

Tellings from Our Elders:
Lushootseed *syəyəhub*

Volume 1: Snohomish Texts

*as told by Martha Williams Lamont,
Elizabeth Charles Krise, Edward Sam,
and Agnes Jules James*

David Beck and Thom Hess



UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Sample Material © 2014 UBC Press

FIRST NATIONS LANGUAGES

The First Nations languages of the world, many of which are renowned for the complexity and richness of their linguistic structure, embody the cumulative cultural knowledge of Aboriginal peoples. This vital linguistic heritage is currently under severe threat of extinction. This new series is dedicated to the linguistic study of these languages.

Patricia A. Shaw, a member of the Department of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia and director of the First Nations Languages Program, is general editor of the series.

The other volumes in the series are:

The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax

Jan van Eijk

Musqueam Reference Grammar

Wayne Suttles

When I Was Small – I Wan Kwikws: A Grammatical Analysis of St'át'imc Oral Narratives

Lisa Matthewson

Witsuwit'en Grammar: Phonetics, Phonology, Morphology

Sharon Hargus

Making Wawa: The Genesis of Chinook Jargon

George Lang

A Tsilhqút'in Grammar

Eung-Do Cook



FIRST NATIONS LANGUAGES

Sample Material © 2014 UBC Press

Contents

Foreword / ix

The Tulalip Tribes Lushootseed Department

Abbreviations and Symbols / xii

Introduction / 1

Language / 2

Texts / 3

Transcription and analysis / 5

Transcription practices / 9

Presentation / 16

Acknowledgments / 27

1 *səswiḵab* Martha Williams Lamont / 29

Pheasant and Raven / 32

The Brothers of Pheasant's Wife / 73

Changer / 199

Owl Lives There / 237

Little Diver Is the Wife of Heron / 263

Crow Is Sick (First Telling) / 297

Crow Is Sick (Second Telling) / 310

Basket Ogress / 323

Mink and Tutyika (First Telling) / 356

Mink and Tutyika (Second Telling) / 370

Coyote and His Daughter / 408

Coyote's Son Had Two Wives / 447

- 2 Elizabeth Charles (Charley) Krise / 513**
Lady Louse / 516
 First Version / 516
 Second Version / 517
- 3 *sʔadacut* Edward “Hagan” Sam / 519**
Black Bear and Ant / 522
Black Bear and Fish Hawk / 534
Coyote and the Big Rock / 547
Mink and Tutyika / 558
- 4 *lalacut* Agnes Jules James / 567**
Basket Ogress / 570
- Glossary of Terms / 591**
- References / 599**

Foreword

The Lushootseed word *syəhub*, which has been used to refer to the texts in this volume, is often translated into English as “traditional story.” As we continue to speak, write, and think in English about these written texts, we shorten “traditional story” to “story,” a word that results in the blending of our concept of *syəhub* with an English-language concept that can refer to everything from a spontaneous lie to an art narrative composed in writing by a sole author and published as a fixed text. “Traditional story” is an ineffective rendition because it fails to address the basic characteristics of *syəhub*, which is an oral tradition; and it is a dangerous rendition because it serves to dilute our awareness of those characteristics.

As we are taught, the *syəhub* is a cumulative unwritten tradition, not any one realization of it. It is also a cloud of possibilities with a particular but unstable centre around a group of potentialities remembered and forgotten, realized and unrealized, constantly changing, known only fragmentarily by any one person or any one tribe or at any one time. It is a gyre of motifs, rhetorical strategies, characters, plots, teachings, commentary, names, formulas, places, histories, customs, songs, specialized knowledge, and much else. The *syəhub* contains private property but also regional borrowings, as well as overlaps with every other oral tradition in the world. However, every realization of a *syəhub* tradition is culturally and individually specific.

When we come to the task of talking about heritage rights and the tribal duty of heritage guardianship as these apply to a *syəhub* tradition, we find that there are no English-language resources available that do not distort what we need to say. This is due in part to the fact that English-language discourse about rights and the legal protection of rights to oral narrative has yet to

develop concepts of heritage and oral tradition. What we can do, however, is state as a basic principle that, whether it is done by tribal members or non-tribal members, all work that makes use of our traditions should be done in such a way as to benefit the people of Tulalip. When we are talking about the *syəhub* tradition and traditional oratory, “benefit” means specifically to be of help to our work in the revitalization of our language and oral traditions.

Our tribal duty of heritage guardianship involves the assertion of protocols to ensure that our traditions are not misconstrued or decontextualized. *syəyəhub* do not exist for the purpose of teaching reading skills or for the purpose of linguistic analysis. For people who work with our *syəhub* tradition, no matter what kind of work they are doing, it is vital that *syəyəhub* continue to serve the purposes for which they have come into existence. The most important of these purposes is to ensure the survival of those who hear them.

Research and curriculum development are not tasks that in themselves permit *syəhub* to do its work. It is not that we do not want these tasks to be done (we do them ourselves); it is that the research or curriculum “use” of the tradition must not stop with that “use,” which is so far short of allowing *syəyəhub* to work. Otherwise, the “use” of the tradition is like girdling the cedar tree from which you are taking bark: you kill it in the course of your work.

Here are some examples of deeds that we hope our assertion of heritage guardianship will prevent in the future: the context-shorn, reductive translation of our stories so that they lose their ability to save lives; the use of such translations in classrooms at all, but especially in classrooms serving Native students; the exclusive use of translations in the classroom; the exclusive reliance on written texts in cross-cultural work involving our traditions; the mining of transcribed texts of our oral tradition for data of various kinds, with no respect for the life-giving nature of the traditions; and the failure of outsiders to share with the Tribe the fruits of their study of our traditions.

As the present volume was being prepared, Professor Beck entered into an agreement with the Tulalip Tribes that will prolong the relationship of many decades between the Tribes and Professor Thom Hess, a relationship involving the mutual exchange of information and assistance. UBC Press has offered the Tribes the opportunity to expand on the work of this volume in a way that will involve our tribal membership and aid us in the work of caring

for our language. We welcome these prospects of further work with both Professor Beck and the Press.

The Tulalip Tribes Lushootseed Department

Abbreviations and Symbols

[]	grammatical amendment	CONT	continuous
()	phonological/contextual elision (in text)	COORD	coordinative
()	additional information (in glosses)	CSMD	causative middle
⌋	two-part lexical item	CTD	contained
=	clitic boundary	DAT	dative applicative
–	affix boundary	DC	diminished control
•	lexical suffix boundary	DIM.EFF	diminished effectiveness
♪	line from a song	DIST	distal
·	rhetorical lengthening	DMA	demonstrative adverbial
1, 2, 3	first, second, third person	DSD	desiderative
ABS	absent	DSTR	distributive
ACT	activity	ECS	external causative
ADD	additive	FEM	feminine
ADNM	adjunctive nominalizer	FOC	focus
ALTV	allative applicative	HAB	habitual
ATTN	attenuative	HMN	human
AUTO	autonomous	ICS	internal causative
CLS	classifier	IMP	imperative
CNN	connective	INCH	inchoative
CNTRFG	centrifugal	INSTR	instrumental
CNTRPT	centripetal	INT	interrogative
COLL	collective	INTJ	interjection
CONJ	conjunction	INTNS	intensivity
		IRR	irrealis
		MAP	middle applicative

MD	middle	PRTV	partitive
NEG	negative	PTCL	particle
NEGP	negative proclitic	QTV	quotative
NM	nominalizer	RCP	reciprocal
NP	nominalizing prefix	RDP	reduplication
NSPEC	non-specific	REFL	reflexive
OBJ	object	REM	remote/hypothetical
PASS	passive	RLNL	relational
PFV	perfective	SBJ	subjunctive
PL	plural	SBRD	subordinate
PO	possessive	SCONJ	sentential conjunction
PR	preposition	SG	singular
PRLV	prolative	SPEC	specific
PROC	proclivitive	SS	secondary suffix
PROG	progressive	STAT	stative
PROP	propriative	SUB	subject
PROX	proximal	UNQ	unique
PRPV	purposive		

Introduction

A key element of the documentation, preservation, and potential revitalization of severely endangered languages is the compilation of transcribed and analyzed texts in the language that can serve as resources for language programs, community activists, and speakers or speaker-descendants; such texts are also essential tools for academic linguists doing research beneficial to the speech community itself, as well as to the larger goals of typological and theoretical studies in linguistics. One particularly important and well-represented genre of indigenous language text is the traditional story, a genre favoured by linguists, especially in North America and in the Pacific Northwest, since the times of Franz Boas. Such texts provide repositories of important cultural knowledge, specialized vocabulary and grammatical structures, and patterns of narrative stylistics and discourse that make them especially rich sources of linguistic data and of very high value to speaker-descendant communities. In the case of Lushootseed, a great many traditional stories, or *syəyəhub*, have been recorded and transcribed, largely through the efforts of the late Thom Hess and Vi Taq^wšəblu Hilbert, and several collections of stories with line-by-line translations have been produced (Hess 1995, 1998, 2006; Hilbert 1995a, 1995b; Bierwert 1996) – but to date only two fully analyzed texts have been published (Hilbert and Hess 1977; Beck and Hess 2010). Thus, ironically, although Lushootseed is one of the better-documented languages of the Salishan family in terms of the amount of recorded and transcribed material available, this material remains in fairly inaccessible form from the perspective of those seeking insight, whether for pedagogical or academic purposes, into the structure and logic of the language itself. The purpose of these volumes is to rectify this situation to some extent by offering

a collection of traditional narratives accompanied by full analysis, translation, and interlinear glosses, beginning here with stories told in the Snohomish dialect of Lushootseed. It is hoped that this collection will serve the purposes of linguists and other scholars, advanced learners, and teachers of the language, and will become an important part of the documentary record of the Lushootseed language as it was spoken by the final generation of Elders who spoke it as an exclusive mother tongue.

Language

Lushootseed (*dəxʷləšucid*, also known as Puget Salish or Skagit-Nisqually) is the name given to the language of the indigenous peoples living in the Puget Sound basin, along the lower stretches of the Skagit and Samish River systems, on Whidbey Island, and in the eastern half of Fidalgo Island in northwest Washington State (Bates et al. 1994). Along with Twana, it forms the Southern branch of the Central Salish division of the Salishan language family (Kiyosawa and Gerdtz 2010). The different varieties of the language constitute a dialect continuum, generally divided by linguists into two groups, Northern and Southern (Hess 1977), based on differences in lexical stress-patterns and the distribution of certain vocabulary and grammatical elements. The Southern varieties include Duwamish, Nisqually, Puyallup, Sahewamish, Skykomish, Snoqualamie, Squaxin, Suquamish, and Whulshootseed (Muckle-shoot), while the Northern division encompasses Sauk-Suiattle, Skagit, Snohomish, Stillaguamish, Swinomish, and Upper Skagit. Although these divisions reflect the current situation in terms of recorded and extant speech varieties, in earlier times, before disruption by European contact and the redistribution of the population to reserves, dialectal differences could be used to identify individual villages and households (Bates et al. 1994). Currently, Lushootseed is the first language of probably fewer than a dozen Elders, although some varieties are being maintained as heritage languages through energetic revitalization programs.

Snohomish (*shudubš*) is the southernmost member of the Northern dialect group, currently spoken on and around the Tulalip Reservation, although the dialect name originally applied to a variety spoken further up the Snohomish River (Bates et al. 1994). While it is the native language of no more than a handful of remaining Elders in their seventies and eighties, Snohomish has been at the centre of serious revitalization efforts and currently

has several fluent speakers who learned the language as adults, as well as many others of varying degrees of proficiency in the spoken and (now) written language. Of the Lushootseed varieties, Snohomish is one of the most familiar. Snohomish materials constitute a substantial portion of the recordings of native Northwest languages made by Leon Metcalf in the 1950s, and the Snohomish dialect was the focus of extensive research by Thom Hess, who began recording and working with Elders at Tulalip in the 1960s. In particular, Snohomish is the source of material for the *Lushootseed Readers* (Hess 1995, 1998, 2006), and vocabulary from Snohomish Elders and recorded Snohomish stories figures prominently in the *Dictionary of Puget Salish* (Hess 1976) and the *Lushootseed Dictionary* (Bates et al. 1994). This volume presents eighteen Snohomish tales from among the recordings in the Hess and Metcalf Collections.

Texts

The stories in this volume are all traditional tales, or *syəyəhub*, told by four Tulalip Elders: Mrs. Martha Lamont, Mr. Edward (Hagan) Sam, Mrs. Elizabeth Krise, and Mrs. Agnes James. Four of the stories (“Crow Is Sick: First Telling,” “Mink and Tutyika: First telling,” “Coyote and His Daughter,” and “Basket Ogress” told by Mrs. Lamont, and “Basket Ogress” told by Mrs. James) come from recordings made by Leon Metcalf in the 1950s; the remainder were recorded in the following decade by Thom Hess. Three of the stories included in this volume (“Mink and Tutyika: Second Telling” and “Crow Is Sick: Second Telling” by Mrs. Lamont, and “Mink and Tutyika” as told by Mr. Sam) are versions of stories first heard on the Metcalf tapes but reprised for Hess’ recordings in the 1960s. The volume also contains two separate versions of the Basket Ogress story, one told by Mrs. Lamont and the other by Mrs. James, both recorded by Leon Metcalf.

The stories included here are selections made initially by Thom Hess for use in preparing lexicographical and pedagogical materials, and represent the most narratively complete and accessible Snohomish *syəhub* in the Hess and Metcalf collections. Twelve have been previously published in the three volumes of the *Lushootseed Reader* (Hess 1995, 1998, 2006), and, of these, three – Mrs. Lamont’s tellings of the Changer story, “The Brothers of Pheasant’s wife” (also known as “The Story of the Seal Hunters”), and the second telling of “Crow Is Sick” – have also appeared in slightly different

form in Bierwert 1996, an excellent volume dedicated to the analysis of Lushootseed narrative aesthetics. The remaining six stories – two tellings of the story of “Mink and Tutyika” by Mrs. Lamont, a telling of the nursery-tale “Lady Louse” by Mrs. Krise, and two tellings of the Basket Ogress story, one by Mrs. Lamont and the other by Mrs. James – are hitherto unpublished, although a redacted version of “Lady Louse” has been used extensively in pedagogical materials and appears in Hilbert 1996.

All of the texts recorded by Hess were initially transcribed by hand with the assistance of an Elder. In the case of the stories told by Mrs. Lamont, transcription was done for the most part with her husband, Mr. Levi Lamont, often in Mrs. Lamont’s presence, though some assistance was also offered by Mrs. Louise George. Mrs. George also assisted with the transcriptions of Mr. Sam’s stories, as did Mr. Sam himself. Mrs. Krise assisted in the transcription of “Lady Louse.” During the transcription process, the connected narrative was broken down into lines corresponding roughly to syntactic units, words, and phrases in ways that seemed intuitive to Hess and the Elders at the time. This was done on a largely informal basis, and the results are particular to each individual story, depending no doubt on the style of the telling, the inclinations of the Elders working with Hess on the transcription, and just how large a chunk of material Hess felt he could cope with in any one instance. These original line breaks have largely been preserved, although some minor adjustments have been made over the years and are reflected in the texts presented in this volume.¹

The recordings made by Leon Metcalf were all transcribed in the first place by Vi Taq^wšöblu Hilbert, who took upon herself the monumental task of listening to, copying down, and translating the many reels in this collection. These transcriptions and Mrs. Hilbert’s translations were then gone over with Hess, corrected and adjusted, and finally passed into clean typescript. Many of the texts from both sets of recordings, Metcalf’s and Hess’, were then entered into a computer, most of them by Hess and a few by Beck. Hess’ original files were created in an ancient DOS-based word processor and later converted by Beck into a more modern format and incorporated into an analytical database that was then used to parse and produce the interlinearizations of the texts presented below.

¹ For an illustrative discussion of a reallocation of line breaks based on phonetic considerations, see Beck and Bennett 2007.

Transcription and analysis

The transcriptions of the stories in this volume differ in some ways from earlier published versions. Most notable are revisions made on relistening to the tapes and comparing the recordings directly with existing transcripts. As an example, consider line 129 of the text “Little Diver Is Wife of Heron,” told by Mrs. Lamont, as it is given in the third volume of the *Lushootseed Readers* (Hess 2006, 17, line 129):

- 1 hay g^wəl (h)uy cutəx^w ti?acəc ?iišəds ?alalš ?ə <ti?acəc cədił č’ətš ?i> tsi?ə? gət š^wu?š^wəy? ?alalš[s] ti?i?i? ?ista?b <ti?acəc ?ista?b, stab k^wi sda?s ?al k^wi, ti?i?i? stəb, divers, stab əw’ə> swuq^wad ?i šəwawq’ [sə]sa?li? ti?i?i? brothers dəx^wsqatəd ?ə tsi?ə? cədił.

‘And then her relatives spoke, the brothers of this gal, Little Diver – her brothers that, uh, What are the names of those? uh, uh – Loon and Big Diver, the two brothers of this one.’ (Hess 2006, 17, line 129; translation on page 244)

This same stretch of text appears in the present volume as follows:

- 2 hay g^wəl (h)uy cutəx^w ti?acəc ?iišəds ?alalš ?ə tsi?ə? gət š^wu?š^wəy?
 hay g^wəl huy cut=ax^w ti?acəc ?iišəd-s ?al-alš
 SCONJ SCONJ SCONJ say=now UNQ relatives-3PO PL-cross.sex.sibling
 ?ə tsi?ə? gət š^wu?š^wəy?
 PR PROX:FEM guy Little.Diver

‘And then her relatives spoke, the brothers of this gal, Little Diver.’

- 3 ?alalš ti?i?i? ?ista?b ti?acəc ?ista?b ...
 ?al-alš-s ti?i?i? ?ista?b ti?acəc ?ista?b
 PL-cross.sex.sibling-3PO PL-DIST be.like UNQ be.like
 ‘Those who are like her older brothers, the very ones who are like ...’

- 4 stab k^wi sda?atəb əlg^wə?
 stab k^wi s=da?a-t-b=s əlg^wə?
 what REM NM=named-ICS-PASS=3PO PL
 ‘What are their names?’

- 5 čəšayu?
 Levi Lamont: ‘??’

- 6 *No ti?iɬ stab ti?iɬ stab divers ...*
 no ti?iɬ stab ti?iɬ stab divers
 no DIST what DIST what divers
 Martha Lamont: ‘No, something, something, divers ...’
- 7 *stab əw’ə? ... swuqʷad*
 stab əw’ə? swuqʷad
 what PTCL loon
 ‘What is it? Loon!’
- 8 *?i swuqʷad ?i ʃəwawq’ ʃəwawq’*
 ?i swuqʷad ?i ʃəwawq’ ʃəwawq’
 CONJ loon CONJ Big.Diver Big.Diver
 ‘Loon and Big Diver, Big Diver.’
- 9 *[sə]sa?li? ti?iɬ brothers ?ə tsi?ə? cədiɬ*
 səsə?li? ti?iɬ brothers ?ə tsi?ə? cədiɬ
 two:HMN DIST brothers PR PROX:FEM s/he
 ‘She has two brothers.’ [Little Diver is wife of Heron, lines 137-44]

The extensive differences between the transcriptions have two sources. One is, of course, careful relistening with the aid of modern equipment for slowing down or enhancing audio recordings. This particular part of the recording of “Little Diver” is difficult to follow because it contains a number of false starts and hesitations, and the recording is muffled as Mrs. Lamont directs some of her speech at her husband rather than into the microphone. This off-task exchange between Mr. and Mrs. Lamont is the second source of the discrepancies between the two versions of the text. In keeping with the intention of presenting the stories as monologues and maintaining their narrative continuity, Mrs. Lamont’s asides and her question to her husband are backgrounded (given in angle brackets to indicate false starts and misspeaking) in the *Reader*, and Mr. Lamont’s reply to the question is left out completely.²

² Note that this volume and the *Readers* do concur in the treatment of the first block of material enclosed in angle brackets in (1), which is clearly a misspeaking as it says, incorrectly, that the relatives being introduced were Kingfisher’s (*č’ətč*). Mrs. Lamont corrects herself immediately, clarifying that they were, in fact, relatives of Little Diver (*č’w’u?č’w’əy?*). Where misspeakings of this type are retained in angle brackets in the *Readers*, they are generally excluded from the texts in this volume (see below for further discussion).

From the point of view of the story itself, much of this can be seen as an interruption; from a linguistic point of view, however, this is extremely valuable data, a conversational exchange, of a type that is very rare for this group of Elders. Although this particular stretch of text is probably the most extensive revision in this volume, there are a few other places where material heard in the recordings but excluded from the transcriptions in the *Readers* has been reincorporated into the versions of the stories presented here.

A second type of change in the transcriptions stems from grammatical reanalysis and minor reinterpretations of forms and structures based on a deepening knowledge of Lushootseed grammar. An example of this kind of revision can be seen in the comparison of the different transcriptions of the following lines from Mrs. Lamont's "The Brothers of Pheasant's Wife":

10 ?əsλ'ubiləx^w čəx^w tə ?a(h)
 ?as-λ'ub-il=ax^w čəx^w tə ?ah
 STAT-well-INCH=now 2SG.SUB NSPEC be.there
 ' "You are fine there." ' (Hess 2006, 49, line 190)

11 ?əsλ'ubiləx^w čəx^w ta?a?
 ?as-λ'ub-il=ax^w čəx^w ta?a?
 STAT-well-INCH=now 2SG.SUB DIST:UNQ.DMA
 ' "You are fine there." ' [The Brothers of Pheasant's Wife, line 190]

The sentence in (10) is the line from the version of this text published in the third *Lushootseed Reader* (Hess 2006), interlinearized as it would have appeared in this volume; (11) is the same line as it appears below. The difference lies in the transcription of the last words in the sentence, originally transcribed as *tə ?a(h)* 'something that is there' and reanalyzed here as the unique distal demonstrative adverb *ta?a?* 'over there'. Semantically, the original expression seems not to fit the translation very well, while syntactically it takes the form of a direct argument that seems not to be part of the normal valency of the main verb, *λ'ubil* 'be fine'. While the original interpretation of the phrase was probably as an adverbial adjunct, the use of the non-specific determiner does not match the translation well, and an adjunct of this type would normally be nominalized and/or be introduced by a preposition. Careful relistening and analysis with the aid of phonetics software (Praat 5.3) reveals the actual word on tape to be [taʔaʔ], the laryngealized mid-

portion of the vowel being a logical realization of an intervocalic glottal stop in rapid speech. All in all there are very few changes of this type, and such alterations to the text were made only when, as in the preceding example, they were fully supported by the phonological, syntactic, and semantic evidence.

Another source of discrepancy between the transcriptions presented here and those found in the *Readers* is the treatment of lexical items, phrases, and sentences spoken in English, many of which are left out of earlier transcriptions. For example, the following line appears in the third volume of the *Readers* as it is given in (12), but appears in this volume as given in (13):

12 bədaʔəbəx^w əlg^wəʔ ʔi tiʔəʔ tək^wtək^wəlus ʔə tiʔəʔ miʔmanʔ čʔačʔas
 ‘She and Owl have a little boy.’ (Hess 2006, 3, line 10)

13 bədaʔəbəx^w əlg^wəʔ ʔi tiʔəʔ tək^wtək^wəlus ʔə tiʔəʔ baby miʔmanʔ čʔačʔas
 bədaʔ–b=ax^w əlg^wəʔ ʔi tiʔəʔ tək^wtək^wəlus ʔə tiʔəʔ baby
 offspring–MD=now PL CONJ PROX owl PR PROX baby
 miʔ–manʔ čʔačʔas
 ATTN–small child
 ‘She and Owl have a little baby boy.’ [Owl Lives There, line 10]

While English is not consistently expunged from the texts in the *Readers*, there are many cases where it is heard on tape but is either not included in the transcription or given in angle brackets. The removal of English material from the text might have originally been motivated by a desire for a “pure” Lushootseed, as closely as possible approximating what might have been heard from monolingual speakers of an older generation. This somewhat artificial practice has been set aside here in the recognition that code switching, code mixing, and other effects of language contact are inevitable and are, in and of themselves, a legitimate area of inquiry that these texts may shed some small light on. English words are given in the transcription lines in italics and, when incorporated into Lushootseed sentences, are glossed like any other element of the sentence, as shown above in (13). When entire sentences are spoken in English, these are numbered in sequence and given in italics, but are not provided with glosses.

Transcription practices

Over and above clear discrepancies between the versions of stories given here and those presented in earlier publications, there are differences between the practices and conventions employed in presenting transcriptions in this volume and those employed in the *Lushootseed Readers*. One of these is the omission of parentheses used in the *Readers* to present “unpronounced” phonological material, a practice put into place as an aid for students using the *Readers* to study Lushootseed grammar. In many cases, such as that in (14) below, this material is added based on morphological considerations, but does not reflect genuine pronunciation of Lushootseed words and phrases:

14 ʔəsčal kʷi gʷədəxʷkʷəd(d)xʷs tsiʔiʔ bədaʔs

‘How would he manage to get his daughter?’ (Hess 1998, 95, line 133)

In this sentence, the extra “d” is added to help the student see that the word *kʷədaxʷ* is composed of the radical *kʷəd(a)*- ‘taken’ and the diminished control suffix *-dxʷ*.³ The same line is presented in this volume as:

15 ʔəsčal kʷi gʷədəxʷkʷədaxʷs tsiʔiʔ bədaʔs

ʔas-čal kʷi gʷə=dəxʷ=kʷəda-dxʷ=s tsiʔiʔ bədaʔ-s

STAT-how REM SBJ=ADNM=taken-DC=3PO DIST:FEM offspring-3PO

‘How would he manage to get his daughter?’ [Coyote and His Daughter, line 133]

This transcription reproduces the line as spoken on tape more faithfully. The analysis of the word is recoverable from the interlinear gloss, and comparison of the two lines provides information about the morphophonemics and phonotactics of the language.

Similarly, the *Readers* provide full forms of the temporal and modal clitics – *tu*= ‘irrealis’, *tu*= ‘past’, *λ'u*= ‘habitual’, *bə*= ‘additive’, and *gʷə*= ‘subjunctive’ – in environments where the full forms are never pronounced:

16 ʃʷulʔ čəd ʔuləʔuʃʷtxʷ tiʔəʔ ʔ(u)adsʔəʔtxʷ ʔ(u)adsʔild əlgʷəʔ

‘I will just take what you will feed them, what food you will give them.’ (Hess 1998, 58, line 56)

³ In this particular case, the radical *kʷəda*- ‘taken’ is one of a set of Lushootseed radicals with a final vowel that surfaces only in certain contexts (cf. the transitive form *kʷədad* ‘take sth’). This vowel is included in the second line of analysis in (15) as part of the “full” or underlying form of the radical.

In normal speech, the sequence of vowels created by joining *tu=* and *ad=* in (16) is simplified to /a/, as shown in the same line as presented in this volume:

- 17 *x̣wul' čəd ṭuɔʔu x̣wṭx̣w tiʔəʔ ṭadsʔə ṭx̣w ṭadsḥild əlg̣wəʔ*
x̣wul' čəd ṭu=ɔ=ʔu x̣w-ṭx̣w tiʔəʔ ṭu=ad=s=ʔə ṭ-ṭx̣w
 only 1SG.SUB IRR=PROG=go-ECS PROX IRR=2SG.PO=NM=be.fed-ECS
ṭu=ad=s=ṭil-t əlg̣wəʔ
 IRR=2SG.PO=NM=give.food-ICS PL

'I will just take what you will feed them, what food you will give them.' [Crow Is Sick: First Telling, line 57]

This reduction is absolutely consistent in all the recordings, and so the elided phonological material (the vowel of the modal clitic) is not presented as part of the transcription, though it is recoverable from the full form of the clitic as given in the interlinear gloss.

There is, however, one environment in which the phonological material in parentheses included in the *Readers* is also included in this volume, even though it is not heard in the recordings. This is where phonological juncture has taken place in rapid speech between two words that, in careful speech, would be pronounced as two completely separate items, with the potential for pauses between them or for the presence of intervening words in slightly different syntactic contexts. An example of this can be seen in (18):

- 18 *ʔəsʔə x̣iṭx̣w čəx̣w six̣w ṭsi(ɪ) adbədaʔ*
ʔas-ʔə x̣id-ṭx̣w čəx̣w six̣w ṭsi ad-bədaʔ
 STAT-what.happen-ECS 2SG.SUB PTCL SPEC:FEM 2SG.PO-offspring

'What have you done to your daughter?' (Hess 1998, 99, line 230; Coyote and His Daughter, line 234)

Instead of the full form of the noun phrase *ṭsi adbədaʔ* 'your daughter', what is heard in the recording here is [tsadbədaʔ], the feminine determiner *ṭsi* being reduced to /ts/ and pronounced as part of the following word. The full form of words pronounced in this way is maintained in the transcription in the interests of clarity in the syntactic analysis, and in recognition of the fact that the reduction of these forms is not absolutely consistent and is particular to rate of speech and specific prosodic environments.

Unlike parentheses, which are not to be interpreted as “corrections” of the text, the square brackets used both here and in the *Lushootseed Readers* indicate grammatical amendments to the spoken line. These are used to provide either: (1) missing grammatical markers or syntactic elements, the majority of which were added on the advice of the Elder working on the original transcription; or (2) repairs of words that were mispronounced due to slips of the tongue or extremely rapid speech. An example of the first type of amendment can be seen in (19):

- 19 cick^wəx^w ?əsduk^wtx^w ti?ə? bad[s]
 cick^w=ax^w ?as-duk^wu-tx^w ti?ə? bad-s
 very=now STAT-abnormal-ECS PROX father-3PO
 ‘She is very angry with her father.’ (Hess 1998, 99, line 223; Coyote and His Daughter, line 227)

Here the source of the amendment is the meaning of the sentence, which (along with the context) makes it clear that the woman being discussed is angry with her own father (Coyote), hence the addition of the possessive suffix. Other (fewer) editorial amendments are motivated by purely grammatical considerations:

- 20 ?əbil’ čəx^w ɬušudx^w ti?iɬ ɬuləg^wax^w ɬu[s]?əλ’cbicids [ti?iɬ] sčəłxəłtəd
 ?əbil’ čəx^w ɬu=šul-dx^w ti?iɬ ɬu=lə=g^wax^w
 perhaps 2SG.SUB IRR=sec-DC DIST IRR=PROG=walk
 ɬu=s=?əλ’-c-bicid=s ti?iɬ sčəłxəłtəd
 IRR=NM=come-ALTV-2SG.OBJ=3PO DIST in.law
 ‘Perhaps you will see some who will be travelling, those brothers of my wife will come after you.’ (Hess 2006, 49, line 180; The Brothers of Pheasant’s Wife, line 180)

In (20) we see two amendments. The first is the addition of the nominalizing clitic *s=* to the word *ɬu[s]?əλ’cbicids* ‘their future coming after you’. This is motivated both by the syntax of the sentence (the nominalization of the clause is an indicator of subordination) and by the fact that the word itself bears the third-person possessive enclitic *=s*, which marks agreement with a subject (the in-laws) only for nominalized verbs. The second amendment, the addition of the determiner *ti?iɬ*, was made following the principle that nouns in argument

position (in this case, the subject/possessor of the nominalized clause) consistently require a determiner. Such amendments are marked in this volume both to alert readers to discrepancies with what is heard in the recordings, and, of course, to leave open the possibility that the utterances as spoken were in fact correct sentences following grammatical patterns that have yet to be understood.

The second motivation for adding material in brackets was mispronunciation, generally in the context of rapid speech, as in (21):

- 21 huy q^wib[icut]əx^w tiʔəʔ ʔaciɬtalbix^w
 huy q^wibi-t-sut=ax^w tiʔəʔ ʔaciɬtalbix^w
 SCONJ prepared-ICS-REFL=now PROX people
 ‘Then the people get ready.’ (Hess 1998, 101, line 272; Coyote and His Daughter, line 276)

Here the word heard in the recording is [q^wibəx^w], whereas the transcribers recognized the form as the word *q^wibicut* ‘prepare oneself’ and offered the full form by way of correction.⁴ In principle, these slips of the tongue are different from the regular, context-sensitive reductions discussed earlier, although in practice there are many subtler cases where judgments would have had to have been made on the part of the transcribers as to what constitutes an error and what is simply normal phonological variation or reduction.⁵ It should be noted that in all three cases presented here, the amendments were made on the advice of the Elders working on the original transcriptions, as were the majority of amendments to the texts presented below, which are also found in other published versions of the same texts. In a very few (and only in absolutely uncontroversial) cases, further amendments have been added to transcriptions as part of the preparation of this volume.

⁴ It is possible that in this case the line as spoken was, strictly speaking, grammatical, as the bare radical *q^wib* ‘be ready’ is found used in sentences in the *Lushootseed Dictionary* – in which case, the gloss of the sentence would be ‘the people were ready’ and the amendment might have been made based on stylistic rather than grammatical considerations; however, the examples in the dictionary all have the stative aspectual prefix on them, and it is not known at this time whether the radical without this prefix would be acceptable in this context.

⁵ There are, in fact, some inconsistencies in the *Lushootseed Readers* as to what is treated as predictable phonological variation and what is treated as an editorial amendment, with the same thing in one instance being given in parentheses and in another in square brackets. This has been standardized for the texts in this volume, following the principles outlined above.

There are some few instances where editorial amendments found in the *Readers* are not maintained in present volume, which instead presents the lines as they are actually spoken on tape. This is done only in those cases where the original structure heard in the recording is well attested in other parts of the corpus (an example of this is seen in [25] below) and/or where the amendment is clearly inconsistent with the intended meaning of the sentence (as judged by the glosses). The only frequent example of this practice is removal of aspect markers, particularly the perfective aspect marker, added to many verbs in the versions of the texts found in the *Readers*. Most of these appear to have been added for stylistic, rather than grammatical, reasons, and this particular series of emendations seems to have been carried out at a later stage of editing, rather than in consultation with Elders during the transcription process.

Brackets in this volume are also used to a limited extent where a mis-speaking has led to a contradictory or potentially confusing statement due to an error in lexical choice. This occurs, for example, in one or two places in Mrs. Lamont's telling of "Little Diver Was the Wife of Heron," as shown in (22):

- 22 g^wəl čaʔčəlal' g^wətuk^wədubəs tə cədiʔ [č'ətš̌]
 g^wəl čaʔčəlal' g^wə=tu=k^wəda-dx^w-b=as tə cədiʔ
 SCONJ almost.caught SBJ=PAST=taken-DC-PASS=3SBRD NSPEC s/he
 č'ətš̌
 kingfisher

'And Kingfisher was almost caught.' [Little Diver is the Wife of Heron, line 224]

The final word in this sentence as spoken on tape is *sbəq'wa?* 'heron'; however, in the context of the story, it is clearly Kingfisher who was almost caught, and nearly killed, by Heron. Because this is a confusion between two major characters in the story, a correction was felt to be in order. In the *Readers*, the corrected version of the sentence is given and the change is acknowledged in a footnote, but the altered lexical item is not marked as such in the text; here, the correction is treated as an editorial amendment.

In other contexts, however, where potential confusion affecting the comprehension of the story is not at stake, similar misspeaking are not corrected. Consider (23), from the story "Owl Lives There":

same phrase again and pressing ahead. The second exclusion represents a mispronunciation, which Mrs. Lamont immediately corrects.⁶ Elements like this have been removed on the premise that the goal of this volume is to present “clean” grammatical structures as the speaker would have wanted to have spoken them. While this may present an idealized, even slightly unrealistic, picture of the spoken language, it is certainly consonant with the treatment accorded English and other languages with more established written forms, as well as representing those aspects of the language of greatest interest from a descriptive and analytic point of view. The excluded material can, of course, be heard in the audio recordings.

There is, however, one type of material that is presented in angle brackets in the *Readers* that is preserved (although without brackets) in the present volume. These are cases such as that in (26), where the storyteller momentarily loses the thread of the story or hesitates while groping for a lexical item:

- 26 həbu? tsi?ił čəg^was ?ə ti?ə? bəda? ?ə ti?ə? sbiaw ?i tsi?acəc stab sxa?hus
 həbu? tsi?ił čəg^was ?ə ti?ə? bəda? ?ə ti?ə? sbiaw ?i
 pigeon DIST:FEM wife PR PROX offspring PR PROX coyote CONJ
 tsi?acəc stab sxa?hus
 UNQ:FEM what sawbill

‘Pigeon is the wife of Coyote’s Son and (so) is, what is it?, Sawbill.’ [Coyote’s Son Has Two Wives, line 4]

In the version of this sentence given by Hess (2006, 22), the second to last word *stab* ‘what’ (there, *stəb*) is enclosed in angle brackets; however, here it is included as part of the sentence because this is a consistent and linguistically relevant use of the word *stab*, of clear interest to students of the language.

⁶ The contrast between (24) and (25) also illustrates a difference in editorial emendation: in both versions, the form heard on tape [əʃəls] has been corrected to [səʃəls], the presence of the nominalizer *s=* being required for a verb ending in the third-person possessive =*s*. In addition, the sentence as given in Hess 2006 adds the remote determiner *k^wi*, probably for stylistic reasons. However, since modifying clauses of this type without determiners are well attested in the corpus, the added determiner is not strictly necessary for the grammaticality of the clause and is not included in the version of the sentence given in this volume.

Presentation

The analyzed texts are presented here in four-line interlinearized format:

27	tuḫ ^w čəd ʔ'udx ^w q ^w ibalusəb dbəda?	transcription
	tuḫ ^w čəd ʔ'u=dx ^w -q ^w ib•alus-ab d-bəda?	parsing line
	just 1SG.SUB HAB=CTD-prepared•eye-DSD 1SG.PO-offspring	analysis line
	'I just want to fix my eye, my son.'	full gloss

The first line presents a transcription of what is considered to be a single line of text based on prosodic and structural criteria (see above). The orthography used is that developed by Thom Hess and currently employed by the Tualip Tribes and the Tualip language program, as well as in the *Lushootseed Dictionary* (Bates et al. 1994) and most other printed materials. The alphabet, based on Americanist versions of the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA), employs forty consonant symbols, given in Table 1, and four vowels (*a*, *ə*, *i*, *u*), three of which have long and short forms (*aa*, *ii*, *uu*). In addition to these symbols, the half-triangular colon, “.”, is used to indicate emphatic or rhetorical lengthening of vowels, a technique used by the storytellers for dramatic effect. Punctuation symbols such as periods, commas, question marks, and exclamation points are not used in the transcription lines.

The transcription practices here follow those of Hess, who chose to write words using a broadly morphophonemic transcription system that gives words in a standardized spelling reflective of careful pronunciation, recognizing only those allophonic and allomorphic alternations that are considered sufficiently regular and rate-of-speech independent. Contracted or prosodically reduced forms such as [tiit] for *ti?it* ‘that’, [ciit] for *cədit* ‘s/he’, or [stəb] for *stab* ‘what’ are written consistently in their full, citation form. Careful listening will certainly reveal a range of phonological and prosodic effects that cause pronunciations to deviate from standardized forms, but representing these in the written texts runs the risk of sowing confusion and making the words they represent impossible to identify.

Table 1

Lushootseed consonants

	Bilabial	Alveolar	Post-alveolar	Velar	Uvular	Glottal
voiceless stops	p, pʰ	t, tʰ		k, kʰ kʷ, kʷʰ	q, qʰ qʷ, qʷʰ	ʔ
voiced stops	b, (bʰ)	d		g, gʷ		
voiceless affricates		c [ts]	č [tʃ]			
voiced affricates		dʒ [dz]	ǰ [dʒ]			
lateral affricates		łʰ [tʰʎ]				
voiceless fricatives		s	š [ʃ]	xʷ	χ [χ] χʷ [χʷ]	h
lateral fricative		ʎ				
approximants		l, lʰ	y, [j] yʰ [jʰ]	w, wʰ		
nasals	(m), (mʰ)	(n), (nʰ)				

() = rare phoneme or phoneme restricted to stylized speech

[] = corresponding IPA symbol

This volume also follows Hess in its treatment of the feminine forms of determiners and demonstratives such as *tsi*, *tsiʔəʔ*, or *tsiʔiʔ*. Phonemically, these are (in Lushootseed orthography) /ci/, /ciʔəʔ/, and /ciʔiʔ/, respectively; however, contrast with the non-feminine forms (*ti*, *tiʔəʔ*, and *tiʔiʔ*), and between pairs such as *kʷi* ‘remote non-feminine’ and *kʷsi* ‘remote feminine’, reveals the presence of a morpheme *-s-* ‘feminine’. This is explicitly recognized in the orthography, which represents the initial /c/ phoneme of such

forms as “ts.” On the other hand, this volume does not continue Hess’ use of the final orthographic “h” with simple CV verbal radicals like *?ah* ‘be there’ and *qah* ‘many’. This became part of standardized Lushootseed spelling in order to maintain a consistent CVC root template, but it is felt that here it might be misleading to those interested in the phonological and phonotactic patterns of the language as represented in these texts.

Following the transcription, a line containing a full parsing of the words in the first line into morphological units is presented, using the following conventions:

- affix-boundary
- lexical suffix boundary
- = clitic boundary
- ⏟ two-part lexical item

For the purposes of the analysis below, an affix (marked by “–”) is considered a bound element with a grammatical meaning (derivational or inflectional) that is a morphological component of the lexeme or the inflected wordform. Grammatical affixes are treated as distinct from lexical suffixes (marked by “•”), which are bound elements with what are traditionally thought of as more lexical meanings (generally, the translation equivalents of English nouns). Lexical suffixes are a well-known feature of Salishan languages (Czaykowska-Higgins and Kinkade 1998), as well as of other language families of the Pacific Northwest (Kinkade et al. 1998). In Lushootseed, they are often only recognizable in words as fossilized elements, but even in non-compositional uses they are parsed here, whenever possible, for their etymological interest.

In contrast to affixes, which are part of the morphological makeup of words, clitics (indicated by “=”) are elements that are phonologically bound to a word but do not necessarily make up part of that word’s morphological structure. Lushootseed has, in fact, a very large number of clitics (some of which have been traditionally identified as affixes), but these can be distinguished from true affixes on syntactic grounds, based on (1) their ability to combine with words of a variety of lexical classes, and (2) the fact that their distribution is determined by syntactic rather than morphological criteria. The first of these properties can be seen in (28):

- 28 $\lambda^w\text{ub}\text{əx}^w\ \check{\text{c}}\text{əx}^w\ \check{\text{x}}^w\text{ul}'\text{əx}^w\ \text{f}\text{u}\text{b}\text{ə}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{c}}\text{əb}\ \text{f}\text{u}\text{p}'\text{a}\lambda^w\text{a}\lambda^w\ \text{f}\text{u}\text{s}\text{d}\text{u}\text{k}^w\ \text{f}\text{u}'\text{al}\ \text{t}\text{u}\text{d}\text{i}'\ \check{\text{c}}\text{a}'\text{k}^w$
 $\lambda^w\text{ub}=\text{ax}^w\ \check{\text{c}}\text{əx}^w\ \check{\text{x}}^w\text{ul}'=\text{ax}^w\ \text{f}\text{u}=\text{b}\text{ə}\check{\text{s}}\check{\text{c}}\text{əb}\ \text{f}\text{u}=\text{p}'\text{a}\lambda^w\text{a}\lambda^w\ \text{f}\text{u}=\text{s}-\text{d}\text{u}\text{k}^w\text{u}$
 well=now 2SG.SUB only=now IRR=mink IRR=worthless IRR=NP-abnormal
 $\text{f}\text{u}=?\text{al}\ \text{t}\text{u}\text{d}\text{i}'\ \check{\text{c}}\text{a}'\text{k}^w$
 IRR=at DIST.DMA seaward
 ‘You had better be just a mink, a no-account, riff-raff down there by the water.’
 [Changer, line 122]

In this example, we see the clitic *f*u= ‘irrealis’ repeated on four consecutive elements belonging to three different parts of speech: two nouns (*bəšcəb* ‘mink’ and *sduk* ‘riff-raff’), a verb (*p’aλ’aλ* ‘be worthless’), and a preposition (*?al* ‘at’). The iteration of the modal clitics seen here is a not-uncommon feature in the narratives below.

The second property, the syntactic regulation of clitics, follows in part from their independence from the morphological structure of the words that they attach to phonologically, and results in patterns such as that seen in (29):

- 29 $? \text{ə}\text{s}'\text{ə}\check{\text{x}}\text{id}\ \text{əw}'\text{ə}\ \text{t}\text{s}\text{i}'\text{ə}'\ \text{a}\check{\text{d}}\check{\text{c}}\text{ə}\text{g}^w\text{as}\ \text{d}\check{\text{ə}}\check{\text{x}}^w\text{ul}'\text{s}\ \text{?}\text{u}\text{b}\text{a}\text{k}'^w\text{a}\text{c}\text{u}\text{t}\ \text{t}\text{i}'\text{ə}'\ \text{q}\check{\text{ə}}\text{d}\text{x}^w\text{s}$
 $? \text{as}-\text{?}\check{\text{ə}}\check{\text{x}}\text{id}\ \quad \text{əw}'\text{ə}\ \text{t}\text{s}\text{i}'\text{ə}'\ \quad \text{ad}-\check{\text{c}}\text{ə}\text{g}^w\text{as}\ \quad \text{d}\check{\text{ə}}\check{\text{x}}^w=\check{\text{x}}^w\text{ul}'=\text{s}$
 STAT-what.happen PTCL PROX:FEM 2SG.PO-wife ADN=only=3PO
 $\text{?}\text{u}-\text{b}\text{a}\text{k}'^w\text{a}-\text{t}-\text{s}\text{u}\text{t}\ \quad \text{t}\text{i}'\text{ə}'\ \quad \text{q}\check{\text{ə}}\text{d}\text{x}^w-\text{s}$
 PFV-move.quickly-ICS-REFL PROX mouth-3PO
 ‘What is the matter with your wife that her mouth is just moving?’ [Owl Lives There, line 23]

This sentence contains a clause, $\check{\text{x}}^w\text{ul}'\ \text{?}\text{u}\text{b}\text{a}\text{k}'^w\text{a}\text{c}\text{u}\text{t}\ \text{t}\text{i}'\text{ə}'\ \text{q}\check{\text{ə}}\text{d}\text{x}^w\text{s}$ ‘her mouth is just moving’, subordinated with the nominalizing proclitic *dəx*^w=; rather than appearing on the verb (*?ubak*^w*acut* ‘be moving quickly’), *dəx*^w= appears on the preverbal adverb *x^wul* ‘only’, as does the third-person enclitic =s, which marks subject agreement for nominalized clauses. Lushootseed grammar requires that these two clitics appear on the first full lexical item of the clause, not on the verb whose nominalization or subordination they mark and whose subject they agree with. This shows clearly that the placement of these two elements is sensitive to syntactic, rather than morphological, restrictions.

A further point to note here is that clitics of this type, which are consistently left- or right-leaning (and display templatic ordering properties with respect to each other; see Hess 1995 for discussion), are treated differently

ǰəł occurs in one or two instances on its own with the gloss of the whole expression, suggesting that *ti* is an “empty” element; however, rather than leaving it unglossed (or glossing it redundantly as ‘seemingly’), the undertie has been adopted to mark explicitly the dependency between *ǰəł* and *ti*.

Affixes and clitics that are identified and segmented out in the parsing line are represented in their full or underlying form, rather than in the contextualized form that appears in the transcription line. Thus, for instance, the diminished control suffix *-dx^w* in (34) and (35) has two different forms in the transcription lines but a single form in the two parsing lines:

34 ǰciːl**dx^w** dx^w?al ?al?als ti?ə? wiw’su
 ǰcił-**dx^w** dx^w-?al ?al?al-s ti?ə? wiw’su
 arrive-DC CNTRPT-at house-3PO PROX children
 ‘She manages to get the children to her house.’ [Agnes James’ Basket Ogress, line 61]

35 x^wu?əłə? haw’ə ?usax^wəb**dx^w**but
 x^wu?əłə? haw’ə ?u-sax^wəb-**dx^w**-but
 maybe PTCL PFV-jump-DC-REFL
 ‘I guess he must have managed to run away.’ [Agnes James’ Basket Ogress, line 67]

In the first example, the suffix comes at the end of a phonological word and has its basic form, *-dx^w*, whereas in (35) it undergoes a regular morphophonological alternation (*-dx^w → -du*) when followed by the reflexive suffix, an alternation that is made explicit by maintaining the underlying representation of the suffix in the parsing line.

Similar treatment is given to epenthetic segments such as that shown in (36):

36 huy g^wəl q^wəłtə**b**ax^w ti?ə? s?əłəd
 huy g^wəl q^wəł-t-**b**=ax^w ti?ə? s?əłəd
 SCONJ SCONJ cooked-ICS-PASS=now PROX food
 ‘Then their food is cooked.’ [Agnes James’ Basket Ogress, line 15]

Example (36) illustrates vowel-epenthesis typical of the sequence of suffixes *-t* ‘internal causative’ + *-b* ‘passive’. The schwa here, is, strictly speaking, not part of either suffix, nor is it itself a suffix: its only function is to separate the two affixes, and as a meaningless phonological element it is not included in the morphological breakdown of the word. Similarly, the sentence in (37)

shows the use of the epenthetic /h/ to avoid hiatus (a sequence of vowels, each in its own syllable):

37 ?ahəx^w səłaxils

?a=ax^w s=lə=łax-il=s

be.there=now NM=PROG=dark-INCH=3PO

‘They are there when it is getting dark.’ [Agnes James’ Basket Ogress, line 14]

This type of epenthesis can be found throughout the text, though to my knowledge it has not been commented on in the literature, underlining the primary reason for using “full” forms in the morphological analyses: our current understanding of Lushootseed morphophonemics is at best sketchy, and using this type of representation makes explicit the contrasts and alternations that will have to be accounted for in a complete Lushootseed morphophonology.

A similar practice is followed with verbal radicals, which can be divided into different classes depending on the forms they take in various contexts. One common class of radical appears in simple CVC form in most contexts but appears in CVCV form in certain others, as shown in (38) and (39):⁷

38 ?əsčal k^{wi} łushuys

?as-čal k^{wi} łu=s=huyu=s

STAT-how REM IRR=NM=made=3PO

‘“How will it be done?” [The Brothers of Pheasant’s Wife, line 863]

39 hay huyutəbəx^w dx^w?al k^{wi} g^wəsəsčəba?s

hay huyu-t-b=ax^w dx^w-?al k^{wi}

SCONJ made-ICS-PASS=now CNTRPT-at REM

g^wə=s=?as-čəba?=s

SBJ=NM=STAT-backpack=3PO

‘So, it was fixed up so that it could be backpacked.’ [Pheasant and Raven, line 83]

In the first sentence, the radical *huy(u)* ‘be made’ appears in its CVC form, while in the second it appears in CVCV form. Because the “extra” vowel in the longer form is unpredictable, the radical is always given in CVCV form in the parsing line (for another example of this, see the footnote on page 9).

⁷ Here, “C” means any consonant and “V” means any vowel.

Another class of verbal radicals varies between CC and CəC forms, depending on the stem in which it appears. One common radical of this class is *šq* ‘be high’:

40 bəšəqəd

bə=šq-t

ADD=high-ICS

‘He raises them.’ [The Brothers of Pheasant’s Wife, line 338]

41 hədʔiwʔəxʷ tiʔəʔ buʔqʷ tulʔšqalatxʷ

hədʔiwʔ=axʷ tiʔəʔ buʔqʷ tulʔ-šq-alatxʷ

indoors=now PROX waterfowl CNTRFG-high-house

‘The Duck People enter the house from the roof.’ [The Brothers of Pheasant’s Wife, line 790]

For this class of radical, the presence or absence of the schwa (ə) in the word is conditioned by the suffix that follows it – specifically, whether or not there is a stressable (non-schwa) vowel in the suffix: if there is none, the radical appears in CəC form (that is, has an epenthetic schwa); if the suffix has a vowel, the radical appears in CC form.⁸ This pattern can be understood only if the basic CC form of the radical is given in the parsing line.

Because one of the aims of this collection is to represent the full grammatical and morphological structure of the language, the level of analysis presented in the parsing line leans a little more towards etymology than might be useful for native speakers – that is, words are broken down as far as possible into their analyzable constituent morphemes, rather than being broken down only insofar as they are semantically compositional. Thus, for example, *dukʷil* ‘be supernatural’ is analyzed as *dukʷ(u)* ‘abnormal’ + *-il* ‘inchoative’, *dukʷud* ‘put a spell on someone’ as *dukʷ(u)* ‘abnormal’ + *-t* ‘internal causative’, and *dukʷtxʷ* ‘get angry at someone’ as *dukʷ(u)* ‘abnormal’ + *-txʷ* ‘external causative’. There are two reasons for this choice. The first is that, from a linguist’s perspective, this makes it easy to identify and track the various meanings and uses that the root and the accompanying affixes have in

⁸ Note that this class of radical is not consistently recognized in the *Lushootseed Dictionary* (Bates et al. 1994), and several radicals in this class, like *šq*, are cited in their CəC forms. It should also be noted that the CəC form of some of these radicals appears when combined with a few (but not all) lexical suffixes where the prosodic rule would predict the CC form.

these texts. The second is that, although the normal place for this kind of etymological analysis of words is in lexicographical materials, the existing dictionaries of Lushootseed (Hess 1976; Bates et al. 1994) are intended for pedagogical purposes and do not always contain explicit analyses of words.

In some cases, where over-analysis is judged simply to be too confusing or to reflect completely non-productive derivational processes, morphologically complex words are left unanalyzed. This is particularly true for common nouns that are analyzable but non-compositional, such as *q'il'bid* 'canoe', which is etymologically composed of *q'il(i)* 'be aboard vehicle' and *-bid* 'implement'. Likewise, words that are not completely analyzable are presented as undivided wholes, even where some of the constituent parts do appear to be identifiable. Thus, we have words such as *ǰax'alap* 'steer with paddle', which appears to contain the lexical suffix *•alap* 'hip' but whose root is not known. This is especially common practice for words containing what appear to be fossilized middle *-b* suffixes such as *sax^wǰb* 'jump' and *q^wǰaab* 'be foggy', and for the many nouns beginning with what appears to be (or to have been) the lexical nominalizing prefix *s-* but whose roots are no longer attested as independent verbal elements in the language.

Following the morphological segmentation, an aligned morphological analysis of each component identified in the previous line is given using a standardized set of abbreviations and glosses for radicals and other lexical items. The abbreviations used are those being developed in the Lushootseed reference grammar currently underway (Beck, in progress), for which this set of interlinearized texts was initially produced. These abbreviations are given in a table at the beginning of this book (page xii), and the terminology behind them is defined informally in the glossary at the end of this volume (page 591) in terms that, it is hoped, will be helpful to the non-specialist. Lexical glosses are as far as possible drawn from a standardized set such that every instance of a particular radical or monomorphemic lexical item is the same for every attestation of that word. The motivations for this are the same as for erring on the side of etymological analysis. In cases where the use of a standardized gloss is felt to be too distorting (e.g., if it makes it too difficult to identify the source in the analysis line of a particular meaning in the full gloss), more context-appropriate glosses are used.

The final line presents a full gloss or free English translation. Unlike previous presentations of Lushootseed texts in the *Lushootseed Readers* (Hess

1995, 1998, 2006) or in Bierwert 1996, the English glosses here do not lean towards presenting the content of the utterance in the most idiomatic, register-equivalent manner: instead, the glosses used lean the other way, towards reflecting the actual syntactic structure of the Lushootseed, insofar as this is possible in an intelligible English sentence. This means that some of the glosses offered may occasionally sound stilted (as opposed to the glosses in the *Readers*, which maintain a colloquial “folksy” style more reflective of the flavour of the original narrative). It is hoped that having more isomorphic English glosses will make the grammatical structure of the line more obvious to English-speaking (or English-dominant) readers.⁹ An example of this is the treatment of the passive voice, whose discourse functions in Lushootseed are markedly different from those in English (Beck 2000). As a result, passive clauses in the *Lushootseed Readers* are generally glossed in the active voice in the interests of more natural-sounding English, whereas here passives are glossed in the English passive voice, except where the English translation-equivalent verb does not have a comprehensible passive form.

While no attempt was made to match the aspect of the Lushootseed sentences in the English translations, the translations do match in tense (departing from the practice in the *Readers* of narrating the stories consistently in the past tense, following standard English storytelling conventions). Since the Lushootseed stories are narrated in the present tense, I have (wherever possible) adopted the convention of glossing the habitual $\lambda'u=$ as ‘always’ or ‘usually’, rather than as the past tense habitual ‘would’ used in the *Readers*. Finally, I have opted to use a fairly rigid translation of the sentential conjunctions *hay* ‘so’, *huy* ‘then’, and *g^wəl* ‘and’ that introduce so many of the lines in these narratives. While this does create some odd-sounding English glosses, the dissonance created by the practice is, as noted by Bierwert (1996, 27), an open invitation to further investigation of the role that these elements play in the structure of narrative discourse.

Unlike the translations in the *Readers* and in Bierwert 1996, the translations here do not make any attempt to maintain the deictic distinctions encoded in the complex Lushootseed system of demonstratives and determiners. One reason for this is that the Lushootseed system reflects so many non-English categories that any attempt to paraphrase would create unwieldy noun phrases

⁹ See Bierwert 1996, 24-39, for a discussion of a more literary approach to translating the same material.

for the English reader. The motivations for taking the approach outlined above are the same as those for opting for isomorphic structural glosses.

As with the transcriptions, the glosses used in this volume do not always correspond exactly to the glosses found in previous published versions of the texts. In a very few cases, these differences result from the reinterpretation, based on grammatical reanalysis, of sentences or phrases. Because these texts were originally transcribed with the help of an Elder native-speaker, this practice was avoided whenever possible; however, there are places where it seems clear that the Elder's translation was either intended to be more explanatory than literal, or that the difficulty of translating the Lushootseed sentence into a fluent-sounding English sentence leads to some reformulation of content.

Acknowledgments

It goes without saying that a volume of this type could not have been put together without the efforts of many other people. First and foremost are those who were involved in the creation and recording of the texts themselves – Mr. and Mrs. Lamont, Elizabeth Krise, Edward Sam, and Agnes James, as well as Leon Metcalf, who made so many of the recordings. Credit and appreciation for the transcription of the Metcalf tapes are due to Vi Taq^wšəblu Hilbert, without whose valiant efforts as a native-speaker transcriber and translator this invaluable material might have remained forever inaccessible. I'd also like to acknowledge the collaboration of Michele Bagalot, Toby Langen, and the Tulalip Tribes in providing the biographical materials on the storytellers and the foreword to this volume – and, of course, ultimately for giving permission to reprint these stories, which form such an essential part of their cultural patrimony. Darcy Cullen and her colleagues at UBC Press also deserve thanks for their patience and adaptability as we moved along the road to final publication.

My late co-author, Thom Hess, deserves, of course, the lion's share of the credit for the material and presentation in this volume. In addition to recording and working with Elders on the transcriptions and translations of the stories, Thom devoted much of his academic career to developing the field of Lushootseed language studies for both the academic and the speaker communities. The writing system currently in use for the language owes everything to Thom, as does much of our current knowledge of Lushootseed

grammar and lexicon. My own interest and what modicum of understanding I have of how the language works flow directly from Thom, and, although his failing health prevented him from participating as energetically as he would have wanted in the final stages of this collaborative project, I'd like to think that he would be pleased with the final results.

David Beck

© UBC Press 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior written permission of the publisher, or, in Canada, in the case of photocopying or other reprographic copying, a licence from Access Copyright, www.accesscopyright.ca.

The stories, as told by Martha Lamont, Elizabeth Krise, Edward (Hagan) Sam, and Agnes James, and as they appear in this book, are reproduced with the permission of the Tulalip Tribes, who are the guardians and holders of the Native copyright and cultural heritage rights. They may not be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without prior permission from the Tulalip Tribes.

21 20 19 18 17 16 15 14 13 5 4 3 2 1

Printed in Canada on ancient-forest-free paper (100% post-consumer recycled) that is processed chlorine- and acid-free.

ISBN 9780774823579

Cataloguing-in-publication data for this book is available from Library and Archives Canada.

Canada

UBC Press gratefully acknowledges the financial support for our publishing program of the Government of Canada (through the Canada Book Fund), the Canada Council for the Arts, and the British Columbia Arts Council.

This book has been published with the help of a grant from the Canadian Federation for the Humanities and Social Sciences, through the Awards to Scholarly Publications Program, using funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

UBC Press
The University of British Columbia
2029 West Mall
Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z2
604-822-5959 / Fax: 604-822-6083
www.ubcpress.ca

Sample Material © 2014 UBC Press