above is given in Catrileo along with examples, except for the form for 2s. I suspect that she does not present this form because, according to Angélica, Smeets, and Agusta (p. 159) the direct command is used for 2nd singular in what is called the "Imperative" (Subjunctive). I have included this form in the above list with examples from Angélica and Smeets. Additional examples by Smeets (p. 233) are included for the other Subjects as well.

Smeets states that "there is no 1d and 1p imperative. Instead, 1d and 1p Ind. may express adhortation." This is essentially consistent with the forms listed by Catrileo, which include the forms for 1st plural indicative (iñ) and 1st dual (although as "yu" rather than "iyu") along with the other Subjunctive forms.

As you may have noticed in the data above, the negative for the Subjunctive Mood is formed with
the morpheme "ki", which must be accompanied by the morpheme "I" in addition to the Imperative Mood morpheme. This morpheme will be further discussed in the section on the negative.

There are three moods, then, in Mapudungun, with their morphemes and paradigms as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicative</th>
<th>Conditional</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inche</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fey</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>(i)mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiw</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>imu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feyengu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>i(ngu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inchiñ</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>iñ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymün</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>imün</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feyengün</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>i(ngün)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three moods, Indicative, Conditional, and Subjunctive, are expressed by a mood morpheme followed by a P/N paradigm, which differs for each mood. In the Indicative and Subjunctive moods, the mood morpheme is Ø. In the Conditional mood the mood morpheme is "I".

As presented above, the mood morphemes fall between the root and P/N. The template developed so far looks like this:

```
ROOT        M           P/N
```

**COMMANDS**

As mentioned above, the command morpheme is "nge". Some other examples are:

- Say.         pi-ngé
- Work.        küdaw-ngé
- Buy.         ngilla-ngé
- Buy the cat. ngilla-fi-ngé ti ñarki

(Angélica)
In addition, I have also heard the future indicative used as a command, such as "amuaymi" = you will go/ go!. It is this form that appears in Agusta:

- Wüle küpayaymi: Come (2s) tomorrow.
- Ngemeaymi waria mew, yemeaymi chadi: Go (2s) to the town, bring salt.
- Anüaymün, pu wen: Sit down (2p), men.
- Lef amuaymi, anai fochüm: Walk lightly (2s), my son.

(Agusta pg. 32)

Since the command form "nge" functions as the imperative mode for second person singular, I will subsume it under M.

B. TENSE

4. PRESENT AND PAST

The three paradigms given above are for present and past tense, which do not have phonetically distinct forms. (For other tenses, though, other morphemes are added before the P/N suffixes. These morphemes will be discussed later). To mark present and past tense, instead time marker words can be used. For example "deo" added before the verb will indicate past tense, or "petu" will mean present progressive. However, some people claim that the bare verb in Mapudungun indicates past tense, and present tense needs to be extra-verbally indicated.

Both Moësbach and Alonqueo Piutrin (el habla de mi tierra) state that there are two types of verbs, which they label as "with movement" and "without movement" (although I believe that Alonqueo Piutrin made this statement based on Moesbach). The examples of these two verb categories given in the two texts are listed below. Moesbach and Piutrin say that the base form for "movement verbs" is the past tense and the base form for "non-movement verbs" is the present tense. Initially I did not find any further evidence of this, and people gave both past and present tense translations for the base form.

Yet supposing that a difference does exist, it is not one I would describe as with or without movement (as they did), based purely on the examples given in the two books. It seems to me that verbs
such as "eat" or "disgust" do not fit easily into the category of verbs "with movement". Rather, it seems that the verbs "without movement" share the characteristic of being constant characteristics, states or actions that continue for some period of time. The exceptions on the lists given by Moesbach and Piurin are "ülcantun" (sing) and "wirarüin" (shout), which aren't usually thought-of as common characteristics. "Ülcantun" is a word that comes from Spanish, "cantar" = "sing", (plus "ül", which means "song" in Mapudungun), which might explain its odd behavior, but "wirarüin" is an original Mapuche word.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Angélica</th>
<th>Armando</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>with movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akun</td>
<td>to arrive</td>
<td>I arrived / (I arrived)</td>
<td>I arrived</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küpän</td>
<td>to come</td>
<td>I came</td>
<td>I came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amun</td>
<td>to go</td>
<td>I went</td>
<td>I went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngemen</td>
<td>to go</td>
<td>I ate</td>
<td>I ate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in</td>
<td>to eat</td>
<td>I felt bad</td>
<td>I felt bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wedaduamelün</td>
<td>to feel bad</td>
<td>I got angry</td>
<td>I got angry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lladkün</td>
<td>to be not pleased</td>
<td>I ran</td>
<td>I ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lefün</td>
<td>to run</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>without movement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nien</td>
<td>to have</td>
<td>I have</td>
<td>I have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kimün</td>
<td>to know</td>
<td>I know</td>
<td>I know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mülen</td>
<td>to be (estar, haber)</td>
<td>I am</td>
<td>I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anülen</td>
<td>to be seated</td>
<td>I am seated</td>
<td>I am seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kümen</td>
<td>to be good</td>
<td>it is good</td>
<td>it is good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayün</td>
<td>to love/ like</td>
<td>I like it</td>
<td>I like it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wüywün</td>
<td>to be thirsty</td>
<td>I am thirsty</td>
<td>I am thirsty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngüñün</td>
<td>to be hungry</td>
<td>I am hungry</td>
<td>I am hungry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ülcantun</td>
<td>to sing</td>
<td>I sing/ I sang</td>
<td>I sang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wirarüin</td>
<td>to shout</td>
<td>I shouted</td>
<td>I shouted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngen</td>
<td>to be</td>
<td>I am</td>
<td>I am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>witra-le-n</td>
<td>to be standing</td>
<td>I am standing</td>
<td>I am standing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>payla-le-n</td>
<td>to be thrown</td>
<td>I am on my back</td>
<td>I am on my back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on your back</td>
<td>on the floor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yafü-le-n</td>
<td>to be strong (healthy)</td>
<td>I feel healthy</td>
<td>I feel healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem-le-n</td>
<td>to be like that</td>
<td>I am like that</td>
<td>I am like that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>additional data:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nülan</td>
<td>to open</td>
<td></td>
<td>she/he opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nüla-le-n</td>
<td>to be open</td>
<td></td>
<td>it is open</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lefün</td>
<td>to run</td>
<td></td>
<td>I ran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lef-küle-n</td>
<td>to be running</td>
<td></td>
<td>I am running or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I was running</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To test the supposed difference between these two lists, I asked Angélica if there is more prominent reading in terms of tense for any given verb. She replied that there is, although depending on the situation the other reading could be obtained. I then asked her to give me translations of the verbs listed in Moesbach and Piutrin (read out of order), which appear on the right. Amazingly enough, her translations correlated nearly perfectly with the tenses predicted by Moesbach and Piutrin: past tense for those verbs "with movement", and present tense for those "without movement". There were three exceptions, though. She said that "Akun" (arrive) could be either "I arrived" or "I arrive" in the sense of announcing one's arrival (not in the sense of "I arrive every day to school at 8:00.") The other two exceptions were "ülcantun", which also seemed to be both past and present to her, and "wirarin", which she gave in the past tense! These and other select verbs were then confirmed with Armando, who gave past translations for both "ülcantun" and "wirarin". If these data are indeed correct, it supports my definition of the difference in verb category. Nevertheless, more data need to be collected on this topic.

In some dialects a morphological difference is seen between past and present tense with verbs that have "tu", "pu", or "mu" preceeding the person-number suffix. This dialect changes the final "u" to an "o" in the present tense. Armando stated that this form is a future form, but a more proximate future than that with the future morpheme "a" (to be discussed shortly), and that it is used for the present tense. For instance,

| Amu-tu-n | Fui | I went |
| Amu-to-n | Me voy, voy a irme | I go, I'm going to go |
| Amu-tu-y | Se fue | She/he went |
| Amu-to-y | Está por irse | She/he is about to go |
| Amu-tu-ymi | Tu fuiste | You went |
| Amu-to-ymi | Tienes que irte | You have to go |
| Kiidaw-pu-n | Llegue a trabajar | I came to work |
| Kiidaw-po-n | Llego a trabajar | I come t work |
| Feyentu-n | Creer, obedecer | To believe, to obey |
| Feyentu-mu-n | Me creyeron, obedecieron | They believed me, they obeyed me |
| Feyentu-mo-n | Me creyeron, obedeceron | They will believe me, they will obey me |

---

(For an explanation of the morpheme "le" that appears here, see section 8 on Stative.)
mate-tu-n to drink mate
mate-to-n I drink mate
petu mate-tu-n I drink mate
*petu mate-to-n

aku-n llegué I arrived
ako-n llego I arrive

amul-el-kűnu-lel-mu-n me hacen funcionar algo (you plural) made something function for me
amul-el-kűnu-lel-mo-n me hicieron funcionar algo (you plural) make something function for me

(Armando)

This difference is not recognized by everybody, however. Angelica said that forms with "0" are not possible:
*amuton
*amutoymi
*amutoy

Neither is the "-0-" form always used. The Llanquitrufs made a distinction between past and present by adding the word "deo" that indicates past tense, rather than "u"/"o" with "tu" when used as a verbalizer:

kofke bread
Inche kofke-tu-n I eat bread
Inche deo kofke-tu-n I ate bread

(Llanquitruf)

On the other hand, as listed above, Armando agreed to a form with the verbalizer: "mateton".

I suspect that this "-0-" form is a phonological variation of "u" + the future morpheme "a". In the first place, present tense forms given with "0" are usually in the context of now or in the near future. Armando even stated once that the "0" form is the future, but not as far in the future as with "a". In addition, one native speaker, Señora Agustina, repeatedly gave the translation for present tense as "amutuan", which is technically the future tense, but seems to be used as the present tense as well.

In any case, this is a dialectical difference and not always recognized. Therefore, if there is no tense marker, the verb will indicate either past or present tense, depending on the categorization of the verb. I will continue to treat this form as both past and present, depending on the translation given at the time. Our verb template still has not changed, and remains:

```
ROOT M T
```
5. FUTURE: a

Whereas past and present tense are not morphologically marked, the simple future in Mapudungun is indicated by the addition of the morpheme "a", after the root but before P/N.

amun (to go) amu-a-n I will go
kúdaw (to work) kúdaw-a-ymi you will work
feypin (to say) feypi-a-iyiw us two will say

Our verb template has now changed to include the future morpheme, which falls between the root and M:

ROOT FUTURE MORPHEME M P/N

6. IMPERFECT

The imperfect is formed by the addition of "fu" between the root and the P/N.

kúdawfun I was workin/ I worked
matetufun I was drinking mate/ I drank mate

Sometimes the "u" is lost, and the morpheme ends up as just "f".

kulli-f-e-yu te pague I paid you
(Ángelica)

The meaning of the Imperfect in Mapudungun is roughly the same as the Imperfect tense in Spanish. This tense, which does not have its own morphological form in English, indicates something done in the past, but over time. The imperfect of the verb "work", then, would have the rough translation of "I was working". However, sometimes it is translated as "I worked", which would be in the past tense in Spanish.

The imperfect marker "fu" is a tense marker just like "a", and appears in the same spot in the organization of the verb. For that reason I will call that spot T, and describe the template as follows:

ROOT T M P/N

C. POLARITY INDICATOR
A polarity indicator, as defined by Brennan, Hoffman, and Napoli in "Gia" and Polarity Items" (1992), is an operator that marks either an affirmative or a negative assertion, but not the other. An example of a negative polarity indicator in English is "no" or "not", while a positive polarity indicator would be "sure" or "well", as in "she sure could do that". The positive polarity indicators are difficult to define because they both have homophones which are not polarity indicators.

It is possible that the following morphemes are polarity indicators in Mapudungun. The negative morphemes "la", "ki", and "nu/no" are certainly negative polarity indicators, in that they are operators on the statement that make it negative. I conjecture that "lle" is the positive polarity indicator in that I believe that "lle" and the negative are mutually exclusive. Although I don't have any data to specifically illustrate this assertion, the fact that in most cases "lle" must appear with the word "mai" (yes) corroborates that it is a purely affirmative morpheme.

7. NEGATIVE: la, ki, nu/no

To express the negative of the verb in the indicative the morpheme "la" is added after ROOT and before T.

\[
\text{dewma-la-n} \quad \text{I don't do}
\]
\[
\text{kūdaw-la-fu-ymi} \quad \text{you weren't working.}
\]

In the conditional the negative morpheme is "nu":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Inche dewma-nu-l-i} & \quad \text{if I don't work} \\
\text{eymi dewma-nu-l-mi} & \quad \text{if you don't work} \\
\text{fey dewma-nu-l-e} & \quad \text{if she/ he doesn't work}
\end{align*}
\]

(Catrileo)

A phonetic variant on "nu" is "no", both of which are mentioned in Agusta (p. 141), although his examples are given with "no":

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{si llego} & \quad \text{aku-no-li} \\
\text{(Agusta p. 142)} & \quad 
\end{align*}
\]

I would suspect that the nu/no variation is another example of a past/present distinction, except that in these examples "no" is not the penultimate morpheme.
The third negative, "ki", is used with the Subjunctive, and is necessarily accompanied by the mood morpheme "1":

\[
\text{langum} \text{-} \text{ki} \text{-} \text{fi} \text{-} \text{-nge} \text{tu} \text{-} \text{chi} \text{un} \text{im}
\]

"don't kill that bird!" (pg. 317 Smeets)

\[
kidaw \text{-} \text{ki} \text{-I} \text{-mu}
\]

¡don't work you two!

\[
kidaw \text{-} \text{ki} \text{-I} \text{-mün}
\]

¡don't work you all! (Catrileo)

Smeets mentions that sometimes "ki" appears along with "nu" without changing the meaning:

\[
\text{langum} \text{-} \text{ki} \text{-} \text{nu} \text{-I} \text{-nge} \text{tu} \text{-} \text{chi} \text{un} \text{im}
\]

(pg. 317 Smeets)

Salas also mentions that "ki" is "eventually reinforced by the suffix -no":

\[
kidaw \text{-} \text{ki} \text{-no} \text{-lmu}
\]

no trabajen ustedes (dos)! don't work you two!

\[
kidaw \text{-} \text{ki} \text{-no} \text{-lmün}
\]

no trabajen ustedes (todos)! don't work you (plural)!

(Salas, Modo, Persona, ...)

Although what "eventually reinforced" refers to is not particularly clear, I take it to mean that these two morphemes can appear together. When I asked Angelica if the addition of "no" or "nu" intensified the negativeness of the verb, she told me that it did not. Neither does it seem to cancel the negation.

The requirement of what we already know as the conditional morpheme with "ki" is unusual. If this is indeed the conditional morpheme, it is unexplained why there should be two mood morphemes at the same time. One possibility is that there are really only two moods, Indicative and Subjunctive, and that they each carry the feature [Conditional]. This is believable in that the P/N paradigms for Indicative and Conditional are so similar. However, the Conditional and Subjunctive paradigms are so different that a union of the two is difficult to reconcile.

Instead, I propose that this is not, in fact, the conditional morpheme. Rather I will say that the Subjunctive has two mood morphemes: Ø in the affirmative and "1" in the negative. In this way the affirmative Subjunctive mood morpheme is homophonous with the Indicative, and the negative Subjunctive mood morpheme is homophonous with the Conditional.
Since all of these negation morphemes appear in the same place and serve the same function, I will call their location NEG. The template now looks like this:

\[
\text{ROOT} \quad \text{NEG} \quad \text{T} \quad \text{M} \quad \text{P/N}
\]

8. AFFIRMATIVE: lle / ll

The morpheme "lle/ll" is one of the more difficult morphemes to define, because it doesn't change significantly the meaning of the verb. According to Smeets, "LLE" is an "Affirmative"—it adds emphasis:

\[
\text{fe-m-lle-n mai; chem-mew am fe-m-lle-nu-a-fu-lu ifiche!} \\
\text{"I certainly did that; why shouldn't I?"} \\
\text{(Smeets pg. 320)}
\]

Catrileo also says that "lle' or 'll' used between the verb and the subject ending indicate will and certain determination on the part of the speaker."² (Catrileo p. 145) The following is the list of examples that Catrileo presented:

- Amu-lle-iñ
- Aku-lle-y mai
- Küpa-lle-iñ mai
- Amu-ll-a-iñ mai
- Dungu-ll-e-yu mai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amu-lle-iñ</td>
<td>ya vamos, pues; sí fuimos lets go already; yes we went</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aku-lle-y mai</td>
<td>sí, sí llego yes, yes I arrive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küpa-lle-iñ mai</td>
<td>sí, sí vinimos yes, yes we came</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amu-ll-a-iñ mai</td>
<td>sí, sí vamos a ir yes, yes we are going to go</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungu-ll-e-yu mai</td>
<td>sí, sí hablamos yes, yes we spoke</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Catrileo p. 145)

(The morphemes "e" and "yu" indicate 1s agent and 2s theme, as will be discussed in section 11 on the Object.)

Armando gave similar translations to Catrileo's data:

- Aku-lle-y mai
- Küpa-lle-iñ mai
- Amu-ll-a-iñ mai
- Dungu-ll-e-yu mai

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Morpheme</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aku-lle-y mai</td>
<td>Ahora, sí que vamos now we're GOING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Küpa-lle-iñ mai</td>
<td>pues, vendremos well, we'll come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amu-ll-a-iñ mai</td>
<td>* no se dice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dungu-ll-e-yu mai</td>
<td>pues volveremos a conversar well, we'll speak again</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Armando)

Despite these translations, however, Armando stated that "lle" indicates the idea of "let's see if it works out or not". For example:
In addition, according to Armando, "lle" forms must always appear with the particle "mai", which is also the word for "yes". This is consistent with the data from Catrileo and Smeets, with the exception of two forms shown above with "lu". According to Smeets, "lu" is a "Subjective Verbal Noun" marker, modifying a noun with a verb in this way:

\[
\text{pichi che kim-nu-lu } \\
\text{small person know-NEG-SVN} \\
\text{"a child that doesn't know"}
\]

(Smeets pg. 281)

I will not be dealing with this morpheme further in the paper, although it appears in a few verb forms used to show other phenomena. It is interesting to note, though, that a verb with "lu" is the only form I know of that can take "lle" without "mai".

This morpheme slot I will call "AFF", for "affirmative". Based on the data in Catrileo, it seems that "ll" appears before "a" and "e", and "lle" everywhere else. Our verb template up until this point has been this:

\[
\text{ROOT NEG } T \quad M \quad \text{P/N}
\]

In comparison with this template, "lle" falls in a slot before T.

\[
\text{Feypi-nge-ka-lle-fu-y mai.} \\
\text{Küdaw-el-nge-pa-ka-ll-a-lu.}
\]

(Catrileo p. 146)

(The other morphemes, such as "nge", "ka", "el", and "pa" should be ignored for the moment. They all come before AFF, and will be explained later in this paper.)

Whether AFF goes before or after NEG is not relevant, since I am assuming that the two can not combine. Therefore I will put AFF in the same slot as NEG. The verb template so far is now:

\[
\text{ROOT NEG } T \quad M \quad \text{P/N} \\
\text{AFF}
\]
There are two indexical morphemes in Mapudungun which indicate the location where the verb takes place, "here" or "there". The morpheme "pa" means "here", and "pu" means "there". This translation of the meaning, however, is approximate. This is the meaning given by Catrileo in her book, but my informants have given me translations such as this:

ktidawpan I come to work
ktidawpun I went to work

All in all, this translation is not far from the indexicals of "here" and "there". If you come to work, it is understood to be at the point of utterance (at least in Spanish, the language the translations were originally given in), and if you go to work, likewise it is understood to be at some other point. There is another location morpheme, "me", which is also translated by Catrileo as "there" but with the implication of returning to the place of utterance afterwards.

The morphemes "pa", "pu" and "me" are located between the verb and the negative:

ktidaw-pu-n I work there
ktidaw-pu-la-n I don't work there
ktidaw-pa-ya-ymi vas a trabajar aca you are going to work here
ktidaw-pa-la-ya-ymi no vendras a trabajar aca you don't come to work here
(Angélica)

(I believe that these translations are somewhat loose, and in the first case the "are going" does not refer to the progressive of the verb "go", but rather indicates the future tense, just as it can in English.)

ktidaw-me-a-ymi vas a trabajar allá you (s) are going to work there
ktidaw-me-la-ya-ymi no vas a trabajar aca (implica regreso) you (s) don't come to work there (implying return)
(Angélica)

ktidaw-me-ke-fu-n I always went to work and came back.

(See section 9 for the description of the morpheme "ke").

The location morphemes also come before AFF:

Fende-nge-pa-lle-a-lu mai.
Ramtu-nge-pu-lle-n mai.

(Catrileo p. 146)

(Note that here "fende" is a verb root borrowed from the Spanish, "vender" = "sell". The morpheme "ka" is not dealt with in this paper, but according to Smeets it falls in the same slot as "tu", RE)

These three morphemes, being semantically related and mutually exclusive, will all be referred to as LOC (for "location"). Thus we have the template:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>P/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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10. REPORTATIVE: rke

The morpheme "rke" is used to indicate that the information communicated is obtained indirectly, is a surprise, or both. Catrileo states that "rke" indicates "occurrence, surprise, and continuity" (pg. 125), and Smeets calls it the "Reportative". The morpheme seems to be used in all of these functions.

The following data is divided into three categories:

1. "rke" indicates surprise
2. "rke" indicates indirect information
3. "rke" indicates both surprise and indirect information

Note: there are four morphemes that appear in the following data on "rke", which have not yet been presented, and will be explained later in the paper:

| kule/le | Stative |
| tu     | Return  |
| fi     | Object  |
| eyu    | Object and Transitive Agent: 1s agent and 2s theme |
| w      | reflexive: 1s agent and theme |

1. Surprise

- kúcha-tu-rk-eyu: yo te había lavado
  - "mira que te haya lavado!"
  - I had washed you
  - look, I washed you!
  - (Angelica) "Vaya que grande esta este niño!"

- kúcha-tu-fu-eyu: yo te había lavado
  - "mira que te lavaste!"
  - you washed you
  - look, you washed yourself!
  - you washed it -- emphasis
  - you went!

- kúcha-tu-rke-ymi: lo lavaste - enfasis
  - "mira que lo lavaste!"
  - you washed it
  - look, you washed it!

- kúcha-tu-rke-fi-mi: fuiste (con exclamación) (Angélica)
  - you went!

- amu-rke-ymi: I had washed you
  - look, I washed you!

- Fútawe-rke-y ti pichi wentru
  - you washed it -- emphasis
  - look, you washed it!

2. Indirect Information

- nglima-rke-y: había llorado
  - I had cried
  - he /she had cried

- weñe-rke-y: había robado
  - he /she had robbed
  - didn't see him /her robbing

- feyengün kúdaw-fu-eyu: ellos estaban trabajando allí (si los vi o no no se sabe).
  - they were working there
  - (no info on seeing or not)

- anü-le-rke-y: estaba sentado
  - he /she was seated
  - estaban sentado
kiucha-turke-y  
kiucha-küle-turk-eyu  
Amurke-y waria mew Kuan  
Nütramka-rke-fi ti pu che  
ju te habría lavado  
te estaba lavando  
Juan se había ido al pueblo  
El le había conversado a la gente (lo supe por otras personas).  
Dicen que se lo comentó a la gente.  
(Catríleo p. 126)  
I had washed you  
I was washing you  
Juan had gone to town (I didn't see him)  
He had conversed with the people (I learned it from other people).  
They say that he told it to the people.

3. Indirect Information and Surprise

| kudu-w-un | acostarse | to lie down  
| kudu-le-n | estar acostado | to be lying down  
| kudu-le-rke-y | estaba acostado | he/she was lying down  
| kudu-le-rke-y pichi domo | estaba acostada la niña | they girl was lying down  
| (puede ser que le vió el hablante cuando se estaba acostada, pero no cuando se acostó -- sorpresa que estaba acostada.) | | (it could be that the speaker saw her lying down, but not when she lay down -- surprised to see her lying down.)  
| anüle-rke-y | estaba sentado | he/she was seated  
| anü-le-n | estar sentado | to be seated  
| anü-w-un | sentarse | to sit down  
| anü-le-rke-y ti pichi wentru | estaba sentada el niño | the boy was sitting down  
| (sorpresa -- no lo vió sentarse pero le vió sentado) | | (surprise -- the speaker did not see the boy sit down, but they saw him seated.)  
| witra-le-rke-y | estaba de pie/levantado | to be standing up  
| ile-rke-y | estaba comiendo | to be eating  
| wankü-rke-y | había ladrado (el perro) | (the dog) had barked  
| *ladró | | *the dog barked  
| (no le vió ladrando, "le pilló ladrando") | | (didn't see the dog barking, "they caught him barking")  
| wankü-y | ladró | (Angelica)  
| | | (Angelica)  

Placement of "rke":

I will call "rke" REP, or "the reportative morphme". It is evident from the data above (of which the following is an example) that "rke" comes before the negative.

kücha-turke-la-eyu  
no te lavé/  
no te había lavado algo  
I didn't wash you  
I hadn't washed something for you  
(Angélica)
It also comes after "tu", the Return morpheme, which we have not looked at yet. Based on the fact that "rke" comes after "tu", and "tu" comes after LOC (as will become apparent later on), I will place REP between LOC and NEG on our current template:

\[
\begin{array}{ccccccc}
\text{ROOT} & \text{LOC} & \text{REP} & \text{NEG} & \text{T} & \text{M} & \text{P/N} \\
& & & & & & \text{AFF}
\end{array}
\]

**D ARGUMENT INDICATORS**

11. OBJECT: fi, e, w(ü), mu/ mo

A. Object Marker: "fi"

Combining my three written sources: Catrileo, Smeets, and Agusta, the object paradigm seems to be as follows. There are two object markers, "fi" and "e", plus a reflexive marker "w" and a third object marker "m/ mo".

The object marker "fi" is most easily translated as "it", "her" or "him". It is simply added in the OBJ position, and refers to a 3 person object and the regular P/N markers designate agent of the action. If "fi" comes directly before a P/N which starts with "i", one "i" gets lost. This is the case for all of the indicative P/Ns except for 1s. I am presenting this Object morpheme as "fi" rather than "f" because in most situations where the morpheme does not precede an "i", it appears as "fi". For instance:

- Entu-ki-fi-I-chi tufachi lifru.
- Dungu-ki-fi-I-iin tiechi pu wingka.
- Nütram-ka-pu-fi-mün. ("mün" here is the Subjunctive P/N) (Catrileo pp. 172-173)

The object marker "fi" thus combines with the following P/N to indicate 3s Object:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>SUBJECT/AGENT</th>
<th>OBJECT/THEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>fi</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>1s</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>imi</td>
<td>2s</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>3s</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>iyu</td>
<td>1p</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>imu</td>
<td>2d</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>ingu</td>
<td>3d</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>iin</td>
<td>1p</td>
<td>3s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Additional Examples:

Note: The morpheme "ke" appears in this data, and will be explained in section 16. The morpheme "ñima", which also appears here, is an indirect object indicator, but will not be discussed further in this paper.

kūdaw-kūle-a-f-imi — you will be working it (command or question)
kūdaw-kūle-ke-f-imi — you always work it (command or question)
kūdaw-kūle-la-pu-f-imi — you won't be working here regularly (command or question)

ktichumu-wū-n — mojarne; me mojo
ktichumu-la-fi-n — no lo moje
ktichumu-ke-fi-n — lo mojo regularmente

kulli-fi-n — le pagué
kulli-ñima-fi-n — se lo pagué (Angélica)

I paid her/him

I paid it to her/him

B. Object Marker: "e"

The marker "e" also appears in OBJ, but whereas with "fi" the Subject is the agent, with "e" the Subject is the theme. That is, P/N markers for "e" indicate theme, and for "fi" they indicate agent. When the object marker "e" is present, there is an additional marker after P/N to specify the agent. SMEETS calls this spot "Dative Subject", but it seems to me more to be a transitive agent spot, so that's what I will call it, T.A for short. The one OBJECT-TA combination that we've seen so far is "-eyu", which is an exception to the given paradigm. It indicates that 1s is agent, and 2s is theme. In AGUSTA's paradigm he listed "-e-ymi" for 1st person agent and 2nd person patient, and "eyu" as a variant "used in the north".

The TA morphemes used with "e" are "(m)ew" for 3s,d,p, and Ø for 2s,d,p and 1s, d,p. The only "e" form listed for 2 person agent is "e-n", which indicates that the theme is 1s. 2s,d,p agent is thus not confused with 1s,d,p, even though they both have the same TA marker, Ø. (The OBJ-P/N-TA combination "e-n" could only indicate 2s,d,p agent, because if it were 1s,d,p agent, then the reflexive marker "w" would be used. This marker will be discussed shortly.) The following chart presents the
OBJ(e)-P/N-TA combinations, as listed in Agusta and Catrileo. On the right is data to illustrate each combination, given by Armando. The last example of 3s,d,p agent "etew" is listed by Catrileo, and means that 3s,d,p is agent and any other Subject is theme. She indicates that the theme in this case is marked by a possessive marker before the verb: "Kuan mûle y kellu-a-e-tew" = "Juan tiene que ayudarme" = "John has to help me". (Catrileo p. 136) In the one piece of data I have for this form, it is used with a 1s theme.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>TA (theme)(agent)</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>ew</td>
<td>pangkow-ûn</td>
<td>abrazar; yo abrazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pangkow-e-n-ew engûn</td>
<td>ellos me abrazan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>feipi-kûnu-e-new</td>
<td>ya que me dejó dicho, un encargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ym*</td>
<td>ew</td>
<td>katrii-n</td>
<td>cortar; yo corto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>u</td>
<td>katrii-e-yu</td>
<td>te corto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>katrii-a-e-yu</td>
<td>te cortaré</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kûchu-mu-w-ûn</td>
<td>mojarse; me mojo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kûchu-eyu</td>
<td>te mojo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>llica-l-ûn</td>
<td>hacer miedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>llica-e-yu</td>
<td>te hago miedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>ew</td>
<td>feipi-kûnu-e-tew</td>
<td>ya que me dejó dicho, he / she left me in un encargo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>iyu</td>
<td>mew</td>
<td></td>
<td>*a ellos le dejó dicho *he / she left them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ymu</td>
<td>mew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>ew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>in</td>
<td>mew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ymûn</td>
<td>mew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>ew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ew</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>TA</th>
<th>EXAMPLE</th>
<th>TRANSLATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>pangkow-ûn</td>
<td>abrazar; yo abrazo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pangkow-e-n</td>
<td>me abrazas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>llica-l-ûn</td>
<td>hacer miedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>llica-e-n</td>
<td>me haces miedo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ymi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ymu</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>ymûn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(* Catrileo lists the P/N theme for 2nd person as "ym" in what she lists as "eymew").

### Additional Data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kichumu-w-ün</th>
<th>Mojarse; me mojo</th>
<th>to wet oneself; I wet myself</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kichu-eyu</td>
<td>Te mojo</td>
<td>I wet you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kichumu-la-e-yu</td>
<td>No te mojo</td>
<td>I don't get you wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kichumu-wu-la-ye-yu</td>
<td>No te mojaré</td>
<td>I won't get you wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ktichumu-w-tin</td>
<td>Ktichu-eyu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ktichu-e-yu</td>
<td>Ktichumu-la-e-yu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ktichu-e-n</td>
<td>Ktichumu-wu-la-ye-yu</td>
<td>(Angelica)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangkow-ün</td>
<td>Abrazar; yo abrazo</td>
<td>to hug; I hug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangkow-e-n</td>
<td>Me abrazas</td>
<td>you hug me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangkow-fi-n</td>
<td>Les/le abrazo</td>
<td>I hug him / her / them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangkow-e-n-ew</td>
<td>Ellos me abrazan</td>
<td>they (all) hug me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trupef-ün</td>
<td>Asustar; yo me asusto/asusté</td>
<td>to surprise; I am/was surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trupef-y</td>
<td>Te asustaste, te asustas</td>
<td>you were / are surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trupef-ymi</td>
<td>Se asustó, se asusta</td>
<td>he / she was / is surprised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illica-l-ün</td>
<td>Hacer miedo</td>
<td>to scare; I am scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illica-e-ye</td>
<td>Te hago miedo</td>
<td>I scare you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illica-e-n</td>
<td>Me haces miedo</td>
<td>you scare me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feipi-künst-e-tew</td>
<td>Ya que me dejó dicho, un encargo</td>
<td>He / she left me with a charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feipi-künst-e-new</td>
<td>Ya que me dejó dicho, un encargo</td>
<td>*He / she left them ...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*A ellos le dejó dicho</td>
<td>*He / she left me with a charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Armando)</td>
<td>*He / she left them ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Another difference between "e" and "fi", as Agusta points out, is that when a second argument is overt, "fi" is coreferenced with the second argument. For example:

Kain languim-f-i ñi Afel peñi, fey ñi fula kastiga-e-y-ew Dios.  
Cail kill -OBJ-3rd sing. possessive Abel brother, punish-obj-3rd sing.-3rd TA God  
Cain killed his brother Abel, therefore God punished him.

Kain languimfi ñi Afel peñi, fey ñi fula kastiga-fi Dios.  
Cain killed his brother Abel, therefore he punished God.
Although Catrileo presents the OBJ-P/N-TA paradigms as single units, it is evident that "e" is a separate morpheme, just like "fi", in that they are separated by P/N by mood morphemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pangko-e-l-i-yu</th>
<th>si yo te abrazo</th>
<th>if I hug you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pangko-e-l-i</td>
<td>si tu me abrazas</td>
<td>if you hug me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangko-e-new</td>
<td>ellos me abrazan</td>
<td>they hug me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangko-e-l-i-mu engün</td>
<td>si ellos me abrazan</td>
<td>if they hug me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pangko-fi-l-mi</td>
<td>si tu le/les abrazas</td>
<td>if you hug him/her/them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data also support my placement of "e" and "fi" in the same slot in our verb paradigm, before M. The Transitive Agent slot is after P/N. The paradigm, is therefore now this:

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccc}
\text{ROOT} & \text{LOC} & \text{REP} & \text{NEG} & \text{T} & \text{OBJ} & \text{M} & \text{P/N} & \text{TA} \\
\text{AFF} & & & & & & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

C. Reflexive: "w"

The other two object markers, "w" and "mu/mo", are found in a different, earlier slot. According to Catrileo and Agusta, the reflexive morpheme is "w(ü)", (Smeets: "(u)w") which is indeed as it appears in the following data:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>küchumu-n</th>
<th>yo mojo</th>
<th>I wet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>küchumu-w-ün</td>
<td>me mojé</td>
<td>I got myself wet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kücha-enew engün</td>
<td>ellos me lavan</td>
<td>they (all) wash me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kücha-tu-ymi</td>
<td>lavas</td>
<td>you wash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kücha-tu-w-üymí</td>
<td>te lavas a ti (sólo)</td>
<td>you wash yourself (alone)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are words which in Spanish are reflexive, but in Mapudungun are not, such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>llica-l-ün</th>
<th>hacer miedo</th>
<th>to scare</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kisu llica-n/llica-l-ün</td>
<td>me hago miedo</td>
<td>I get scared</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would hypothesize that "I" was part of the root, except that it is not present in the first possibility of "I get scared": "kisu llican". This "I" could not be BEN (which will be explained soon), since there is no theme or benefactive explicit in the verb.
Smeets identifies this morpheme as "(u)w" and calls it "first person agent", since it marks the agent as the first person, and designates P/N as the agent-marker. This is true of "w" as a reflexive as well, since the first person is both agent and theme. It also works for the following example given by Smeets:

\[ \text{langüm-uw-yiñ} \quad \text{"I/we killed you"} \]

(Smeets p. 350)

D. 2nd person agent: "mu/ mo"

The morpheme "mu/mo" (either regional or temporal varieties, I conjecture) is an indicator of 2s,d,p agent (according to Smeets). The P/N form indicates the 1s,d,p theme. For example, "Eymün feyentu-mu-ke-n" = "Ellos me obedecen" = "they obeyed me" (Catrileo, p. 163). The Object form "mu" does not seem to be used as commonly as "e", in that Angelica was less clear as to what these forms meant and whether you could say them.

Additional "mu" examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ramtu-mu-la-n</td>
<td>no me preguntaste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ramtu-küle-mu-la-n</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymün feyentu-mu-ke-n</td>
<td>ustedes me obedecen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi feypi-mu-pa-la-iśni</td>
<td>tu no nos vienes a decir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ramtu-mu-a-n</td>
<td>pregunta(\text{me})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kellu-mu-a-n</td>
<td>ayuden(\text{me})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi ramtu-mu-a-n</td>
<td>pregunta(\text{me})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eymi kellu-mu-a-n</td>
<td>ayuden(\text{me})</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Catrileo) (Armando)

(Note in the last four verbs here how Armando translates the 2nd person future indicative as a command.)

Looking at some data given by Angélica, it seems that the Reflexive "w" may be able to appear
in addition to the Object marker "e", where the theme is indicated by the "e" rather than the "w":

ktichumu-w-\textsc{u}-n \quad \text{mojarse; me mojo} \quad \text{to wet oneself; I wet myself}
kî\textsc{c}hu-\textsc{e}-\textsc{y}u \quad \text{te mojo} \quad \text{I wet you}
kì\textsc{c}humu-la-\textsc{e}-\textsc{y}u \quad \text{no te mojo} \quad \text{I don't get you wet}
kù\textsc{c}humu-wu-la-\textsc{y}e-\textsc{y}u \quad \text{no te mojare} \quad \text{I won't get you wet}

(Angélica)

These are the only data that suggest that "e" and "w" can co-occur, and more investigation needs to be done on this point.

The following data from Catrileo, though not translated, is useful for placing "mu", which comes before LOC.

feyentu-m\textsc{u}-k\textsc{e}-n

Eymùn feyentu-m\textsc{u}-r\textsc{k}e-l\textsc{e}-n
Eymùn feyentu-m\textsc{u}-p\textsc{a}-k\textsc{a}-k\textsc{e}-l\textsc{a}-n

Eymi feyentu-m\textsc{u}-k\textsc{e}-i\textsc{i}\textsc{\text{"a}}, rumel.
Eymi allk\textsc{\i}tu-m\textsc{u}-k\textsc{e}-i\textsc{i}\textsc{\text{"a}}, rumel.

Eymùn kellu-m\textsc{u}-p\textsc{a}-k\textsc{e}-i\textsc{i}\textsc{\text{"a}}, fillant\textsc{"u}.

Eymi kimeltu-m\textsc{u}-p\textsc{u}-k\textsc{e}-i\textsc{i}\textsc{\text{"a}} k\textsc{\i}n\textsc{\i}ke mew.
Eymi ramsu-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-n
Eymi feypi-m\textsc{u}-p\textsc{a}-k\textsc{e}-l\textsc{a}-i\textsc{i}\textsc{\text{"a}}
Eymi kellu-m\textsc{u}-p\textsc{a}-k\textsc{a}-k\textsc{e}-n

Eymùn turpu kellu-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-n k\textsc{a} tripantu.
Chewnurume feypi-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-n u\textsc{a}.
Eymùn ka kimel-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-i\textsc{i}n chemnurume.
Eymùn turpu ngilla-l-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-i\textsc{i}n k\textsc{\i}n\textsc{\i} lifrurnurume
Eymùn chumel-m\textsc{u}-p\textsc{a}-l\textsc{a}-n rume kamel.
Chem pi-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-n rume u\textsc{a}.
Eymùn chemrume k\textsc{\i}p\textsc{\i}al\textsc{-}el-m\textsc{u}-l\textsc{a}-n fachiant\textsc{"u}.

(Catrileo, pg. 163)

I will call "mu" AG(2), for second person agent, and I will call "w" REF, for reflexive. I am placing these two morhemes in the same slot on the basis that both Smeets and Agusta do. The template now looks like this:

\text{ROOT AG2 LOC REP AFF NEG T OBJ M P/N REF}

12. BENEFACTIVE: lel, el, l

The morpheme "lel/el/l" is labeled Benefactive (BEN), since it indicates that the action is
performed for someone, marking the Benefactive argument. Smeets states that this morpheme changes the theme into the benefactive (pg. 365). This re-assignment of theta role is particularly evident when the theme is overt. In the following data, where the ending -e-yu indicates that 1s is agent and 2s is theme, 2s becomes the benefactive:

| nier-e-yu | I hold you |
| nier-e-yu | I hold for you |
| nier-l-e-yu mi kulliš | I take care of your cattle for you |
| nier-l-ng-e-ymi mi kulliš | one takes care of your cattle for you |
| lit: you are taken care of your cattle |
| (Smeets) |
| küpal-e-yu | te traigo/ traje | I bring/brought you |
| küpal-el-e-yu | te traje algo/ te traigo algo | I bring/brought you something |
| te lo traje (para ti) | I brought it (for you) |
| ngilla-e-yu | te compró/ compré | I buy/bought you |
| ngilla-l-e-yu | te compré a ti algo | I bought something for you |
| te lo compré | I bought it for you |
| ngilla-l-a-e-yu | te compraré algo | I will buy you something |
| ngilla-l-el-a-e-yu | te compraré | I will buy it for you |
| ngilla-l-lel-a-e-yu | te compraré algo | I will buy you something |
| ramtu-e-yu | te pongo | I ask you |
| ramtu-l-el-a-eyu | pongo algo para ti, | I will ask something for you, |
| lo consultaré para beneficio | I will consult something for your |
| tuyo | benefit |
| mütrum-eyu | te llamaré | I will call you |
| mütrum-el-eyu | te lo/la llamaré | I will call him/her for you |
| ngilla-l-kenu-eyu | te dejaré comprado (algo) | I will leave something purchased |
| ngilla-kenu-l-el-eyu | para ti | for you |
| (Catrileo p. 68 and Angelica) | | | |
ngillan kiñe ñarki
ngillaelfin ti ñarki iyael
OR ngillaelfin iyael ti ñarki
le compré la comida al gato
I bought the cat food.
(Angéllica)

Similarly, the ending OBJ-TA combination "-e-n", which indicates 2s agent and 1s patient, marks a 1s benefactive when used with "le1":

ngillaelen ti ñarki
comprame el gato,
me compras el gato
buy me the cat,
you buy me the cat
(Angéllica)

In one case I got different translations from Catrileo and Angéllica for the same verbal form. In both cases BEN changes theme to benefactive, but the meaning is different. Later Angéllica agreed that Catrileo's definition was also acceptable to her.

yefaltu-I-a-e-yu 
te encargaré (algo para
que me comprés)
(Angéllica)
te lo encargaré para ti
(Catrileo)

I will ask you to buy
me something
I will order it for you

The duality in glosses I believe is a product of the word "encargar", which doesn't have an exact translation in English. It can be used in the sense of asking someone else to buy or get something for you, or in the sense of ordering something (such as ordering a loaf of bread to be made). It can also be used in the sense of entrusting someone with something (such as a child to take care of), or taking charge of something for someone else. This accounts for the difference in meaning of "yefaltu" in the two examples.

The Object pronoun "te" in Spanish also has two meanings: it can either mark "you" as the benefactive or as the theme. In this way the phrase "te lo encargaré" is lexically ambiguous. If the
pronoun "lo" was understood to be bread from the context, this phrase could mean either "I will order bread for you" or "I will order bread from you". I beleive that in this case Mapudungun functions similarly to Spanish, and for this reason the two translations are given.

When BEN is used with the passive, the Subject is theme and therefore becomes benefative:

- amul-el-nge-kunu-y they made something go for a 3rd person
- amul-el-nge-kunu-n they made something go for me
- amu-l-ktinu-nge-tu-y 1.accompanied a little so that he / she doesn't get lost, to indicate the path.
- amu-l-ktinu-n 2.accompanied when someone dies, in their trip
- Subject = the person who is accompanied

(Armando)

When the theme isn't overt, however, the benefactive may be underdetermined, which is evidenced by the fact that it's often translated with "someone" or "him/her":

- amu-l-kunu-lel-me-n I went to make something work for him/ her
- amu l-kunu-lel-me-n go make sure it works

(This example is odd in that the P/N is 1s, but the translation seems to indicate that it should be 2s,d, or p. The only way I can understand this example is to assume that Angélica heard an extra "e" at the end, which would indicate that 2s is agent and 1s is theme. This is possible, if there is a rule that deletes one "e" when two "e"s are found together. In that case Angélica gave a loose translation, and this really means "go make sure it works for me".)
- amul-el-künu-l-me-n the same thing, but more ridgid -- you can say it, but it's not socially correct
- amul-künu-y 41

* Angelica

- amu-l-künu-y he/she made something or someone go
- amu-lel-künu-y he/ she sent (something) with someone for someone else
- amul-kunu-me-nge-tu-y he / she went to leave him/ her in some place

41
As can be seen by the data in the following table, "leI" has two positions which seem to be consistent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>IMPSTAT</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ngilla</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngilla</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngilla</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ngilla</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>yu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amul</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>nge</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amul</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu</td>
<td>leI</td>
<td>kunu</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first BEN position is after STAT and before PASS, the second is after NEG and before LOC. Since this is the first time we have seen a LOC after NEG, we have to propose a new slot for LOC, after NEG and BEN. In terms of the template as it stands, there is one BEN before NEG, and one after NEG. I am placing the first BEN before the AG2 and REF for reasons that will be made clear with the addition of the Passive "nge" and the Imposed State "kunu". The two slots can even be filled at the same time, as in "amu-leI-kunu-leI-me-n".

The full verb template so far is thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>AG2</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>REF</th>
<th>AFF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

13. PASSIVE: nge

The passive in Mapudungun is formed just as in English and Spanish -- effectively with the addition of the verb "ngen" = "be". That is, the morpheme "nge" is added to the other verb to indicate that the Subject has the theme theta role. This usage and meaning is uniformly cited by Catrileo, Smeets,
Agusta, and native speakers.

lang-üm-nge-y  
die-cause-PASS-3s Ind  "He/she/it/they was/were killed"  
(Smeets pg. 350)

Lang-üm-nge-y  lo mataron  they killed it/ him
Trana-künu-nge-y  le dejaron tendido, tirado  they left her/ him stretched out
küpal-nge-ingu  fuisteis traídos  you (two) were brought  
(Agusta pp. 57-60)

(Note: "künu" is the Imposed State morpheme, and will be described in section 18.)

fey amul-nge-y Angélica  la mandó a Angélica  he/she sent it to Angélica
amul-tu-nge-la-y  no fue mandado  it wasn't sent
amu-lel-tu-nge-la-y  no se lo enviaron  they didn't send it  
(Angélica 23 marzo)

El-künu-lel-nge-pa-la-ya-y  no lo/la van/va a venir a dejar  they won't come leave him/her
Inche ulel-nge-n.  Me pegaron.  They hit me  
(Angélica)

S V O  
Feyengün pe-y kíñe kura.  -->  Kíñe kura pe-nge-y
El-künu-kantu-lel-nge-pa-la-ya-y  
(Catrileo pp. 116-119)

amul-el-nge-künu-y  le hicieron andar a 3a persona  they made someone walk
amul-el-nge-künu-n  me hicieron andar a mí  they made me walk  
(Armando)

It is also generally mentioned that the agent in the passive form is never indicated linguistically.  
In this sense "nge" is a detransitivizer. It cuts one argument from the argument frame of the verb,  
leaving the remaining arguments to be relinked to the available grammatical functions (GFs). That is,
what was previously the agent (Subject) is relinked to the theme argument, deleting the agent argument completely. For instance, the verb "elun" = "give", is subcategorized for three arguments: agent, theme and benefactive. If the verb form were originally "elu-fi-n" = "I gave it", with the addition of "nge" it becomes "elu-nge-fi-n" = "I was given it". In this case the relinking of argument to GF is this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Direct Object</th>
<th>--&gt;</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Direct Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>agent</td>
<td>theme</td>
<td>--&gt;</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
<td>agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although all three arguments can be represented within the verb, they can't all appear at the same time. It is impossible for the morpheme "nge" to appear along with an object morpheme. This is illegal because (a) there would be competition for the theme theta role between the Object Marker "e" and P/N, and (b) the Object Marker "e" must appear with a transitive agent marker (TA), and "nge" may not appear with any agent marker.

I will call "nge" PASS, for "passive". The position of PASS, according to the following data, seems to be at two locations. The first, primary slot is after BEN and before "kïïnu":

- kiïïel-nge-pa-ka-ll-a-lu
- kiïïel-nge-pa-ka-ya-lu
- amul-el-nge-kïïnu-y
- amu-lel-nge-y

By the following data it is apparent that "kïïnu" can also come before BEN and PASS. Rather than propose a new slot for "kïïnu" before BEN, the example "amu-l-kïïnu-nge-tu-y" forces us to propose another BEN and PASS after "kïïnu", since in this example "kïïnu" comes between the two.

- el-kïïnu-lel-nge-me-fu-li-in
- amu-kïïnu-nge-tu-y
- amu-l-kïïnu-nge-tu-y
- amu-lel-nge-tu-la-y

(Catrileo) if they had accompanied us (Angélica)
acompanied a little so that he/ she doesn't get lost, or when someone dies. (Armando)
(Anmando)
(Anmando)
(Anmando)

they didn't send it to him / her (Angélica)
By the same reasoning as above, PASS cannot combine with "mu" or "w", since "mu" and "w" mark 2nd and 1st person agent, and PASS cannot appear with an overt agent. For this reason I will put PASS in the same slot as AG2 and REF in the first slot. In the second slot I will only mark PASS, since I have no examples of AG2 or REF appearing in that position. The verb template now looks like this:

ROOT BEN PASS IMSTAT BEN PASS LOC REP NEG BEN LOC T OBJ M P/ N TA
REF
AG2

(IMPSTAT, included here to show the necessity of the second BEN and second PASS, is discussed in section 18, "Imposed State".)

The passive "nge" should not be confused with other "nge" morphemes. For instance, when used with an adjective or noun, "nge" serves as a verbalizer:

Kayu-ngë-eyngün
Fey kalku-ngë-y

son seis
El es brujo
they are six
He is a witch.

(Catrileo p. 55)

As mentioned earlier, it is also used as the Imperative form for 2s, which is essentially the command form.

14. AEL/AM

Both "am" and "ael" seem to mark instrument for an action in the future:

Nieymi tífachi pincel mi kúdaw-ael. Tienes este pincel para
plata ñí ngillaka-yam la plata que tengo para
trabajarlo.
comprar

You have this brush to work
the money that I have for
it.
buying

(Ángelica)

But despite the fact that Agusta states that they have the same function and meaning, each morpheme has different characteristics.

In Harmelink's paper "Towards a Functional Analysis of -Am and -Ael" he states that the
functions of -am and -ael are as follows:

**AEL:**
1. In the construction of a verb such as "I want" or "I prefer" plus infinitive. -Am is not used in these situations.
2. In the logical relation expressed by "in order to/that".

**AM:**
1. Locative: "where" + possessive pronoun + verb + am
2. The means by which something occurs.
3. Instrument marker.

Harmelink gives a pair of example sentences, and a pair of example words, which differ only in whether the suffix is -am or -ael:

Feypifíñ tañi aretupen mansun ñi ngan-ael.
Dijo que consiguió bueyes con los cuales sembrará.
He/she said that he/she obtained some oxen with which he/she will plant seeds.

Feypifíñ tañi aretupen mansun ñi ngan-am.
Dijo que consiguió bueyes para sembrar.
He/she said that he/she obtained some oxen to plant seeds.

iyael: comida, "lo que se come"
food, "what you eat"

iyam: servicio, "los instrumentos con los cuales se come"
silverware, "the instruments with which you eat"
(Harmelink, p. 70)

A difference that I noticed in data from Angelica is that "ael" can be followed by other suffixes, such as OBJ, whereas "am" cannot.

Nie-n ñufachi pincel ñi kúdad-ael-eyu
Tengo para ti este pincel para que tu lo trabajes.
I have for you this brush so that you can work it.

rúpi ñi rupa-yam
el camino para que él pase
the path so that he can pass

*rúpi ñi rupa-yam-e-yu

Both suffixes can be preceded by other suffixes, though.

kúdad-kùle-ael
para que este trabajando
so that you are working
(Angélica)

kim-el-tu-ngé-nu-ael
(Catrileo p. 117)
plata ñi ngillakaw-küle-am la plata que tengo para estar comprando
the money that I have to be buying
(Ángelica)

In both cases the noun that precedes the verb is the instrument. Also in both cases the Subject is indicated by the possessive pronoun that precedes the verb, unless (in the case of “ael”) there is a further indication of agent. The possessive pronouns are:

Inche
ñi

eymi
mi

fey
ñi

Inchiw
yu

eymu
mu

feyengu
ñi...engu

Inchiñ
ñi...iñin

eymün
mün...eymün

feyenguñ
ñi...engün

"Ael" can also be used in expressions such as "One has to...", or "It's good that...". In these cases also the Subject is indicated by the possessive pronoun. For instance, the verb "mülen" = "to be, to have", can be used in the 3s with the possessive and "ael" in this way:

müley ñi ruka-yael
tengo que construir una casa
I have to build a house

müley mi ruka-yael
tienes que construir una casa.
you have to build a house

kümey mi küpa-yael
esta bien que vengas
it's good that you come

kümé dungu mi rukayael
es bueno que construyas una casa
it's good that you build a house

(Catrileo p. 83)

Whether or not "am" and "ael" are formed with the future morpheme "a" + "m" or "el" is debatable. There is evidence that "am" does not seem to mark future in the same way that "ael" does. Often Angelica gave the definition for "ael" as "in the future", whereas never did this translation appear with "am". Also, "am" can be used with the future morpheme "a":

plata ñi ngillaka-ya-yam
la plata que tengo para comprar en el futuro
the money that I have to buy with in the future

On the other hand, "am" can be formed using "afu" instead of "a" before "m":

ñi yemetu-afu-mñi asul palti
para ir a buscar mi balde azul
to go look for my blue pail
(from "Lafkenkawell")
This "afum" form here is rather disturbing. It indicates that one of three things may be happening:

1. There are two T morphemes, "a" and "fu", which appear at the same time.
2. There is a single morpheme "am" which is not formed from the future morpheme "a", and T can be infixed in this morpheme.
3. There is a third T morpheme, "afu", which can also combine with "m" and produce something much like "am".

I am inclined to believe (3) rather than (1) or (2) for the following reasons. First, it does not make sense that two T morphemes should appear at the same time, ruling out (1). Second, there is no other known case of infixation within a morpheme in this language, which makes (2) unlikely. Third, "afu" is cited in other situations as a T morpheme. María Eugenia Osses says that "afu" marks a "doubtful situation in the future." This morpheme can also appear in the T slot with regular indicative endings. Although it is referred to as a conjunction of "a" and "fu", it seems to behave as a single tense morpheme. In this light, then, the aforementioned co-occurrence of T with "am" appears odd. It could be that once "am" or "afum" is formed, it does not indicate the future any more. It may also be that "am" and "afum" become cliticized and can take a second T. The details of the "am" formation are not fully explained by the present data, and remain an open question.

In any case, both "ael" and "am" verbal forms can indicate that the preceding noun is the instrument by which the action will be done. However, as Harmelink pointed out, they do this in different ways. The following data illustrate that the "am" form seems to be modifying the preceding noun, whereas the "ael" form does not. In a structural sense, the difference between "am" and "ael" could be described in terms of the I" (the I" of the "am" or "ael" verbal form, that is). The I" of an "am" form will be dominated by the instrument noun. The I" of an "ael" form, on the other hand, forms its own clause.

"am" and "ael" data:

**AM:**
plata ñi ngillaka-pu-am
la plata que tengo para comprar allá
the money that I have to buy with there

calla mi kúpal-am lichi
la olla que tienes tú para traer leche
the pot that you have to bring milk in
metawe ŋi kūpal-am ko
el cántaro (que tengo) para traer leche
the jug (that I have) to bring milk in

rūpū fey ŋi rupa-yam
el camino para que él pase
the path for him to pass on

rūpū Inčiini ŋi rupa-yam
el camino para que nosotros todos pasemos
the path for all of us to pass on

AEL:
Nien tūfachi pincel ŋi kūdaw-lel-ael.
Tengo este pincel yo para que me lo trabaje/n.
I have this brush so that they can work on it for me.

Nien tūfachi pincel ŋi kūdaw-ael-e-yu
Tengo este pincel para que tu lo trabajes.
I have this brush so that you can work on it.

Nien e-yu tūfachi pincel mi kūdaw-ael.
Tengo para ti este pincel tu para trabajarlo.
I have for you this brush so that you can work on it.

pepikaw-ael
para arreglarse
in order to fix up oneself

ayiw-ael
para alegrarse en el futuro
in order to be happy in the future

I will not be including "am" and "ael" on the regular verb template, for a lack of data. Instead, I will lay out here the structure within which we know they can appear, based on the data in this section.
**6. TIME FRAME INDICATORS**

15. **STATIVE: küle / le**

When the morphemes "küle" or "le" are affixed to the verb, the result is the state of doing the verb. For instance, "küdaw-küle-n" is "I am working", "amu-küle-n" is "I am going", and so on.

Smeets mentions three other morphemes that describe state, making four in all:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>morpheme</th>
<th>description</th>
<th>slot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;küle&quot;</td>
<td>stative</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;meke&quot;</td>
<td>progressive</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;nie&quot;</td>
<td>progressive persistent</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;künu&quot;</td>
<td>perfect persistent</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

"Künu" will be dealt with later in this paper; the other two are only mentioned here. All of these morphemes share the property that their meaning changes depending on if the verb is telic or atelic (according to Smeets). A telic verb is one which "denotes a process or event that leads up to a terminal point," whereas an atelic verb is one which has no terminal point inherent in its meaning. (Smeets p. 386) Smeets states that a telic verb combined with one of these morphemes is result-oriented, while an atelic verb with these morphemes is event-oriented. For example:

**TELIC:**

lög-küle-y "it is white" (result of an event)
"I kept it white"
"I left it white"

ATELIC:
"I am/was swimming"
"I keep/kept him/her/it swimming"
"I let him/her/it swim"

(Smeets p. 386)

The distribution of "küle" vs. "le" is as follows: "küle" appears after consonants except for "l", and "le" appears after vowels and "l". ("W" counts as a consonant here. I don't have any examples with the Stative following "y", and so am unable to generalize that küle appears after glides. In fact, I was unable to find an example of a verb that has a "y" glide as the last phoneme; one may not even exist.) This generalization is drawn from a series of data supplied by Angélica and Rubén, which is listed below:

Roots ending in a Consonant:

küdaw-küle-n ---- I am working
mütrong-küle-n ---- I am beating
ayüw-küle-n ---- I am happy
mütrum-küle-n ---- I am calling

Roots ending in a Vowel:

amu-le-n ---- I am going
ilotu-le-n ---- I am eating meat
matetu-le-n ---- I am drinking mate
papeltu-le-n ---- I am studying
liftu-le-n Estoy limpiando/ me estoy lavando I am cleaning/ I am washing myself
(Rubén)

*lifru-kaw-küle-n (Rubén)
liftu-meke-n estoy limpio I am clean
(Rubén)
pimu-le-n estoy hinchada I am bloated
(Ángelica)
kudu-le-n estoy acostada I am lying down
ngilla-le-n  I am buying
estoy comprando
(Rubén)

Roots ending in "l":
lica-le-n  I am afraid
weyel-küle-n  I am swimming (Smeets)

Roots ending in "k":
lladk-küle  I am angry

(Angelica stated that "küle" was used here, although the difference is minimal, because with "le" a /ω/ would get inserted epintheretically between the "k" and "l" anyway. In fact, I have seen "küle" spelled "kle" on a brochure by a Mapuche women's group "Keyukleayń" (Kellu-küle-a-iñ = we (p) will be helping.)

Addition of "kaw"/ "w":
takun  to cover/dress oneself  taku-kaw-küle  I am getting dressed
       taku-le  I am covered
ellkan  to hide  ellkaw-küle-ymi  you (sing.) are in hiding
       ellka-le  I am hidden
ngillakan  to go shopping  ngillaka-w-küle  I am buying regularly
       ngillaka-le  I am buying (at the moment)
nülan  to open  nüla-kaw-küle-y  it is usually open (like a door)
       nüla-le-y  it is open

(Rubén)

It is evident that the addition of "kaw" or "w" (in cases where the verb ends in "ka") adds a new meaning to the sense of the morpheme, which seems to be that of longer duration of the state. For instance, in the case of "takun" it changes the verb from a telic to an atelic verb, as well as taking on the alternate meaning of the verb "to get dressed".

In the case of the verb "ngillan", "to buy", the addition of "ka" to the end changes the verb to mean "to go shopping". This also in a sense increases the duration of the verb. It may be that the added
morpheme is simply "ka", and the "w" gets added on with the Stative through a phonological process. This is purely conjecture, though, and data would have to be collected to see if "ka" can appear on verbs other than "ngillan".

Exceptions:

küchumu-küle-n  I am wetting myself (Angélica and Rubén)
ngilla-küle-n    I am buying (Rubén)

In the original set of data, Angelica also gave the following two forms:

matetu-küle-n    I am drinking mate
ilotu-küle-n     I am eating meat

In addition, Ruben had agreed to the form "papeltu-küle-n" (I am studying) which I produced. These three verbs share the characteristic that they are all formed from nouns plus the verbalizer "tu" (see the section on verbalization). Three days later, however, both Angelica and Ruben informed me that the correct forms are:

matetu-le-n
ilotu-le-n
papeltu-le-n

What surprises me is that not one, but two people, gave me such systematic data that is contrary to the supposed rule of "le" following vowels, which they later changed. Later still, Angélica told me that the new data was obtained by asking her mother. While Angélica uses forms such as "matetukülen", she considers her mother (an older member of the Mapuche community), to be an authority on Mapudungun, so when Angélica is in doubt about a grammaticality judgement, she confers with her mother.

What this indicates to me is that one of two things may be happening. Either Angélica and Rubén truly were mistaken the first time, the mistake stemming from their limited use of Mapudungun, or a linguistic change is taking place among the younger generation. I tend to believe the former rather than
the latter, since Angélica and Rubén seemed convinced of the "proper" form the second time around. Furthermore, Armando mentioned exclusively the forms "matetulen" and "ilotulen", and he is around the same age as Angélica and Rubén, although Mapudungun is his primary language. However, the possibility still exists that this is an example of a generational or geographic difference.

A second such inconsistency also surfaced with the addition of the morpheme "(küle)". Originally there seemed to be a change in the placement of the location morphemes "pu" and "pa" to after the negative in the presence of "küle":

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT STAT LOC CF LOC NEG LOC T OBJ P/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>küdaw      pu  ke  la   pu   fu n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küdaw kule ke  la   pu   fu n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küdaw      ke  me  fu n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayuw kule  ke  pu  fu n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ayuw kule  ke  la  pu  fu n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küdaw kule pu  ke  n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>küdaw kule ke  pu  n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The only exception to this organization was this form:

| küdaw kule pa  la   ya   fi n |

(Angélica, 13 February 1992)

(NOTE: the morpheme "ke" indicates regularity, and will be presented in the next section.)

This set of data, which was given by Angélica on 13 February, led me to assume three positions for pa/pu/me. The only piece of contradictory data is the last one shown here, and Angélica stated a temporal difference between "küdaw-küle-ke-pu-n" and "küdaw-küle-pu-ke-n", the former which she translated as "estuve trabajando alla regulamente" = "I was working there regularly and the latter as "estoy trabajando alla regularmente" = "I am working there regularly.

The verb template that I assumed then looked like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT STAT LOC1 &quot;KE&quot; LOC NEG LOC2 T OBJ P/N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

However, this template was inconsistent with the literature (Smeets), so I checked it with another
informant, Armando, who starred all forms including LOC2 and LOC3, giving the "correct" forms which put all LOCs in LOC1, leaving the rest the same. (This happened with LOC2 as well, which I thought was for "me" regardless of the presence of "küle" or not). Checking the data again with Angelica, on March 19, this time she starred all LOC2s and LOC3s as well (without knowing that this was what I was after). Later still she corroborated her second judgements again, leading me to believe that Angelica's second judgements are indeed more reliable data.

Assuming that the data showing a single position for LOC is indeed incorrect, the placement of "küle" appears to be before all morphemes discussed so far, witness the following data:

| Küdaw-küle-n | Estoy trabajando | I am working |
| Dungu-küle-pa-e-yu | Estamos (2) hablando aca | We (2) are talking here |
| Ámuni-küle-la-n | No me estoy yendo | I am not going |
| Küdaw-küle-l-ün | Me estoy dando el trabajo | I'm giving myself work |

The verb paradigm thus far then results like this:

ROOT STAT BEN PASS IMSTAT BEN PASS LOC REP NEG BEN LOC T OBJ M P/N TA REF AFF AG2

16. CONSTANT FEATURE: ke

The morpheme "ke" poses problems both in its definition and its placement. First let's tackle its meaning.

The translation given by Catrileo is that "ke" indicates an action performed regularly. Smeets also says that it "expresses a constant or characteristic feature" (p. 328), or a general rule:

Pod-küle-ke-y | it is always dirty |
Küpa-leli-ke-n | I like to watch movies |
Umáni-pa-ke-la-y ta witran ta | a visitor does not stay here |

(Smeets p. 328)

Angelica agrees with this translation:

Ámu-ke-n | Voy regularmente | I go regularly |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Llama</th>
<th>Gloses</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kūdaw-ke-la-fu-n</td>
<td>no trabajaba reg.</td>
<td>I wasn't regularly working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kūchumu-ke-a-n</td>
<td>me mojaré reg.</td>
<td>I will regularly wet myself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Angéllica)

However, this translation was one that I suggested to her and she agreed with, and the idea of "regularly" did not seem to be a necessarily prominent one in the meaning of the verb.

Other native speakers gave similar glosses to "ke", such as these two:

- Inche kon-ke-n entro siempre (Llanquitru) I always enter
- amu-tu-ke-n siempre regreso (Armando) I always return
- Inche ramtu-ke-yu te pongo reg. (Angéllica) I ask you regularly
  yo te preguntaba (Llanquitru) I was asking you

Yet some given translations seem to attribute no meaning to this morpheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Llama</th>
<th>Gloses</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kūdaw-pa-ke-la-n</td>
<td>No trabajo aquí regularmente (Angéllica)</td>
<td>I don't work here regularly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  no vengo a trabajar (Domingo) | I don't come to work |
| kūdaw-küle-ke-la-fu-n | no estaba trabajando reg. (Angéllica) | I wasn't regularly working |
  * (Domingo) | * |
| Inche utu-ke-yu | te visito regularmente (Angéllica) | I visit you regularly |
  yo te he visitado (Llanquitru) | I have visited you |
| Inche kūdaw-ke-n | yo trabajo regularmente (Angéllica) | I work regularly |
  yo trabajé (Llanquitru) | I worked |
| amu-ke-tu-n | me estoy yendo/ regresando (Angéllica) | I am going/ returning |
  * (Angéllica) | * |
| amu-tu-ke-n | me voy (Angéllica) | I go / was going regularly |
| feyentu-mu-ke-n | me creyeron, obedecieron (Armando) | they believed me, they obeyed me |

56
(Note that here when "ke" is combined with "eyu", one "e" is lost. This data was given by various speakers, and transcribed by me. This means that I may have missed the extra "e", but at the time of transcription it sounded like a single "e". The deletion of one "e" is contradictory to what Angélica later stated, that the two "e"s should be pronounced sequentially.)

The morpheme "ke" appeared in Alonqueo Piutrin "el habla de mi tierra" as a suggestion for translation (as a way of avoiding the confusion between past and present in the base form):

- inche amuken: I have gone
- eymi amukeymi: you have gone
- fey amukey: he has gone

This translation doesn't include the idea of "regularly", and although the translation is in the present tense, it denotes an action in the past.

Smeets states "A -ke- form denotes a situation which may continue into the present. It is therefore often translated as present tense." On two separate occasions Rubén has given me translations for "amu-ke-n" in both past and present: "I go regularly" and "I was going". In both the idea of going regularly is present.

Despite the conflicting data in terms of temporal frame, "ke" usually indicates regularity, and present tense is the tense that glosses are most often given in.

In terms of the placement of "ke", in the data given by Angélica it appears consistently after LOC and before "tu" (ignoring the extra LOCs which I discussed in the last section):

- kiidaw-pu-ke-la-n: I don't work there regularly
- kiidaw-pa-ke-la-ya-fi-mi: you won't work it here regularly

(Angélica 13 Febrero)

Although we haven't discussed "tu" yet, in most of my data "tu" falls before REP.

However, in Smeets this morpheme is placed in Slot 14, which on my template would put it after "tu". When I asked Armando if "ke" could be used before or after "tu", he offered the data above (repeated here):

- amu-ke-tu-n: Me estoy yendo/ regresando I am going/ returning
- amu-tu-ke-n: Siempre regreso I always return

It appears that the order of "ke" relative to other morphemes is somewhat variable, where this variability
affects its meaning, which brings us back to the original question.

To resolve the duality of positions of "ke", I will assign it two positions -- one before "tu" and one after. On the template that we have at this point, however, it will just appear before REP. I am calling "ke" CF, for constant feature, (after Smeets), which approximates the meanings it has appeared with.

ROOT STAT BEN AG2 IMSTAT BEN PASS LOC CF REP NEG BEN LOC OBJ M P/N TA
REF PASS

17. RETURN: TU

The morpheme "tu", although easy to place in our verb template, is also difficult to define. Catrileo states that "tu" indicates "return of an action or fact,"8 (Catrileo, p. 128). The examples that she gives are:

- kullin pagar to pay
- kullitun pagar lo adecuado to pay what is due
- küpan venir to come
- küpatun volver to come back
- amun ir to go
- amutun regresar to go back
- akun llegar to arrive
- akutun llegar de regreso to arrive upon return

(Catrileo p. 128)

However, the idea of return is not as obvious in the data given by other native speakers, where the difference that the "tu" makes is not necessarily consistent. For instance, take a look at data given by Angélica:

- amu-tu-n me voy/ me fui I go/ went, leave/ left
- amu-n fui/ voy I go/ went
- kulli-e-yu te pago I pay you
- kulli-tu-e-yu te lo pago I pay it to you
kulli-f-e-yu te había pagado I had paid you
kulli-tu-f-e-yu te pagué I paid you
(Note that the "u" gets dropped off the Imperfect morpheme "fu" when it appears before the "e". For a full description of the object marker "e", see section 13.)

When Armando was questioned about the meaning of "tu" in the word "ngilla-lel-pu-tu-a-e-yu" = "te compraré (algo) cuando voy", he said that it was "to soften the language."9

One example given by Anglica seems to fit with Catrileo's definition, where "tu" indicates an action/state that once was, ceased to be, and now is again:

nien yo tengo I have
nie-tu-n tener ahora, otro to have now, another

Fewla kiñe we lapiz nietun.
Now I have a new pencil.

This meaning also surfaced in data from the Llanquitruf family:

konün I enter
kon-tu-n when you entered, stopped entering, and after a time started to enter again
(This last translation I believe is a loose one, and that the verb itself only refers to the time when the agent returned to entering, thus marking "return".)

Regardless of the meaning, when "tu" is added to a verb it falls into a position before NEG and usually before CF ("ke"), although it can appear after CF, as seen in the section on CF.

amu-kül-e-tu-n me estoy yendo I'm going
amu-pu-tu-n me voy allá I go there
amu-ke-tu-n me voy regularmente allá I go there regularly
amu-tu-la-n no me voy / fui I don't go / I didn't go
amu-tu-la-ya-n no me iré I won't go
(Angélica)
amu-ke-tu-n me estoy yendo/regresando I am going / returning
amu-tu-ke-n siempre regreso I always return
(Armando)
Since the approximate definition of "tu" is "return", I will label it as RE, rendering the verb template like this:

```
ROOT STAT BEN PASS IMSTAT BEN PASS LOC CF RE CF REP NEG BEN LOC T OBJ M P/N TA
AC2 REF
```

However, just to complicate things, there is another morpheme "tu", homophonous with the morpheme just described, which behaves differently. This one is a verbalizer for nominals, as seen in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOUN</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>VERB</th>
<th>SPANISH</th>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yefal</td>
<td>encargo</td>
<td>order (N)</td>
<td>yefaltun</td>
<td>encargar</td>
<td>order (V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ilo</td>
<td>carne</td>
<td>meat</td>
<td>ilotun</td>
<td>comer carne</td>
<td>eat meat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mate</td>
<td>mate</td>
<td>mate (an herb)</td>
<td>matedun</td>
<td>tomar mate</td>
<td>drink mate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kofke</td>
<td>pan</td>
<td>bread</td>
<td>kofketun</td>
<td>comer pan</td>
<td>eat bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mansana</td>
<td>manzana</td>
<td>apple</td>
<td>mansanatun</td>
<td>comer manzana</td>
<td>eat an apple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanku</td>
<td>banco</td>
<td>seat/bench</td>
<td>wankutun</td>
<td>tomar asiento</td>
<td>sit down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kawell</td>
<td>caballo</td>
<td>horse</td>
<td>kawelltun</td>
<td>ir a caballo</td>
<td>ride a horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>koyla</td>
<td>mentira</td>
<td>lie (N)</td>
<td>koylatun</td>
<td>mentir</td>
<td>lie (V)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Catrileo p. 95)

(Note that the words "mansana", "wanku", and "kawell" all come from Spanish. Catrileo lists these words in her book, as well as others borrowed from Spanish. However, there are some Mapuche academics who reject the usage of such borrowed terms, especially if they are replacing similar terms in Mapudungun.)

This "tu", instead of falling in the position of RE, derives a verb from a noun and can be viewed as part of the newly formed root. As can be seen in the following examples, the "tu" falls before the stative "küle" and not after it, as it would if it were RE:

```
matetu-küle-la-n  no estoy tomado mate       I am not drinking mate
matetu-ke-la-n    no tomo mate (regularmente) I am not drinking mate (regularly)
```
matetu-la-n        no tomo mate  I don't drink mate
                      (Angelica)

Since this "tu" is part of the root and doesn't behave the same way as the RE "tu", I will represent it as part of the root and not separately.

18. IMPOSED STATE: künü

Smeets calls "künü" the "Perfect Persistent", and presents it along with "nie", the "Progressive Persistent", both of which he puts in the same slot. He says that both morphemes indicate a lasting situation, but "nie" is when the agent makes an effort to keep the theme in the given state, and with "künü" the agent makes no such effort. I will only be talking about "künü", but here are some of Smeets examples for "nie" just to give a general idea of its meaning:

(By the way, the verb "nien" also means "to have").

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>lug-nie-fi-n</td>
<td>I kept it white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lug-künu-fi-n</td>
<td>I left it white</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weyel-nie-fi-n</td>
<td>I keep/kept him swimming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weyel-künu-fi-n</td>
<td>I let him swim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puntü-nie-fi-n</td>
<td>I keep it separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puntü-künu-fi-n</td>
<td>I left it separated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Smeets p. 386)

The glosses I have heard for verbs with "künü" generally indicate that the agent argument leaves the theme argument in the indicated state. The agent is indicated by the P/N marker, unless there is another morpheme that specifies the agent.

Mapudungun  | Spanish gloss of Map. | English gloss of Spanish |
------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|
ngilla-lel-künu-a-eyu | te dejaré comprado (algo) | I will leave something bought for you |
ngilla-künu-lel-a-eyu | te dejaré comprado (algo) | I will leave something bought for you (Angelica) |
amul-künu-me-nge-tu-y | se le fue a dejar en algun lugar | he/she sent to leave it for him/her in some place |
amu-l-künu-nge-ya-e-imí | indicar el camino a ustedes 2 | to indicate the path to you two |

(I imagine that this translation is loose, and that "amulkünungeyaeimi" means that the theme (2nd person) is left on the path, after the path has been indicated. In this way the meaning of "künü" would be consistent with the other data. I am unsure why the gloss is "to you two". With the Object morpheme "e", the P/N should indicate the theme (which with BEN is now
the benefactive), and the P/N is 2s.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>amu-l-künu-nge-tu-y</td>
<td>acompañado/a un poco para que no se pierda</td>
<td>accompanied a little so he/she doesn't get lost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feipi-künu-e-tew</td>
<td>ya que me dejo dicho, un encargo</td>
<td>he/she left an order for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feipi-künu-e-new</td>
<td>ya que me dejo dicho, un encargo</td>
<td>he/she left an order for me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pültrüntu-künu-le-fu-l-iñ</td>
<td>si le hubiesemos dejado puesto (algo)</td>
<td>if we had left (something) attached on it</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above verbs the meaning of "künu" is fairly consistent. In the cases where it is translated as "accompanied a little", I understand it in the sense that the guide accompanied them, and then left them on the path after a little bit (as explained above).

In the list above, there are three odd pieces of data, which have the 3s indicative P/N, but are translated with 1s indicative. I tend to believe that this is erroneous data, since in no other situation have I seen 3s P/N used for 1s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ünif-künu-ye-y</td>
<td>dejé extendido</td>
<td>P/N = 3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ye is a pluralizer verbal morpheme)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amul-el-künu-y</td>
<td>eché a andar allí/ envié a traves de para alguien</td>
<td>P/N = 3s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amul-el-me-künu-y</td>
<td>yo fui a otra parte para ayudar a funcionar algo</td>
<td>P/N = 3s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that there are three such mysteries, instead of a single lone aberration, indicates that "künu" may change the argument frame in some underdetermined way. Such speculation, however, must be put aside for investigation in future research.

The second two of the odd data above furthermore do not suggest that "künu" means "leaving in a state". Neither does the following data. With the exception of the first two, all of the following examples appear with BEN, which may be affecting the meaning. I conjecture that the first two may be an idiomatic use of the morpheme "künu".
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amu-kūnu-me-n  fui de una carrera  I went and came back quickly
amu-kūnu-y  dió unos pasos  he/she/it took a few steps
amul-el-nge-kūnu-y  le hicieron andar a 3a persona  he/she made a 3rd person walk;
                 he/she made something work for someone else
amu-lel-nge-kūnu-n  me hicieron andar a mi  they made me walk, something work for
me                                             
amul-kūnu-lel-me-n  le fui a hacer funcionar/ I went to make something work for him/
her                                            
amul-el-kūnu-lel-m-e-n  anda/ve a hacer funcionar/ go make something work
                        andar (algo)
                        
(Armando)

(The only way I could make this last example fit the translation is to assume that the speaker is ordering that the second person go make something work for that speaker, even though this was not specified by Armando. In this case the "e" is an object marker, and BEN makes the theme the benefactive, and TA indicates agent, which is 2cnd person. This implies that the "e" from LOC "me" is lost next to the OBJ "e".)

Although this second set of data does not include the idea of the theme being "left" in some state, the translations do show that there is some control from without (excluding the first two examples.) Therefore I will generalize and call the slot for "kūnu" IMSTAT, for "imposed state." This covers the idea that if the theme is left in a state by the agent, then the theme has that state imposed on it. It also includes the second set of data, in which "kūnu" seems to indicate that a state is imposed on the theme from without.

The position of "kūnu", according to the data below, is most easily described by putting it between the first PASS and BEN. A new position for LOC preceding IMSTAT is now needed as well to account for the example "amul-el-me-ke-ku-ny". As was stated in the section on the passive "nge", a new position could have been created for IMSTAT to avoid the second slots for BEN, PASS, and now LOC. However, the following data point illustrates that two BENs can appear on either side of IMSTAT, which means that the second BEN is necessary in any case, so it is descriptively simpler to propose an extra BEN and PASS.

amu-l-ke-ku-ny-lel-y to help carry something halfway10 (Armando)
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With the addition of IMSTAT and the new LOC, the verb template in its final state is now:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROOT</th>
<th>STAT</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>IMSTAT</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>PASS</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>CF</th>
<th>REP</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>BEN</th>
<th>LOC</th>
<th>OBJ</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>P/N</th>
<th>TA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevertheless, this template is by no means complete. There are a number of verbal morphemes which were not included at all, and of those that have been discussed there may be additional arrangements. New data may furthermore indicate that it would be descriptively simpler to organize the morphemes differently, and perhaps even dispense with the verb template altogether. In any case this template can be used as a guide to understanding the structure and semantics of the verb morphology in Mapudungun.

**FURTHER RESEARCH**

This study has attempted to present systematically some of the general characteristics of the
verb morphology in Mapudungun. In any case, however, it is impossible to fully address every aspect of the verb morphology, much less every characteristic of Mapudungun. The data collected for this paper raise many questions, which could be topics for future investigation of this language. These questions range across the Phonology, Semantics and Syntax of Mapudungun.

For instance, the verb structure laid out in this paper is contradicted by one datum, presented in section 13: "kúchumwu-la-yeyu" = "I won't get you wet". This example is strange because the reflexive marker "wu" co-occurs with "e", the object marker. Supposedly each of these morphemes are marking the theme, which means that we end up with two themes, which is illegal.

A Syntactic and Semantic question that arose in the section on the Subjunctive is whether the "chi" in forms such as "kidawînchi" is part of the verb or a separate particle. I suspect that this "chi" is not a part of the verb, but an investigation of the other environments in which "chi" can appear with a similar meaning would enlighten this problem. This is one of many homophonous "chi" morphemes, it seems. For instance, when "chi" is added onto the verb root before a noun, it turns the verb into a modifier of the noun:

- rupachi dungu: the past, what passed the past things
- tripayechi che: the people who left
- aku-ye-chi domo: the women who have arrived

("Ye" is a pluralizer verbal morpheme.)

In addition, as seen in the section on the Subjunctive, "chi" is the P/N for 1s in the Subjunctive mood. One has to be careful not to confuse this "chi" with "chi"s with other meanings such as this one.

As was discussed in the penultimate section of this paper, the semantics of the verbal morpheme "kún" has yet to be resolved. It seems to indicate that a state of some sort is imposed from without, but this meaning doesn't arise in all of the translations. With a wider body of data perhaps the meaning of this morpheme could be better defined.

Another Semantic issue which arose is the difference between present and past tense. Most of the time this difference is not morphologically marked, and seems instead to be dependent on a categorization of the verbs themselves. This in itself is a topic that merits more study in order to better define the characteristics of the verbs for which the base form indicates present tense, versus the characteristics of those for which the base form indicates past tense.

(Catrileo p. 158)
In some dialects, though, there seems to be a morphological marking of present and past in verbs where the very last vowel is -u-. The difference here is that the present, which is marked by -o-, may be in fact derived from the "u" + the future "a" by some phonological process. This future is however a more proximate future than that normally indicated by the future morpheme "a". This phenomenon needs to be studied more in order to determine if this really is a conjunction of "u" and the future morpheme. If it is, does it indicate the future, a "proximate future", or the present tense?

The phonology of Mapudungun in general was not addressed in this paper, but many phonologically interesting data are listed here. In particular, unusual things happen when morphemes appear before the letter "e". In the first place, when two "e"s fall next to each other, one of them may get deleted. Angélica stated that both of them are pronounced sequentially, but in some data here only one "e" was present:

- Inche utu-k-e-yu    Angélica: I visit you regularly
- Inche ramtu-k-e-yu    Llanquitru: I have visited you
- amul el-kīnu-lel-m-e-n    Llanquitru: I was asking you

In addition, Armando stated that words that end in "e-yu", the "e" is sometimes dropped when preceded by an "a". For example:

- kon-tu-a-yu    entrará en ti (en la alma)    I will enter you (in your soul)
- kon-tu-la-yu    no te entré    I didn't enter you
- kon-tu-la-ya-yu    no te entré    I won't enter you

The phonological environments in which these changes occur could be a topic for investigation, as well as what these changes do to the accent structure of Mapudungun.

Another oddity is present in the example listed above, "kūchum-wu-la-ye-yu" = "I won't get you wet". A consistent phonological rule that I have observed is the addition of "y" between two "a"s:

\[ \emptyset \rightarrow y / a# \_ \_ #a \]

In this example this same phonological rule is applied to the conjunction of an "a" and an "e". This may be a regular change that takes place in some regions or phonological environments, or it may be simply a single stray exception.

A phonological/morphological phenomenon that was addressed briefly in the section on the
Sitative is the addition of "kaw" or "w" to the verbal root in the presence of "küle". With the exception of "ngillakan" = "go shopping", I have never run across this morpheme in any other circumstances. Whether "kaw" is a separate morpheme which uniformly changes the meaning of the verb, or "ka" is the morpheme which undergoes a phonological process is not apparent with the data in this paper.

The questions presented in this section are some of those that arise based on the data collected for this paper. In future studies they could be used as starting points for investigation about the various aspects of Mapudungun. In the face of the growing interest in learning Mapudungun among both Mapuche and winka, and political efforts to support the use of Mapudungun, it is with these ends that I offer the present account of my investigation of Mapudungun during February-April, 1992. With hope, this paper will be of use to those people interested in learning the language of the Mapuche, and perhaps will serve to initiate additional linguistic studies of Mapudungun.
### Appendix A: VERB TEMPLATE SUMMARY

| ROOT | STAT | BEN | PASS | LOC | IMST | BEN | PASS | LOC | REF | AG2 | CF | RE | CF | REP | NEG | BEN | T | OBJ | M | P/N | TA | AFF | etc.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>küle</td>
<td>lel</td>
<td>nge</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>künu</td>
<td>lel</td>
<td>nge</td>
<td>pa</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>tu</td>
<td>ke</td>
<td>rke</td>
<td>lel</td>
<td>lel</td>
<td>a fi</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>el</td>
<td>(u)w</td>
<td>el</td>
<td>pu</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>el</td>
<td>fu</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>l'</td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>mu</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>nu/ki l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. amu ke tu n
2. amu tu ke n
3. küdaw me ke la fu n
4. entu ki fi l chi
5. küdaw pu ke la n
6. küdaw küle me tu rke la a fi n
7. kücha
8. matetu küle me la n
9. küdaw küle me ke la fu n
10. küdaw el pu ke la ya fi n
11. küdaw pu ke la fu n
12. ngilla pu la a e yu
13. kúpal el pu tu a e yu
14. ngilla lel pu tu a e yu
15. amu lel künu amu lel künu amu lel künu amu lel künu
16. küdaw el nge pa ka ll a lu
17. amul künu lel me n
18. amul el künu lel me n
19. amul künu lel me n
20. amul el nge künu y
21. amu künu pu y
22. el künu lel nge me la ya y
23. pútirintuku künu lel nge pu l iin
24. amu künu nge tu y
25. amu lel nge tu y
26. amu lel nge tu la y
27. amu lel me künu y
28. wiño lel nge tu la y
29. kücha tu (l) ke la e yu

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WORD</th>
<th>SOURCE</th>
<th>TRANSLATIONS</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. amu-ke-tu-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>me voy siempre</td>
<td>Armando me estoy yendo/ regresando, pero es poco común</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. amu-tu-ke-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>me voy siempre</td>
<td>siempre regreso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. küdaw-me-ke-la-fu-n</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>no iba a trabajar</td>
<td>cada vez que yo iba, no iba a trabajar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. entu-ki-fi-l-chi</td>
<td>Catréleo</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>Juanita: nentu-ki-fi-l-chi = que no lo voy a sacar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. küdaw-pu-ke-la-n</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>no trabajo allí regularmente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. küdaw-küle-me-a-fi-n</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>lo iré a trabajar (implica regreso)</td>
<td>lo iré a trabajar, pero no implica regreso</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. kūcha-tur-ke-la-e-yu</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>no te lave/ había lavado algo</td>
<td>de repente no vamos a poder lavar, o nunca lavamos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. matetu-küle-la-n</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>no estoy tomando mate</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. küdaw-küle-me-ke-la-fu-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>no estaba trabajando reg. allí y regresando</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. küdaw-el-pu-la-yá-fi-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>no le iré a trabajar allá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. küdaw-pu-ke-la-fu-n</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>no iba a trabajar allá</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ngilla-pu-l-a-e-yu</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>te lo comprare allá para ti/ te comprare a ti allá</td>
<td>José: *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12b. ngilla-lel-pu-a-e-yu</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. küpal-el-a-e-n</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>me traerás algo (falta complemento)</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ngilla-lel-pu-tu-a-e-yu</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>te compraré (algo) cuando voy – tu para dar suavidad a la lengua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. amu-lel-künü-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>1. le hizo andar/ funcionar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amu-l-künü-lel-y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. ayudar a llevar algo a la mitad del camino, o hasta la mitad-del camino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amu-künü-lel-y)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. (envió a través de alguien para alguien) – poco común</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>deberia haber permitido que le trabaje una 3a persona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. küdaw-el-ng-e-pa-ka-il-á-lyu</td>
<td>Catrileo</td>
<td></td>
<td>le fui a hacer funcionar/ andar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. amul-künü-lel-me-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>enviáme lo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17b. amulkünumeafin</td>
<td>Angélica</td>
<td>le fui a hacer funcionar/ andar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. amul-el-künü-lel-mé-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>1. anda o ve a hacer funcionar/andar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18b. amul-kelel-me-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. le fui a ayudar a funcionar algo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. amul-künü-lel-me-n</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot; &quot; pero mas rigida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. amu-lel-ng-ku-nu-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>lo dejó/ dejaron funcionando</td>
<td>le hicieron andar a 3a persona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. amu-künü-pu-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>se escapó, arrancó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. el-künü-lel-ng-e-me-la-ya-y</td>
<td>Catrileo</td>
<td>no se lo iran a dejar</td>
<td>no se le ayudará ir a dejar algo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22b. el-lel-ng-e-me-la-ya-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>no se lo iran a dejar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. pülltrüntuku-künü-lel-fu-li-iñ</td>
<td>Amulungun</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>OK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. amu-künü-ng-e-tu-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>acompañada/o un poco para que no se pierda, o cuando muere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. amu-I-künu-ngé-tu-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>acompañado/a un poco para que no se pierda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. amu-le-ngé-tu-la-y</td>
<td>Armando</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>no se le hizo funcionar/ no se le llevó</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 27. amu-lel-me-kunuy   | Armando | ----| 1. alguien ayuda a llevar a la mitad del camino algo para alguien  
|                        |         |    | 2. se fue a hacer funcionar algo         |
| 28. wiñolelgetulay     | Angelica| no se lo devolvieron | ---- |
| 29. kúcha-tu-I-ke-la-e-yu | Armando | ---- | nunca te he lavado |
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Appendix B: ORIGINAL QUOTES

1. Salas: “ki es . . . eventualmente reforzado por el sufijo -no.”

2. “lle’ o ‘l’ usado entre el verbo y la terminación de sujeto indica voluntad y cierta determinación de parte del hablante”. (Catrileo p. 145)

3. “. . . ocurrencia, sorpresa y continuidad” (Catrileo p. 125)

4. amul-el-nge-kunu-y le hicieron andar algo a 3a persona
   amul-el-nge-kunu-n me hicieron andar algo a mi
   amu-I-kűnu-ngue-tu-y 1. acompañada/ o un poco para que no se pierda, para indicar el camino
                          2. acompañarlo cuando muere -- para su viaje
                          Subject = la acompañada, el acompañado
                          (Armando)

5. amul-kunu-lel-me-n le fui a hacer funcionar/ andar (algo)
   amul el-kűnu-lel-me-n anda o ve a hacer funcionar/ andar
   amul-el-kűnu-l-me-n la misma cosa, pero más rígido -- se puede decir, pero no es correcto SOCIALMENTE
                           Angélica: *
   amu-l-kűnu-y hizo andar a algo/ alguien
   amu-lel-kűnu-y envío a través de para alguien
   amul-kunu-me-nge-tu-y se le fue a dejar en algún lugar
                           (Armando)

6. kūdaw-kūle-a-f-imi lo estaras trabajando
   kūdaw-kūle-ke-f-imi lo trabajas continuamente
   kūdaw-kūle-la-pu-f-imi no estaras trabajando regularmente allí
                           (Angélica)

7. Title: "Hacia Un Analysis Funcional de -Am y -Ael"

8. ”. . . regreso de una acción o hecho.” (Catrileo, p. 128)

9. Armando: “‘tu’ para dar suavidad a la lengua”.

10. amu-l-kűnu-lel-y “ayudar a llevar algo a la mitad del camino, o hasta la mitad del camino” (Armando)

11. rupachi dungu = el pasado, lo que pasó, las cosas pasadas
    tripayechi che = la gente que salió
    akuyechi domo = las mujeres que han llegado
                    (Catrileo p. 158)
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