



# Anthropological Linguistics

---

VOLUME 38, NUMBER 3

FALL 1996

**Offprint**

**A Reconstruction of the Earliest Songish Text**

**TIMOTHY MONTLER**

## A Reconstruction of the Earliest Songish Text

TIMOTHY MONTLER

*University of North Texas*

**Abstract.** This paper presents a reconstruction of what is probably the earliest recorded text in any Straits Salishan language. The text, a traditional tale told by Thomas James of Songhees, near Victoria, British Columbia, was recorded and first published in 1907 by Charles Hill-Tout. Modern researchers have routinely dismissed Hill-Tout's linguistic work on Northern Straits as unusable. This paper shows that Hill-Tout's transcription is better than it first appears and that, given our current understanding of the phonology and grammar of Northern Straits and other Salishan languages, useful versions of his work can be reconstructed.

**1. Introduction.** From the 1890s through the 1930s Charles Hill-Tout conducted and reported on ethnological, archeological, and linguistic fieldwork in the Salishan-speaking areas of southern British Columbia. In Salishan linguistics alone his output was prodigious. From 1899 to 1911 he published grammatical, lexical, and textual material on Thompson, Squamish, Sechelt, Lillooet, Okanagan, Songish, and four dialects of Halkomelem. In his day there was certainly no publishing scholar who knew the Salishan languages as well as Hill-Tout.

In his four volume edition of Hill-Tout's collected ethnological work, Ralph Maud (1978a-d) gives a detailed and sensitive biography and summary of Hill-Tout, his work, and contemporary attitudes toward it. In short, Hill-Tout was a self-made "professor" with very little advanced education and no training whatsoever in the areas to which he came to dedicate his life. Because he lacked training he also lacked any preconceived notion of scientific method and of what might be a useful focus for scientific investigation. He was as occupied with psychic phenomena as he was with cultural and linguistic phenomena. He was as interested in the speculative relationships among North American, Oceanic, and Asian languages as in the relationships among the Salishan languages he knew well. Because of his unconstrained theorizing and, I suspect, also because of an element of cultural elitism in his work, Hill-Tout was snubbed by Boas and considered a dilettante and something of a joke among those of the great, rising school of American anthropology.

In spite of the attitudes of leading contemporary anthropologists, Hill-Tout's work was well acknowledged by numerous citations in Boas's publications. In the bibliography of Boas (1916), for example, Hill-Tout, with seven references, is



the most-cited author after Boas himself. And Hill-Tout's published linguistic data were crucial to Boas and Haeberlin (1927).

Hill-Tout's linguistic work has not fared as well in recent times. In the second half of this century he has been only very rarely cited. His linguistic materials are almost entirely missing from Maud's edition. After all, for all the languages Hill-Tout studied there are today excellent published grammatical, lexical, and textual materials produced by well-trained professional linguists. And at best Hill-Tout's work is difficult to use (see section 2). Mitchell's impression of Hill-Tout's work represents the modern attitude: "Hill-Tout's (1907) material, both in English and Songish, was considered but attempts to pronounce the latter forms, from his transcriptions, were none too successful" (1968:5). Mention of Hill-Tout in Raffo (1972) is limited to repeating this same quote of Mitchell. Moreover, there is no mention of Hill-Tout in Montler (1986), since in my early work on Klallam and Saanich I had taken a look at Hill-Tout's Songish material and hastily deemed it useless.

A few pages after the previous quotation Mitchell continues documentation of her heroic effort to make use of Hill-Tout:

. . . verification on a very limited scale was attempted with Hill-Tout's 1907 paper. However, the author's imperfect transcription system and his desire to force the grammar into a European framework made corroboration difficult except for a relatively small number of forms. [Mitchell 1968:7]

However, Mitchell follows these words with an insightful remark that brings us to the point of the present paper: "On the other hand, as the Songish texts are analyzed his work may become a more useful reference" (1968:7).

In this paper I have taken Hill-Tout's one published Songish text, deciphered, retranscribed, and sometimes corrected it with a complete grammatical analysis based on our current understanding of Northern Straits and neighboring languages. As far as I have been able to determine, this text is the earliest recorded for either of the Straits languages, including all of the dialects of Northern Straits and Klallam. Boas had recorded Northern Straits material some years before, but there is no record of his having written down any texts. What I hope to accomplish is to make this text available to those interested in Salishan linguistics, to show that Hill-Tout's linguistic work is not useless, to make some substantive linguistic discoveries in the Songish dialect of Northern Straits, and to encourage those who are familiar with the other languages Hill-Tout studied to revive his work in those areas. The analytical reconstruction is presented in section 4, the commentary listed by line number in section 5, and the conclusion in section 6.

**2. Hill-Tout's Songish sketch.** Songish, called *LEk-oñénEñ<sup>1</sup>* by Hill-Tout, is a dialect of Northern Straits, a Coast Salishan language. It is most similar to the Saanich dialect of Northern Straits, differing from it in only minor phonetic



variation and in a very few lexical items. Other recorded dialects of Northern Straits, Lummi, Samish, and Sooke have slightly greater differences from Songish in pronunciation and grammar, but are still quite similar (see Montler 1996).

Songish was the aboriginal language of the area of modern Victoria, British Columbia. To my knowledge there are currently no native speakers of Songish. The last fluent speakers are generally believed to have passed away in the early 1980s. There was, however, one native Songish speaker living on the Elwha Klallam Reservation in Washington until she passed away in 1993. Thus our only resources now on the Songish language are those texts, grammars, and word lists recorded by linguists and anthropologists: by Boas, Hill-Tout, Suttles, Mitchell, and Raffo.

Hill-Tout's Songish material is the most extensive published. In thirty-four pages Hill-Tout lists approximately 600 elicited phrases sorted more or less by grammatical construction and semantic content, a 120 sentence narrative text with word-by-word interlinear glosses, and an alphabetical word list containing some 800 lexical items. The sheer quantity of this data exceeds many modern treatments of Salishan grammars. The grammatical material is not excessively "forced into a European framework" as are some early missionary grammars. Once one gets past its basic problems, it is in some ways more useful than more recent sketches.

For example, the future particle has slightly different syntax in Saanich, Klallam, and Lummi. In Saanich the 'past' particle precedes the first and second person subject markers. The 'future' *səʔ* has the same position as the 'past' particle in the second person, but it follows the first person subject markers. In Klallam the 'future' precedes all first and second person subject markers, but the first person singular subject has a special form in the future. In Lummi both the 'past' and 'future' precede the first and second person subjects with no modification. A reasonable and possibly interesting question would be "How does Songish do it?" I was unable to determine this from Raffo (1972). The pattern can be deduced from Mitchell's data (1968:87), but there are no exactly comparable forms. In Hill-Tout's data the answer is laid out clearly in several paradigms: Songish is like Saanich.

The first and the major problem one encounters with Hill-Tout's linguistics is its phonetics. For some things he had a remarkably good ear. The well-known Salishan consonant clusters seem to have been less difficult for him than one would expect, and he usually did hear and transcribe the difference between the prevelar and postvelar fricatives that nearly everyone has difficulty with.

There is evidence in this text that Hill-Tout's ear was better than his understanding of transcription. Although he was generally deaf to glottal stops and glottalization—even to the very distinctive ejection of stops and affricates—he occasionally did manage to indicate them. In line 1, and in a few other places in this text, glottalization is indicated by a vowel sequence—suggesting that he was hearing things he did not know how to transcribe.



His transcriptional system was probably taken from Boas (1891). The following is a paraphrased summary of Hill-Tout's presentation of his system (1907: 313-14): Vowels: *a*, as in English *hat*; *ā*, as in *father*; *â*, as in *all*; *ä*, as in *gnat*; *e*, as in *pen*; *ē*, as in *they*; *i*, as in *pin*; *ī*, as in *pique*; *o*, as in *pond*; *ō*, as in *tone*; *u*, as in *but*; *ū*, as in *boot*; *ɛ*, as in *flower*; and *ʷ*, which sometimes follows the palatalized *k*. Diphthongs: *ai*, as in *aisle*; *au*, as in *cow*; *oi*, as in *boil*. Consonants: *h*, *k*, *m*, *l*, *p*, *s*, *t*, *w*, *y*, *ts*, all as in English; *ḳ*, a strongly palatalized or "clicked" *k*; *tl*, an explosive palatalized *l*; *ñ*, a strongly nasalized *n*, equal to *ng*; *q*, as in *ch* in *loch* in broad Scotch; *q̣*, approximately as *wh* is uttered in North Britain; *c*, as in English *sh*; *tc*, as *ch* in *church*; *kw*, as *qu* in *quantity*.

The preceding are the symbols that appear in the text. In addition he lists a *k* with a subdot, "intermediate between our *k* and *g*," a *p* followed by an apostrophe, "a kind of semi-mute, semi-sonant," and a small capital *h*, "as in the German *ich*," all of which appear only in the word list, not in the text.

The vowels present the largest problem to retranscription for several reasons. The major phonetic differences in vowels among the Northern Straits dialects make it difficult to determine exactly what the original quality was through comparative evidence. There is also considerable variation in vowel quality within a dialect. For example, what I have transcribed as *e* has allophonic variants [e], [ɛ], and [æ]. Also, Hill-Tout was not terribly consistent with his transcription key. It seems, though, that the text was done with a different key in mind than the other material in the sketch. For example, *ē* never matches the key, but is nearly always [i]; *ā* rarely matches the key and is usually used to represent [e]. The word list and the grammatical material are, though not models of precision, more consistent with the key.

Thus Hill-Tout used a different transcriptional system for the text than for the grammatical material and the word list. The text transcription lacks several consonant distinctions that appear in the other parts, and the transcriptions of the vowels in the text are different and somewhat more inconsistent. Given these facts, it seems likely that Hill-Tout collected the text first, then later, after the transcriptional system was more polished, picked up the paradigms and lexical items.

Phonetics is not the only problem with Hill-Tout's linguistics. Often the gloss does not match what the word or phrase must actually be. This can be seen here and there throughout the text. One example in line 117, where Hill-Tout glossed the word *?it̄ən* as 'get up', when it actually means 'eat'. His grammatical analysis suffers from a similar problem. Under a list of forms headed "Desiderative Forms" (Hill-Tout 1907:324), the first two, given in example (1), certainly contain the conjectural marker *yax<sup>w</sup>* and must actually be rendered as in example (2).

- (1) *I wish I had struck it*, ctcut-yuk-sen-ala.  
*I wish we had struck it*, ctcut-yuk-tlta-ala.

- (2) *ščát yax<sup>w</sup> sən ?al* 'I must have hit it.'  
*ščát yax<sup>w</sup> ltə ?al* 'We must have hit it.'

In another place he states, "there is a secondary past which answers pretty nearly to our 'perfect past'" (Hill-Tout 1907:321). Then he lists sentences of the pattern given in example (3); these must represent the sentences shown in example (4), which certainly have nothing to do with perfect past.

- (3) *I have been sick, klā-lā-sEn-sqátlatl.*  
*thou hast been sick, klā-lā-sōq-sqátlatl.*
- (4) *λ'áy' ləʔ sən sxéləl* *I was sick, too/again.*  
*λ'áy' ləʔ sx<sup>w</sup> sxéləl* *You were sick, too/again.*

Beyond these honest mistakes, the likes of which appear in any pioneering grammar, Hill-Tout did some outright fudging. This appears in several places in the text where he did not record what the consultant said but wrote part of the text himself in very bad Songish. These cases, however, are limited to the very narrow context of reporting clauses, which are pointed out in the comments on individual lines and discussed for line 117.

**3. The story.** The text, told to Hill-Tout by Thomas James of Songhees, is the story of *Smátəqsən*, also known as "Snotboy" or simply "Snot." Gunther (1925) records six versions of this story from Jamestown and Elwha Klallam speakers. Unfortunately, her versions are in English only; she refers to the main character as "Mucus Boy." All of the Elwha Klallam elders I have talked to and many of the younger people know this story. In Klallam the character is known as *Sma?mítqsn*, 'Snotboy' or 'Little Snot'. I have also heard this story from speakers of Malahat Samish. It is unknown to the Saanich speakers with whom I have worked and also to the Becher Bay Klallams.<sup>2</sup>

Thomas James provided Hill-Tout with a more detailed version of the story in English (Hill-Tout 1907:334–36; also in Maud 1978d:135–37). The following summarizes the version recorded by Hill-Tout:

A girl is tricked by a monster into going with him to his home. The girl's ten brothers, one at a time, go to look for her. The monster, who lives across a lake, is alerted by Crane when anyone comes near. Each brother's approach is signaled by Crane so that the monster is prepared. The monster tears out the heart of each brother and devours it.

Meanwhile the mother is weeping unceasingly. She wipes her nose on some moss and it begins to move and grow. Soon it is a baby that grows quickly into a strong man whose name is Snot.

The new son sees his mother crying and asks her what's wrong. She tells him. He then prepares for battle and goes off to find his siblings.



He arrives at the lake, is announced by Crane, but defeats the monster. He retrieves his brothers' hearts from inside the monster, replaces them, and brings them back to life.

They return home and the mother is happy again. Snot and the brothers go duck hunting. There is a dispute between Snot and the eldest brother about whose arrow got a duck. Snot addresses the eldest brother respectfully as *láx'* 'eldest sibling'. The eldest brother takes offense at this and tells him he is nothing but snot, not his brother.

Snot goes home, gets in bed, and pulls the covers over his head. His mother tries to rouse him but gets no response. When she pulls back the blanket she finds the boy no longer there, only snot.

**4. The reconstruction.** The following reconstruction relies on my knowledge of Northern Straits and regular patterns I have found especially in Saanich texts. Montler (1996) shows that among the Northern Straits dialects, Saanich and Songish are closest phonologically and grammatically. The analysis given here is essentially the same as that in Montler (1986, 1991, 1993). I have also relied heavily on Mitchell (1968) and Raffo (1972), the two modern treatments of the Songish dialect. When none of these were adequate in the decipherment of particular words in the text, I made use of modern descriptions of other Coast Salishan languages, including Klallam (Thompson and Thompson 1987; Montler 1995), Halkomelem (Galloway 1980), Lushootseed (Bates, Hess, and Hilbert 1994), and Squamish (Kuipers 1967). The comments on the lines, given in section 5, indicate where this has been done.

For purposes of comparison, and since Hill-Tout's original text is not readily available except on microfilm, I have included a copy of his transcription and translation first, before my own rendition. Comments on his transcription and my reconstruction follow in section 5. Line numbers followed by a dagger are those that are commented on in section 5.

- 1<sup>†</sup> *Skwácin utlsmeántc.* Click on boxes to go to comments  
 Skwacin was chewing gum.  
*s-√k<sup>w</sup>éy=šən. ?át-s-√mán<'>č.*  
 be chewing pitch
- 2<sup>†</sup> “*Enátce úña uts en-smánitc.*”  
 (Said she) “Give me some of your gum.”  
*“√?ən?é čī √?áŋ-ə-s ?ə tsə ?ən'-s-√mánəč.”*  
 come IMP give me OBL DEM your gum
- 3 “*Enátci ésūwa*  
 “come-you with me  
*“√?ən?é čī ?i?-√sawé?.*  
 come IMP go along

4<sup>†</sup> *ā kwāseSEM a kwícqilas ñuñ smānitc.*  
and I show you where is lots of gum" (said he).

*√?ak<sup>w</sup>á?-sə sən ?ə k<sup>w</sup>i šx<sup>w</sup>-√?álə-s √ŋən' s-√mánəč.*  
show you I OBL DEM place for much gum

5<sup>†</sup> *Nētl-sō yās k.wācúNETEN.*  
Then they went together.

*√nił s-əw'-√yé?-s √q<sup>w</sup>a?-šən-ət-əŋ.*  
it is goes is accompanied on foot

6<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō "aqéin átce tE cwólas tE smānitc?"*  
Then (said she) "Where is the place of the gum?"

*√nił s-əw'-čté-t-s "√?əxín ?áčə tə šx<sup>w</sup>-√?álə-s tə s-mánəč?"*  
it is asks him where REQ DEM place for DEM gum

7 *"Tūq tcilálatlta étūs."*  
"Nearly there-we getting" (said he).

*"tx<sup>w</sup>-√čəlél tə ?i?-√tás."*  
become almost we arriving there

8<sup>†</sup> *YE-kúmtES tE sélekwus tE skēts.*  
She breaks off the fringe-of the blanket-her.

*√yé? √q'ám'-t-əs tə √síl=ək<sup>w</sup>əs-s tə √tq'ít-s.*  
go she's breaking it off DEM √cloth=side-3POS DEM her clothes

9<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō ēYE- kúlkutes.*  
Then she hangs it on the limbs of the trees.

*√nił s-əw'-?i?-√yé?-s √q'ál'q'-ət-əs.*  
it is goes along she's tangling it

10 *Sō yās ēcutuñ.*  
Then they go on walking.

*s-əw'-√yé?-s ?i?-√šát-əŋ.*  
they go walking along

11 *nētl sō hais tE sélekwus.*  
Then she finished the fringe.

*√nił s-əw'-√háy-s tə √síl=ək<sup>w</sup>əs.*  
it is finish DEM √cloth=side

12<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō tūq tcekaíwuks skelukelánliñuq,*  
Then she bent the boughs young trees,

*√nił s-əw'-tx<sup>w</sup>-č-√q'áy<'>=əqs-s tsə s-qəl+√qəl-él=ŋəx<sup>w</sup>,*  
it is DEM trees



- 13 *tus utsä qátca,*  
they get to a lake.

$\sqrt{tás}$              $ʔə$  *tsə*     $\sqrt{xáčəʔ}$ .  
arrive there OBL DEM lake

- 14<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō kwáles tE slēñ.*  
Then spake the crane.

$\sqrt{nīl s-əw'-\sqrt{q}^wél-s}$  *tə*     $s-\sqrt{líj}$ .  
it is            speak DEM crane

- 15<sup>†</sup> *Sō enás o tátcil tluttalē.*  
Then there appears a shallow-canoe.

$s-əw'-\sqrt{ʔənʔé-s}$      $ʔəw'$   $\sqrt{téc-əl}$          $\chi'ə+\sqrt{\chi'aléy'}$   
they come            arrive here    small shovel-nosed canoe

- 16 “*áletl-tcē.*”                            *Nētl so áletls.*  
“Get-in-you” (said he). Then they get in.

$\sqrt{ʔáləł}$     *či!*”  $\sqrt{nīl s-əw'-\sqrt{ʔáləł-s}$ .  
go aboard IMP it is            goes aboard

- 17 *sō tákwels;*  
Then they cross.

$s-əw'-\sqrt{t'ék}^w-əl-s$ .  
goes across

- 18<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō tcañs*                            *tsāa Skwācin.*  
Then they reach the home of that Skwacin.

$\sqrt{nīl s-əw'-\sqrt{č'éŋ'-s}$                     *tséʔə sk<sup>w</sup>éyšan.*  
it is            arrives home DEM

- 19<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō “nūwēliñ-tcē.”*  
Then “Go in” (said he).

$\sqrt{nīl s-əw'-\sqrt{sé-t-s}$ ,                    “ $\sqrt{nəw'-íl-əŋ}$  *či!*”  
it is            he tells her enter            IMP

- 20 *Nētl sō nūwēliñs.*  
Then she-went-in.

$\sqrt{nīl s-əw'-\sqrt{nəw'-íl-əŋ-s}$ .  
it is            enters

- 21<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō qaitēñs*  
Then she-slipped-down

$\sqrt{nīl s-əw'-\sqrt{qxí-t-əŋ-s}$ .  
it is            is made to slip

- 22 *nētl sō slēñistens,*  
then he picked her up,  
*√nīl s-əw'-√stí-ŋə-st-əŋ-s.*  
it is is stood upright
- 23 *sō amât'ens;*  
and set her down;  
*s-əw'-√?ámət-t-əŋ-s.*  
is set down
- 24<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō umuts tsāa Skwācin umuts slēñli.*  
then sat down that Skwacin sat down (also) the girl.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√?ámət-s tsé?ə sk<sup>w</sup>éyšən, √?ámət tsə s-√tēni?.*  
it is sits DEM sit DEM woman
- 25 *Nētl sō kwálnūkwel.*  
Then they talked together.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√q<sup>w</sup>əl-nák<sup>w</sup>əl-s.*  
it is talk to each other
- 26<sup>†</sup> *Skwācin "Kwenála uncwelākwa?"*  
Skwacin (said) "How many your brothers?"  
*√čte-t-əŋ ?ə tə sk<sup>w</sup>éyšən, "√k<sup>w</sup>ən=élə ?ən'-šx<sup>w</sup>-√?<əl>áq<sup>w</sup>ə??"*  
is asked OBL DEM how many your siblings
- 27<sup>†</sup> *"ápen-tlta"*  
"Ten-we" (said she)  
*√?ápən tlə."*  
ten we
- 28<sup>†</sup> *tōwa kwālkwels tsau nenétlia kw'tl-kwal te slēñ.*  
awhile they talked they when cry out the crane.  
*təwə-√q<sup>w</sup>él+q<sup>w</sup>əl tsə w' nə+√nīl-iyə ?i? k<sup>w</sup>t-√q<sup>w</sup>él tə s-√lín.*  
still talking DEM CON they and already speak DEM crane
- 29 *Nētl sō te k.wéstens.*  
Then the the canoe brings him over.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√t'ək<sup>w</sup>í-st-əŋ-s.*  
it is is taken across
- 30<sup>†</sup> *"Nētl unskw'kwa?" "Nētl"*  
"Is that your brother?" (he asks) "It is" (she replies)  
*√nīl ə ?ən'-sx<sup>w</sup>-√?áq<sup>w</sup>ə??" "√nīl."*  
it is QUEST your sibling it is



- 31 *enā nūwéleñ*  
then he enters  
*√ʔənʔé √nəw'-il-əŋ.*  
come enter
- 32 *nētl so tcak·ES,*  
Then he slips down,  
*√nił s-əw'-√čéq'-s.*  
it is falls (while walking)
- 33<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō nuqtlkwenkwaŋeñ tsätsālas,*  
then (Skwacin) takes out the heart his,  
*√nił s-əw'-nəx<sup>w</sup>-√tq<sup>w</sup>=ənk<sup>w</sup>és-t-əŋ tsə √c'él'əʔ-s.*  
it is LOC-√ pry out=guts-TRANS-PSV DEM his heart
- 34<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō tl'pútsets.*  
then he swallows it whole.  
*√nił s-əw'-√tp'á-t-sət-s.*  
it is gets gulped down
- 35 *K·la kw'tl-kwal tE slēñ.*  
Again cries out the crane.  
*√x'éy' k<sup>w</sup>t-√q<sup>w</sup>él tə s-√lín.*  
again speaks DEM crane
- 36 *K·la tátcil tE nātsa*  
Again comes another one  
*√x'éy' √téč-əl tə √n<áʔ>c'əʔ.*  
again arrive here DEM another one person
- 37 *klauaqENātiñ.*  
he does the same to him.  
*√x'éy' w' ʔiʔ-√xəné-t-əŋ.*  
also CON is done to
- 38 *aiyū yaqENātiñ.*  
then does same to all (the brothers).  
*√háy w' ʔiʔ-√xəné-t-əŋ.*  
finish CON is done to
- 39 *Aiyū auk.<sup>u</sup> tsä ápen.*  
Then finished the ten (of them).  
*√háy w' √ʔáw'k<sup>w</sup> tsə √ʔápen.*  
finish CON all gone DEM ten

- 40 *QEOñ SE tāns muk<sup>u</sup> skwātcil.*  
Crying the mother-their every day.  
*√x<sup>w</sup>á<?>-əŋ sə √tén-s. √mák<sup>w</sup> s-√k<sup>w</sup>éčəl.*  
crying DEM their mother every day
- 41 *Nētl sō kwénets tsä k·utci.*  
Then she took some moss.  
*√nił s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>án-at-s tsə √q'áč'i?.*  
it is takes it DEM moss
- 42 *Nētl sō tliñas tsä smútuksen*  
Then she took some snot  
*√nił s-əw'-√liŋ-as-s tsə s-√mát=əqsən*  
it is pulls it out DEM snot
- 43<sup>†</sup> *ē yeáqtES útsa k·útcī,*  
and put it on the moss,  
*?i? √?í<?>x-t-əs ?ə tsə √q'áč'i?.*  
and she is scraping it OBL DEM moss
- 44 *nētl sō muk<sup>u</sup> skwātcil,*  
then every day,  
*√nił s-əw'-√mák<sup>w</sup>-s s-√k<sup>w</sup>éčəl.*  
it is every day
- 45 *nētl sō kwéukset,*  
then it begins to-move,  
*√nił s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>éy'əx-sət-s.*  
it is moves, shakes
- 46 *nētl sō k·wónES tE sáles ē tsä sqúna,*  
then she perceives the hand and the feet,  
*√nił s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>án-nəx<sup>w</sup>-s tə √séləs ?i? tsə s-√xána?.*  
it is she sees it DEM hand and DEM foot
- 47 *sō kwónūq tsä kúloñ*  
then she sees the eye,  
*s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>án-nəx<sup>w</sup>-s tsə √qáləŋ.*  
she sees it DEM eye
- 48 *ānā sō ālésets.*  
then it becomes alive.  
*√?ən?é. s-əw'-√həlī-sət-s.*  
it comes it becomes alive



- 49 *Muk.<sup>u</sup> skwātcil tcē señs Smútuksen.*  
 Every day (growing) it grows into Smutuksen.  
*√māk<sup>w</sup> s-√k<sup>w</sup>écət √cís-əŋ s-√mát=əqsən.*  
 every day grow snot
- 50 *Nētl sō yeyāseñs.*  
 Then he plays about.  
*√nīl s-əw'-yə+√yás-əŋ-s.*  
 it is plays
- 51<sup>†</sup> *"Qutsésiñ-tcē kw's nāyétcut."*  
 "Make-me-you a shooting weapon" (said he to his mother).  
*"√xət-sí-səŋ čí k<sup>w</sup>s nə-√yáčət."*  
 make for me IMP DEM my arrow
- 52<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō qutēts tE cwōmátúñ*  
 Then she made a bow  
*√nīl s-əw'-√xtí-t-s tə šx<sup>w</sup>-√?əmá-tən*  
 it is makes it DEM hunting bow
- 53 *ē k·la yétcut,*  
 and also arrows,  
*?i? √x'é? √yáčət.*  
 and also arrow
- 54<sup>†</sup> *'nētl sō ctuñs.*  
 then he went hunting.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√štá-ŋ-s.*  
 it is walks
- 55 *"Aúa-sōq lēlēloñ,*  
 "Don't you go far away,  
*"√?áwə sx<sup>w</sup> lə+√lil'-əŋ.*  
 not you a little far
- 56 *auk.<sup>u</sup> un-cecéetl."*  
 lost your elder brothers."  
*√?áw'k<sup>w</sup> ?ən'-šə+√š<í?>yət."*  
 all gone your elder siblings
- 57<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō tcuk swéeka Smútuksen.*  
 Then big man (was) Smutuksen.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√čáq-s s-√wá?yqə? s-√mát=əqsən.*  
 it is is big man snot

- 58<sup>†</sup> “*Stañ yūqatce kwe tlāaúq?*”  
 “What kind of wood may be hard?” (said he)  
*“s-√tén yax<sup>w</sup> ?ačə k<sup>w</sup>ə √x’əx<sup>w</sup>?”*  
 what CONJ REQ SUB hard
- 59<sup>†</sup> “*ē aúa ō kō nuñúna*  
 “I don’t know my-son (answered she)  
*“?əw’ √?əwə√nə nə-s-√xč-í-t, nə-√ŋəná?*  
 CON not exist I know it my offspring
- 60<sup>†</sup> *ē-aúa atce so éi kwens-táat?*  
 hadn’t you better try” (for yourself)  
*?i? √?əwə ?ačə se? √?əy’ k<sup>w</sup>ə ?ən’-s-√t’é?-at?*  
 and not REQ FUT good SUB you try it
- 61<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō táats muk.<sup>u</sup> swunéñ ctcatl,*  
 So he tries all kinds of wood,  
*√nīl s-əw’-√t’é?-at-s tsə w’ √mák<sup>w</sup> s-√tén s-√čál,*  
 it is tries it DEM CON all kinds wood
- 62<sup>†</sup> *wonāi k.luñ-átltc k.laaúq.*  
 only yew tree hard.  
*?əw’ √háy ?al’ √x’əŋ’q’=itč √x’əx<sup>w</sup>.*  
 CON only LIMIT western yew hard
- 63<sup>†</sup> *Smútuksen ectät te tans:*  
 Smutuksen asks the mother-his:  
*√čte-t-əs tə √tén-s tsə s-√mát=aqsən,*  
 he asks her DEM his mother DEM snot
- 64<sup>†</sup> “*Estañes atce ēsyás ō qaón?*”  
 “Why always crying?”  
*“?əs-√tánət sx<sup>w</sup> ?ačə ?i? ?əs-√yás sx<sup>w</sup> ?əw’ √x<sup>w</sup>á<?>-əŋ?”*  
 do what you REQ and always you CON crying
- 65 “*Muk.<sup>u</sup> qái uncwalák.wa.*  
 “All dead your brothers and sister.  
*“√mák<sup>w</sup> √x<sup>w</sup>áy ?ən’-šx<sup>w</sup>-√?<əl>áq<sup>w</sup>ə?”*  
 all die your siblings
- 66<sup>†</sup> *ēwa ātce slalakum kwe-tcáluk.*  
 may-be a monster lives in the woods.”  
*?i? √wá?ačə s-√x’éləqəm k<sup>w</sup>ə √čél’əq<sup>w</sup>.”*  
 and presume monster DEM up in the woods



- 67 *Aúa skwāls ō lēlāniñāl.*  
Not speaks he listens only.  
 $\sqrt{?áwə} s \quad s\sqrt{q^wél-s} \quad ?áw' \quad lə+\sqrt{lé?n-əŋ} \quad ?al'.$   
not UNREAL he speaks CON listening LIMIT
- 68<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō yās Smútuksen stuñ qelqallekwets,*  
Then he goes Smutuksen for a walk all armour-clad,  
 $\sqrt{nił} s-əw'-\sqrt{yé?}-s \quad s-\sqrt{mát=əqsən} \quad \sqrt{štá-ŋ} \quad \sqrt{xəlx=álk^wət-s}.$   
it is goes snot walk  $\sqrt{war=}$ clothes-3POS
- 69 *nētl sō kwónūqs tE seélekwus,*  
then he perceives the fringe,  
 $\sqrt{nił} s-əw'-\sqrt{k^wán-nəx^w}-s \quad tə \quad \sqrt{síl=ək^wəs}.$   
it is sees it DEM fringe
- 70<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō yetleás nētl sō sáūs*  
then he follows (the signs) then he reaches the lake  
 $\sqrt{nił} s-əw'-?i?-\sqrt{x'éy'-s} \quad \sqrt{nił} s-əw'-\sqrt{séw'-s}.$   
it is it is goes down toward water
- 71 *sō kwāls tE slēñ.*  
whereupon cries out the crane.  
 $s-əw'-\sqrt{q^wél-s} \quad tə \quad s-\sqrt{lín},$   
speaks DEM crane
- 72 *"Nētl-a uncwákwa sáū?"*  
"Is that your brother at the lake?" (said Skwacin)  
 $\sqrt{nił} ə \quad ?ən'-šx^w-\sqrt{?áq^w}ə? \quad \sqrt{séw'?"}$   
it is QUEST your sibling down at the beach
- 73 *"Tūq aúina";*  
"None left" (she answers);  
*"tx<sup>w</sup>-√?áwə/nə."*  
become nothing
- 74<sup>†</sup> *"ha! ha! skwāls tE Skwácin*  
*"ha! ha! said Skwacin*  
*"ha! ha!"*  $\sqrt{q^wél-s} \quad tə \quad sk^wéyšən,$   
says DEM
- 75<sup>†</sup> *smemátsen,*  
he is shoving off,  
 $s-mə+\sqrt{méc'ən'}$   
a little conceited

- 76 *éi sä nE sétlen.*  
fine will be my meal."  
*“√ʔáy’ seʔ nə-s-√ʔítən.”*  
good FUT my food
- 77 *SmútuksEN ētcīāwun:*  
SmutuksEN was singing:  
*s-√mát=əqsən ʔiʔ-č-√yéwə-n*  
snot has a power song
- 78<sup>†</sup> *“ää sōq SE ō slalakum*  
“No matter how great a monster  
*“√ʔéʔi sx<sup>w</sup> √sáw’ s-√x’éləqəm.*  
go on you go into woods monster
- 79<sup>†</sup> *éwā úSEN sä ō tcilaúsa.”*  
maybe I am shall turn you down.”  
*ʔiʔ √wáʔ sən seʔ ʔaw’ √čələw’ seʔ.”*  
and presume I FUT CON out do FUT
- 80 *SmútuksEN sō k-wēns.*  
SmutuksEN then disembarks.  
*s-√mát=əqsən s-əw’-√q<sup>w</sup>íŋ-s.*  
snot disembarks
- 81 *Sō tus’ útsa sātł*  
When he reaches the doorway  
*s-əw’-√tás-s ʔə tsə √sál.*  
arrives there OBL DEM door
- 82<sup>†</sup> *sō qéltES stauwok.*  
then threw down clay  
*s-əw’-√x<sup>w</sup>él’-t-s tə s-√t’éwək<sup>w</sup>.*  
throws it DEM diatomaceous earth
- 83 *qéltES núas*  
he throws it inside (the house)  
*√x<sup>w</sup>él’-t-əs √nəw-és.*  
he throws it put it inside
- 84 *nētl sō nūwēluñs tE SmútuksEN,*  
then he enters (does) the SmutuksEN  
*√nīl s-əw’-√nəw-īl-əŋ-s tə s-√mát=əqsən.*  
it is goes inside DEM snot



- 85 *nētl sō kwéntels,*  
then they fight,  
*√nīl s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>ín-təl-s.*  
it is fight each other
- 86<sup>†</sup> *nēlt sō nūqtlkwēnkwástiñ*  
then he (the Slalakun) thrust his fingers into his heart (Smutuksen's)  
*√nīl s-əw'-nəx<sup>w</sup>-√lq<sup>w</sup>=ənk<sup>w</sup>ás-t-əŋ-s.*  
it is LOC-√pry out=gut-TRANS-PSV-3POS
- 87<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō teltuks tc' sálic."*  
then they break off his fingers."  
*√nīl s-əw'-t<əl>-√tákw-s č' √séləs-s.*  
it is they are broken off EVID his hand
- 88<sup>†</sup> *"Kw'tlnētl aúens qonáñ?"*  
"Is that all you can do?" (said Smutuksen)  
*"k<sup>w</sup>l-√nīl √ləwə s lən'-s-√x<sup>w</sup>əné-ŋ."*  
now not UNREAL you do that way
- 89 *nētl sō ctcéakwutuñ tE Skwácin,*  
then he struck him on the head the Skwacin,  
*√nīl s-əw'-√šč<sup>w</sup>=íq<sup>w</sup>-ət-əŋ-s tə sk<sup>w</sup>éyşən.*  
it is is hit on the head DEM
- 90<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō kwiskwan tE Skwácin.*  
then fell down Skwacin.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>əsk<sup>w</sup>áw-s tə sk<sup>w</sup>éyşən.*  
it is fall down DEM
- 91<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō k-áni set Smútuksen nūqtltcäkut.*  
Then the maiden bade Smutuksen cut him open.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√sé-t-əŋ-s lə tsə √q'á?ŋi?, "nəx<sup>w</sup>-√lc<sup>w</sup>=íq<sup>w</sup>-ət."*  
it is is bade OBL DEM maiden LOC-√butcher=head-TRANS
- 92 *"Muk.<sup>u</sup> nE-cwálakwa tsálas usnáwetl."*  
"All my brothers' and sisters' hearts inside" (of him, said she).  
*"√mák<sup>w</sup> nə-şx<sup>w</sup>-√lq<sup>w</sup>ə? √c'élə?-s ləs-√néw'-ət."*  
all my siblings their heart is inside
- 93 *Nētl sō nūqtltcakuts,*  
Then he opens him,  
*√nīl s-əw'-nəx<sup>w</sup>-√lc<sup>w</sup>=éq<sup>w</sup>-ət-s.*  
it is he cuts open his head

- 94 *tuq sanyuq átce tsála tláa*  
 whose heart this one (he wonders)  
 “*tx<sup>w</sup>-√sén yax<sup>w</sup> ?ačə √c’élə? √lé?ə?*”  
 whose CONJ REQ heart this
- 95 *EstanEtl ō nenētia eskwákwai, ē-tlāmātes,*  
 he lays in a row those dead-ones, he fits each (heart),  
*?əs-√t’án’-əl ?əw’ nə+√nūl-iyə ?əs-q<sup>w</sup>á+√q<sup>w</sup>əy ?i? √x’əmə-t-əs.*  
 be lain in a row CON they dead and he fits it
- 96 *nētl sō halētens.*  
 then he restores them to life.  
*√nūl s-əw’-√həlī-t-əŋ-s.*  
 it is is brought to life
- 97 “*hēs-lā kō wā nicwētet.*”  
 “Long-time have slept” (say they).  
 “*√hīs lə? k<sup>w</sup>ə? √wa? nə-šx<sup>w</sup>-√?ítət.*”  
 long time PAST INFORM presume because I sleep
- 98 *Nētl sō tākūs,*  
 Then go home,  
*√nūl s-əw’-√t’ák<sup>w</sup>-s*  
 it is goes home
- 99<sup>†</sup> *tcāstcesa kw’s-tākwels.*  
 two-by-two cross they.  
*čəs+√č<é?>sə? k<sup>w</sup> s-√t’ék<sup>w</sup>-əl-s.*  
 two people at a time SUB cross over
- 100 *Smútuksen ētl-kwāwus kw’s tātchwels.*  
 Smutuksen was the last to cross.  
*s-√mát=əqsən ?it-√k<sup>w</sup>áw’-əs k<sup>w</sup> s-√t’ék<sup>w</sup>-əl-s.*  
 snot is last SUB cross over
- 101 *Nētl sō k·w’tcātens tE slēñ,*  
 Then he killed the crane,  
*√nūl s-əw’-√q<sup>w</sup>čá-t-əŋ-s tə s-√lín.*  
 it is is killed DEM crane
- 102<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō tultustiñ tlitlélāi*  
 then he destroyed the ferry-boat  
*√nūl s-əw’-t’ <əl> + √t’ás-t-əŋ-s x’ə+√x’aléy’.*  
 it is is destroyed small shovel-nosed canoe



- 103 *nētl sō tākūs,*  
then went home,  
*√nīl s-əw'-√t'ák<sup>w</sup>-s.*  
it is goes home
- 104<sup>†</sup> *ēi-skwálekwenS SE taus.*  
rejoices the mother-their.  
*√?áy' s√q<sup>w</sup>él=ək<sup>w</sup>ən-s sə √tén-s.*  
good her thoughts DEM their mother
- 105<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō yās tciātutl muk.<sup>u</sup> nēnétlia.*  
Then went duck-hunting all of them.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√yé? -s √či?ét-əl. √mák<sup>w</sup> nə+√nīl-iyə.*  
it is goes hunt ducks all they
- 106 *Nētl sō kwuqenuqwels.*  
Then quarrel they together.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>əx<sup>w</sup>-nək<sup>w</sup>əl-s.*  
it is quarrel with each other
- 107 "Nētl *neskwa* *ne* *yētcut.*"  
"This is my my arrow" (said one).  
*√nīl nə-s-√k<sup>w</sup>é? nə-√yáčət.*  
it is mine my arrow
- 108 "Aúa, *nētl neskwa.*"  
"No, it's mine" (said another).  
*√?áwə. √nīl nə-s-√k<sup>w</sup>é?."*  
not it is mine
- 109<sup>†</sup> *Nētl sō lat·l kwuqnuqwel utl Smútuksen.*  
Then the elder one quarrels with Smutuksen.  
*√nīl s-əw'-√k<sup>w</sup>əx<sup>w</sup>-nək<sup>w</sup>əl-s tsə √láχ' ?ə χ' s-√mát=əqsən.*  
it is quarrels DEM eldest OBL DEM snot
- 110 "NecēyEtl *nētl ō neskwa ne-yētcut.*"  
"My elder brother, it's my my arrow" (said Smutuksen).  
*√nə-√šáyət, √nīl ?əw' nə-s-√k<sup>w</sup>é? nə-√yáčət."*  
my elder sibling it is CON mine my arrow
- 111<sup>†</sup> "Aúa-sōq *tcētluñ ute-úsa,*  
"Don't-you 'brother' me,  
*√?áwə sx<sup>w</sup> √šáy't-əŋ ?ə tə √?ásə.*  
not you brothering? OBL DEM I

- 112<sup>†</sup> *smútuksensōq.*  
 you snotty-one.”  
*s-√mát=əqsən sx<sup>w</sup>.*  
 snot you
- 113 *Nētl sō tātcuks,*  
 Then he becomes angry  
*√nūl s-əw'-√t'écəq'-s.*  
 it is is angry
- 114 *sō tākūs,*  
 and goes home,  
*s-əw'-√t'ák<sup>w</sup>-s.*  
 goes home
- 115 *sō tcañs*  
 when reaches home  
*s-əw'-√č'ėṅ-s.*  
 arrives home
- 116<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō étūts, ctlqaléekwoñ.*  
 then he lies down, covers his face with the blanket.  
*√nūl s-əw'-√?ítat-s šx<sup>w</sup>-√x'x<sup>w</sup>-əl=iq<sup>w</sup>-əṅ.*  
 it is goes to bed REAS-√cover-CON=head-MDL
- 117<sup>†</sup> “*Umut-tcē étlunsōq,*” *set sa tans*  
 “Sit-up-you, get up,” said his mother,  
*“√?ámət či! √?iṭən sx<sup>w</sup>!” √sé-t-əṅ ?ə sə √tén-s.*  
 sit up IMP eat you is told OBL DEM his mother
- 118 *aúia skwals, tsä Smútuksen,*  
 not he replies, that Smútuksen,  
*√?áwə s√q<sup>w</sup>él-s tsə s-√mát=əqsən.*  
 not speaks DEM snot
- 119 *nētl sō tcáñit aúina,*  
 then she felt him and behold nothing was there,  
*√nūl s-əw'-√c'əṅ-ət-s. √?áwə√nə.*  
 it is feels him it is nothing
- 120<sup>†</sup> *nētl sō twésts*  
 then she pulled back the blanket  
*√nūl s-əw'-√x<sup>w</sup>ís-t-s*  
 it is shakes it



- 121 *ō twāí tsä smútuksen.*  
and lo! only that snot.
- ʔəw' tx<sup>w</sup>-√háy tsə s-√mát=əqsən.*  
CON become only DEM snot

- 122 *Hái kwɛ.*  
Finished.
- √háy k<sup>w</sup>əʔ.*  
finish INFORM

### 5. Comments on the text.

*Line 1.* No word like *Skwacin* has been recorded anywhere in Northern Straits, so it is impossible to say with certainty what the form of the word heard by Hill-Tout actually was. This first word of the text, the name of the monster in this version, does, however, point to some possibilities.

In the Malahat version of this story told by John Harry and Lena Daniel the monster's name is *nác'əʔsən*, which means 'one-legged'. But there is nothing else in the story that makes reference to the monster's being one-legged or even lame. The Malahat storytellers have no explanation for why this monster has such a name, and they know of no other stories about this monster.

The transcription given here is a guess based on Hill-Tout's transcription and the name of the monster in the Malahat version of the story. I have analyzed this as a root *k<sup>w</sup>ey* 'unable' and a suffix *-sən* that occasionally appears in words referring to the leg or foot. The whole word would then mean 'lame' and be obviously related to the meaning of the Malahat name for the monster.

The form *k<sup>w</sup>éyšən*, however, is not the ordinary word for 'lame' and *-sən* is a suffix for 'foot, leg' that appears rarely, probably only in some loanwords. The ordinary 'foot' suffix in Northern Straits is *-sən*, as in the Malahat version of the monster's name.

In the Klallam versions of the story recorded by Gunther the monster is either Mountain Lion or Grizzly Bear. An explanation for the Malahat name for the monster and for Hill-Tout's transcription may be that the name recorded by Hill-Tout is a Songish folk etymology based on the pan-Straits word for 'grizzly bear', *k<sup>w</sup>əyéčən*. *Skwácin* is probably not a rendering of the word for 'grizzly bear' itself since, first of all, mistaking *š* for *č* is not the kind of error Hill-Tout makes, and, secondly, Hill-Tout does list a word for 'grizzly bear', *k-waiétcin* (1907:337), that correctly matches both the glottalization of the initial sound and the affricate. The Malahat name goes beyond the folk etymology and substitutes a genuine native word.

Another possibility is that both the Klallam name and the Songish name are based on folk etymology. The monster's assistant in this story is Crane (*slín*, see note to line 14). It may be that in the history of the diffusion of this story the

monster became confused with his assistant. Cranes are, after all, typically seen standing on one leg as the Malahat name suggests.

The word given for 'crane' in most other Coast Salishan languages is either cognate with Songish *slín* (Saanich *líməs*,<sup>3</sup> Lushootseed *slihíb*, Halkomelem *slí:m*) or with the Saanich word for 'heron', *ʃəq<sup>w</sup>ə?* (Klallam *ʃəq<sup>w</sup>u?* 'crane', Halkomelem *smóq<sup>w</sup>ə* 'heron', Squamish *sməq<sup>w</sup>á?* 'crane', Lushootseed *sbəq<sup>w</sup>á?* 'heron'). In the Interior Salishan languages, however, the word for 'crane' is surprisingly similar to the name of the monster transcribed by Hill-Tout. In Coeur d'Alene,<sup>4</sup> for example, 'crane' is *sk<sup>w</sup>ársən* (lit., 'yellow leg'). It may be that an old epithet for 'crane', 'yellow leg' or 'one leg', was transferred to and became the name of the monster. 'Yellow leg' then became the phonetically similar (and more monstrous) *k<sup>w</sup>əyéčən* 'grizzly bear' in Klallam and the 'lame' *sk<sup>w</sup>éysən* in Songish.

It is common for such Northern Straits narratives to begin with a sentence that introduces a character simply by naming it, followed by a short sentence telling what the character is doing or has done.

Hill-Tout's transcription clearly shows the 'actual' aspect in the second word of this line, even though he does not indicate glottal stops and glottalized sonorants. Compare the last word here to that in line 2. Both the gloss and the missing final unstressed vowel here indicate the 'actual' (Montler 1989).

*Line 2.* Hill-Tout's gloss for the first word is inexplicable, especially since the first word of line 3 is the same and is glossed correctly.

Also inexplicable and atypical is the missing *-s* (the first person object) at the end of the second word.

*Line 4.* The root *?ək<sup>w</sup>á?* usually is used to mean 'show how', but I have recorded it in contexts nearly identical to this with the meaning 'show where' or perhaps 'show how or where to get something'.

The *m* at the end of the second word is perhaps a typo. There are certainly mistakes in the text that cannot be attributed to Hill-Tout.

*Line 5.* This line is the first of many in the text that displays a very typical pan-Straits construction. In this construction the first predicate is the general third person predicate *níl*. It is immediately followed by a predicate that is introduced by the discourse connective *əw'* and that uses the subjective genitive where the third person topical agent is indicated by the *-s* genitive suffix. This construction is found only in connected discourse such as this. In some Saanich stories I have recorded, nearly every sentence begins with this *níl səw' . . .*; the *níl* is often dropped, so that sentence after sentence begins with *səw'* and the subjective genitive.

This construction is interesting with respect to the question of a noun-verb distinction. The word *níl* fits with *?ásə* 'I', *nək<sup>w</sup>ə* 'you', and *tníjəl* 'we' into the independent person deictic paradigm as the third person singular. If it is con-



sidered a pronoun and the *s-* prefix is considered a 'nominalizer', then most of the sentences in this and all other Northern Straits texts have no verb or the only verb is the third person pronoun.

The last word of this line is unique in the Northern Straits corpus, but the morphology as analyzed is consistent with what we know about the grammar. The root  $q^w a?$  means 'be a companion';  $q^w á?šən$ , also attested, is 'accompany on foot'. It is the first time that this root has been seen with the transitive and passive morphology.

*Line 6.* There is definitely something missing in this line. As mentioned in the comment to line 5, the *níl səw'* must be followed by a predicate ending in *-s*, the third person genitive. I have added the reporting clause *čtétš* 'he asks him', which in other Northern Straits narratives is the word that would be found in this position. Throughout this text the direct discourse reporting clause is either missing or artificially created by Hill-Tout. See lines 19, 26, 63, 91, 109, and discussion in comments to 117.

*Line 8.* I have not been able to find any word for 'fringe' in Northern Straits. However, the analysis given makes some sense. The root *sil* occurs alone as 'piece of cloth' and suffixed in the word *siláw'tx<sup>w</sup>* 'tent' (lit., 'cloth house'). It is probably a loan from English 'sail' via Chinook Jargon.

*Line 9.* The third word in Hill-Tout's transcription ends in a hyphen and comes at the end of a line in the original. It is not clear what was intended by it. If it is a line-break hyphen, it is the only one in the text. The first word on the next line, *kúlkutes*, does not start at the beginning, as would be expected if the hyphen were a typographer's line break, but is indented as I have reproduced it here relative to its gloss below.

In any case, as noted previously, the word following the *níl səw'* should end in *-s*, and the only semantically and syntactically feasible words corresponding to Hill-Tout's transcription and gloss are those given in the analysis.

*Line 12.* This is one of the most difficult sentences in the text. There are several possible speculative analyses. Hill-Tout's *tūq* is surely the mutative prefix  $tx^w-$  'become', but the rest of the word above 'bent the boughs' is obscure.

It is possible that the word has the *č-* 'have' prefix and the expected *-s* suffix. It may also have the *-əqs* 'nose, point' lexical suffix. This far everything is semantically and grammatically plausible. The root, however, is mysterious and the total interpretation is vague. The root shown here is unattested in Northern Straits. In Lushootseed there is, however, a root  $q^w əč$  'crooked'. In 'actual' forms in Northern Straits a *č* in this position would surface as *y'*. If it is the root here, the form would be  $tx^w-č-\sqrt{q^w əy}<'>=əqs-s$  and the meaning of the whole word would be 'it (they) becomes having crooked point(s)'.

There are problems with this analysis. Hill-Tout's *w* is unaccounted for, but there are numerous spurious letters in Hill-Tout's transcriptions. A more



serious problem is the entire meaning of the sentence. The last word is not a diminutive as Hill-Tout's gloss suggests. The word is clearly *sqəlqəlélŋəx<sup>w</sup>*, the collective plural of *sqəlélŋəx<sup>w</sup>*, which refers only to any large tree. It would not be used to refer to small bushes implied in the translation. It is unlikely that anyone would make the points of large trees crooked.

Another possibility is that there is no *č-* prefix and that the root is *tək<sup>w</sup>* 'break'; thus the whole form would be *tx<sup>w</sup>tək<sup>w</sup>əqss* 'the points become broken'; which is farther from Hill-Tout's transcription, but the meaning matches the text of Hill-Tout's free translation of the story: "She now marks her course by breaking off the ends of the twigs and branches in her path" (Hill-Tout 1907:334). The problem with this analysis is the same as the previous: it cannot be big trees whose points are being broken.

If we dismiss Hill-Tout's gloss and do a direct retranscription, we get *tx<sup>w</sup>čəqə?íwəqss*, which appears to have the root *čəq* 'big' followed by suffixes that can only be speculatively identified. Perhaps there is a first suffix, *-ə?iw*, related to a Squamish suffix *-ewa* 'long thing' (recorded by Haeberlin 1974) or *-iw?as* 'stick, pole' (Kuipers 1967:126) followed by the *-əqs* 'point' suffix. If this is the case, the meaning of the word would be 'become large pointed', and the meaning of the whole sentence would be 'the trees became large (as they entered deeper into the forest)'.

*Line 14.* The character Crane appears in a number of traditional Northern Straits stories. He is always the tattletale—the lookout. In this story it is Crane who signals the monster of an approaching victim.

This behavior of Crane has relevance to traditional hunting methods. In a Saanich narrative explaining how to pit-lamp (i.e., hunt from a canoe at night) for ducks it is explained that ducks like to sleep in a sheltered cove with a crane or heron nearby. The art of pit-lamping for ducks depends on one's skill at sneaking up on the crane as it sleeps, then silently grabbing and wringing its neck before it awakens and alerts the ducks.

*Line 15.* The word here for a type of canoe has never been recorded in modern documentation of Songish, Saanich, or Samish. It also is unknown in Klallam. A similar form, *t'lái*, was, however, recorded for Songish by Boas (1891:566), who provides a drawing and description of it as a large fishing boat with a shovel-shaped bow and square stern. The word for 'shovel-nose canoe' in Lushootseed is *χ'əláy?*, and in Halkomelem it is *χ'ələ:y*; for Lummi Gibbs (1863) gives *klai* and James (1980) *χəy?*. The expected Songish-Saanich cognate would be *χ'éy'* or *χ'ələy'*, which would have the diminutive *χ'əχ'ələy'*. This latter form corresponds closer to Hill-Tout's transcription of the same word in line 102.

The word *χ'ələy'* actually does occur in modern Saanich. It is the name of Samuel Island, a small island between Mayne and Saturna Islands in the Gulf Islands chain between traditional Saanich and Semiahmoo territory. Saanich speakers are not able to give any other meaning for this word. It is reported that

this island was an old burial ground in the days when people were put to rest above ground in canoes. Until very recently the remains of old burial canoes could be seen on various small islands in the straits.

*Line 18.* This sentence actually means 'Then Skwacin gets home'.

*Line 19.* As in line 6 and elsewhere, the reporting clause is missing, leaving a syntactic as well as a discourse functional gap. I have put in the expected form *set* 'command, send, tell someone (to do something)'.

*Line 21.* The English free translation that accompanies Hill-Tout's interlinear text (Hill-Tout 1907:334; also Maud 1978d:135) is much richer in detail. There it is explained that Skwacin's floor is "so slippery that no one can stand upon it." See line 80 for Snotboy's solution to the problem.

*Line 24.* This is the first mention in the Songish text that Skwacin's first victim is female. The free English translation (Hill-Tout 1907:334; Maud 1978d:135) and Gunther's (1925) Klallam versions make this fact clear from the beginning. It is interesting that the word *sténi?* is used rather than *q'é?ni?*. The former refers to a married or nonvirginal woman, while the latter is consistently used in modern Northern Straits to refer to a maiden or teenage girl, which presumably this character is. In some of the Klallam versions the girl becomes the monster's wife. Perhaps that is what the use of this word implies here—she is now married to the monster.

*Line 26.* Again as in lines 6 and 19 the reporting clause is missing where it seems to be required. I have supplied the form meaning 'she was asked by'.

*Line 27.* This reply actually means 'we are ten, there are ten of us', with the girl including herself in the ten. In the free translation there are definitely ten boys in addition to the girl. In one of the Klallam versions there are ten boys and one girl, in another there are seven brothers and a girl, and in the other versions there is an indefinite but substantial number of brothers.

*Line 28.* I have added the expected conjunction here.

*Line 30.* The second word does look something like *?ən'sx<sup>w</sup>?áq'<sup>w</sup>ə?* 'your sibling' as Hill-Tout's gloss suggests. It also looks like *?ən'sk<sup>w</sup>é?* 'yours, belong to you'. Either works grammatically and either fits the overall meaning of the sentence in the discourse.

I have added the yes-no question particle *ə*. It would be required here. Without it the sentence would be a statement, 'it is your brother'. This little particle tends to become inaudible in rapid speech in contexts like this where it is followed by a word beginning with *?ə*.

*Line 33.* The word *nəx<sup>w</sup>tq<sup>w</sup>ənk<sup>w</sup>éstəŋ* appears nowhere else in the Northern Straits corpus. Nevertheless, it matches Hill-Tout's transcription here and in



line 86 almost exactly, and the component morphemes fit the meaning. The root given here,  $lq^w$ , means 'pry out', but it may also be  $lk^w$  'peck (as a bird)' or  $lk^w$  'hook, snag'. The meaning of the whole line is 'his guts are pried out (pecked, snagged)'.

*Line 34.* The root here,  $láp'$ , means 'eat without chewing' and is the ordinary word used for eating soup. It can be used in reference to eating other things, and in these cases it implies 'gulping down' or 'slurping up'.

Hill-Tout's gloss is transitive, but the form is clearly intransitive. It has the reflexive suffix, which often has a 'become, get' interpretation. Since we have the  $níl sáw'$  construction, the subject must be the current topic, which is  $tsə c'él'əʔs$ , introduced in the previous sentence.

*Line 43.* The root of the predicate must be  $?íx$  because it is the only root in the corpus that looks remotely like Hill-Tout's transcription and is semantically appropriate. Hill-Tout's two vowels were his attempt to render the 'actual' aspect glottal stop infix. He uses this transcription pattern elsewhere. See, for example, line 1, where the form is certainly 'actual'.

*Line 51.* The word  $yáčət$  for 'arrow' is unknown in Saanich and Samish and does not appear in any modern Songish material. The fact that it was in use in 1905 but not since the 1960s suggests that it is an older word. But it was apparently not in use earlier when Boas was collecting Songish material in the late 1880s. The word for 'arrow' in Boas's Songish list is  $tsemán$  (1891:701), obviously the same word as Saanich and Samish  $c'am'éen$  'arrow' composed of the root for 'bone' and the lexical suffix meaning 'ear, angle, arrowhead'. The word given by Hill-Tout does appear in Lummi; Gibbs (1863:2) gives  $yicht$  and James (1980:3)  $yächt$ . And the word also occurs in Klallam:  $yáčt$  'arrow'. Hill-Tout's  $é$  is explained by the fact that schwa becomes high between palatals.

*Line 52.* The word  $šx^w?əmátən$  literally means 'thing for hunting', but is the common word for 'hunting bow'.

*Line 54.* This sentence means 'Then he walked'.

*Line 57.* Again, as in lines 1 and 46, Hill-Tout apparently uses  $E$  for a glottal stop. This usage may indicate that he was hearing a slight schwa release of the glottal stop, but in modern pronunciations of this word there is no vocalic release. Here the glottal stop is part of the root and not an infix.

*Line 58.* This sentence simply means 'What is hard?'

*Line 59.* Hill-Tout's transcription is very obscure here. It looks like it should be as in example (5) below.

- (5)  $?i? \sqrt{?áwə} ?aw' k^wə nə-\sqrt{?ánə?}$   
and not CON DEM? my offspring

But this is not a sentence, and it does not seem possible to fix it by simply adding a little material. The following line suggests that the gloss given for this line has the correct content. The transcription I have given ignores Hill-Tout's and is a translation of his gloss.

*Line 60.* This means 'Will it not be good if you try?'

*Line 61.* Hill-Tout's transcription suggests the rendition in example (6).

(6)  $\sqrt{ni\check{l}}\ s-\acute{a}w'-\sqrt{t'é?}-\acute{a}t-s$   $\sqrt{m\acute{a}k}^w$   $s-\sqrt{x}^w\acute{a}ni-\eta$   $s-\sqrt{\check{c}a\check{l}}$ ,  
 it is            tries it            all            way            wood

But such a structure has never been recorded for any Straits language. First, the phrase meaning 'all kinds of wood' following  $t'é?ats$  here would have to be preceded by a determiner such as  $ts\acute{a}$ ,  $t\acute{a}$ , or  $k^ws\acute{a}$  and  $?aw'$ . And, secondly, the phrase  $m\acute{a}k^w\ s\acute{x}^w\acute{a}ni-\eta$  means 'every way, any way' not 'all kinds'. Phrases corresponding to 'all kinds of X' are very common in the corpus and invariably have the form  $m\acute{a}k^w\ (?al')\ st\acute{e}\eta\ X$ .

Hill-Tout's gloss makes sense given the preceding and following sentences. Therefore I have translated the gloss.

*Line 62.* Added here is the 'limit' particle  $?al'$ , which invariably appears in this context.

*Line 63.* In lines 6, 19, and 26 the reporting clause is completely missing. This line is the first reporting clause (a type common in Northern Straits narratives) in the text. The original transcription would be:  $sm\acute{a}t\acute{a}qs\acute{a}n\ \acute{c}tet\ t\acute{a}\ t\acute{e}ns$ . Here Hill-Tout takes liberty with Songish grammar both by using English word order and by leaving off the subject inflection. I have given the correct form for this clause.

This is a common sentence type. Both arguments specified on the predicate cross-reference subsequent full words preceded by demonstratives. When one of these words is possessed by the other, as is the case here, the order of the two demonstrative phrases is free. For example,  $\acute{c}tet\acute{a}s\ ts\acute{a}\ sm\acute{a}t\acute{a}qs\acute{a}n\ t\acute{a}\ t\acute{e}ns$  is equally grammatical as the form given with the only possible interpretation being that the possessor is the agent. See Montler (1993) for further discussion.

*Line 64.* The phrase  $?\acute{a}st\acute{a}\eta\acute{a}t\ s\acute{x}^w\ ?\acute{a}\check{c}\acute{a}$  can mean 'What are you doing?' or 'What's the matter?' Thus the meaning of this line is 'What's the matter with you; why are you always crying?'

*Line 66.* This means 'presumably it is a monster up in the woods'.

In Montler (1986) the word  $w\acute{a}?\acute{a}\check{c}\acute{a}$  is listed as one of a set of post-predicate particles that indicate mood with "unknown position." The semantics fits with the other particles in this group, and in the data available in 1986 it always followed the first predicate, as do the other post-predicate particles. At the time, sufficient examples had not been recorded to precisely determine its position in the post-predicate particle constituent. Data now available make it clear that



this word is not a particle at all and, as in this line, can be the first predicate itself. It does usually follow the first predicate, but as part of a complex predicate construction, not as a particle. It apparently has alternate forms *wá?* and *wáts*, whose alternation is unaccounted for.

Hill-Tout's transcription and gloss of the first word can be accounted for as his recognition of a very common word *?i?wəwə* 'maybe'.

*Line 68.* The last word in this line is otherwise unattested, but the obvious component morphology is well known.

*Line 70.* This is the one totally baffling word in the text. I know of no word meaning 'follow the signs'. It may be that this form contains the *?i?*- 'accompanying activity' prefix and the root *ʔ'éy* 'again, too, additionally'. It might also be two roots with the first one being *yé?* 'go'. The second might be the 'again, too' root or perhaps the root *lé?ə* 'this'. None of these possibilities is satisfying.

*Line 74.* In the nearly 300 narrative texts I have collected from some twenty native speakers in Saanich, Samish, and Klallam, there is not one case of laughter quoted like this. I would expect something like that in example (7).

- (7) *náčəŋ tə sk<sup>w</sup>éyšən.*  
 laugh DEM  
 'Skwacin laughed.'

*Line 75.* Probably the original gloss intended here was 'he is showing off' and either Hill-Tout or the typographer misread the *w* for a *v*.

This goes with the previous line to give the meaning "Ha! Ha!" says Skwacin, who is a bit conceited'.

*Line 78.* This is the first line of Snotboy's power song. It is a little more difficult to interpret than most of this text because typically the words of such songs inserted into the narrative do not necessarily follow from the immediate discourse context. Sometimes a hero sings the song of his particular spirit power, which is connected with an animal, such as Mink, that has nothing to do with the story. Often the words are simply uninterpretable.

In this case I assume that Hill-Tout's gloss is more or less a free translation. The interpretation given is based on the most plausible grammatical sentence following Hill-Tout's transcription and the overall spirit of the context.

The form *?é?i* 'keep going, be on your way' is usually a word of encouragement.

*Line 79.* The difficulties mentioned for the previous line apply here as well.

The word *čaléw* means 'pass by' and can be used also to mean 'out do, surpass'. Thus the meaning of this line is 'and I guess I will surpass you'.



*Line 82.* The last word of this line does not occur in any recent Northern Straits or Klallam material and may actually be *st'éwəq<sup>w</sup>*. Galloway (1980:60) lists the Halkomelem word *st'əwók<sup>w</sup>* 'diatomaceous earth', and Kuipers (1967:285) gives Squamish *st'əwaq<sup>w</sup>* 'kind of mud that is burnt and used as white paint'. Suttles (1951:245) records *stóoq<sup>w</sup>* in Northern Straits, probably Lummi, as a 'white earth' used in the preparation of yarn. Boas (1891:566) did record the word *st'áuok* for Songish. In the text he refers to it as 'pipe-clay', but in a footnote he says that George M. Dawson has identified it as diatomaceous earth.

Boas's description of the use of *st'áuok* in the production of blanket wool helps us understand its role in this story:

A ball, about the size of a fist, of this clay is burnt in a fire made of willow wood; thus it becomes a fine, white powder, which is mixed with the wool or hair. The mixture is spread over a mat, sprinkled with water, and for several hours thoroughly beaten with a sabre-like instrument until it is white and dry; thus the grease is removed from the hair. [Boas 1891:566-67]

The last line explains Snotboy's use of this material. Diatomaceous earth is used even today as an industrial adsorbent. Lines 21 and 32 let us know that Skwacin's floor is slippery and that it allows the monster to capture the brothers. Snotboy, evidently knowing this, comes prepared with a material that will neutralize the slippery substance on the floor.

*Line 86.* The last word here is otherwise attested only in line 33 (q.v.).

*Line 87.* Mitchell (1968:87) indicates that in Songish the root of the last word here can mean 'hand' or 'finger'. The word *təltək<sup>w</sup>* is a plural diminutive, so it must be the fingers that are broken off.

*Line 88.* This is a statement, not a question: 'Don't you do like that now'.

*Line 90.* The word *k<sup>w</sup>əsk<sup>w</sup>áw* 'fall' looks like it should be analyzable, but no component morphology is detectable. This word occurs regularly in Saanich, but is unknown in Klallam, and it is not listed in any of the other material on Songish or Samish. Thompson (1969) gives *k<sup>w</sup>sk<sup>w</sup>ów* 'drop' for Lummi.

Here the typographer inverted Hill-Tout's *u*. See line 104 for the complementary typographical error.

*Line 91.* In this reporting clause, as in that of line 63, Hill-Tout flouts Songish grammar. His original transcription would be *níl səw' q'á?ni? sét smátəqsən nax<sup>w</sup>lc'éq<sup>w</sup>ət*, ignoring inflection and using English word order as in his gloss. I have recast the clause in a form that is common in Saanich texts. It has the meaning 'The girl told him, "Cut open his head"'.  
 In Saanich data, reporting clauses with *sét* always mention only one non-pronominal participant. This may be a requirement or it may be an accident of the data. If an accident, then this could also be *níl səw' sétəns ?ə tsə q'á?ni? tsə smátəqsən*, "*nax<sup>w</sup>lc'éq<sup>w</sup>ət*" 'Snotboy was told by the girl, "Cut open his head"'. The

positions of the oblique and non-oblique phrases here can be reversed without changing grammaticality or meaning. Following patterns common in the Saanich corpus, it would also be possible to render this with an indirect rather than direct quote: *nīl s̄aw' s̄et̄əŋs ʔə tsə q'áʔŋiʔ k<sup>w</sup>ə nax<sup>w</sup>lc'ég<sup>w</sup>at̄əs* 'He was told by the girl to cut open his head'.

The last word here is not otherwise attested, but the morphology is clear.

*Line 99.* Hill-Tout's transcription suggests the first word is *č̄ésč̄əsəʔ*. But in both Saanich and Mitchell's (1968:38) recording of Songish the stress is on the second vowel as in the transcription given.

*Line 102.* The word *t'alt'ástəŋ* has diminutive reduplication and the collective plural infix. It is diminutive because the thing that is destroyed is small. The plural here is ambiguous between plural action by one agent or plural agents. The basic meaning of the root, *t'əs*, is 'break (an object such as a container)'. There is another root usually used to mean 'destroy', *táy'əq<sup>w</sup>*, but this means 'smash beyond recognition, pulverize'. Here it is probably the case that Snotboy broke the little canoe several times.

*Line 104.* The phrase *ʔáy' sq<sup>w</sup>élək<sup>w</sup>ən* is very common and its meaning matches Hill-Tout's gloss very well. The root of the second word means 'speak' and the suffix means 'mind'.

*Line 105.* The word *č̄iʔét̄əl* is otherwise unattested. In Saanich, however, the word for duck hunting is *piʔát̄əl*, obviously cognate. The Squamish form, *píat̄əl*, is like the Saanich. There is a regular sound correspondence in Coast Salish that indicates that \**p* has become *č̄* in the Straits languages. For example, the 'plant' lexical suffix in Halkomelem is *-əlp*, corresponding to Saanich and Klallam *-əłč̄*. The Saanich word for duck hunting must be borrowed. The form given by Hill-Tout is the expected historical development.

*Line 109.* Here, as in lines 63 and 91, the syntax and morphology are not native. I have added the necessary morphology and put the words into acceptable order.

*Line 111.* Hill-Tout's *tc̄ētluñ* looks like it should be *č̄it̄əŋ*, but no such word could be found in any of the Straits linguistic data. Nor have I been able to find a viable cognate in other Coast Salishan languages. The only reasonably close form is Saanich *š̄áyəl* 'older sibling'. The derived form based on this that I have given is unattested and not as close to Hill-Tout's transcription as would be expected from the rest of the text. This derived form includes the root for 'older sibling' (as in line 110) with the 'middle' suffix and in the 'actual' imperfective.

*Line 112.* This line means 'you are snot'.

*Line 116.* The last word of this line is otherwise unattested, but the morphology is clear. The meaning of this line is 'then he goes to bed to cover up his head'.



*Line 117.* As in every other reporting clause in this text, Hill-Tout uses English word order and ignores basic Northern Straits morphology. The form suggested by Hill-Tout's transcription is *sét sə téns*, which would be an imperative 'tell his mother' with 'mother' as the direct object, not the subject. The passive is required here. Thus this means '“Sit up! Eat!” he was told by his mother'.

In the Saanich and Klallam narratives I have recorded, direct quotes are very common and they almost invariably are framed by a reporting clause. Typically the only direct quotes that lack a reporting clause are those that include direct address, which itself performs the function of the reporting clause in identifying the discourse as direct and indirectly indicating the source of the quote. For example, this pair of unframed direct quotes is literally translated from a Saanich text: "Good-bye, Raven." "Good-bye, Grouse." No reporting clause is required here since direct address occurs only in direct discourse, and, since there are only two characters in the scene, there is no doubt about which quote is to be attributed to which character.

What is going on with the reporting clauses in this Songish text? There are thirty direct quotes in this text, none with direct address, but Hill-Tout gives reporting clauses for only three (lines 63, 91, and 117), which have obviously been composed by Hill-Tout himself, not the native speaker. In addition to these contrived reporting clauses, there are four other direct quotes (lines 6, 19, 26, and 110) where the framing material would require a reporting clause, but it is missing. And in twenty instances Hill-Tout felt obliged to include a parenthetical reporting clause in the interlinear gloss.

The explanation for this seems to me to be partly in the nature of direct discourse and reporting clauses and partly in the way Hill-Tout collected his data. Quoted speech in a narrative functions as a foregrounding device that adds vividness to crucial events and characters in the story. There is nothing more unimportant in the unfolding of a story than the dialogue machinery. As Fowler puts it, "The fact is that readers [or listeners or storytellers] care much what is said, but little about the frame into which a remark or a speech is fitted" (1965:302).

As Thomas James was dictating line by line a story he had been familiar with his whole life, Hill-Tout, struggling for phonetic accuracy, watching for familiar and unfamiliar vocabulary, attempting to follow the story line, was very busy. As Hill-Tout asked James to repeat a line, one can bet he got only the quote and not the 'useless' frame. I am sure that this has happened to everyone who has collected texts in this way. But most trained linguists spend a considerable amount of time working out the grammar and basic lexicon before they venture into texts. Hill-Tout was not so well trained, and, as we saw in section 2, he dove into texts at the beginning of his work, then later worked on paradigms and vocabulary. He thus missed those little narratively insignificant clauses on the first utterance and they did not appear again in the repetitions.



*Line 120.* The last word here implies shaking something, as a bush or blanket, to get something out of it.

**6. Conclusion.** I would not go so far as to say that Hill-Tout's texts are a gold mine of linguistic information, but I do think that I have managed to dig up a few shiny nuggets. Aside from simply making this text usable and available, what I hope to have done here is to demonstrate that this is a possible and manageable task. Hill-Tout's texts in their original form are practically useless unless one already knows the language; hence if the rest of his voluminous material is to be made useful, it will have to be done by those who have long studied the relevant Salishan languages.

As Speck (1980) showed for Kalispel, and Doak (1983) for Okanagan, this kind of reconstruction of early grammars and word lists can provide useful insights into recent phonological, morphological, and lexical developments. I think, moreover, that the reconstruction of early texts will provide answers to major questions of Salishan grammar. Such textual reconstruction is the application of our modern understanding of Salishan grammar to purer forms of Salishan narrative. As the old texts are clearly less influenced by European culture, we can expect that, obvious contrivances aside, they are also less influenced by the English language.

Plausible but unsupported claims have been made about the effects of English influence on recently collected data in Salishan languages. For example, Jelinek and Demers (1994) reiterate the suspicion of Thompson (1979:740) and Kinkade (1983:32) that real VSO (or VOS) sentences with two full determiner phrases cross-referenced by pronominal marking occur in the data on Salishan languages only because of the influence of English. If we had reliable editions of the oldest texts such as those of Boas and Hill-Tout, we could put this idea to a test; we would expect no such sentences in the old texts.

Since the oldest recorded texts are the form of the language least tainted by European influence, reconstructed texts should also play a part in language revival efforts. My recent work with the Klallam language revival effort has shown me that the attractiveness inherent simply in the age of old stories is a significant motivator for young language learners. These texts and the language they were told in are the deepest roots accessible to modern native Americans; they are also the profoundest emblems of their heritage.

### Notes

*Acknowledgments.* Background fieldwork on Northern Straits and Klallam has been supported by the National Science Foundation, the Jacobs Funds of the Whatcom Museum, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the National Park Service, and the University of North Texas Office of Sponsored Projects. I thank the Saanich, Samish, and Klallam elders who helped me understand their languages. I also thank Yolanda Dewar, Ivy Doak, Thom Hess, and Dale Kinkade for their comments and suggestions. I especially am grateful to Ivy Doak for her help in the task of proofreading.

*Abbreviations.* The symbols and abbreviations in the analysis generally follow Montler (1986):  $\sqrt{\quad}$  = root; X- = prefix; -X = suffix; =X = lexical suffix; <X> = infix; CON = contemporaneous discourse connector; CONJ = conjectural; DEM = demonstrative; EVID = evidential; FUT = future; IMP = imperative; INFORM = informative; LOC = locative; LIMIT = limiting; MDL = middle voice; OBL = oblique object; 3POS = third person genitive; PSV = passive; QUEST = yes-no question marker; REAS = reason for (causal); REQ = request information marker; SUB = subordinator; TRANS = transitive; UNREAL = unrealized.

1. The native name for the people of several former villages south and east of the Saanich peninsula on Vancouver Island is *lək<sup>w</sup>əhən*. The set of very closely related dialects of the *lək<sup>w</sup>əhən* is *lək<sup>w</sup>əhín'ən*. The *lək<sup>w</sup>əhən* people eventually settled on what are today the Songhees and Esquimalt reserves. In the modern literature the language is called Songish.

2. Yolanda Raffo Dewar (p.c. 1996) also recorded a version of the Snotboy story in Songish from the late Sophie Misheal.

3. The *ŋ* in Hill-Tout's transcription is the expected historical reflex. The *m* in Saanich indicates that the Saanich-word is a loan.

4. Thanks to Ivy Doak for pointing this similarity out to me.

### References

- Bates, Dawn, Thom Hess, and Vi Hilbert  
 1994 Lushootseed Dictionary. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Boas, Franz  
 1891 Second General Report on the Indians of British Columbia. Report of the Sixtieth Meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science Held at Leeds in September 1890. Pp. 562–715. London: British Association for the Advancement of Science.  
 1916 Tsimshian Mythology. Thirty-First Annual Report of the U.S. Bureau of Ethnology 1909–1910. [Reprinted by Johnson Reprint Corporation 1970.]
- Boas, Franz, and Herman Haeberlin  
 1927 Sound Shifts in Salishan Dialects. International Journal of American Linguistics 4:117–36.
- Doak, Ivy G.  
 1983 The 1908 Okanagan Word Lists of James Teit. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 3. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- Fowler, H. W.  
 1965 A Dictionary of Modern English Usage, Second Edition. Revised by Sir Ernest Gowers. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Galloway, Brent  
 1980 The Structure of Upriver Halq'emelem. Sardis, B.C.: Coqualeetza Education Training Centre.
- Gibbs, George  
 1863 Alphabetical Vocabularies of the Clallam and Lummi. New York: Cramoisy Press.
- Gunther, Erna  
 1925 Klallam Folk Tales. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 1.4:113–70.
- Haeberlin, Herman  
 1974 Distribution of the Salish Substantival [Lexical] Suffixes. Edited by M. Terry Thompson. Anthropological Linguistics 16:219–350.



## Hill-Tout, Charles

- 1907 Report on the Ethnology of the South-Eastern Tribes of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland* 37:306-74.

## Kinkade, M. Dale

- 1983 Salish Evidence Against the Universality of "Noun" and "Verb." *Lingua* 60: 25-39.

## Kuipers, Aert H.

- 1967 *The Squamish Language*. The Hague: Mouton.

## James, William Arthur

- 1980 *Xwlemi>chosen, Lummi Indian Language*. Lummi Indian Reservation: Lummi Tribe.

## Jelinek, Eloise, and Richard Demers

- 1994 Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in Straits Salish. *Language* 70:697-736.

## Maud, Ralph

- 1978a *The Salish People: The Local Contribution of Charles Hill-Tout. Volume I: The Thompson and the Okanagan*. Vancouver: Talonbooks.
- 1978b *The Salish People: The Local Contribution of Charles Hill-Tout. Volume II: The Squamish and the Lillooet*. Vancouver: Talonbooks.
- 1978c *The Salish People: The Local Contribution of Charles Hill-Tout. Volume III: The Mainland Halkomelem*. Vancouver: Talonbooks.
- 1978d *The Salish People: The Local Contribution of Charles Hill-Tout. Volume IV: The Sechelt and the South-Eastern Tribes of Vancouver Island*. Vancouver: Talonbooks.

## Mitchell, Marjorie Ruth

- 1968 *A Dictionary of Songish, a Dialect of Straits Salish*. M.A. thesis, University of Victoria.

## Montler, Timothy

- 1986 *An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 4. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- 1989 Infixation, Reduplication, and Metathesis in the Saanich Actual Aspect. *Southwest Journal of Linguistics* 9:92-107.
- 1991 *Saanich, North Straits Salish Classified Word List*. Canadian Ethnology Service Mercury Series Paper 119. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- 1993 *Relative Clauses and Other Attributive Constructions in Saanich*. In *American Indian Linguistics and Ethnography in Honor of Laurence C. Thompson*, edited by Anthony Mattina and Timothy Montler. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 10. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.
- 1995 *Klallam Classified Word List*. Ms.
- 1996 *Languages and Dialects in Straits Salishan*. Papers for the Thirty-First International Conference on Salishan and Neighbouring Languages. Vancouver: Linguistics Department, University of British Columbia.

## Raffo, Yolanda

- 1972 *A Phonology and Morphology of Songish, a Dialect of Straits Salish*. Ph.D. diss., University of Kansas.

## Speck, Brenda

- 1980 *An Edition of Father Post's Kalispel Grammar*. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory,



University of Montana.

Suttles, Wayne

- 1951 The Economic Life of the Coast Salish of Haro and Rosario Straits. Ph.D. diss., University of Washington.

Thompson, Laurence C.

- 1969 Lummi Classified Word List. Ms.  
1979 Salishan and the Northwest. *In* The Languages of Native America, edited by Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun, 693-765. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson

- 1987 Klallam Dictionary. Ms.