

### **Addendum to Zenk and Schrock, *Learning to read Tualatin***

This addendum corrects an oversight in our account of the Tualatin Northern Kalapuya texts published by Jacobs (1945)—see section 1 of our paper. Besides the texts mentioned there, Jacobs also published a Yamhill Northern Kalapuya text, originally dictated to Frachtenberg in 1914. As published, the Yamhill appears in Jacobs' orthography, and is accompanied by a Tualatin translation from Louis Kenoyer. We have also located an unpublished typescript version of the Yamhill, prepared by Frachtenberg himself. The various comparisons thereby made possible are of particular relevance to a central issue posed in our paper: the extent to which Kenoyer's Tualatin verbal prefix morphology should be seen as an expression of obsolescent Tualatin.

#### **1 Introduction: an overlooked Northern Kalapuya source**

In 1914, L. J. Frachtenberg transcribed a Yamhill Northern Kalapuya myth fragment from Louisa Selky of Grand Ronde. The only surviving version of this text from his own hand, as far as we know, is an incomplete typescript with interlinear translation (Frachtenberg ca. 1915:113-119). This transcript shows blank spaces for later hand-lettering of vowel symbols; it also lacks a free translation. In 1936, Jacobs elicited a Tualatin Northern Kalapuya translation of the same text from Louis Kenoyer. As we point out in the paper, Frachtenberg had also prepared typescripts of Gatschet's 1877 Tualatin texts. While Jacobs brought the latter to Kenoyer in the field in 1936, writing his re-elicitations directly into the originals, the Yamhill typescript shows no such indications of direct use. Evidently, Jacobs worked either from Frachtenberg's original Yamhill field text, or from a copy, when he re-elicited this text from Kenoyer. We do not know which, since we have so far failed to locate either an original field text, or any working version thereof used by Jacobs. In preparing the text for publication, Jacobs reinterpreted Frachtenberg's original phonetic notation to align it with his own perceptions of Kalapuyan phonetics. This Yamhill transliteration is presented, along with Kenoyer's Tualatin translation and a free English translation, as Jacobs (1945:199-203). In the Text sample appended to this addendum, we reproduce Frachtenberg's original typescript and interlinear translation of this text, presenting it together with Jacobs' Yamhill, Tualatin, and free English versions as published—all versions being given in their original transcriptions.

This text turns out to be of particular relevance to our focus on Kenoyer's verbal prefixes: it provides a glimpse of corresponding forms in a dialect of the same language; and it was recorded independently of the Tualatin

texts that Gatschet transcribed in 1877, and that first Frachtenberg, and then Jacobs reviewed with Kenoyer. Jacobs' presentation of the Yamhill text includes a standardized transliteration of the original, along with his re-elicitation of it from Kenoyer. By contrast, for those of Frachtenberg's Gatschet-text typescripts that he was able to review with Kenoyer, Jacobs presented only Kenoyer's re-elicited version. For the remaining Gatschet-text typescripts (the ones left unreviewed, owing to Kenoyer's untimely passing), he provided his own standardization of Frachtenberg's orthography (applying his own intuitions of Kalapuyan phonetics, just as he did in standardizing Frachtenberg's Yamhill spellings), while gleaning translations and making various corrections with reference to Gatschet's original field versions. The resulting two versions of Tualatin—"Gatschet-Frachtenberg Tualatin" as re-elicited from Kenoyer; and as reconstituted by Jacobs—show quite different forms for many corresponding verbal prefixes. Either Kenoyer's Tualatin verbal prefixes had mutated during the interim between Frachtenberg's 1915 fieldwork and de Angulo-Freeland's and Jacobs' subsequent sessions; or Frachtenberg elected to preserve this aspect of the Gatschet record largely as-is (*vs* Jacobs, who largely ignored it); or both. To go by Jacobs' (1945:155) published comments, one could be forgiven for attributing any significant differences to deficiencies in the Gatschet-Frachtenberg record.

At best the Gatschet texts are of most inferior linguistic quality, honeycombed with phonetic, grammatical, and translational errors and gaucheries, the number of which it has been my vain effort to reduce to a passable minimum. There remain a great many words and forms which neither Mr. Kenoyer nor I could recognize or check in any way.

With respect to the verbal prefixes in particular, it is only fair to point out that in three separate versions of one short Gatschet-Frachtenberg text (the first in published order: Jacobs 1945:156-160), Jacobs did include bracketed alternate forms as recorded by Gatschet and Frachtenberg. Nevertheless, the question remains: what explains the many differences of form contrasting Kenoyer's verbal prefixes from those transcribed by Gatschet, who recorded an older generation of speakers, notably including Kenoyer's own father?

## **2 Verbal prefixes in two dialects of Northern Kalapuya**

Since Jacobs did very little morphological work with Kenoyer (possibly, he was planning to undertake such work, but was stymied by Kenoyer's unexpected demise), our main source of analyzed Northern Kalapuya data remains Frachtenberg's fieldnotes, slip files, and prepared transcripts, the latter including grammatical notes and some interlinear translations. Obviously, Northern Kalapuya morphology is long overdue for a fresh, independent treatment. For now though, as a first step, we base our comparisons on

Frachtenberg’s prepared transcripts—the Yamhill typescript appended here; and the typescripts that he prepared from Gatschet’s Tualatin field texts.<sup>1</sup>

To simplify things somewhat, we tabulate only tokens assigned third-person subjects in the translations (since this is a myth text, these constitute the great majority of tokens). Elements that Jacobs (and incidentally, Gatschet too) show as verbal prefixes, usually appear in Frachtenberg’s transcripts as independent particles (which he refers to elsewhere as “loose prefixes”—“proclitics” would be an appropriate modern term). Most of the Yamhill verbal proclitics appearing in Frachtenberg’s appended transcript match corresponding elements in his Tualatin Gatschet-text transcripts, as illustrated by the following tabulation (simplified transcriptions; Frachtenberg’s glosses):

**Table 1: Selected Tualatin and Yamhill verbal proclitics appearing in Frachtenberg’s typescripts**

Yamhill typescript	Tualatin typescripts
<i>ka, k-</i> (not) at all	<i>k-</i> (neg. emphatic)
<i>kam</i> will	<i>kam</i> should/will
<i>kii</i> if	<i>ki-</i> will
<i>ku</i> did	<i>ku</i> (past tense sign)
<i>kwi</i> should	<i>kwiit</i> if (was done)
<i>m[ə]</i> is	<i>hum</i> is
<i>ni, nii</i> they	<i>ni</i> they
<i>pka</i> (not) did	<i>pka</i> was, as did, who was
<i>pku</i> did, was	<i>pku</i> did, was
<i>pku ma</i> did back/here	<i>pkuma</i> did/were here
<i>pku nii</i> did they	<i>pkuni</i> did/were they
<i>pku tit, pkut</i> did on _’s part	<i>pku tit-, pkut</i> did/was on _’s part
<i>pkum</i> did	<i>pkum</i> did
<i>pkuni ma</i> did they here	<i>pkuma ni</i> (they came)
<i>pkunii</i> did they	<i>pkuni</i> did/were they
<i>pta</i> when	<i>pta</i> when did
<i>pu</i> did	
<i>pu tini</i> did when they	
<i>pu tit, put</i> did on _’s part	
<i>pun, puni</i> did they	
<i>tuu, tu-</i> for	<i>tum</i> (to, for)
<i>uu</i> does	<i>hu</i> (is)
<i>u tit</i> does on _’s part	<i>hut-</i> ( <i>hu</i> present; <i>t</i> “discriminative”)
<i>um</i> is	<i>hum</i> is

<sup>1</sup> A short sample of one of the latter typescripts, presented with corresponding text segments from Gatschet’s original fieldnotes, appears as appendix 3 of the main paper.

By far the most frequently appearing verbal proclitic in Frachtenberg's transcripts for both dialects is *pku* (Gatschet: *pku-*, *pgu-*; Jacobs: *pgu-*, *bgu-*) which he glosses 'did, was'. The appended short Yamhill Text sample shows at least 35 tokens of this element (excluding cases in which the form of the element appears to have been affected by contraction and assimilation), while Kenoyer's Tualatin translation shows none. Yet *pku-* (*pgu-*) happens also to be the most frequently occurring verbal prefix in Gatschet's Tualatin narrative texts. What explains this discontinuity?

An examination of the very first Frachtenberg Gatschet-text typescript re-elicited by Jacobs with Kenoyer offers some hints for addressing this question (Frachtenberg ca. 1915:3-8). That this was the first transcript reviewed is indicated by its position in the typescript-packet, as well as by inconsistencies seen below—suggestive of some indecision on Kenoyer's part. Excerpts (1)-(3) show the text as it appears:

- a. in Gatschet's (1877:85-86) original field version;
  - b. in Frachtenberg's (ca. 1915:3) typescript;
  - c. in Kenoyer's field re-elicitation (written into *b* by Jacobs);
  - d. in Jacobs' (1945:156) published Tualatin version;
  - e. in Jacobs' (1945:156) published translation.
- Note:* Bracketed forms in *d* are Jacobs' transliterations of forms in *a* and *b* that he considered plausible alternates to those used by Kenoyer.

- (1) a. Amhú'lk mēn pgumapī'nt tsetfálati;
- b. Am Hū'luk' mēn pku'ma pī'nt' tca Atfa'latlī.
- c. amu'luk<sup>w</sup> mē'n tɕuma-bi'nt tce'tfa'lati.
- d. amu'luk<sup>w</sup> mē'n gumabi'nd [pgu...] tce'tfa'lati.
- e. The Water Being used to be in Tualatin valley (Wapato Lake).
  
- (2) a. pē'ma pgú'mma ha'lpam pgú'mma tchúmampka,
- b. pämi pku ma'a ha'lpam, pku ma'a tca ma'mpka.
- c. pe''ma gōtma''a ha'lvam tōtma''a tce-ma'mpka.
- d. pe''ma gutma''a [pgu'm'a, pguma'a] ha'lvam, gutma''a tce-ma'mpka,
- e. Then it came up above, it came to the water (?),
  
- (3) a. háta gām pgutguéyuk. pgunhú'psin.
- b. Ha'ta gām pkut' k!wēyuk'. pku'ne hu'pcin.
- c. ha'da ɕe'm ɓɕōtk<sup>w</sup>e'yuk. ɓɕōnihu'pcin.
- d. ha'da ɕe'm ɓgutk<sup>w</sup>e'yuk, ɓgunihu'pcin.
- e. Those two had been carried away, they had been three.

These excerpts show that while Frachtenberg's typescript served as Jacobs' model for re-eliciting the text from Kenoyer, he also later checked his results

against Gatschet's original, often deferring to the latter to arrive at a final version of the Tualatin. Also, aside from some scattered English clarifications from Kenoyer, it is obvious that he depended upon Gatschet's original for the translations as published (this text, as well as most of the others in Frachtenberg's typescript packet, lacks a translation there).

It is very interesting that Kenoyer substituted *tgu-*, *tgut-* for Gatschet's *pgu-* in (1) and (2). Since these forms with the cluster *tg* (*tk*) were recorded elsewhere by both Gatschet and Frachtenberg, they appear not to be errors, although Jacobs appears to have taken them as such. Frachtenberg indeed shows *tku* for Gatschet's *pgu-* elsewhere in the typescript of this same text, noting: "tku and pku interchange frequently. My Atfalati informant [Kenoyer] invariably substituted tku for Gatschet's pku" (Frachtenberg ca. 1915:7). That Kenoyer may not even have recognized "Gatschet's pku" as meaningful is revealed by his declustered reproductions in (3)-c, suggesting that he perceived the cluster *pk* to be anomalous.

While the system underlying Tualatin verbal prefixes remains to be worked out (Frachtenberg's glosses tend to be very imprecise, as a glance at Table 1 will show), annotations by Gatschet suggest that the pair *pgu-* : *tgu-* may signal an evidential contrast: *pgu-* being a kind of reportative evidential; *tku-* a direct experience evidential (thanks to John Lyon for suggesting this terminology). Note also Yamhill *pu* (Text sample: 9, 10, 14, 50, 54, 58, 63, 73, 112, 113), which does not appear in any of the Gatschet-Frachtenberg narrative texts. Yamhill *pu* however suggests Central Kalapuya *b-*, which Berman identifies as a mythological tense marker (see main paper, footnote 3). While *pgu-* is indeed ubiquitous in the few recorded Tualatin and Yamhill myths (that is, in their originally recorded versions, vs Kenoyer's re-elicitations), it also appears in Tualatin historical narratives, so it is not restricted to mythological time. However, since mythological time is not (normally) available to direct experience, it is quite possible that the two elements are historically related. It bears mentioning here that Kenoyer had spent much of his childhood and adolescence in government boarding schools, and was therefore highly acculturated. According to Jacobs (1945:155), he "seemed quite unable to give us myth motifs." If, as seems therefore likely, Tualatin traditional narrative genres were not part of his education, we may have an explanation as to why he apparently did not recognize the verbal prefix *pgu-*, *bgu-*, which is ubiquitous in the few Tualatin and Yamhill traditional narratives recorded by Gatschet and Frachtenberg.

Following the short text excerpted in (1)-(3), Jacobs never again re-elicited *tgu-*, *tgut-* from Kenoyer. Rather, Kenoyer thereafter glossed Frachtenberg's *pku* using a number of combinations, almost all of which show the element *gu-*. By far the most frequently appearing of these is *gud-*, *gut-*. In our paper, we point out that the element *d-*, *t-* appears to match *d-*, *t-* in Central Kalapuya: a directive prefix of obscure significance, but which may often be taken to connote completed action, or action viewed from a distance or as a whole. Its occurrence is sporadic in Gatschet's Tualatin texts, as well as in the

appended Yamhill text (Text sample: 43, 46, 57, 64, 68)<sup>2</sup>; but Kenoyer used it habitually. The same observation applies to Kenoyer’s *gu-* (Frachtenberg: *ku*), which occurs twice in the Yamhill text (Text sample: 45, 121), and sporadically in Gatschet’s Tualatin texts. It suggests the element *g-*, frequent in Central Kalapuya, where Berman (ca. 1986:12) explains it as an aorist tense marker, Takeuchi (1969:xix) as part of the habitual aspect complex, and Banks (2007:15) as a past tense realis marker.<sup>3</sup> It is possible that the vowel *u-* can be understood as Banks’ realis, since Kenoyer also shows *ga-*, *gam-* as a conditional prefix, perhaps implying Banks’ irrealis marker *a-*.

While intriguing, such observations must remain somewhat speculative, pending a comparative grammar of all the recorded Kalapuyan dialects. A difficulty with the Tualatin material supplied by Kenoyer is that his many variant forms often prove frustratingly difficult to elucidate from the translations (main paper, section 2). Like de Angulo before us, we have come to suspect that a significant amount of this variation is probably random morphophonetic “noise.” Considering Kenoyer’s status as a last speaker—after all, he had not used his natal language for daily communication since the age of 17 (he was 68 when Jacobs worked with him)—we are led inevitably to the conclusion that his Tualatin materials should be viewed in a context of language obsolescence.

### 3 Conclusion: Louis Kenoyer’s verbal prefixes as an expression of obsolescent Tualatin

In conclusion, we propose that the morphological discontinuities setting Kenoyer’s variety of Tualatin off from that recorded by Gatschet, who recorded Kenoyer’s father as well as other older-generation speakers, are to a considerable extent accountable to Kenoyer’s life-history as a last speaker: his exposure to what very likely was a household hybrid variety of the language, in which the influence of his mother’s Central Kalapuya dialect is discernable; and his evident lack of exposure to aspects of Tualatin traditional culture associated with specialized language registers, notably, traditional narrative genres.

The situation we have encountered in attempting to decode Kenoyer’s Tualatin verbal prefixes appears to parallel that noted by Berman (1990:39-40) for Kenoyer’s Tualatin phonology.

There are special difficulties with the Tualatin material in the Jacobs Collection, all of which comes from Louis Kenoyer or was rechecked with him. Kenoyer could

---

<sup>2</sup> Frachtenberg identifies it as a suffixed form of the “discriminative” proclitic *tit* ‘on...part’ (see his note to Text sample:43). We have a different interpretation of the elements *di-*, *did-*–*dit-* in Kenoyer’s Tualatin: see section 3.

<sup>3</sup> See main paper, table 1. The obvious equivalence between Kenoyer’s *g-* and Banks’ (2007:15) past tense realis escaped us there, because the Santiam text with Tualatin translation we were working from (Santiam version as analyzed by Banks 2007:94-97) glosses *g-* as POT (potential)—a mistake?

understand Central Kalapuya because his mother had spoken the Hantchayuk dialect of that language. It appears that in a few instances he used a Central Kalapuya-like form of a word in place of or in addition to the correct Tualatin form. [There follow two examples of such problematic forms.]

Another difficulty is the considerable variability in Jacobs's transcriptions of Tualatin. [There follow two words by way of example, each illustrated by eight different phonetic variants.] The other recorders of Tualatin were not always phonetically reliable. Thus there are no consistent, accurate records of Tualatin, as there are for Santiam and Yonkalla.

A likely Central Kalapuya influence on Kenoyer's Tualatin is apparent also for certain of his verbal prefix forms. Table 2 below lists Kenoyer's glosses to the Yamhill forms appearing in Table 1. The Central Kalapuya comparisons entered in column 3 show that Kenoyer's Tualatin prefixes often appear to resemble corresponding Central Kalapuya prefixes, more than they do the forms and functions recorded by Frachtenberg and Gatschet for Northern Kalapuya. The forms *di-*, *dini-* (see Table 2: *gudi-*, *gudid-*, *gudini-*, *gudinid-*) provide an instructive example. The record of Central Kalapuya shows frequent occurrences of the 3 pl verbal form *diini-* and the 3 pl possessive form *dini-*; while the usual Northern Kalapuya equivalent is *ni-* (as in the table). Yamhill *pu tini* (Table 2: *gudini-*) is unusual in showing an apparently identical 3 pl verbal form. It is plausible to conjecture that Kenoyer's frequent use of the form *dini-*, both as a verbal prefix and as a possessive prefix, represents a kind of household hybrid Tualatin, reflecting a degree of morphological convergence between his father's Northern Kalapuya dialect, and his mother's Central Kalapuya dialect; in this case involving the merging of a usual form from one dialect, with an analogous less usual form from another dialect. Note also Frachtenberg's gloss 'did when they' for *pu tini*, suggesting a temporal meaning for the element *ti* (*di-*). *di-* is very frequently exemplified from Kenoyer, usually with a terminal *t*, *d* (*gudid-*, *gudinid-*), but sometimes not (*gudi-*). Frachtenberg analyzes *did-* (his *tit*) as a "discriminative" proclitic. However, we observe that when forms with *did-* appear in subordinate clauses in Kenoyer's own Tualatin texts, they can usually be glossed with temporal meanings. While this does not necessarily hold for main clauses, Berman (ca. 1986:29-30) notes a like restriction (temporals showing temporal meaning in subordinate clauses, but not necessarily in main clauses) for Santiam Central Kalapuya. A special difficulty presented by Kenoyer's variety of Tualatin is that the ordering of *di-* and the other elements of the prefix complex is somewhat variable. An example from Table 2 is the form *gudinidni-*, in which *ni-* appears in two positions. Other examples from Kenoyer's autobiographical text: *gunid-* : *gudni-*; *gudinid-* : *gudidin-*. One possibility here is that Frachtenberg was right that these elements are better considered to be proclitics than true prefixes, and that their ordering is somewhat free.

**Table 2: Kenoyer's glosses to Yamhill forms in Table 1, column 1**

Kenoyer's glosses	Yamhill models (with Text sample segment #s)	Central Kalapuya comparisons to column 1 <sup>4</sup>
<i>dum-</i>	<i>tuu, tu-</i> 'for' (15, 18)	<i>dumi-</i> 1/2/3 sing objective
<i>duminiman-</i>	<i>ki ma ni</i> 'if here they' (110)	<i>dumini-</i> '3 pl objective'
<i>gu-</i>	<i>pku</i> 'did' (20)	<i>g-</i> aorist (Banks: past realis) <i>u-</i> realis (?) (Banks)
<i>gud-, gut-</i>	<i>k-</i> '(not) at all' (81) <i>ku</i> 'did' (45, 121) <i>pku</i> 'did' (7, 11, 12, 27, 28, 31, 32, 33, 35, 36, 41, 42, 51, 55, 59, 65, 69, 71, 74, 77, 80, 93, 96, 100, 101, 103, 104, 114, 115) <i>pkut</i> 'did on _ part' (43, 46) <i>pu</i> 'did' (9, 50, 54, 58, 63, 73, 112, 113) <i>put</i> 'did on _ part' (57, 64, 68) <i>um</i> 'is' (98)	(see <i>gu-</i> ) <i>t-</i> directive (motion away from speaker)
<i>gudi-</i>	<i>pta-</i> 'when' (75)	(see <i>gu-</i> ) <i>di-, dii-</i> temporal
<i>gudid-, gudit-</i>	<i>pku</i> 'did' (122) <i>pku tit(-)</i> (30, 44, 45, 66) <i>pu</i> 'did' (10) <i>pu tit</i> 'did on _ part' (56, 87) <i>u tit</i> 'does on _ part' (48)	(see <i>gu-, gud-, gudi-</i> )
<i>gudini-</i>	<i>ni</i> 'they' (89) <i>pkuni</i> 'did they' (97, 99, 116, 118) <i>pu tini</i> 'did when they' (90) <i>puni</i> 'did they' (92, 117)	(see <i>gu-, gudi-</i> ) <i>ni-</i> 3 pl present indicative <i>diini-</i> 3 pl present temporal; 3 pl usitative relative <i>gi-dii-ni</i> 3 pl aorist temporal
<i>gudinid-, gudinidni-</i>	<i>pkuni</i> 'did they' (107) <i>puma ni</i> 'did here they' (111)	(see <i>gu-, gud-, gudi-, gudini-</i> )
<i>gudma-</i>	<i>pku ma</i> 'did here' (120)	(see <i>gu-, gud-</i> ) <i>ma-</i> directive (motion towards speaker)
<i>gud.si-<sup>3</sup></i>	<i>pku tit</i> 'did on _ part' (40)	(see <i>gu-, gud-</i> )

<sup>4</sup> After Berman (ca. 1986), except Banks refers to Banks (2007).



<i>gum-</i>	<i>pku</i> ‘did’ (2, 14, 16) <i>pkum(-)</i> ‘did’ (5, 21, 28, 29, 34, 52, 82) <i>pu</i> ‘did’ (14) <i>um</i> ‘is’ (102)	<i>gum-</i> 1/2/3 sing aorist indicative
<i>gumdit-</i>	<i>pku</i> ‘did’ (2)	(see <i>gum-</i> , <i>gumdi-</i> , <i>gud-</i> )
<i>gunima-</i>	<i>pkuni ma</i> (76)	(see <i>gu-</i> , <i>gudini-</i> , <i>gudma-</i> )
<i>gwi-</i>	<i>kwi</i> ‘should’ (8)	<i>gwii-</i> 1/2/3 sing recent (past) relative
<i>ma-</i>	<i>ma</i> ‘here’ (38)	(see <i>gudma-</i> )
<i>ma-<sub>2</sub></i>	<i>m[ə]</i> ‘is’ (78)	<i>um-</i> 3 sing present usitative
<i>ni-</i>	<i>ni</i> ‘they’ (84, 88)	(see <i>gudini-</i> )
<i>u-</i>	<i>uu</i> ‘does’ (49)	(see <i>ma-<sub>2</sub></i> ) <i>uu-</i> 3 sing relative
<i>um-</i>	<i>kam</i> ‘will’ (113)	(see <i>ma-<sub>2</sub></i> )

**Appendix: Text sample: a Yamhill myth fragment with Tualatin translation**

Frachtenberg’s (ca. 1915:113-119) original title: *Coyote visits the country of the spirits*. Jacobs’ (1945:199-203) published title: *Coyote follows his (entrails) daughter to the land of the dead*. All lines **original transcriptions**. Each line set is laid out as follows:

- (x) [Frachtenberg’s Yamhill typescript.<sup>fn-1</sup>]  
[Frachtenberg’s interlinear translation.]  
[Jacobs’ transliteration of Frachtenberg’s Yamhill field text.]  
[Jacobs’ transcript of Louis Kenoyer’s Tualatin translation.<sup>fn-2</sup>]  
[Jacobs’ free English translation.<sup>fn-2</sup>]  
<sup>fn-1</sup>selected grammar notes by Frachtenberg: *lf*: ...  
<sup>fn-2</sup>selected notes on content and transcription by Jacobs: *mj*: ...

- (1) ē’cīn wa’ntafan pku pī’nt tca to’māi.  
Coyote one only did live in his house.

1. e’icīn wa’ndafan Ɂgubi’nt tcaɁu’māi.

1. e’icīn wa’dafan gubi’nd tcaɁu’m’ai.

1. Coyote was living alone at his home.

---

<sup>5</sup> *s(i)-* is the Tualatin 2 sing imperative. Kenoyer sometimes inserts it in between a person-tense prefix (any person) and a verb stem.

- (2) **pku mēdj pkū'm<sup>6</sup>, \_fp pku ts'a'tso'.**  
 Did day become did go, gopher did hunt.  
**BGU'me'IDJ BGu''um BGumyu''wi u'fp** [sic], **BGuts'a'tsu,**  
**GUMDITme'IDJ Gu''um GUMyu''wi u'fp**  
 When it became morning he went (and) he looked for gophers,  
 (Y[amhill:] he hunted them down),
- (3) **pku hī'li \_fp'.**  
 Did kill him gopher.  
**BGuhi'li u'fp.**  
 . . . [no Tualatin or free translation]
- (4) **pkū'mūk'<sup>7</sup> tca to'māi ē'cīn.**  
 Did arrive at his house Coyote.  
**BGumu'G tcaDu'mai e'icin**  
**Gumu'G tcaDu'm'ai e'icin,**  
 Coyote got back home,
- (5) **pa'm pkum wōs \_fp'.**  
 Now did skin gopher.  
**pa''ŋ BGumwu'c u'fp,**  
**pε''ma GUMwu'c·uf u'fp,**  
 and he skinned the gopher,
- (6) **pa'm pkun<sup>8</sup> gwī'n k\_'k' ē'cīn tumī'ndjal,**  
 Now did seize it he Coyote his paunch,  
**\_fp' tumī'ndjal.**  
 gopher his paunch.  
**pa'm BGu'ŋG<sup>w</sup>in Gō'k e'icin Dumi'nt'cal u'fp Dumi'nt'cal.**  
**pε''ma Gu'ŋG<sup>w</sup>in Gō'k e'icin Dumi'nt'cal u'fp Dumi'nt'cal.**  
 And then Coyote took the gopher's entrails.

---

<sup>6</sup> /f/: “Contracted for pku u'm TO GO.”

<sup>7</sup> /f/: “Contracted for pkum ūk' TO ARRIVE.”

<sup>8</sup> /f/: “For pkum. The final m assimilated to n because of the following k.”

(7) **k\_’k’ ē’cīn pku na’ka’t’.**  
He Coyote did say continually.

**1 (2) ɢω’k e’icin ɓɢu’na’git,**  
**1 (2) ɢω’k e’icin ɢuɓna’git,**  
1 (2) Coyote said,

(8) **kuc \_fp’ tumīndjal ca’nō tci’**  
That gopher his paunch wish I  
**kwī tat\_p’.**  
should my daughter.

**“guc-u’fp dumi’nt’cal, ca’’mu tci’’ gwida’ɗp! [sic]”**  
**“ɢuca-a’u’fp dumi’nt’cal, ca’’mu tci’’i ɢwɪɗawa’pi.”**  
“These gopher entrails, I wish they were my daughter!”

(9) **pu pu’ntca pī’na’ kuc \_fp’ tumī’ndjal.**  
Did make self girl that gopher his paunch.

**ɓUBU’ntca ɓi’na guc-u’fp dumi’nt’cal.**  
**ɢuɓBU’ntca ɓɓi’n’a ɢuca-u’fp dimi’nt’cal.**  
The gopher’s entrails turned into a girl.

(10) **pa’m pu pa’lyū’ kuc a pī’na’,**  
Now did big become that the girl,  
**ē’cīn tumī’ndjal.**  
Coyote his child.

**pa’’m ɓUBA’lyu’ guc-ɓɓi’n’a e’icin duwa’pi.**  
**pe’’ma ɢuɓɓi’lyu’ ɢuca-ɓɓi’n’a e’icin duwa’pi.**  
Now the girl, coyote’s daughter, became large.

(11) **an klwīn pku h\_t’.**  
The Coon did see.

**a’ŋkʷin ɓɢuhω’ɗ,**  
**a’ŋkʷin ɢuɓhω’ɗ,**  
Coon saw her,

(12) pku na'ka't' an gwīn pku e'ut'.  
Did say continually the Coon did want.

**вгуна'гат а'ηк'wīn вгу'ε'ut,**  
**гудна'гит а'ηк'wīn гуд'ε'ut,**  
coon said that he wanted her,

(13) pku'n ku' tca to'māi.  
Did take to his house.

**вгу'nku tcadu'mai.**  
**гугу'ηku tcadu'm'ai.**  
he took her to his house.

(14) pa'ma pku ma' yī, pu mī'nakut.  
Then did back return, did run from him.

**1 (3) pa'ma вгумε'yi, бу'mi'nagut.**  
**1 (3) пε''ma гум'ε'yi, гум'и'nagut.**  
Then she returned, she ran away from him.

(15) pa'm an tqop' kwī'līyū  
Then the Skunk again  
pku'n ku' tuta'galo'kon'.  
did take in marriage.

**pa'm a'ntgub г'wi'li'-yu вгу'nku дуда'гала'gun,**  
**пε'ma ma'ntgub г'ε'l'-yu гугу'ηku думде'игуле'игун,**  
Now skunk took her away in marriage again,

(16) kwī'līyū pku mī'nakut yū,  
Again did run from him indeed,

**г'wi'li'-yu вгуми'nagut-yu',**  
**г'ε'l'-yu гум'и'nag'wi'nit-yu',**  
again she ran away,

---

<sup>9</sup> /f: “da'galo'k' passive from tēkal- TO MARRY; -n nominalizing suffix.”

(17) pku ma' yī tca to'māi.  
 did back return to her house.

**Ɂgume'yī tcaɁu'mai.**  
**gum'e'yī tcaɁu'm'ai.**  
 she came back home.

(18) pa'ma ha'm hūc pku ma' tū da'galo'kon  
 Then the Panther did come for marriage  
 ē'icīn towa'pī toa'na'.  
 Coyote his child his girl.

**pa'ma ha'mhuc Ɂguma'' duda'gala'gun**  
**e'icīn duwa''pī du'a'na.**  
**pε''ma ha'mhuc guma''a dumɁe'igule'igun**  
**e'icīn duwa'pī dī'a'n'a.**

Now cougar came to marry coyote's child (and) daughter.

(19) kuc a pī'na' wa' pku e'ut  
 That the girl not did want  
 kuc a'm hūc.  
 that the Panther.

**guc-abi'na wa'' Ɂgu'e'ut guc-a'mhuc.**  
**gu'ca-abi'n'a wa'ŋq dumɁi'e'ut gu'ca-ha'mhuc.**

The girl did not want (like) that cougar.

(20) pa'ma k\_ 'k' ha'm hūc  
 Then he the Panther  
 pku yō'yāit' a mī'nk'.  
 did break it a marrow bone.

**1 (4) pa'ma Ɂω'k ha'mhuc Ɂguyu''yait a'mi'ŋk,**  
**1 (4) pε''ma Ɂω'k ha'mhuc guyu''yait a'mi'n'ik,**  
 1 (4) So now cougar broke up marrow bones (a delicacy),

- (21) **pku'm tit' kuc a mi'nk'.**  
 Did give that the marrow bone.  
**BGU'mdit guc-a'mi'ŋk,**  
**GUMDI'D GUC-a'mi'n'ik,**  
 he gave her the marrow bones,
- (22) **wa' pka<sup>10</sup> e'ut.**  
 Not did want.  
**wa'' BGE'e'ut.**  
**wa'ha GUD'e'ut.**  
 (but) she did not want them.
- (23) **pu tit[']wa'lt' ha'l'im.**  
 Did on her part throw outside.  
**BUDI'twalt ha'l'im.**  
**GUDI'twalt he''lum.**  
 She threw them outside.
- (24) **kwī'liyū pkū'm tī yū'wal ha'm hūc.**  
 Again did go to hunt the Panther.  
**ḡwi'li'-yu BCU''um di'yu''wa'l ha'mhuc,**  
**ḡwε'l'-yu GU''um diyu''wal ha'mhuc,**  
 Again cougar went away to hunt,
- (25) **kwī'liyu pku yō'yāit' a mi'nk'.**  
 Again did break it the marrow bone.  
**ḡwi'li'-yu BCU'yu''yait a'mi'nk,**  
**ḡwε'l'-yu GUYU''yait a'mi'n'ik,**  
 again he broke marrow bones,

---

<sup>10</sup> *lf*: “Assimilated for pku.”

(26) **kwī'liyu wa' pke<sup>11</sup> e'ut.**  
 Again not did want.

**ḡ'i·li'-yu wa'' bḡe'e'ut.**  
**ḡ'e'l'-yu wa'ha ḡuḡ'e'ut.**  
 again she did not want them.

(27) **wa' k\_'k' ha'm hūc wa' pkī yu'k'in**  
 Not he the Panther not did know it  
**k\_'k' a'ga pku ga'cīn.**  
 he what did do to her.

**1 (5) wa'' ḡo'k ha'mhuc wa'' bḡi'yu'kin ḡo'k a'ḡ'a [sic]**  
**bḡuḡa'cin.**

**1 (5) wa'ḡḡ ḡo'k ha'mhuc wa'ḡḡ ḡityu'k'in ḡo'k a'ḡ'a**  
**ḡuḡḡa'cin.**

1 (5) Cougar did not know what to do about her.

(28) **pa'm pku mēdj hā'm hūc pkum hup.**  
 Then did day the Panther did swim.

**pa''ḡ bḡu'me'itca ha'mhuc bḡumhup,**  
**pe''ma ḡutme'idj ha'mhuc ḡumhu'p,**  
 Now when it became morning cougar swam,

(29) **pa'm pkum tis k\_'k' ha'm hūc**  
 Then did find he the Panther  
**kuc a mī'nk'.**  
 that the marrow bone.

**pa''ḡ bḡu'mḡeḡ ḡo'k ha'mhuc ḡuc-a'mi'nk.**  
**pe''ma ḡumḡu'mḡic ḡo'k ha'mhuc ḡuca-a'mi'n'ik.**  
 and then cougar found the marrow bones (he had given her and  
 which she had thrown away to spite him).

---

<sup>11</sup> *lf*: “Assimilated for pku.”

(30) **ha'm hūc pku ti't'kwīn a mī'nk'.**  
The Panther did on his part seize it the marrow bone.

**ha'mhuc ʋGUDI'tGʷin a'mi'nk,**  
**ha'mhuc GUD'i'tGʷin a'mi'n'ik,**  
Cougar took a marrow bone,

(31) **pa'ma pku pu'fī kuc a mī'nk'.**  
Then did blow at it that the marrow bone.

**pa'ma ʋGUPU'fi GUC-a'mi'nk,**  
**pe''ma GUDPU'fi GU'ca-a'mi'n'ik,**  
and he blew at the marrow bone,

(32) **pku pu'ntsa ha'noq'**  
Did make self a wildcherry

**kuc a mī'nk'.**  
that the marrow bone

**ʋGUBU'ntca ha''nuq GUC-a'mi'nk.**  
**GUDBU'ntca ha''nuq GUca-a'mi'n'ik.**  
the marrow bone turned into wildcherry (chokecherry?).

(33) **pku tci'ptcēt' kuc ha'noq'.**  
Did break it that the wildcherry.

**1 (6) ʋGUTCI'ʋTCET GUC-ha''nuq,**  
**1 (6) GUD'ji'ʋDJA't GUca-ha''nuq,**  
1 (6) The wildcherry broke off,

(34) **pkum la'mo'tca ha'māi.**  
Did enter in the house.

**ʋGUMla'mu tca ha'mai,**  
**gumla'm'u tca ha'm'i,**  
he came back into the house,



- (35) **pku kwīn kuc ha'noq'.**  
 Did carry it that the wild cherry.  
**вгуќ<sup>wi</sup>·'n guc-ha''nuq.**  
**гудќ<sup>wε</sup>·'n guca-ha''nuq.**  
 he brought the wildcherry.
- (36) **pa'ma k\_k' kuc a pī'na' pku na'ka't'.**  
 Then she<sup>12</sup> that the girl did say continually.  
**pa''ma гω'k guc-abi'na вгунa'gat,**  
**pe''ma гε<sup>δ</sup>·ak guca-abi'n'a гудna'git,**  
 Now the girl said,
- (37) **"m\_ha'lil pku ma'' ya'mbī kuc**  
 "Is where did thou come from cause that  
**ha'noq'."**  
 the wildcherry?"  
**"məha''lil вгумaya'mbi guc-ha''nuq?"**  
**"hε'l'a гумiya'mbi guca-ha''nuq?"**  
 "Where did that wildcherry come from?"
- (37a) [not in Frachtenberg's typescript]  
**(e'icin, "ci'dit dawa''pi guc-aḡa'ya'n!")**  
**(e'icin, "gumci'd dawa'ḡi guca-aḡa'y'a'ḡ!")**  
 (Coyote [said], "Give my child those berries!")<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that the (limited) linguistic record of Yamhill shows only one third-person singular independent pronoun, corresponding to the masculine third-person singular in Tualatin. As shown by the Tualatin translation here and below, Tualatin also has a form for the feminine third-person singular.

<sup>13</sup> *mj*: "I infer that this command was made to the magically created wildcherry tree, telling it to induce the girl to climb and eat its cherries which he knows will choke her. It is probable that *e'icin*, 'coyote', is an error and that *ha'mhuc*, 'cougar', was meant. ..."

(38) nau ha'm hūc hac ha'līm ma yāt' to'mpī.  
 And the Panther here outside here stood his tree.  
 nau ha'mhuc ha'c ha'lim ma'ya't du'mpī.  
 nau ha'mhuc ha'c he''lum ma'ya'ḏ du'mpī.  
 Now cougar's tree (wildcherry) stood outside here.

(39) kuc a pī'na' pku tī't'ī<sup>14</sup> kuc  
 That the girl did on her part go that  
 ha'noq' tca to'mbī.  
 the wildcherry to its tree.

1 (7) guc-abi'na vGUDI'ti guc-ha''nuq tcaḏu'mpī,  
 1 (7) guca-abi'n'a gud'i't guca-ha''nuq tceḏu'mpī,  
 1 (7) The girl went to his wildcherry tree,

(40) pku tīt' klla'k' tca to'mbī ha'noq'.  
 Did on her part climb on its tree the wildcherry.  
 vGUDI'tklak tcaḏu'mpī ha''nuq,  
 gud.si'klak tcaḏu'mpī ha''nuq,  
 she climbed up his wildcherry tree,

(41) pa'ma kuc ha'noq' pku lo'mpāt'.  
 Then that the wildcherry did choke her.  
 pa'ma guc-ha''nuq vGU'lu'mpat.  
 pe''ma guca-ha''nuq gud.lu'mpat.  
 and then those (astringent) wildcherries (which she ate) choked her.

(42) pku to'pto' kuc ha'noq' to'mbī,  
 Did pull up that the wildcherry its tree,  
 vGUDU''ptu guc-ha''nuq du'mpī,  
 gud'u'pḏi guca-ha''nuq du'mpī,  
 The wildcherry tree was peeled,<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> *lf*: “For tīt' discriminative particle ON...PART; yī TO RETURN.”

(43) **pkut<sup>16</sup>**      **i't'**                      **tca**      **am ya\_k.**  
 did on its part    go habitually    to      the sky.

**ɓgut'i't<sup>17</sup> tca'a'myaŋk.**  
**ɓud'i't tca'a'myaŋk.**  
 she went up skywards.

(44) **pa'mī** **k\_'k'**    **kuc**    **a**      **pī'na'**  
 Then    she      that    the      girl  
           **pku**    **tät<sup>18</sup>**                      **lom,**  
           did    on her part      choke,

**1 (8) pa''mi ɓw'k ɓuc-abi'n'a ɓɓudɛ'ɫlum,**  
**1 (8) pɛ''ma ɓɛ'd'ak ɓu'ca-abi'n'a ɓudɛ'ɫlam,**  
 Now that girl swallowed (the astringent cherries),

(45) **pa'ma** **pku**    **tät'**                      **lom.**    **ku**      **tu'kyū,**  
 then    did      on her part      choke. Did    die,

**pa''ma ɓɓudɛ'ɫlum ɓudu'ɗyu'.**  
**pɛ''ma ɓudɛ'ɫlam ɓufu''u.**  
 and when she swallowed (she choked) she died.

(46) **pkut'**                      **i't'**                      **tca**      **a'mya\_k'.**  
 did on her part    go continually    to      the sky.

**ɓgut'i't tca'a'myaŋk.**  
**ɓud'i't tca'a'myaŋk.**  
 She went skywards (to the land of the dead).

---

<sup>15</sup> *mj*: “-*DupD-* is translated ‘pull’ by Dr. Frachtenberg, ‘peel’ by Mr. Kenoyer. The latter never heard this myth before and I am at a loss to comprehend this portion of the myth plot.”

<sup>16</sup> *lf*: “pku DID; -t' the suffixed discriminative particle ON...PART.”

<sup>17</sup> Note copying error (here and below): ' (glottalization) miscopied for ˘ (aspiration). This repeated error suggests that Jacobs may have been working from a copy of Frachtenberg's field text, rather than from the original.

<sup>18</sup> *lf*: “Another form of the discriminative particle tīt'.”

- (47) **pa'ma k\_ 'k' ē'cīn ts!ō'li tuwa'pī.**  
 Then he Coyote lost her his child.  
**2. pa'ma ɣō'k e'icin t'su'li duwa''pi.**  
**2. pε''ma ɣō'k e'icin ɣut'su'l'i duwa'pī.**  
 Now Coyote had lost his child.

- (48) **ū<sup>19</sup> tīt' wū tutcu'hī.**  
 Does on his part go after his quiver.  
**udi'twu duɖju''hi ɣō'k [sic],**  
**ɣudi'twu diɖju'hi ɣō'k<sup>20</sup> [sic],**  
 He went to get his arrow quiver,

- (49) **k\_ 'k<sup>21</sup> ū ka's tuqwa'tp'.**  
 This [sic] does make his launch [sic].  
**uɣa''c duɖ'wa'tp ɣō'k [sic],**  
**uɣε''c diɖ'wa'dp ɣō'k [sic],**  
 he made his lunch,

- (50) **k\_ 'k<sup>22</sup> pa'm pu h\_t' tuwa'pī tca a'mya\_k'.**  
 He then did see his child in the sky.  
**pa''ŋ buhō'd duwa''pi tca'a'myaŋk,**  
**pε''ma ɣuhō'd di'wa'pī dja'a'myaŋk,**  
 and then he saw his child up above,

---

<sup>19</sup> *lf*: “Instead of um.”

<sup>20</sup> See (49), (50): notes to k\_ 'k' in Frachtenberg's typescript.

<sup>21</sup> Spelled ɣō'k by Jacobs, and placed at the end of the preceding segment (48). Jacobs' placement is paralleled elsewhere in this text, so it appears either that Frachtenberg misread his field text here, or that Jacobs saw fit to correct it. Note also that Frachtenberg's gloss ('this') seems anomalous.

<sup>22</sup> Jacobs' transcript shows this pronoun at the end of the preceding segment (49): cf. (48)-(49).

- (51) **pku tu'kyū pa'mī.**  
 Did die now.  
**ԵԳՄԻ՝ԿՅՄ ԲԱ՛ՄԻ.**  
**ԳՄԲՄ՝Ս ԲԵ՛՛ՄԱ.**  
 she had died now.
- (52) **pa'mī pku'mtq' ē'cīn tuwa'pī.**  
 Now did cry Coyote his child.  
**ԲԱ՛ՄԻ ԵԳՄ՝ՄԻԳ Ե՛ԻԿԻՆ ԴՄԱ՛ՐԻ.**  
**ԲԵ՛՛ՄԱ ԿՄ՝ՄԻԳ Ե՛ԻԿԻՆ ԴԻ՛ՎԱ՛ՐԻ.**  
 Then coyote wept on account of his child.
- (53) **pa'ma k\_'k' ē'cīn mi'ntcīatīn tca ma'mpo'l.**  
 Now he Coyote run continually on ground.  
**2 (2) ԲԱ՛ՄԱ ԿՔ՛Կ Ե՛ԻԿԻՆ ՄԻ՛ՆԴԻՏԻՆ ԿԿԱ՛ՄՐՍ՛Լ [sic],**  
**2 (2) ԲԵ՛՛ՄԱ ԿՔ՛Կ Ե՛ԻԿԻՆ ԳՄՄԻ՛ՆԿԻՏԻՆ ԿԿԱ՛ՄՐՍ՛Լ,**  
 2 (2) Now coyote ran along on the ground,
- (54) **pu yū'wan towa'pī,**  
 Did follow her his child,  
**ԲՄ՛ՅՄ՝ՎԱՆ ԴՄԱ՛ՐԻ,**  
**ԳՄԴՅՄ՝ՎԱ ԴՄ՛ՎԱ՛ՐԻ,**  
 he followed his child,
- (55) **pku tā'xti't' k\_'k'.**  
 did cry continually he.  
**ԵԳՄԻ՛ՎՄԻԴԻԴ ԿՔ՛Կ.**  
**ԳՄԻ՛ՎՄՄԻԴԻԴ ԿՔ՛Կ.**  
 he cried.

- (56) **k\_’k’ pu tī’t’ ūk’ tca mī’lāq’**  
 She did on her part arrive at ocean  
**kuc a pī’na’.**  
 that the girl.

**ḡw’k budi’t’uk tca’mi’lāq ḡuc-abi’na,**  
**ḡε’ḡak ḡuḡi’ḡwuk tca’mi’lāq ḡu’ca-abi’n’a,**  
 The girl had reached the ocean,

- (57) **kuc yū k\_’k’ put’ ū’k’,**  
 There also he did on his part arrive,  
**ḡuc-yu’ ḡw’k but’u’ḡ,**  
**ḡu’ca-yu’ ḡw’k ḡutwu’ḡ**  
 there too he arrived,

- (58) **pu yū’wan towa’pī.**  
 did follow her his child.  
**buyu’wan duwa’pi.**  
**ḡuḡyu’wan du’wa’pi [sic]**  
 he followed his child (to there, across which water lay the land of the  
 dead).

- (59) **kuc a pī’na’ pku na’ka’t’,**  
 That the girl did say habitually,  
**ḡuc-abi’na bḡu’na’gat,**  
**ḡu’ca-abi’n’a ḡudna’git,**  
 (There) the girl said to him,

- (60) **“a’ga ma’m<sup>23</sup> pku’mō<sup>24</sup>?**  
 “Something thou here did arrive?  
**“a’ga ma’mbḡu”ma?**  
**“a’ḡa ma’ha ḡuma’a?**  
 “How did you come to here?”

<sup>23</sup> *lf*: “Contracted for ma “ THOU; ma HERE.”

<sup>24</sup> *lf*: “Contracted for pkum wō- [sic] TO GO AFTER.”

- (61) [“]tci’ hī tu’kyū, hä’m<sup>25</sup> lo’m.  
 [“]I indeed died indeed do choke.  
 2 (3) [“]tci’hi-du’q̄yu, he’mlum.  
 2 (3) [“]tci’i-gutfu’u, tci’i-tciḡε’qu.  
 2 (3) [“]I died, (I) choked (to death).
- (62) [“]tci’ta’ cä’toq’!  
 [“]Now do build fire!”  
 [“]tci’da-ce’duq’!  
 [“]tci’de-se’duq’!  
 [“]Now you build a fire!”
- (63) ē’cīn k\_’k’ pu tä’ctoq’,  
 Coyote he did build fire,  
 e’icin ḡω’k buḡε’cduq,  
 e’icin ḡω’k ḡuḡε’cduq,  
 Coyote made a fire,
- (64) put’ fu’yū.  
 did on its part go out become.  
 butfu’yu.  
 gutfu’yu.  
 it went out.
- (65) pa’ma k\_’k’ kuc a pī’na’ pku tä’stoq’.  
 Then she that the girl did build fire.  
 pa’ma ḡω’k ḡuc-abi’na buḡε’cduq,  
 pe’ma ḡεḡak ḡuca-abi’n’a ḡuḡε’cduq,  
 So then the girl made a fire,

---

<sup>25</sup> *lf*: “Consists of hī INDEED; um IT IS.”

(66) pku tit' wō a wa't\_k'  
 Did on her part fetch some wood  
 tca ma'mpka'.  
 in river.

**ɓɓudi'twu a'wa'dik tca'ma'mpɓa,**  
**ɓɓu'i'twu a'wa'dik tce'ma'mpɓa,**  
 she went for (wet) wood in the water,

(67) wa' l\_ a wa't\_k';  
 Not wet the wood;  
 wa'' lɔ' a'wa'dik,  
 wa'ha lɔ'f a'wa'dik,  
 not rotten (dry, easily inflammable [sic]) wood,

(68) ku'cfan put' qwa'twai. [sic]  
 quickly did on its part burn make.  
 a \_s tuwa't\_k'.  
 The spirit his wood.

**ɓu'cfan ɓuɓq'a'twai a''ɔs du'wa'dik.**  
**ɓu'cfan ɓuɓq'a'twai a''ws [sic] du'wa'dik.**  
 (and nonetheless that) dead people's wood burned rapidly (though  
 green and wet).

(69) pku na'k't' kuc a pī'na'.  
 Did say continually that the girl.  
 2 (4) **ɓɓu'na'git ɓuc-abi'na,**  
 2 (4) **ɓɓu'na'git ɓuca-abi'n'a,**  
 2 (4) The girl said,



- (70) [“]tci'ta' ma'' cla'wē<sup>26</sup>!”  
 [“]Now thou do shout!”  
 “tci'da ma' cla'wei!”  
 “tci'da ma'ha cla'l'wai!”  
 “Now you call out!”
- (71) ē'cīn k\_k' pku la'wāi: “am pa:u [sic].”  
 Coyote he did shout: “A canoe.”  
 e'icin ɢw'k ɓɢu'la'wai, “ampa'.....u!”  
 e'icin ɢw'k ɢuɓ.la'l'wi, “ha'mbu.....!”  
 Coyote halloed, “A canoooooe!”
- (72) --- “o'', wa' ma'' ka ti'na' an kla'wāidīn<sup>27</sup>.”  
 — “Oh, not thou at all good the shouting.”  
 “u' wa'' ma' gati'na angla'wa'idin.”  
 “u' wa'ha ma'ha gute'n'a bulal'waidin.”  
 “Oh you are no good at calling out.”
- (73) k\_k' pu la'wē.  
 She did shout.  
 ɢw'k ɓu'la'wei,  
 ɢɛ'd'ak ɢuɓ.la'l'wi,  
 She halloed,
- (74) kō'fan pku wa'tsō',  
 Just did sigh,  
 k̄u'fan ɓɢu'wa't'su,  
 k̄u'nfu ɢuɓwa't'cu<sup>28</sup>,  
 (but) she merely sighed,

<sup>26</sup> *lf*: “c- imperative; la'w- TO SHOUT; -ē (āi) verbalizing suffix.”

<sup>27</sup> *lf*: “k- affixed form of the emphatic particle ka AT ALL; la'w TO SHOUT; -āi connective; -dīn continuative.”

<sup>28</sup> *mj*: “Mr. Kenoyer is not sure he is right in giving this as a Tualatin word.”

- (75) **kī'nuk'**      **a**      **\_s**      **pu'n**      **qa'ptūn**  
 they            the      spirits      did      hear her  
                  **kuc**      **k\_'k'**      **pta**      **wa'tso'.**  
                  that      she      when      sighed.

**gi'nuk a'ʷs bunça'bdun guc-gō'k bda'wa't'su.**

**gi'nuk a'ʷs gudiniça'p̄din gu'ca çε'd'ak gudiwa't'cu.**

(and therefore) those dead people (across the water) heard her when she sighed.

- (76) **pku'ne**            **ma'**      **ku'**      **ha'mbō.**  
 Did they            here      bring      the canoe.

**ḅgunima'ku ha'mbu.**

**gunima'ku ha'mbu.**

They brought a canoe.

- (77) **k\_'k'**      **kuc**      **a**      **pī'na'**      **pku**      **na'k't',**  
 She      that      the      girl      did      say continually,

2 (5) **gō'k guc-abi'n'a ḅcu'na'git,**

2 (5) **çε'd'ak guca-abi'n'a gudna'git,**

2 (5) The girl said,

- (78) **"m\_ kwa'yuku't'<sup>29</sup>            pa'm**      **ha'mbō;**  
 ["]is      brought continually      now      the canoe;

**"muk'wa'yugut pa''ḡ ha'mbu.**

**"ma'k'we'ygut pε''ma ha'mbu.**

"Now the canoe has been brought.

- (79) **["]pa'mī            tcu'tū wō'yoq'<sup>30</sup>."**  
 ["]now            are we      come after."

**["]pa''mi tcuḅu'wu''yuq."**

**["]pε''ma tcuḅu'wu''yuq."**

["]Now they have fetched us."

<sup>29</sup> *lf:* "um IT IS; ku'- TO FETCH; -yuk' passive; -'t'continuative."

<sup>30</sup> *lf:* "wō- TO COME AFTER; -yoq' passive."

- (80) **ē'cīn pku na'k't'.**  
 Coyote did say habitually.  
**e'icīn ʋgūna'git,**  
**e'icīn gūḍna'git,**  
 Coyote said,
- (81) **“ō, m\_ wa' ka, wa' tci' kh\_'ton.”**  
 “Oh, is not at all, not I at all see it.”  
**“u' muwa''! gawa'' tci'' ghō'din.”**  
**“u' mawa'ha! guwa'ha tci''i guthō'd.”**  
 “Oh there is not any (canoe)! I have not seen any (canoe).”
- (82) **pkum ū'k' ha'mbō.**  
 Did arrive the canoe.  
**ʋgum'u'k ha'mʋu.**  
**gum'u'g ha'mʋu.**  
 (Nevertheless) a canoe had come.
- (83) **“tci'ta' mī'tī pmōi'tca<sup>31</sup> tca ha'mbō!”**  
 “Now ye ye put in selves into the canoe!”  
**2 (6) “tci'da mi'di ʋmu'itca tcaha'mʋu!”**  
**2 (6) “tci'd'a mi'd'i pmu'itca tcaha'mʋu!”**  
 2 (6) “Now you get into the canoe!”
- (84) **ē'cīn nō t[ ]a'na' ni k'a'no'**  
 Coyote and his daughter they crossed  
**tca mī'lāq',**  
 in ocean,  
**e'icīn nu' da'a'na ni'qa'nu tca'mi'laq,**  
**e'icīn nau-di'a'n'a ni'qa'n'u tce'mi'laq,**  
 Coyote and his daughter crossed the sea (towards the land of the  
 dead),

---

<sup>31</sup> *lf*: “p- imperative for 2<sup>nd</sup> person plural; mōi- TO BE INSIDE; -tca reflexive.”

- (85) **tca'hō a mī'lāq' nī'<sup>32</sup>,**  
 across the ocean they go,  
**tca'hu' ami'laq ni'',**  
**ɔju'hu ɔjemi'l'aq ɔɔɔini'ni''i,**  
 they went to the other side of the sea,
- (86) **tca a \_s ma nī'.**  
 to the spirits this way they go.  
**tca'a''os ma'ni''.**  
**ɔja'a''ws mani''i.**  
 they came to the place of the dead people.
- (87) **pu tī't' ūk' tca'hō tca mī'lāq'**  
 Did on its part arrive across on ocean  
**kuc ha'mbō pa'm.**  
 that the canoe now.  
**ɔɔɔi't'u'k tca'hu' tcamī'laq ɔuc-ha'mbu pa'm,**  
**ɔɔɔi'twuk ɔju'hu ɔjami'l'aq ɔu'ca-ha'mbu pɛ''ma,**  
 Now that canoe had gotten across to the other side of the sea,
- (88) **nī k'ā'nyoq'<sup>33</sup>,**  
 They taken across,  
**niqa'nyuq.**  
**niqa'n'yuq.**  
 they had gone across it.
- (89) **nī ha'mī pa'mī.**  
 they leave it now.  
**2 (7) niha''mi pa''mi.**  
**2 (7) ɔɔɔiniha'm'i pɛ''ma.**  
 2 (7) Now they got out of the canoe to shore.

---

<sup>32</sup> *lf:* “For ne THEY; yī- TO GO.”

<sup>33</sup> *lf:* “k'an- TO CROSS; -yoq' passive.”

- (90) pu ti'ne wa'l tca ha'mē,  
 Did when they arrive at the house,  
 budi'niwa'l tcaha'mi,  
 gudiniwa'l djeha'mi,  
 The arrived at a house,
- (91) wa' ka a mīm.  
 not at all the people.  
 wa'' gu'a'mim,  
 wa'ha a'mim,  
 no people were (visible) there,
- (92) pu'ne wēf<sup>34</sup>.  
 Did they sleep continually.  
 buni'we'if.  
 gudiniwe'if.  
 they were sleeping.
- (93) kuc ē'cīn towa'pī pku nī'cīn<sup>35</sup> tuī'fa'm.  
 That Coyote his child did speak with him her father.  
 guc-e'icīn duwa''pi bguni'cin du'i'fam,  
 guca-e'icīn duwa'pī gudni'cin di'ē'fam,  
 Coyote's child said to her father,
- (94) "wa' ka a'ga nam ga'sīn!  
 "Not at all something wilt thou do it!  
 "wa'' ga'a'ga namga'cin!  
 "wa'ŋq a'g'a dumge'cin!  
 "Do not do anything (wrong)!

<sup>34</sup> *lf*: "wē- (wāi-) TO SLEEP; -f plural continuative."

<sup>35</sup> *lf*: "nic- TO TELL; -īn instrumental."

- (95) [“]tca a \_s tcu'tū wa'l.”  
 [“]At the spirits do we arrive.”  
 [“]tca'a''os duduwa'l.”  
 [“]tca'a''ws duduwa'l.”  
 [“]We have reached the place of the dead people.”
- (96) pa'm pku hūi'.  
 Then did dark.  
 pa'm̄ ɓɓuhu'wi,  
 pɛ''ma ɓɓuhu'wi,  
 Then it became dark,
- (97) pa'm pu'qulfan pku'nī pu'qlai  
 Then entirely did they wake up  
 kuc a \_s.  
 those the spirits.  
 pa'm̄ ɓu'gulfan ɓɓunibu'klai ɓuc-a''os.  
 pɛ''ma ɓu'gulfan ɓɓunibu'klai ɓuca-a''ws.  
 and now all those dead people arose.
- (98) pa'm um hūi'.  
 Now is night.  
 2 (8) pa'm̄ umhu'wi  
 2 (8) pɛ''ma ɓɓuhu'wi  
 2 (8) Then when it became dark,
- (99) pku'nī yāt' nī ya'lū' kī'nuk' kuc a \_s.  
 Did they stand their dance they those the spirits.  
 ɓɓuni'ya't-niya''lu' ɓi'nuk ɓuc-a''os.  
 ɓɓuniya'd dini'yɛ'l'wa ɓi'n'u'k ɓuca-a''ws.  
 the dead people danced.

- (100) **pa'm k\_ 'k' ē'cīn wa' pku yāt' tīya'lū'.**  
 Then he Coyote not did stand his dance.  
**pa'm ɣō'k e'icin wa'' ɓɣu'ya't-Diya''lu'.**  
**pɛ''ma ɣō'k e'icin wa'ŋɣ ɣutya'ɗ ɗiyɛ'l'wa.**  
 Now coyote did not (could not) dance (the dance of the dead people,  
 because they danced on their heads).
- (101) **pa'm pku na'qo't'<sup>36</sup>.**  
 Then was told continually.  
**pa'm ɓɣu'na'git,**  
**pɛ''ma ɣuɗna'git,**  
 The he was told,
- (102) **“ma' puwa'pī um yū'yuk'<sup>37</sup> a'm ūi.”**  
 “Thou thy child is married a man.”  
**“ma' buwa''pi umyu'yuk amhu'i.”**  
**“ma'ha biwa'pī ɣumyu''wi ɣu'ca-a'mu'i.”**  
 “Your child married a man.”
- (103) --- **“o',” pku na'k't' k\_ 'k'.**  
 — “Oh,” did say continually he.  
**“u',” ɓɣu'na'git ɣō'k.**  
**“u',” ɣuɗna'git ɣō'k.**  
 “Oh,” he said.
- (104) **pku na'qo't' k\_ 'k' am ūi'.**  
 Was told continually he the man.  
**ɓɣu'na'git ɣō'k am'u'i,**  
**ɣuɗna'git ɣō'k a'mu'i,**  
 The man (his son-in-law) said to him,

---

<sup>36</sup> *lf:* “Simplified for nak'o't'; nak'- TO SAY, -qo't' continuative passive.”

<sup>37</sup> *lf:* “yū- TO MARRY; -yuk' passive.”

- (105) “cā’tō tcu’tū la’\_qlifū.”  
 “We will we hunt  
 “cē’du tcudula’ηli’fu.”  
 “su’du tcidha’ηqlufui.”  
 “We will hunt.”
- (106) pa’ma pku nī’ kī’nuk’.  
 Now did they go they.  
 2 (9) pa’ma vcu’ni’’ gi’nuk,  
 2 (9) pε’’ma gudiniD’i’f gi’nuk,  
 2 (9) So then they went,
- (107) pku’ne hū’itē<sup>38</sup> tupa’na’k’.  
 Did they go together his son-in-law.  
 vgunihu’idi’ duba’nak,  
 gudiniDhu’D’i diba’n’ak,  
 he accompanied his son-in-law,
- (108) pa’ma pku nī’ kī’nuk’.  
 Then did they go they.  
 pa’’ma vcu’ni’’ gi’nuk.  
 pε’’ma gudiniD’i’f gi’nuk.  
 and they went away.
- (109) “hac ma’’ ctā’p\_’t’<sup>39</sup>,  
 “Here thou do stand habitually,  
 “ha’c ma’’ cada’bit!  
 “he’ca ma’ha cida’bit!  
 “You stand here!

---

<sup>38</sup> *lf*: “hūi- TO WALK; -tē (-tai) reciprocal.”

<sup>39</sup> *lf*: “c- imperative; tap- TO STAND; -‘t’ continuative.”



(110) [“]tīc a’ntq’ kī ma nī qa’nt’!”  
 [“]soon the elks if here they pass.”  
 [“]ḍi’c a’ntq gi’maniḡa’nt.”  
 [“]ḍi’c a’ntq ḍuminima’ḡḡant.”  
 [“]Pretty soon eld will go by.”

(111) a’ntq’ pu’ma nī’ qant’.  
 The elks did here they pass.  
 a’ntq ḅumani’ḡant,  
 a’ntq ḡḍinidni’ḡant,  
 Elk did pass by,

(112) k\_’k’ ē’cīn pu kō’nīn an tpeu’t’,  
 He Coyote did call it the snail,  
 ptī e’tq’.  
 whereas elk.

ḡō’k e’icin ḅuku’nin a’ntpeut, pḍi’e’tq.

ḡō’k e’icin ḡḍḡu’u’nin a’ntmilt, ḡusa-a’ntq.

(but) coyote called it snail, (though) it was (the dead people’s) elks.

(113) pu nī’cīn, “ct!wa’n<sup>40</sup>  
 Did speak with him, “Do shoot it!,  
 nam h\_’tūn kam ya’hak’<sup>41</sup>.”  
 thou wilt see it will here pass.”

ḅu’ni’cin, “ctwa’n namhō’din ḡamya’hak.”

ḡḍni’cin, “stwa’an ḍamdithō’d umya’hak.”

He said to him, “Shoot it when you see it go by.”

<sup>40</sup> *lf*: “c- imperative; t!wa’- TO SHOOT, TO STRIKE; -n transitive.”

<sup>41</sup> *lf*: “ya a discriminative particle occurring before verbs of motion; hak’- TO GO, TO PASS.”

(114) pa'm pku h\_t', pku t!wa'n k\_'k'.  
Then did see, did shoot it he.

2 (10) pa'mḡ ʋguhō'ḏ, ʋguḡwa''an ɢō'k,  
2 (10) pɛ''ma ɢuḏhō'ḏ, ɢuḡwa''an ɢō'k,  
2 (10) Now he saw it, he shot it,

(115) hū'wan pku hī'lī a'ntq'.  
Five did kill it the elks.

hu'wan ʋguhi'li a'ntq.  
pɛ''ma hu'wan ɢuḏhɛ'li a'ntq.  
he killed five (dead people's) elks.

(116) pkunī wōc kuc a'ntq' kī'nuk'.  
Did they skin those the elks they.

ʋguni'wu'c ɢuc-a'ntq gi'nuk,  
ɢuḏiniwu'cp ɢuca-a'ntq gi'nuk,  
They skinned the elks,

(117) nau l[o]u'yū' a'mhūk'  
And much became the meat  
pu'nī wōs kuc a'ntq'.  
did they dry those the elks.

na'u ʋɢule'u'yu amhu'k ʋuni'wu'c ɢuc-a'ntq.  
na'u ɢutha'l'u amu'kʷ ɢuḏiniwu'cp ɢuca-a''antq.  
and there was a quantity of meat when they skinned those elks.

(118) pa'ma pu'qulfan pkunī' walt'  
Then entirely did they throw away  
kuc a'mhūk'.  
that the meat.

pa'ma ʋu'gulfan ʋguni'walt ɢuc-a'mhu'k,  
pɛ''ma ʋu'gulfan ɢuḏiniha'w'alt ɢuca-amu'kʷ,  
Now then they threw away all the meat,

(119) **ya'lfan to'nts!**                    **punī' ku'**  
 Only    its bones                    did they take  
          **a        ḡs        tuqwa'f.**  
          the        spirits    his pack.

**ya'lfan du'nt's buni'ku a'u's duk'wa'f.**  
**ye'lfan didu'nt'c gudiniḡni'ku a'ws niḡ'wa'f.**  
 (and) only the bones did they take along (in their) dead people's  
 packs.

(120) **k\_ 'k'    ē'cīn   pku    ma'    ku'**  
 He        Coyote did        here    take  
          **tuqwa'f        wa'n    tulḡ'n.**  
          his pack            one    its leg.

**2 (11) ḡw'k e'icin ḡguma'ku duk'wa'f wa'n dulu'n,**  
**2 (11) ḡw'k e'icin ḡduma'ku duk'wa'f wa'an dulu'un,**  
 2 (11) Coyote took one leg in his pack,

(121) **ku        wḡ'kī   tca        ha'mē            tuqwa'f.**  
 Did        bring it into        the house            his load.

**ḡuwu'ḡi tcaha'mi duk'wa'f.**  
**ḡudwu'ḡi tcaha'mi duk'wa'f.**  
 he brought his pack home.

(122) **pa'ma   pku        hūi'.**  
 Then    did        dark.

**pa''ma ḡghu'wi,**  
**pe''ma ḡdidihu'wi,**  
 Then it became dark,

- (123) pa'ma pku'nī            yāt' nī    ya'lū'  
 Then did they            stand their dance  
                                  kwī'lū            kī'nuk'            a    \_s.  
                                  again            they            the    spirits
- pa''ma ʁguniya'tu-niya''lu ɕwi'lu gi'nuk a''os...  
 pɛ''ma ɕuɖini'ya'twan ɖiniɛ'l'wa ɕwɛ'l'-yu gi'nuk a''ws...  
 and now the dead people dance again. . .

### References

All references key to the main paper, except that Frachtenberg (ca. 1915) is mistitled there. Instead of reading “[Typed Tualatin texts based on Gatschet (1877)],” that title should read: “[Typed Kalapuyan text transcripts].” Besides typed versions of Gatschet’s Tualatin texts, these typescripts also include Frachtenberg’s own texts representing the Yamhill, Marys River, Santiam, and Lower McKenzie dialects.