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 We have also located an unpublished typescript version of the Yamhill, prepared by Frachtenberg himself.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.\(^1\)

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yamhill typescript</th>
<th>Tualatin typescripts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ka, k-</td>
<td>k-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kam</td>
<td>kam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kii</td>
<td>ki-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ku</td>
<td>ku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kwi</td>
<td>kwiit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m[ɔ]</td>
<td>hum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ni, nii</td>
<td>ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pka</td>
<td>pka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pku</td>
<td>pku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pku ma</td>
<td>pkuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pku nii</td>
<td>pkuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pku tit, pkut</td>
<td>pku tit-, pkut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pkum</td>
<td>pkum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pkuni ma</td>
<td>pkuma ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pkunii</td>
<td>pkuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pta</td>
<td>pta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu</td>
<td>did</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu tini</td>
<td>did when they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pu tit, put</td>
<td>did on ’s part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pun, puni</td>
<td>did they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tuu, tu-</td>
<td>tum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uu</td>
<td>hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u tit</td>
<td>hut- (hu present; t “discriminative”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>um</td>
<td>hum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) 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 pgumɑ̃pɑ̃nt tsetfɑ́lati;
b. Am Hū’luk’mēn pku’mɑ̃nt tca Atfa’lati.
c. amu’lukʷ me’n tguma-bi’n tce’ tfa’ lati.
d. amu’lukʷ me’n cumasi’nd [pgu...] tce’tfa’lati.
e. The Water Being used to be in Tualatin valley (Wapato Lake).

(2) a. pē’ma pgû’mma ha’lpa’m pgû’mma tchúmampka,
b. pámĩ pku ma’a ha’lpa’m, pku ma’a tca ma’mpka.
c. pe’ma cotma’a ha’lsam tootma’a tce-ma’mpga.
d. pe’ma gutma’a [pgu’ma, pgu’m’a] ha’lsam, gutma’a tce’ma’mpga,
e. Then it came up above, it came to the water (?).

(3) a. háta güm pgutguéyuk. pgunhû’psin.
b. Ha’ta gâm pkut’ klwéyuk’. pku’ne hu’pcin.
c. ha’dǝ ge’m ñütkw’e’yuk. bûonihu’pcin.
d. ha’dǝ ge’m bût’kwe’y’uk, bûonihu’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 $tg_u$-, $tgut$- 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 $pgu$- : $tg$- 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 $tg_u$-, $tgut$- 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)\(^2\); 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.\(^3\) 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

\(^2\) 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 \(d\-, \, did\-\) - in Kenoyer’s Tualatin: see section 3.

\(^3\) 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 putini (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 putini, 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 gudinidmi-, 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kenoyer’s glosses</th>
<th>Yamhill models (with Text sample segment #s)</th>
<th>Central Kalapuya comparisons to column 1&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>dum-</em></td>
<td><em>tuu, tu-</em> ‘for’ (15, 18)</td>
<td><em>dumi-</em> 1/2/3 sing objective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>duminiman-</em></td>
<td><em>ki ma ni</em> ‘if here they’ (110)</td>
<td><em>dumini-</em> ‘3 pl objective’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gu-</em></td>
<td><em>pku</em> ‘did’ (20)</td>
<td><em>g-</em> aorist (Banks: past realis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>u-</em> realis (?) (Banks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gud-, gut-</em></td>
<td><em>k-</em> ‘(not) at all’ (81)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*ku ‘did’ (45, 121)</td>
<td><em>t-</em> directive (motion away from speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pku ‘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)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pkut ‘did on _ part’ (43, 46)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pu ‘did’ (9, 50, 54, 58, 63, 73, 112, 113)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*put ‘did on _ part’ (57, 64, 68)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*um ‘is’ (98)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gudi-</em></td>
<td>*pta- ‘when’ (75)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>di-</em>, <em>dii-</em> temporal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gudid-, gudit-</em></td>
<td>*pku ‘did’ (122)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pku tit(-) (30, 44, 45, 66)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pu ‘did’ (10)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pu tit ‘did on _ part’ (56, 87)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*u tit ‘does on _ part’ (48)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gudini-</em></td>
<td>*ni ‘they’ (89)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pkuni ‘did they’ (97, 99, 116, 118)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pu tini ‘did when they’ (90)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*puni ‘did they’ (92, 117)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gudinid-, gudinidni-</em></td>
<td>*pkuni ‘did they’ (107)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gudma-</em></td>
<td>*pku ma ‘did here’ (120)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gudi.si-</em></td>
<td>*pku tit ‘did on _ part’ (40)</td>
<td><em>(see gu-)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>4</sup> After Berman (ca. 1986), except Banks refers to Banks (2007).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gum-</th>
<th>Pku ‘did’ (2, 14, 16)</th>
<th>Gum- 1/2/3 sing aorist indicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gun-</td>
<td>Pkm(-) ‘did’ (5, 21, 28, 29, 34, 52, 82)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pu ‘did’ (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um ‘is’ (102)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gumdit-</th>
<th>Pku ‘did’ (2)</th>
<th>(see gum-, gumdi-, gud-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gunima-</td>
<td>Pkuni ma (76)</td>
<td>(see gu-, gudini-, gudma-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gwi-</th>
<th>Kwi ‘should’ (8)</th>
<th>Gwii- 1/2/3 sing recent (past) relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ma-</th>
<th>Ma ‘here’ (38)</th>
<th>(see gudma-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ma-2</td>
<td>M/a/ ‘is’ (78)</td>
<td>Um- 3 sing present usitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni-</td>
<td>Ni ‘they’ (84, 88)</td>
<td>(see gudini-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U-</td>
<td>Uu ‘does’ (49)</td>
<td>(see ma-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Um-</td>
<td>Kam ‘will’ (113)</td>
<td>(see ma-2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 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.\(^{fn-1}\)]
[Frachtenberg’s interlinear translation.]

[Jacobs’ transliteration of Frachtenberg’s Yamhill field text.]
[Jacobs’ transcript of Louis Kenoyer’s Tualatin translation.\(^{fn-2}\)]
[Jacobs’ free English translation.\(^{fn-2}\)]

\(^{fn-1}\)selected grammar notes by Frachtenberg: If: ...
\(^{fn-2}\)selected notes on content and transcription by Jacobs: mj: ...

1. **ē’cìn wa’nta’an pku pì’nt tca to’m’ai.**
   Coyote one only did live in his house.

1. **ē’icìn wa’an’da’fan bsùi’nt tca’u’m’ai.**
1. **ē’icìn wa’p’af’an gusì’nò tca’u’m’ai.**
   1. Coyote was living alone at his home.

---

\(^5\) 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’mē fp pku ts’a’tso.’
Did day become did go, gopher did hunt.

Bgu’me’idj Bgu’um Bguny’um wi u’fp [sic], Bguts’a’tsu,
Gumditme’idj Gu’um Gumyu’um wi u’fp
When it became morning he went (and) he looked for gophers,
(Yamhill:) he hunted them down.

(3) pku hi’li _fp’
Did kill him gopher.

Bguhi’li u’fp.
. . . [no Tualatin or free translation]

(4) pkū’mük’ tca to’māi e’cīn.
Did arrive at his house Coyote.

Bgun’g tcau’ma’i e’cīn
Gum’g tcau’ma’i e’cīn,
Coyote got back home,

(5) pa’m pkum wōs _fp’.
Now did skin gopher.

Pa’’m Bgunw’c u’fp,
Pē’’ma Gumwu’c’uf u’fp,
and he skinned the gopher,

(6) pa’m pkun gwi’n k’k’ e’cīn tumi’ndjal,
Now did seize it he Coyote his paunch,

_fp’ tumi’ndjal.
gopher his paunch.

Pa’’m Bgun’go’ in go’k e’cin Dumi’nt’cal u’fp Dumi’nt’cal.
Pē’’ma Gu’go’ in go’k e’cin Dumi’nt’cal u’fp Dumi’nt’cal.
And then Coyote took the gopher’s entrails.

---

6 If: “Contracted for pku u’m TO GO.”
7 If: “Contracted for pkum ūk’ TO ARRIVE.”
8 If: “For pkum. The final m assimilated to n because of the following k.”
k_’k’ ē’cīn pku na’ka’t’.  
He Coyote did say continually.

1 (2) ɢɷ’k  e’icin  bgu’na’git,  
1 (2) ɢɷ’k e’icin  gudna’git,  
1 (2) Coyote said,

kuc _fp’ tumǐndjal  ca’nō  tcī’  
That gopher his paunch wish I
kwī  tat_p’.  
should my daughter.

“guc-u’’fp  dumĭ’nt’cal,  ca’’mu  tcī’’ gwida’dp! [sic]”  
“guca-a’’fp  dumĭ’nt’cal,  ca’’mu  tcī’’ i  o’idawa’pī.”  
“These gopher entrails, I wish they were my daughter!”

pu pu’ntca  pi’na’ kuc _fp’ tumǐ’ndjal.  
Did make self girl that gopher his paunch.

buwu’ntca  bi’na  guc-u’’fp  dumĭ’nt’cal.  
gusuwu’ntca  abi’n’a  guca-u’’fp  dimĭ’nt’cal.  
The gopher’s entrails turned into a girl.

pa’m pu  pa’lyū’  kuc a  pi’na’,  
Now did big become that the girl,
ē’cīn  tumǐ’ndjal.  
Coyote his child.

pa’’m bua’lyu’  guc-abi’n’a  e’icin  duwa’pī’.  
pe’ma  guditba’lyu  guca-abi’n’a  e’icin  duwa’pī.  
Now the girl, coyote’s daughter, became large.

an k’wīn pku  h_t’.  
The Coon did see.
a’ŋk’in  bguhō’p,  
a’ŋk’in  gudhō’p,  
Coon saw her,
(12) pku na’ka’t’ an gwīn pku e’ut’.
Did say continually the Coon did want.
bguna’at a’ŋk’wın bgu’e’ut,
gudna’git a’ŋk’wın gup’e’ut,
coon said that he wanted her,

(13) pku’n ku’ tca to’māi.
Did take to his house.
bg’u’nku tcaDU’mai.
ggu’ŋk’u 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 bgume’yī, su’mi’nagut.
1 (3) pe’’ma gum’e’yī, gum’i’nagut.
Then she returned, she ran away from him.

(15) pa’m an tqop’ kwī’liyū
Then the Skunk again
pku’n ku’ tuta’galok’on’.
did take in marriage.
pa’m a’ntgub gwi’’li’-yu bgu’nku dum’daga’gun,
pes’mu ma’ntgub gwe’l’-yu gug’u’ŋk’u dum’digule’i’gun,
Now skunk took her away in marriage again,

(16) kwī’liyū pku mī’nakut yū,
Again did run from him indeed,
gwi’’li’-yu bgumi’nagut-yu’,
gwe’l’-yu gum’i’nagwi’nit-yu’,
again she ran away,

9 If: “da’galo’k’ passive from tēkal- TO MARRY; -n nominalizing suffix.”
(17) pku ma’ yī tca to’māi.
did back return to her house.

āgume’yī tca du’maī.
gum’e’yī tca du’ma’i.
she came back home.

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

pa’ma ha’mhuc āguma’ dūda’gala’gun
e’icin duwa’pī du’a’na’.
pe’ma ha’mhuc guma’ dūmi’e’igule’igen
e’icin duwa’pī di’a’na’.

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-asī’na wa’ sgu’e’ut guc-a’mhuc.
gu’ca-asī’na wa’ŋq dumdi’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 yē’yāit’ a mī’nk’.
did break it a marrow bone.

1 (4) pa’ma gō’k ha’mhuc sguyu’’yait a’mi’ŋk,
1 (4) pe’ma gō’k ha’mhuc sguyu’’yait a’mi’n’ik,
1 (4) So now cougar broke up marrow bones (a delicacy),
(21) pku’m tit’ kuc a mî’nk’.
Did give that the marrow bone.

bgumoit guc-a’mî’ngk,
gumd’ô guc-a’mî’n’ik,
he gave her the marrow bones,

(22) wa’ pka¹⁰ e’ut.
Not did want.

wa’ bgε’ut.
wa’ha gu’d’ut.
(but) she did not want them.

(23) pu tit[']wa’lt’ ha’lim.
Did on her part throw outside.

bud’twalt ha’lim.
gud’twalt he’’lum.
She threw them outside.

(24) kwî’liyū pkû’m tî yû’wal ha’m hûc.
Again did go to hunt the Panther.
gwî’li’-yu bou’um di’yu’’’w’l ha’mhuc,
gwε’l’-yu gu’um diyu’’’wal ha’mhuc,
Again cougar went away to hunt,

(25) kwî’liyû pku yô’yâit’ a mî’nk’.
Again did break the marrow bone.
gwî’li’-yu bgyu’’’yait a’mî’nk’,
gwε’l’-yu guyu’’’yait a’mî’n’ik,
again he broke marrow bones,

¹⁰ If: “Assimilated for pku.”
Again she did not want them.

Again she did not want it.

Again she did not want them.

Again he the Panther did not know it.

Again he the Panther did not know what to do about her.

Then did the Panther did swim.

Now it became morning cougar swam,

and then cougar found the marrow bones (he had given her and which she had thrown away to spite him).

11 *pf: “Assimilated for pku.”*
(30) ha’m hūc pku tī’t’kwūn a mī’nk’.  
The Panther did on his part seize it the marrow bone.  
ha’mhuc bgūdi’t’wīn a’mi’nk,  
ha’mhuc gu’d’i’t’wīn a’mi’n’ik,  
Cougartook a marrow bone,

(31) pa’m a pku pu’fī kuc a mī’nk’.  
Then did blow at it that the marrow bone.  
pa’ma bgupu’fé gu’c-a’mī’nk,  
pe’’ma guupu’f’i gu’ca-a’mī’n’ik,  
and he blew at the marrow bone,

(32) pku pu’nts a ha’noq’  
Did make self a wildcherry  
kuc a mī’nk’.  
that the marrow bone  
bgubu’ntc a ha’nuq gu-c-a’mi’nk.  
gubu’ntc a 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) bguci’bstcet gu-c-ha’nuq,  
1 (6) gu’d’ja’t guca-ha’nuq,  
1 (6) The wildcherry broke off,

(34) pku m la’mo’ tca hā’maī.  
Did enter in the house.  
bgumla’mu tca ha’mai,  
gumla’m’u tca ha’m’i,  
he came back into the house,
(35) pku kw̱i n kuc ha’noq'.
Did carry it that the wild cherry.

bgukʷi’n guc-ha’nuq.
guukʷe’n guca-ha’nuq.
he brought the wildcherry.

(36) pa’ma k_’k’ kuc a pī’na’ pku na’ka’t’.
Then she¹² that the girl did say continually.

pa’ma gow’k guc-ab’na bguna’gat,
pe’ma Ge’d’ak guc-ab’n’ a gudna’git,
Now the girl said,

(37) “m_ha’lil pku ma’” ya’mbi kuc
“Is where did thou come from that
ha’noq’.”
the wildcherry?”

“m̱ха’’lil bgumaya’mai guc-ha’nuq?”
“he’l’a gumiya’mai guca-ha’nuq?”
“Where did that wildcherry come from?”

(37a) [not in Frachtenberg’s typescript]
(e’icin, “ci’dit dawa’pi guc-aq’a’ya’n!”)
(e’icin, “gumci’’d dawa’pi guca-aq’a’y’a’ŋ!”)
(Coyote [said], “Give my child those berries!”)¹³

¹² 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.

¹³ 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’lim ma yā’t’ to’māʾ.  
And the Panther here outside here stood his tree.

nau ha’mhuc ha’c ha’lim ma’ya’t’ du’māʾ.  
nau ha’mhuc ha’c hε’’lim ma’ya’ā du’māʾ.  
Now cougar’s tree (wildcherry) stood outside here.

(39) kuc a pī’na’ pku tī’t’ī¹⁴ kuc  
That the girl did on her part go that  
ha’noq’ tca to’mbī.  
the wildcherry to its tree.

1 (7) gu-c-ɛ’’na ɛgudi’’ti gu-c-ha’’nuq tcau’māʾ,  
1 (7) gu-c-ɛ’’n’a ɛgudi’’t’ gu-c-ha’’nuq tcau’māʾ,  
1 (7) The girl went to his wildcherry tree,

(40) pku tī’t’ kła’k’ tca to’mbī ha’noq’.  
Did on her part climb on its tree the wildcherry.

ɛgudi’’t’kla’k’ tcau’māʾ ha’’nuq,  
gu-d. ɛi’k’kla’k’ tcau’māʾ 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 gu-c-ha’’nuq ɛgul’um’pat.  
pɛ’’ma gu-c-ha’’nuq gu-d. lu’mpa’t.  
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,

ɛgudi’’pto gu-c-ha’’nuq du’mpī,  
gu-d’pdi gu-c-ha’’nuq du’mpī,  
The wildcherry tree was peeled,¹⁵

¹⁴ ṭ: “For ṭh' discriminative particle ON...PART; yī TO RETURN.”
(43) **pkut'**¹⁶  i'ᵗ'  tca  am ya_k.
did on its part  go habitually  to  the sky.

**bgut'i'ᵗ**¹⁷  tca'a'myaŋk.
**gud'i't**  tca'a'myaŋk.
she went up skywards.

(44) **pa'mi**  k'_k'  kuc  a  pĩ'na'  
Then  she  that  the  girl

**pku**  tā't'¹⁸  lom,
did  on  her  part  choke,

1 (8) **pa'™i**  gö'k  guc-abi'na  gude'ṭlum,
1 (8) **pe'”ma**  çe'dak  gu'ca-abi'n'a  gude'ṭlam,
Now that girl swallowed (the astringent cherries),

(45) **pa'ma**  pku  tā't'  lom.  ku  tu'kyū,
them  did  on  her  part  choke.  Did  die,

**pa'™a**  gude'ṭlum  gudu'ʤyu'.
**pe'”ma**  gude'ṭlam  gutfu'”u.
and when she swallowed (she choked) she died.

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

**bgut'i’ᵗ**  tca'a'myaŋk.
**gud'i’t**  tca'a'myaŋk.
She went skywards (to the land of the dead).

---

¹⁵ mj: “-du-pa- 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.”

¹⁶ If: “pku DID; -t' the suffixed discriminative particle ON...PART.”

¹⁷ 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.

¹⁸ If: “Another form of the discriminative particle tī’t.”
Then he Coyote lost his child.

Now Coyote had lost his child.

Does on his part go after his quiver.

He went to get his arrow quiver,

This does make his launch.

He then did see his child in the sky.

19 “Instead of um.”

20 See (49), (50): notes to k’k in Frachtenberg’s typescript.

21 Spelled Gök 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.

22 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.

bgu'tu'kyu pa’mi.
gudfu’u pe'’ma.
she had died now.

(52) p’a’mi pku’mtq’ é’cín tuwa’pi.
Now did cry Coyote his child.

p’a’mi bgu’mdiq e’icin duwa’pi.
p’e’’ma qu’mdiq e’icin di’wa’piar.
Then coyote wept on account of his child.

(53) p’a’má k’k’ é’cín mi’ntcīatīn tca ma’mpo’l.
Now he Coyote run continually on ground.

2 (2) p’a’ma gō’k e’icin mi’nōjīsoin tcama’mp’u’l [sic],
2 (2) p’e’’ma gō’k e’icin gu’dmi’ntcīsoin tcama’mpul, 
2 (2) Now coyote ran along on the ground,

(54) pu yū’wan towa’pi,
Did follow her his child,

bu’yü’wan duwa’pi,
gudyu’wa du’wa’pi,
he followed his child,

(55) pku tā’xtl’t’ k’k’.
did cry continually he.

bgu’ta’x̣ did gō’k.
gut’a’x̣ did gō’k.
he cried.
(56) k_‘k’ pu ti’t’ ū’k tca mi’lāq’
She did on her part arrive at ocean
kuc a pi’na’.
that the girl.
gω‘k budi’t’uk tca’mi’laq gu’ca-abi’na,
gε‘g’ak gu’diwuk tca’mi’laq gu’ca-abi’na,
The girl had reached the ocean,
(57) kuc yū k_‘k’ put’ ū’k’,
There also he did on his part arrive,
guc-yu’ gω‘k but’u’g,
gu’ca-yu’ gω‘k gutwu’g
there too he arrived,
(58) pu yū’wan towa’pī.
did follow her his child.
buyu’wan duwa’pī.
gudyu’wan du’wa’pī [sic]
he followed his child (to there, across which water lay the land of the dead).
(59) kuc a pi’na’ pku na’ka’t’,
That the girl did say habitually,
gu’c-asi’na bgu’na’gat,
gu’ca-abi’n’a gu’dna’git,
(There) the girl said to him,
(60) “a’ga ma’m23 pku’mō24?”
“Something thou here did arrive?
“a’ga ma’mbgu’ma?
“a’g’a ma’ha gu’ma’”a?
“How did you come to here?”

23 If: “Contracted for ma’ THOU; ma HERE.”
24 If: “Contracted for pkum wō- [sic] TO GO AFTER.”
(61) [“]tcī’ hī tu’kyū, hā’m²⁵ lo’m.
[“]I indeed died indeed do choke.
2 (3) [“]tcī’hi-ду’yu, he’mlum.
2 (3) [“]tcī’i-gutfu’u, tcī’i-tci’dq’equ.
2 (3) [“]I died, (I) choked (to death).

(62) [“]tcī’ta’ cā’toq’!
[“]Now do build fire!
[“]tcī-’da-ce’duq!”
[“]tcī’ne-se’duq!”
[“]Now you build a fire!

(63) ē’cin k_’k’ pu tā’ctoq’,
Coyote he did build fire,
e’cin go’k bude’cduq,
e’cin go’k gu’d’e’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 tā’stoq’.
Then she that the girl did build fire.
pa’’ma go’’k guc-abi’’na bgude’cduq,
pe’’ma če’d’ak guca-abi’’n’a gu’d’e’cduq,
So then the girl made a fire,

²⁵ ḝ": “Consists of hī INDEED; um IT IS.”
(66) pku ĭt' wō a wa't_k'
Did on her part fetch some wood
tca ma’mpka'.
in river.

بغدي’twu a’wa’dik tca’mampa,
غدي’twu a’wa’dik tce’mampa,
she went for (wet) wood in the water,

(67) wa’ l_ a wa’t_k';
Not wet the wood;
wa’’ l’’ a’wa’dik,
wa’ha l’’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.

غع’cfan بع’تواي a’’وس du’wa’dik.
غع’cfan غع’تواي a’’وس [sic] du’wa’dik.
(and nonetheless that) dead people’s wood burned rapidly (though green and wet).

(69) pku na’k’t' kuc a pl’na'.
Did say continually that the girl.

2 (4) غع’نا’git guc-asi’na,
2 (4) غعنا’git guca-abi’n’a,
2 (4) The girl said,
(70) ["tcıˇta’ ma” cla’wē26!"
[“]Now thou do shout!”
“tcıˇda ma” cla’weil”
“tcıˇda ma’ha cla’l’wai!”
“Now you call out!”

(71) ē’cın  k_’k’  pku  la’wāi: “am pa:u [sic].”
Coyote he did shout: “A canoe.”
e’icin  gö’k  sou’la’’wai, “ampa’……u!”
e’icin  gö’k  gup.la’T’wi, “ha’mau……!”
Coyote hallooed, “A canoooooe!”

(72) --- “o’’, wa’ ma”  ka  ti’na’ an  kla’wāidin27.”
___ “Oh, not thou at all good the shouting.”
“u’’ wa’ ma”  gati’na  angl’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.
gö’k  bu’la’wei,
ĝe’p’ak  gup.la’T’wi,
She hallooed,

(74) kō’fan  pku  wa’tsō’,
Just did sigh,
ku’’fan  agu’wa’t’su,
kunfu  guwa’t’cu28,
(but) she merely sighed,

26 If: “c- imperative; la’w- TO SHOUT; -ē (āi) verbalizing suffix.”
27 If: “k- affixed form of the emphatic particle ka AT ALL; la’w TO SHOUT; -āi connective; -ān continuative.”
28 mj: “Mr. Kenoyer is not sure he is right in giving this as a Tualatin word.”
(75) kɨ’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’’os bunq’a’dbun guc-gə’k bda’wa’t’su.
gi’nuk a’’ws gudiniga’p’din gu’ca qε’da’k guniwa’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.

bungima’ku ha’mbu.
gunima’ku ha’mbu.
They brought a canoe.

(77) k_’k’ kuc a pɨ’na’ pku na’k’t’,
  She that the girl did say continually,
  2 (5) gə’k guc-ası’na bgu’na’git,
  2 (5) qε’da’k guca-ası’n’a gudna’git,
  2 (5) The girl said,

(78) “m_ kwa’yuku’t’29 pa’m ha’mbō;
   [“]is brought continually now the canoe;
“muk’a’yugut pa’m hâ’mbu.
“maḵ’e’yugut pe’’ma h’a’mbu.
“Now the canoe has been brought.

(79) [“]pa’mi tcu’tū wō’yoq30.”
[“]now are we come after.”
[“]pa’’mi tcu’du’wu’’yuq.”
[“]pe’’ma tcu’du’wu’’yuq.”
[“]Now they have fetched us.”

29 If: “um IT IS; ku’- TO FETCH; -yuk’ passive; -’t’continuative.”
30 If: “wō- TO COME AFTER; -yoq’ passive.”
(80) ē’cīn pku na’k’t.’
Coyote did say habitually.
e’icin bguna’git,
e’icin guuna’git,
Coyote said,

(81) “ō, m_ wā’ ka, wā’ tci’ kh_’ton.”
“Oh, is not at all, not I at all see it.”
“u’ muwa’! cawa’ tci’ ghō’din.”
“u’ mawa’hal 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.
bgum’u’k ha’mau.
gum’u’c ha’mb’u.
(Nevertheless) a canoe had come.

(83) “tci’ta’ mi’tī pmōi’tca31 tca ha’mbō!”
“Now ye ye put in selves into the canoe!”
2 (6) “tci’da mi’di bmū’tca tcahama’b’ul!”
2 (6) “tci’d’a mi’d’i pmu’tca tcahama’b’ul!”
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 mi’lāq’,
in ocean,
e’icin nu’ da’a’na’ niqa’n’u tca’mi’laq,
e’icin nau-di’a’n’n’a niqa’n’u tce’mi’l’aq,
Coyote and his daughter crossed the sea (towards the land of the dead),

31 *p- imperative for 2nd person plural; mōi- TO BE INSIDE; -tca reflexive.”
(85)  tca’hō a mī’lāq’ ni’³²,
an across the ocean they go,
tca’hu’ ami’’laq ni’’
ʤu’hu ʤemī’l’aq gu’dinini’i,
they went to the other side of the sea,

(86)  tca a _s ma ni’.
to the spirits this way they go.
tca’a’’ws ma’ni’’
ʤa’a’’ws mani’’i.
they came to the place of the dead people.

(87)  pu tī’t’ ük’ tca’hō tca mī’lāq’
Did on its part arrive across on ocean
kuc ha’mbō pa’m.
that the canoe now.
buṇi’t’u’k tca’hu’ tcami’’laq gu’c-ha’ma’u pa’m,
gu’ni’twuk ʤu’hu ʤemī’l’aq gu’ca-ha’ma’u pe’’ma,
Now that canoe had gotten across to the other side of the sea,

(88)  nī kā’nyoq³³,
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) gu’biniha’’mī pe’’ma.
2 (7) Now they got out of the canoe to shore.

³² If: “For ne THEY; yī- TO GO.”
³³ If: “K’an- TO CROSS; -yoq passive.”
(90) pu tì’ne wa’l tca ha’mē,
Did when they arrive at the house,

bud’niwa’l tcaha’’mī,
gudiniwa’l djeha’m’i,
The arrived at a house.

(91) wa’ ka a mîm.
not at all the people.

wa’’ gu’a’mim,
wa’ha a’m’im,
no people were (visible) there,

(92) pu’ne wēf4.
Did they sleep continually.

buni’we’if.
gudiniwe’if.
they were sleeping.

(93) kuc ē’cīn towa’pī pku ni’cīn tui’fa’m.
That Coyote his child did speak with him her father.
guc-e’icin duwa’’pī bguni’’cin du’i’’fam,
guca-e’icin duwa’’pī guñi’’cin di’’f’am,
Coyote’s child said to her father,

(94) “wa’ ka a’ga nam ga’śīn!“Not at all something wilt thou do it!
“wa’ ga’a’ga namga’cīn!
“wa’ηq a’g’a dumge’c’īn!
“Do not do anything (wrong)!

34 If: “wē- (wāi-) TO SLEEP; -f plural continuative.”
35 If: “nic- TO TELL; -i instrumental.”
[\"tca a _s tcu\'tū wa\'l.\"]
[\"At the spirits do we arrive.\"]
[\"tca\'a\'ws ɗuwa\'l.\"]
[\"tca\'a\'ws ɗuwa\'l.\"]
[\"We have reached the place of the dead people.\"]

\(95\)  
\[\text{pa\'m pku hūi}'\]  
Then did dark. 
\[\text{pa\'m águhu'wi, pe\'\"ma guðhu'wi,}\]  
Then it became dark,

\(96\)  
\[\text{pa\'m pu'quľan pku'nī pu'qlai}\]  
Then entirely did they wake up 
\[\text{kuc a _s.}\]  
those the spirits. 
\[\text{pa\'m ñu'quľan ñunisu'klai guć-a\'ws.}\]  
\[\text{pe\'\"ma ñu'quľan ñuninisu'klai guć-a\'ws.}\]  
and now all those dead people arose.

\(97\)  
\[\text{pa\'m um hūi}'\]  
Now is night. 
\[\text{2 (8) pa\'m umhu'wi}\]  
\[\text{2 (8) pe\'\"ma guðhu'wi}\]  
\[\text{2 (8) Then when it became dark,}\]

\(98\)  
\[\text{pku'nī yāt' nī ya'lū' kī'nuk' kuc a _s.}\]  
Did they stand their dance they those the spirits. 
\[\text{buniy'ya\'t-niya'lu' gi'nuk gúc-a\'ws.}\]  
\[\text{gunikny'á dini'ye'l'wa gi'n\'uk guć-a\'ws.}\]  
the dead people danced.
(100) pa’m  k_’k’ e’cîn wa’ pku yāt’ tîya’lû’est. 
Then he Coyote not did stand his dance.

pa’m gô’k e’cîn wa’ bgu’ya’t-diya’lu’est.
pe’”ma gô’k e’cîn wa’ng gutya’’d diye’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’36.
Then was told continually.

pa’m a’gu’na’git,
pe’”ma gu’na’git,
The he was told,

(102) “ma’” puwa’pî um yû’yuk’37  a’m ūi.”
“Thou thy child is married a man.”

“ma’” buwa’pi umyu’yuk amhu’i.”
“ma’ha siwa’pi gumyu’wi gu’ca-a’mu’i.”
“Our child married a man.”

(103) --- “o’,” pku na’k’t’  k_’k’.
___ “Oh,” did say continually he.

“u’,” bgu’na’git gô’k.
“u’,” gu’na’git gô’k.
“Oh,” he said.

(104) pku  na’qo’t’  k_’k’ am ūi’.
Was told continually he the man.

bgu’na’git gô’k am’u’i,
gu’na’git gô’k a’mu’i,
The man (his son-in-law) said to him,

36 If: “Simplified for nak’o’t’; nak’- TO SAY, -qo’t’ continuative passive.”
37 If: “yû- TO MARRY; -yuk’ passive.”
“cā’tō tcu’tū la’ qlīfū.”
“We will we hunt
“ce’du tcudula’ qli’fu.”
“su’v’u tcūh’ a’ qlufui.”
“We will hunt.”

pa’ma pku nī’ ki’nuk’.
Now did they go they.
2 (9) pa’ma bgu’ni’’ gi’nuk,
2 (9) pe’’ma gudini’d’i’ f gi’nuk,
2 (9) So then they went,

pkune hū’ıtē38 tupa’na’k’.
Did they go together his son-in-law.
bgunihu’idi’ duba’nak,
gudini’dhu’i diba’n’ak,
he accompanied his son-in-law,

pa’ma pku nī’ ki’nuk’.
Then did they go they.
pa’’ma bgu’ni’’ gi’nuk.
pe’’ma gudini’d’i’ f gi’nuk.
and they went away.

“hac ma’’ ctā’p’ t’39,
“Here thou do stand habitually,
“ha’c ma’ cada’ sit!
“he’ ca ma’ ha cida’ sit!
“You stand here!

38 If: “hūi- TO WALK; -tē (-tai) reciprocal.”
39 If: “c- imperative; tap- TO STAND; -t continuative.”

A32
(110) "["tîc a‘ntq’ kî ma nī qa‘nt’!"]
["soon the elks if here they pass.”

["dî‘c a‘ntq gi‘manîq’a‘nt.”
["dî‘c a‘ntq ñûminîìa’gîqant.”
[“Pretty soon eld will go by.”

(111) a‘ntq’ pu‘ma nī’ qant’. The elks did here they pass.

a‘ntq ñûmanî‘gîqant,
a‘ntq gûdînîìîq’gîqant,
Elk did pass by,

(112) k_’k’ ē’cîn pu kō‘nîn an tpeu’t’,
He Coyote did call it the snail,
ptî e’tq’.

whereas elk.

gâ‘k e’cîn sîku’ânin a‘ntpeut, pøî’e’tq.
gâ‘k e’cîn gûqû‘u’ânin a‘ntmîlt, gûsa-a‘ntq.
(but) coyote called it snail, (though) it was (the dead people’s) elks.

(113) pu nî’cîn, “ct‘wa’n” Did speak with him, “Do shoot it!,

nam h_‘tûn kam ya’hak”’
thou wilt see it will here pass.”

bû’nî’cîn, “ct‘wa’n” namhø-‘din gàmîya’hak.”
gûdînî’cîn, “st‘wa’an dàmpîthø-‘ð umya’hak.”
He said to him, “Shoot it when you see it go by.”

40 If: “c- imperative; t‘wa’- TO SHOOT, TO STRIKE; -n transitive.”
41 If: “ya a discriminative particle occurring before verbs of motion; hak’- TO GO, TO PASS.”
(114) pa’m pku h_t’, pku tlua’n k’k’.
Then did see, did shoot it he.

2 (10) pa’n bguh-’d, bguw’’an go’’k,
2 (10) pe’’ma guh-’d, guw’’an go’’k,
2 (10) Now he saw it, he shot it,

(115) hu’wan pku hi’li a’ntq’.
Five did kill it the elks.

hu’wan bguh-i’li a’ntq.
pe’’ma hu’wan guh-e’li i a’ntq.
he killed five (dead people’s) elks.

(116) pkunî wôc kuc a’ntq’ kî’nuk’.
Did they skin those the elks they.

bguni’wu’’c guc-a’ntq gi’’nuk,
gudiniwu’’cp guca-a’ntq gi’n’uk,
They skinned the elks,

(117) nau l[o]u’yü’ a’mhük’
And much became the meat

pu’ni wôs kuc a’ntq’.
did they dry those the elks.

na’u bgule’u’yu amhu’’k bunî’wu’’c guc-a’ntq.
na’u gutha’l’u amu’’k gudiniwu’’cp guca-a’’antq.
and there was a quantity of meat when they skinned those elks.

(118) pa’ma pu’qulfan pkunî’ walt’
Then entirely did they throw away

kuc a’mhük’.
that the meat.

pa’ma bu’qulfan bguni’’walt guc-a’mhu’’k,
pe’’ma bu’qulfan gudiniha’’walt guca-amu’’k,
Now then they threw away all the meat,
(119) ya’lfan to’nts! puni’ ku’
Only its bones did they take
a oṣ tuqwa’f.
the spirits his pack.

(120) k ’k’ ō’cín pku ma’ ku’
He Coyote did here take
tuqwa’f wa’n tulō’n.
his pack one its leg.

(121) ku wō’kī tca ha’mē tuqwa’f.
Did bring it into the house his load.
guwu’gi tcaha’mi duk’wa’f.
gūwu’gi tcaha’mi duk’wa’f.
he brought his pack home.

(122) pa’ma pku hūi’.
Then did dark.
 pa’ma bguhu’wi,
pe’ma gūdihu’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 ṣguniya’tu-niya’lu gi’l’lu gi’n’uk a”ws...
pe”ma gudini’ya’twan diniye’l’wa gwe’l’yu gi’n’uk a’ws...
and now the dead people dance again...
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