Margaret Sherwood's Badger And Skunk
A Spokane Traditional Legend With Commentary

Steven M. Egesdal
Salish Lexicography Project
University of Hawaii

This paper presents a traditional Spokane legend from a comparative perspective. The Spokane text is annotated with comparative material primarily from Thompson River Salish and secondarily from Interior (and other) Salish languages. The comparative approach developed unintentionally, but naturally. I initially intended to work up a Spokane text I gathered in 1979 (but had not looked at since). I soon noticed, however, that I kept seeing Spokane through a Thompson River Salish lens (which language I have worked on since 1980). The text below is a sketch of that Spokane-Thompson River Salish vision.[1]

This Spokane legend is the first of six told to me in 1979 by the late Margaret Sherwood.[2] The legend's main character is Badger, with Skunk as his foil. The legend divides naturally into four episodes, four also being the pattern number in Spokane (and Thompson River Salish).

The first episode begins with Badger walking down a road. Badger hears Skunk coming his way, whom Badger does not want to see.[3] Badger decides to play dead, hoping that Skunk will leave him alone and pass on by. The episode ends with Badger lying down in the road "playing 'possum" as Skunk approaches.

The second episode begins with Skunk finding Badger. Skunk complains about his "friend" Badger having abandoned him through death. Skunk then goes on his way, only to turn back, toss Badger on his back, and announce that he will take Badger home to eat. Skunk rationalizes that Badger would want him to do just that. The second episode ends with Skunk carrying Badger homeward.

The third episode begins with Skunk bragging that he fears nothing. Badger meanwhile puzzles over how he might get out of this sticky situation. Skunk swaggers on down the road, like a miniature *miles gloriosus*, bragging again that he fears nothing. When he brags of his fearlessness the third time, he concedes that there is one thing he fears, but he adds that he would never tell what it is. When he brags his fourth and final time, he lets slip that it is Bobwhite whom he fears. The third episode ends with Badger thinking to himself, "now I've got you."

The fourth episode begins with Badger whistling softly like Bobwhite. Skunk stops abruptly, hears nothing, and then quickens his pace. Badger whistles a little louder. Skunk stops, hears nothing, and

[1]The Thompson River Salish data are drawn from L. C. Thompson's and M. T. Thompson's *The Thompson Language* and their *Thompson-English Dictionary*, both forthcoming.

[2]My research on the Salish languages has been supported generously by the Meville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

[3]Margaret later explained that Badger did not wish to see Skunk because one never knew just which way Skunk was going to go and that he was "moody." His odor also was thought to be lethal in mythic times. Mythic Skunk apparently was considered unpredictable, even irrational. (Skunk in Thompson River Salish folklore is similarly characterized.) Skunk's behavior in the legend fits that characterization.

begins to trot. Badger whistles still louder. Skunk stops, hears nothing, and runs. Badger's fourth whistle is a "loud noise." Skunk throws Badger down on the road and runs off, not to be seen again.[4] The fourth episode ends with Badger standing up and commenting how Skunk had run off.

The Spokane text is presented in a general three-line format. The Spokane line is shown first, followed by an English morph-by-morph gloss line, which is then followed by a translation line. The symbols from the list below are used to segment forms in the Spokane line and correspond to a same symbol in the English morph-by-morph line to facilitate understanding of the analysis.

/	(slash)	precedes root
-	(hyphen)	follows prefix
		precedes grammatical suffix
=	(double hyphen)	precedes lexical suffix
–	(2 hyphens)	precede grammatical suffix in forms that show re-analysis of word stress
-=	(single hyphen & double hypen)	precede lexical suffix in forms that show re-analysis of word stress
·	(raised dot)	indicates reduplication; may precede or follow affix
[ ]	(brackets)	infix
···	(3 raised dots)	rhetorical lengthening of segment (V, C)
V́	(acute accent over vowel)	primary stress
V̀	(grave accent over vowel)	secondary stress
V:	(colon after vowel)	long vowel
ÇV	(subdot under phoneme)	used with Thompson River Salish retracted phonemes ə̣, i̱, s̱, c̱; x̱ is not retracted, rather post-velar

Capital letters are used to gloss particles and grammatical affixes, except in a very few cases where lower case letters are used for certain particles that have definite English correlates. Lexical glosses are in lower case letters.

Languages cited in the footnotes are abbreviated as follows.

Interior Salish			
Northern	(N. Int.)	Southern	(S. Int.)
Li	Lillooet	Cm	Columbian
Sh	Shuswap	Cr	Coeur d'Alene
Th	Thompson River Salish	Ka	Kalispel
		Sp	Spokane
		Ok	Okanagan

[4]Actually, in the text below Skunk whistles four times, and then on the *fifth* time he throws Badger down and runs off. When I analyzed the story with Margaret, however, she told me that Skunk should have whistled only *four* times. I was not aware of the significance of that "editing" at the time.

The following abbreviations and labels used to gloss the Spokane text.

ADJ	*ɬiʔe, ɬuʔ*	adjunct marker	deictic
AFF	$C_1V\cdot$	affective (Th)	prefix
AUG	$C_1VC_2\cdot$,	augmentative	prefix
AUT	*-(i)lš*	autonomous	suffix
CAU	*-s*	causative	pretransitive suffix
CHR	$\cdot C_1VC_2$	characteristic (Th)	suffix
CNTV	*pn'*	contrastive	particle
CTD	*-i*	continued	suffix
CTMP	*ʎ'e*	contemporaneous	aspectual particle
DIM	$C_1V\cdot$	diminutive (Sp)	prefix
DIM	$C_nV[\cdot C_n]$	diminutive	infix
DEM	varied	demonstrative	deictic
DEP	*ne*	dependent	particle
DRV	*-n*; *-i* (< *-n*)	directive	pretransitive suffix
DT	*-t*	durative (Sp)	suffix
FUT	*m*	future	particle
IDF	*-m*	indefinite subject form	suffix
IM	*-t*	immediate (Th)	suffix
IMP	*-š*	imperative	suffixes
INC	*-p, [ʔ]*	inchoative	suffix (wk); infix (str)
IND	*-ši, -ši[·š]*	indirective	pretransitive suffix
INS	*-tn*	instrumental	suffix
LCL	*n-*	localizer	prefix
MDL	*-m*	middle	suffix
NEG	*/tá*	negative	limited predicative
NCT	*-nún, -núi*	noncontrol	pretransitive suffix
NOM	*s-*	nominalizer	prefix
O.C	·VC	out-of-control	suffix
OBJ	varied	object	
OBL	*t*	oblique	particle
P	varied	plural	person marking
PSN	*ʔep(ɬ)-*	possession	prefix
PSV	varied	possessive	
RCP	*-wé[ʔ]xʷ*	reciprocal	suffix
RFL	*-cút, -st*	reflexive	suffix
RLT	*-m(ín), -mí, -mn*	relational	pretransitive suffix
RPL	*-ɬ*	replacive	pretransitive suffix
RPT	$C_1e\cdot$	repetitive	
S	varied	singular	person marking
SBJ	varied	subject	
SPTV	*χʷa*	speculative	particle
ST	*(h)ec-*	stative	prefix
TR	*-t*	transitive	suffix
UNR	*q(ɬ)-*	unrealized	prefix
1	varied	first person	
2	varied	second person	
3	varied	third person	

Margaret Sherwood's Badger And Skunk
A Spokane Traditional Legend With Commentary

1.	**ɬiʔe**[1]	**s/m'em'íʔ**[2]	**χʷl'**	**/χʷiχʷyútšn**[3]	**u**	**/χχstéy'eʔ**[4]
	ADJ	NOM/story	about	/badger	and	/skunk

This story is about Badger and Skunk.

---

[1]Carlson (1972:57-58) further analyzes Sp *ɬiʔe* ADJ[junct marker] into several component morphemes: *ɬ* "secondary," *i* (< *hi*) "special," and *ʔé* "this/these." Similarly, Carlson (1972:57-58) analyzes Sp *ɬuʔ* ADJ[junct marker] into component morphemes: *ɬ* "secondary," *uʔ* "particular." Carlson (1978:4) presents *ɬiʔe* and *ɬuʔ* more simply as ADJ. I follow the latter, simpler analysis here. The initial *ɬ* segment in Sp *ɬiʔe* and *ɬuʔ* probably reflects the same initial *ɬ* segment as in Th demonstratives *ɬán'e* "that particular one, not visible," *ɬʔé* "that one, there (not far)," *ɬéʔ* "there, that (not far)," and possibly Th locative *ɬúʔe* "there (remote)." Shuswap also shows demonstratives with an initial *ɬ* element; e.g., *ɬéne* "over there (far invisible)," *ɬáne* "that one (close invisible)" (Kuipers 1974:58). Cr shows articles or demonstratives with the intial *ɬ* element; e.g., demonstrative *ɬuíɛ* "that," demonstrative *ɬuʔ* "there far from speaker and second person or not near anyone," and definite article *ɬɛ* "the there" (Reichard 1938:656). Further afield, the *ɬ* element likely reflects a PS morpheme reflected in the deictic systems of Coast Salish with the meaning of secondary and sometimes feminine; e.g., Tillamook particle *ɬ(ə)* "feminine marker," which Edel (1939:47) writes as *ɬa*.

[2]Carlson and Flett (1989:276) gives *s-m'em'íʔ* "story, legend." This form may reflect an earlier analysis as *s-m'e·/m'íʔ* NOM-DIM·/tell, with the $C_1V\cdot$ reduplicative prefix indicating an diminutive or affective nuance.

[3]Carlson and Flett (1989:139) analyzes "badger" further as *s/χʷiχʷy=út=šn*. The meaning of the root */χʷiχʷy* is unclear. The lexical suffix *=út* may mean "position, state of," as in neighboring Cr *=út* id. (Reichard 1938:607). The element *=šn* strongly suggests the lexical suffix "foot" (cf. Th *=xn* id.). "Badger" is perhaps analyzable alternatively as *yaχʷ·/yaχʷ=út=šn*, although the meaning for the root */yaχʷ* would remain unclear (perhaps obscured historically as with English *were-* "man," found in *werewolf* and *weregeld*). The initial syllable */yaχʷ/* would convert in regular phonological fashion to [iχʷ], and the unstressed second syllable */yaχʷ/* would similarly convert to [iχʷ]. Those changes would account for the phonetic realization of "badger" in the story, [iχʷiχʷúšn]. The initial syllable morphologically would represent $C_1VC_2\cdot$ augmentative reduplication. Kinkade (1989:12; 1981:540) shows Cm *yaχʷyχʷútxn* "badger," very likely cognate. The Sp form may have undergone reanalysis, accounting for the Carlson and Flett analysis as *s/χʷiχʷy=út=šn*. Ok, however, apparently also shows */χʷiχʷyutxn* "badger" (Mattina 1973:122) and *yaχʷyχʷútxn* id. (Doak 1983:65), so the analysis of Sp "badger" remains uncertain. Finally, in this legend the form for "badger" does not show the *s-* nominalizer prefix shown in the Carlson and Flett dictionary form. Mythic animal names occasionally differ from their real world counterparts.

[4]Carlson and Flett (1989:264) analyzes "skunk" further as */χχs-t-éy'eʔ*, presenting it also as a derived form under the entry for the root */χæs* "good" (1989:116-117). Compare Th cognate root */χás* "favorable," as in */χás-t* "[food] has nutty flavor." Sp "skunk" perhaps is analyzable slightly differently as *χ-/χs-t-éy'eʔ* (DIM·/good-DT-pretense) "seems good (but isn't)." Vogt (1940:176) gives Ka "skunk" only in the simplex */χstéy'eʔ* (tranliterating his symbols into current Salish orthography). Thompson similarly shows the affective *s-pə·/plánt* (NOM-AFF·/skunk) "skunk," with the much rarer simplex *s/plánt* id. Ok and Cm "skunk" show final elements similar to those in Sp "skunk": Ok *sn'akstíyaʔ* (Doak 1983:65) and Cm *n'aktáy'aʔ* (Kinkade 1981:87).

2. **n/x^{w}st=á···qs**[5] **łiʔe** **/x̱^{w}ix̱^{w}yútšn**
LCL/walk=road ADJ /badger
Badger was walking down the road,

3. **u** **t/séw=neʔ**[6] **ʔe ?** **n/k^{w}né···(-m)**[7]
and toward/hear=ear DEM ? LCL/sing(-MDL)
and he heard someone coming toward him singing.

4. **k^{w}ent** **łiʔe** **/séw=neʔ-mi-s**[8] **n/sx^{w}=q=cí-s**[9]
then ADJ /hear=ear-RTL-3.SBJ LCL/know=head=voice-TR.3.SBJ
Then he heard him and recognized the voice.

[5]Rhetorical segment lengthening (RSL), indicated by three raised dots ··· , has varied discourse functions in Sp (and Th) narrative. For example, RSL can highlight or indicate the beginning of an episode. RSL also can intensify or show the extended duration of an action. In this sentence, RSL likely indicates the beginning of the story proper, after the "titular" first sentence.

[6]Margaret also gave as a further example for the directional prefix *t-* "toward": *t/wíč-n*, "I see him approaching." Compare Sp directional prefix *t-* with possible cognate Th general preposition *t(ə)* "over, through, to, near, around, at."

[7]Carlson and Flett (1989:262) analyzes "sing" as *n-k^{w}né-m*, with the affixes apparently the localizing prefix *n-* LCL and the middle suffix *-m* MDL. Compare possible Th cognate or related */k^{w}éy-m* "sing, chant [of Indian doctor]." Sp *n/k^{w}né-m* may be analyzed alternatively as */nk^{w}ném*. Kinkade (1981:86) gives Cm */nk^{w}nám*; Ok similarly shows the root */nk^{w}ním* "sing." Margaret gave both *n/k^{w}né* and *n/k^{w}né-m*, without differentiating them. The *n/k^{w}né* form likely represents a common Sp pattern where material after the stressed vowel is lost. In this sentence, RSL likely has a highlighting function; the person singing will present the dilemna that Badger, the story's main character or "hero," must resolve.

[8]Sp */séw=neʔ-mi-s* < underlying */séw=eneʔ-min-t-es* (/hear=ear-RLT-TR-3.SBJ). Th lexical suffix *=en'i* "ear" is cognate with Sp *=eneʔ* id.

[9]The underlying form for Sp lexical suffix "voice" is *=cín*; the surface form *=cí* shows the expected loss of *n* before *s* here. Compare Sp */sx^{w}* "recognize" with Th */sux^{w}* id. Reichard (1938:619) gives Cr *=qin* "voice," distinct from *=qin* "head." That differentiation may suggest that *=q* here means "voice," and *=cí* here means "noise" or (redundantly) "mouth."

5. **ƛ'e**[10] **/x̱x̱stéy'eʔ** **łiʔe** **c'/enés**[11]
CTMP /skunk ADJ toward.speaker/proceed
"That is Skunk who is approaching.

6. **/tám**[12] **in/x̱m=énč**[13] **i-q-s/wíč-m**[14]
/not 1s.PSV/want=stomach 1s.PSV-UNR-NOM/see-MDL
I do not want to see him." (Said twice.)

7. **x̱^{w}a** **x̱^{w}l'** **s/tém'**[15] **x̱^{w}a** **x̱ímte** **ʔe** **n/x̱íl-m-s**
SPTV about NOM/s.t. SPTV maybe DEM LCL/fear-RLT-3.SBJ
Maybe he was afraid,

8. **u** **x̱^{w}a** **x̱^{w}l'** **s/tém'** **u** **/cú-t-i**[16]
and SPTV about NOM/s.t. and /say-DT-CTD
and maybe that is why he said,

9. **/tàm** **in/x̱m=énč** **k^{w}u** **q-s/wíč-i-s**[17]
/lack 1s.PSV/want=stomach 1s.OBJ UNR-NOM/see-DRV-3.SBJ
"I do not want him to see me,"

[10]Sp particle *ƛ'e* indicates contemporaneous activity; it is glossed variously as "now, then, already." Compare Sp *ƛ'e* CTMP and *ƛ'əm* "usual" or "already" with Th aspectual particles *ƛ'əm'* CMPL (completed), *ƛ'əɬ* CTMP (contemporaneous), and *ƛ'uʔ* PER (persistent), all of which have an initial *ƛ'* segment. While some of these may reflect false cognates (Proto-Salish [PS] *t' > Sp *t'*, Th *ƛ'*; PS *ƛ > Sp *ƛ'* Th *ƛ'*), some of these Th and Sp particles likely reflect true cognate elements. Compare also Sh prefix *t'l-* "during" (Kuipers 1974:162, 197) (PS *ƛ' > Sh *ƛ'* or *t'*), and Cr *t'iʔ* "already, surely, absolutely. quite" (Reichard 1938:670) (PS *ƛ' > Cr *t'*). The initial *t'* or *ƛ'* elements of those morphemes probably reflect the same initial *ƛ'* element as in the Sp (and Th) aspectual particles.

[11]Sp *c'/enés* derives from the directional prefix *c-* indicating motion toward speaker and the root */ɬenés* "come." Compare Th /cn'és "come toward person who is speaking." These cognates have developed differently. (1) Proto-Interior Salish [PIS] *c + */ɬenés > Sp *c'/enés* : loss of glottal stop with corresponding glottalization of the preceding prefix *c-*; (2) PIS *c + */ɬenés > Th */cn'és* : loss of unstressed vowel and initial glottal stop with corresponding glottalization of the following resonant *n*. Th shows similar glottalization of a preceding prefix *c-* followed by a glottal stop in certain forms. E.g., the emphatic form of the introductory predicative *c'/é* < *c-* EMPH + */ɬé* INT (introductory predicative); and emphatic existential *c'/éx* < *c-* EMPH + */ɬéx* "be."

[12]Th cognate */tém* "not, lack."

[13]Compare Th */x̱m=énk-m* (/heavy=belly) "keepsake, memento of dead person"; Th *n/x̱m=ink-m* (< Ok loan) "I like it."

[14]Th cognate */wík-m* (/see-MDL) "he sees something."

[15]Th *s/tém'* (NOM/s.t.) "what, something."

[16]Th cognate root */cəw* "say" as in */cú-t* (/say-IM) "he said."

[17]Compare Th */wík-cm-s* (/see-TR.1s.OBJ-3.SBJ) "he sees me."

10. **u** **k^{w}ènt** **/ta** **q-ep-s-n/wék^{w}-i-st-(t)n**[18]
and then /NEG UNR-PSN-NOM-LCL/hide-DRV-RFL-INS
and then, "there is no place to hide.

11. **lʔe** **/čén'**[19] **čn**[20] **/ʔaχíl-m**[21]
DEM /what 1s.SBJ /act.so-MDL
What should I do

12. **m** **/tá**[22] **k^{w}u** **q-s/wíč-i-s**
FUT /NEG 1s.OBJ UNR-NOM/see-DRV-3.SBJ
so he cannot see me?"

[18]MS gives a parallel example for the main predicative, indicating it is an instrumental form: */tà q-ep-s-n/ʔemíut-(t)n*, "there's no place to sit." Sp "chair" is *s/ʔemíut-(t)n* (NOM/sit-INS). Th also has the *n-* LCL locative prefix and the (unstressed) reflexive suffix *-st* RFL. Sp prefix *ep-* is reduced from the prefix *ʔepɬ-* PSN (possession). Compare probable Th cognate particle *pəɬ* INH (inherent), which shows the inherent connection between two things often with possessive nuances. Sh shows cognate prefix *pə(ɬ)-* "having, possessing, owner of"; e.g., *pəɬ/cítx^{w}* "having a house," and *pə-s/k^{w}íye* "having a child, parent" (Kuipers 1974:71). The Sh prefix appears more akin functionally to Sp *ʔepɬ-* than Th *pəɬ*. The final *ɬ* of both Sh *pəɬ-* and Sp *ʔepɬ-* also is similarly lost before the *s-* (NOM) prefix. Reichard (1938:699) treats Cr *ʔapɬ* as a predicative in the example *ʔapɬ g^{w}ə·/g^{w}íx̣·t* (transliterated into modern Salish orthography) "she had a baby"; Cr *ʔapɬ* probably better reflects a possessive prefix cognate with Sp *ʔepɬ-*.

[19]Th cognate */kéʔ* "which" (PS *k > Th *k*, Sp *č*); perhaps also Th clitic particle *n'* QN (question).

[20]Th cognate *kn* 1s.SBJ. Sp *čn* precedes the predicative with which it agrees; Th *kn* follows the predicative with which it agrees. Sp intransitive subject pronouns (*čn*, *k^{w}*, *qeʔ*, *p*) similarly precede the predicative, while the Th analogues (*kn*, *k^{w}*, *kt*, *kp*) follow the predicative. Sp reflects the apparent S. Int. pattern of such pronominal clitics preceding the predicative, while Th reflects the N. Int. pattern of following the predicative. Sp apparently also has innovated on the shape of its intransitive subject pronouns, where Th has been conservative. Newman (1980:156) posits as PS intransitive subject prominal clitics: *kən (1s), *kəx^{w} (2s), *Ø (3s), *kət (1p), *kəp (2p), and *Ø (3p).

[21]Sp */ʔaχ̣íl* is a "proverb" (as opposed to pronoun), a deictic for some action vis-à-vis an entity or object. Compare Th cognate proverb */χ̣íy* "act.so" (PS *l > Th *y*, Sp *l*) and probable Th cognate or related root */χ̣íɬ* "act so." With Th */χ̣íɬ*, PS *l would have devoiced to *ɬ* and thus avoided the later PS *l > Th *y* change; *l* devoices sporadically to *ɬ* in Interior Salish.

[22]Th cognate negative */te* (/NEG) "not" or "no."

13. **hoy**[23] **/nté**[24] **/χ̣'l-éy'eʔ**[25]
then /think /die-pretense
Then he thought he would pretend to be dead.

14. **hoy** **/nté** **χ̣'e** **či** **q-s/χ̣'l-éy'eʔ**
then /think CTMP 1s.SBJ UNR-NOM/die-pretense
He thought, "I will pretend I am already dead.

15. **χ̣^{w}a** **ne** **k^{w}u** **/wíč-i-s** **ɬiʔe** **čn** **/χ̣'íl**
SPTV DEP 1s.OBJ /see-DRV-3.SBJ ADJ 1s.SBJ /die
Perhaps if he sees me already dead,

16. **k^{w}ént** **ne**[26] **m** **k^{w}u** **č'/χ̣^{w}c-n-t-és**
then DEP FUT 1s.OBJ up.to.speaker/pass.by-DRV-TR-3.SBJ
then he will pass by me

17. **k^{w}ent** **tl'** **ʔe** **/ʔenés**
then from DEM /proceed
and then go on his way from here."

[23]Cm particle *híy* "then" apparently has a similar narrative function as Sp *hoy* (Kinkade 1978:15-17), as does Cr *hoy* (Reichard 1938:695).

[24]Carlson and Flett (1989:57, 284) gives "he thought" as */nt=éls* (/think=?). The meaning of the lexical suffix *=éls* apparently means "mind, heart". Vogt (1940:57) instructs that *=éls* "is used in verbs expressing subjective states, psychological and emotional." Margaret in this text only gives "he thought" as */nté*, which apparently is a reduced form of */nt=éls*. In this text, "he thought" will be analyzed simply as */nté* (/think). In closely related Flathead Ka speakers regularly reduce all material following the stressed vowel; e.g., for Sp "fire" (> "matches") [sur'šíct] or Ka [sɔl'šíct], the Flathead pronunciation is [sɔl'ší]; Sp knife [n'ín'č'mn'], Sp "needle," [čɪɬχ^{w}ɛ́plɛʔ], and Sp "elk," [snɛ́čɬcɛʔ], is pronounced in Flathead as [ɬn'í] (*ɬ-* is a diminutivizing prefix), [čɪɬχ^{w}é], and [snɛ́]. Vogt (1940:2, 17) discusses the same phenomenon more generally for Ka. (Margaret thought that the phenomenon was especially prevalent in Flathead.) Cr apparently has a similar process of reducing material after the stressed vowel (Ivy Doak, p.c.).

[25]Th cognate root */χ̣'əy* "motionless" (PS *l > Th *y*, Sp *l*). Th cognate suffix *-áze* (PS *y > Th *z*, Sp *y*) and Th *-éc'e* (PS *y' > Th *c'*) "pretense." There are cognates for Sp *-éy'eʔ* and Th *-áze*, *-éc'e* throughout Interior Salish (PIS * -áyaʔ ?).

Li	*-éz'e*	:	"pretending to" (Anatole Lyovin, p.c.)
Sh	*-éy'e*	:	"not real, for children, little" (Kuipers 1974:285)
Ok	*-áyaʔ*	:	"play"
Cr	*-íyɛʔ, -ɛyɛʔ*	:	"playingly" (Reichard 1938:606)

[26]Reichard (1938:669) shows Cr particle *nɛʔ*, which has a function of tying together dependent clauses similar to Sp *ne* here: Cr *nɛʔ . . . nɛʔ*, "if . . . then"; Sp *ne . . . ne*, id. Further afield, Edel (1939:40) gives *na* as a subordinating particle, glossed as "if, when."

18. **hoy t'k'^{w}·/t'k'^{w}-n-cút[27] ɬiʔe n šuʔ·/šwéɬ[28] /x̌'l-éy'eʔ**
then AUG·/lie-DRV-RFL ADJ on DIM·/road UNR-NOM/die-pretense
Then he lay down on the road. He pretended to be dead.

19. **hoy s/čí···c-n-t-m[29] ɬu[30] t /x̣x̣stéy'eʔ**
then NOM/arrive-DRV-TR-IDF ADJ OBL /skunk
Then Skunk got to him.

20. **he(c)/cú-t-i ʔa··· k^{w} e/c's/čén'-i[31]**
ST/say-DT-CTD ahhh 2s.SBJ ST?/?/what-CTD
He said: "Ahhh, what happened to you,

21. **ɬiʔe k^{w} i-s/l'áx̣-t[32] hoy k^{w} /x̌'lí·l**
ADJ 2s.SBJ 1s.PSV-NOM/friendly?-DT then 2s.SBJ /die·O.C
you my friend so you died?

22. **k^{w} e/c's/čén'-i u k^{w} /x̌'lí·l**
2s.SBJ ST?/?/what-CTD and 2s.SBJ /die·O.C
What happened to you that you died.

23. **ho···y k^{w}u /x̣^{w}él-n-t-x^{w}[33]**
then 1s.OBJ /abandon-DRV-TR-2s.SBJ
You left me,

---

[27]Use of the augmentative here is not understood.

[28]Carlson and Flett (1989:89, 250) analyzes Sp "road" as *šuʔšw'=éɬ*. An alternative analysis would treat "road" as a diminutive *šuʔ·/šw'éɬ*. Th cognate */xw'éɬ* "road" (PS *x > Th *x*, Sp *š*); Cm cognate */xəwál* (Kinkade 1981:79). (PS *xəwál ?; cf. Ti */šəg^{w}áɬ* "road"). The additional *ʔ* in the Sp diminutive (C_1V·) prefix *šu·* in *šuʔšw'éɬ* is not understood.

[29]Th cognate form */kic-e-t-m* /arrive-DRV-IDF "he got to him." Use of the IDF form here indicates that Badger is in focus. Focus shifts to Skunk below (lines 68, 72, 75, 77, 81), where the IDF form then is used to indicate that Skunk is in focus. When an agent is identified in a clause with an IDF form, it is marked with an oblique particle (OBL) in Sp (*t*) and Th (*te* or *tə*). Kinkade (1989a) discusses the use of the IDF (*-t-m*), his "passive," as a means of topic maintenance in certain Salish narratives. Vogt (1940:68) and Kuipers (1974:78) similarly had remarked on the use of the IDF as a topicalizer in Ka ("indefinite dependent form") and Sh ("passive"), respectively.

[30]*ɬuʔ* ADJ[junct marker] > *ɬu* before *t* OBL. Carlson (1972:57-58) analyzes Sp *ɬuʔ* ADJ[junct marker] into component morphemes *ɬ* "secondary," *uʔ* "particular." Carlson (1978:4) presents *ɬiʔe* and *ɬuʔ* more simply as ADJ ("adjunct marker"). I follow the latter, simpler analysis here. Note 1 above discusses further Sp *ɬiʔe* and *ɬuʔ*.

[31]Analysis of this form is unclear.

[32]Th cognate */l'áx̣-t* (/friendly-IM) "friend" (vocative) in Spences Bridge and Merritt dialect areas (< Ok loan). Mattina (1973:74) analyzes the Ok source form as *s/l'áx̣-t* "partner" (NOM/share-ST[ative]).

[33]Possible Th cognate or related root */x̣^{w}ál* "sad (formal usage);" as in Th */x̣^{w}ál·xəl-t* (/sad·CHR-IM) "sad." The semantic extension in the Th root would be from "abandoned" to "sad." Compare Th *x^{w}i·/x^{w}y-áp* (AUG·/heartsick-INC) "feel very bad, heartsick, lonely, abandoned."

24. **ɬiʔe k^{w} i-s/l'áx̣-t[34]**
ADJ 2s.SBJ 1s.PSV-NOM/friendly-DT
you my friend.

25. **hoy tl' šeʔ[35] /x^{w}íst[36] x̣^{w}a n/k'^{w}nš-ep=ús=šn[37]**
then from DEM /walk SPTV LCL/how.many=bottom=face=foot
Then he moved away and went on who knows how many footsteps.

26. **heɬ-c/ʔaxl-mn-cút[38] u /cú-t-i**
back-toward/act.so-RLT-RFL and /say-DT-CTD
Then he turned back toward him and said,

27. **x̌'e ne m eɬ/k^{w}én-c-n[39]**
CTMP DEP FUT back/take-DRV.TR.2s.OBJ-1s.SBJ
"I am going to carry you back now. (Said twice.)

---

[34]Th suffix *-t* IM (immediate) corresponds to Sp suffix *-t* DT (durative). Th *-t* IM has several functions Th *-t* usually indicates that action has just happened or a change into the present state has just occurred Th *-t* also may refer to the general characteristic of something. Reichard (1959:157) refers to the *t* suffix in Cr as "inherent" or "natural state." Kinkade (1989b:118) refers to the *-t* suffix in Cm as "stative, as does Mattina (1973:40) for Ok. Kuipers (1974:62) refers to Sh *-t* as "state."

[35]Th cognate demonstrative *xeʔe* NEARBY (PS *x > Th *x*, Sp *š*).

[36]Th cognate */x^{w}esit* "travel, walk" and/or Th */x^{w}ást* "leave for home, go home, depart."

[37]Th cognates *n-* LCL, */k^{w}inex* /however.many, *=ep* "bottom," *=ús* "face," *=xn* "foot."

[38]Sp has two forms of the reflexive (RFL) *-cút* (stressed) and *-st* (unstressed). Both could derive from underlying // -n-t-sut // (-DRV-TR-RFL): (1) *-n-t-sút* > *-n-cút* (e.g., Sp */ɬuʔ-n-cút* "he stabs himself"); (2) *n-t-sut* > *n-t-st* > *-n-st* > *-i-st* (e.g., */wék^{w}-i-st* "he hid himself"). Th shows a similar pattern, but the *-n-* DRV is vocalized to an *-e-* before *s* (and *c* here) instead of an *-i-* as in Sp: (1) *-n-t-sút* > *-n-cút* > *-e-cút* (e.g., Th */wəq'-e-cút* "it opens itself"); (2) *-n-t-sut* > *-n-t-st* > *-n-st* > *-e-st* (e.g., */mén-e-st* "she shades herself"). Sh, which does vocalize the *-n* DRV before *s* but does before *c* (as in Th), apparently substantiates the underlying form *-n-t-sut* : *s/k^{w}úl-n-st* "rainbow"; */nək'-e-cút* "he cut himself" (Gibson 1973:37). Forms that Vogt (1940:58), Carlson (1972:94-95), and Mattina (1973:99) analyze as "middle" reflexives, *-mist*, *-m-ist*, and *-m-i-st*, respectively, might be analyzed instead as *relational* reflexives: *-mín-t-sut* > *-mín-t-st* > *-mín-st* > *-mít-st* > *-mí-st*. Th shows the (probable) relational reflexive */qiʔx^{w}-mín'-st* "bachelor" (/man-RLT-RFL), which form likely parallels Ok */qəltmx^{w}-mí-st* "bachelor" (/man-RLT-RFL) (see Doak 1983:43). Sp relational reflexives also occur with the suffix configuration *-mn-cút* (e.g., */ʔaxl-mn-cút* in this line), an occurrence also common in Th. Compare also Cr relational reflexive forms showing *-mn-cút* and *-mín-cut* (Reichard 1938:629; Reichard calls the *-mín* suffix "use"). Th stressed RFL *-cút* often occurs in forms with regenerated stress, with such forms replacing older unstressed RFL *-e-st* forms; e.g., underlying // *púc-n-cut* // > */púc-e-st* "he covers himself with down [feathers] [preparation for ritual performance] and */puc-n-cút* id. Sp shows *č'ɬ/ʔaxl-mí-st* "he did it secretly because he was intimidated" along with */ʔaxl-mn-cút* "he turned himself around" (Carlson and Flett 1989:2; analysis mine). The second form may reflect regenerated stress: */ʔaxl-mn-cút*.

[39]Th cognate root */k^{w}én* "take"; Th probable cognate *ʔeɬ* "and, also" (particle) with Sp *heɬ-* "back, again" (prefix).

28. **x̣ʷa /mí ? w kʷ /nté ne m /ʔaxí-s-t-m-n[40]**
SPTV /true ? and 2s.SBJ /think DEP FUT /act.do-CAU-TR-2s.OBJ-1s.OBJ
That is probably what you would want me to do with you,

29. **ne (e)ɬ/xʷúy-s-t-m-n**
DEP back/go-CAU-TR-2s.OBJ-1s.SBJ
that I take you back

30. **ne kʷ i-q-s/ʔiɬn'-m[41]**
DEP 2s.SBJ 1s.PSV-UNR-NOM/eat-MDL
so I could eat you (lit. so you would be my eating),

31. **tmá[42] kʷ i-s/l'áx̣-t**
because 2s.SBJ 1s.PSV-NOM/friendly-DT
because you are my friend."

32. **hoy /kʷéy-s[43] ɬiʔe /x̣ʷix̣ʷyútšn**
then /take-TR.3.SBJ ADJ /badger
Then he took that Badger

33. **u /qʼʷéɬt-mi-s[44] kʼʷ hoy tl' šeʔ /ʔenés**
and /carry.on.back-RLT-3.SBJ EVD then from DEM /proceed
carrying him on his back.

34. **hoy n/xʷst=á···qs u /cú-t-i**
then LCL/walk=road and /say-DT-CTD
He walked on the road and said,

[40]The expected root here would be */ʔax̣íl*, not */ʔax̣í*. Perhaps the *l* is devoiced to *ɬ* before the following voiceless *s*, which then is lost under the regular Sp phonological rule of *ɬ* > ∅ / __ *s*.

[41]Sp */ʔiɬn* "eat" has cognates throughout Interior Salish. PIS **/ʔiɬn* has been narrowed to Th */ʔiɬn* "animal eats." Th */ɬáʔx̣ans* means "person eats." Compare German *fressen* (animal eats) versus *essen* (human eats).

[42]Carlson (1973:49) calls *tmá* (written *təmá* then) "rhetorical interrogative." Vogt (1940:168) characterizes *tmá* similarly, adding it often is translated as "namely." Margaret translated *tmá* as "because" here. Sp *təmá* may derive from */tam* "not, lack," and Sp interrogative particle *ha*. Th *témn'*, which likely derives from Th */tém* "not, lack" (*a > *e* here) and Th interrogative particle *n'*. The meaning and function of Th *témn'* is not yet fully understood; recognition of apparently parallel Sp *tmá* may help to solve the mystery of Th *témn'*.

[43]Sp */kʷéy-s* < underlying */kʷén-n-t-es* (/take-DRV-TR-3.SBJ). Compare Th */kʷén-s* < underlying */kʷén-n-t-es* (/take-DRV-TR-3.SBJ). Sp and Th apparently have the same morphophonemic rules of unstressed vowel loss followed by loss of consonants. */kʷén-n-t-es* > */kʷén-n-t-∅s* > */kʷén-n-∅-s* > */kʷén-n-s* > */kʷén-∅-s* (> */kʷéy-s*). Sp has an additional final nasal vocalization rule: *n* > *i* / __ *s*.

[44]Th cognate root /qʼʷéɬt "carry on back."

35. **/tá s/tèm' ʔe ? n/x̣él-m-s-t-n[45]**
/NEG NOM/s.t. DEM ? LCL/fear-MDL-CAU-TR-1s.SBJ
"I am not afraid of anything!

36. **/tá s/tèm' ʔe ? n/x̣él-m-s-t-n**
/NEG NOM/s.t. DEM ? LCL/fear-MDL-CAU-TR-1s.SBJ
I am not afraid of anything!"

37. **kʷent tl' šeʔ /xʷú···y[46]**
then from DEM /go
He went on from there.

38. **kʷent eɬ/cú-t-i**
then back/say-DT-CTD
Then he said again,

39. **/tá s/tèm' ʔe ? n/x̣él-m-s-t-n**
/NEG NOM/s.t. DEM ? LCL/fear-MDL-CAU-TR-1s.SBJ
"I am not afraid of anything!"

40. **kʷènt pn'[47] ɬiʔe /x̣ʷix̣ʷyútšn**
then CNTV ADJ /badger
But Badger meanwhile,

41. **ɬiʔe /qʼʷéɬt-mn-t-m[48] kʷent /nté**
ADJ /carry.on.back-RLT-TR-IDF then /think
carried on the back thought,

42. **hóy /sic liʔe /čén' čn /ʔax̣íl-m**
then /now DEM /what 1s.SBJ /act.so-MDL
"Oh now what can I do

[45]Sp and Th form causative middle (-MDL-CAU-) constructions. It is one way to transitivize middles in both languages. E.g., Th */yax̣-m-s-t-és* "he understands s.t." (/lucid-MDL-CAU-TR-3.SBJ).

[46]Th cognate auxiliary *xʷuy* FUT[ure] and rare Th root */xʷúy* "go." Th predicative */xʷúy* has developed into an auxiliary indicating future tense.

[47]Th particle *pe* has a contrastive or switch reference function similar to Sp *pn'*. Th *pe* may be glossed as "but." E.g., *pe n-wén' us /síxʷt-e-t-m teʔ ɬ /kíyeʔ*, "but the elder sister already recognized him [Coyote] (where the younger sister had not)." Ka *pən'* expresses opposition or contrast to the preceding statement.," and is translated as "but" (Vogt 1940:71). Sh particle *pe* apparently has a similar function/meaning (Kuipers 1974:73, 135). Margaret explained that *pn'* meant "back to Badger" here.

[48]Th */qʼʷéɬt-e-t-m* (/carry.on.back-DRV-TR-IDF) "he carried it on the back," shows DRV *-e-* (underlying *//-n-//*) transitive suffix instead of the RLT *-min-* suffix. Use of the IDF form here indicates Badger still is in focus vis-à-vis Skunk.

43. **m k^{w}u /ɬx̣^{w}p'-núi-s**[49]
FUT 1s.OBJ /escape-NCT-TR.3.SBJ
so I can escape?

44. **šey' eɬ/cú-t-i**
DEM.CTD back/say-DT-CTD
Right then he said again,

45. **/tá s/tèm' ʔe ? n/x̣él-m-s-t-n**
/NEG NOM/s.t. DEM ? LCL/fear-MDL-CAU-TR-1s.SBJ
"I am not afraid of anything!"

46. **ho···y /pút**[50] **ɬuʔ n**[51] **/čeʔɬés**[52] **/cú-t-i**
then /just ADJ at /three /say-DT-CTD
Right on that third time he said,

47. **/tá s/tèm' ʔe ? n/x̣él-m-s-t-n**
/NEG NOM/s.t. DEM ? LCL/fear-MDL-CAU-TR-1s.SBJ
"I am not afraid of anything!"

[49]The morpho-syntactic combination *k^{w}u /ɬx̣^{w}p'-núi-s* apparently is a performative error; that form would mean "he managed to escape me," not the apparently intended "I escape him." MS also provided *čn /ɬx̣^{w}úp'* "I escape," as an alternative. The expected non-control transitive form would be */ɬx̣^{w}p'-núm-t-n* "I manage to escape him." Sp pre-transitive suffix *-núm* probably is cognate with Th *-nwén'* NCT. Th NCT forms usually are translated as "(s)he managed to _____," indicating success at an action after unusual or considerable effort. Sp apparently agrees with Th on that point (e.g., Vogt 1940:57), so the NCT designation is used here. Compare also Cr *-nun* "succeed after considerable effort" (Reichard 1939:607), and Ok *-nu* "denotes that an action is performed by an actor only with great difficulty" (Mattina 1973: 53). Th cognate root */ɬx̣^{w}* "escape" shows the inchoative */ɬx̣^{w}-ôp* (*kn*) "(I) escape." The Th form suggests Sp */ɬx̣^{w}úp'* "escape" might be the inchoative */ɬx̣^{w}ú-p* "escape." Sp root */ɬux̣^{w}* would metathesize in regular phonological fashion to */ɬx̣^{w}ú-p* in the inchoative; e.g., */p'íʎ'* "exposed," */p'ʎ'í-p* "it broke loose from something (Carlson and Flett 1989:65); */loʃ^{w}* "fit together" */lʃ^{w}ô-p* "it fits together" (Carlson and Flett 1989:39). The distinction between *p'* and *p* (with varying degrees of aspiration) in final position often is hard to hear in both Sp and Th; Th */ɬx̣^{w}-ôp* might be */ɬx̣^{w}ôp'*. Corroboration one way or the other from another (Interior) Salish language would be helpful.

[50]Th cognate */pút* "just."

[51]Th cognate general preposition *n* "at, on, in," etc.

[52]Th cognate */keʔɬés* "three."

48. **/čmíš /nk'^{w}úʔ**[53] **ɬuʔ i-s-n/x̣l'=s=n'úx^{w}**[54]
/only /one ADJ 1s.PSV-NOM-LCL/fear=face?=?
There is only one thing I really fear.

49. **k^{w}ent pn' /tá s/wét**[55] **q-s/cúw-n**[56]
then CNTV /NEG NOM/someone UNR-NOM/say-TR.1s.SBJ
But I would never say it to anyone.

[53]Th "one" is */péyeʔ*. Th apparently has innovated. Ti shows probable cognate */načʼ-* "one" (PS *k' > Ti *č'*) to Sp */nk^{w}úʔ*. PS */nVk'- or ? */nVk'^{w}-* "one." Reference to other Salish material should help to determine whether the PS form had a final *k^{w}* that lost labialization and then was palatalized in Ti or a final *k'* that was rounded secondarily in Sp.

[54]Carlson and Flett (1989:182) analyzes "anything that is feared" as */x̣d'=s=níɬx^{w}*, with the latter two elements as lexical suffixes. The meaning of *=s* apparently is "face," and the meaning of *=nux^{w}* is unclear. There might be an alternative analysis, treating the latter two elements as *-s* CAU[sative] and *-níɬx^{w}* PRV (perseverative). The *-níɬx^{w}* suffix then would be cognate with Th *-níɬx^{w}* PRV; e.g., Th */c'əɬ-níɬx^{w}* "animal freezes to death." The semantic range for PRV may vary somewhat, but it apparently indicates an intensification of the act or state of the predicative's CVC root. Sh also shows *-níɬx^{w}* "be caught or affected by some phenomenon," as in */tyʼ-níɬx^{w}-m* "want, wish" (Kuipers 1974:64).

[55]Th cognate *s/wét* (NOM/someone) "someone, who."

[56]Sp */cíuw-n* < underlying */cíuw-n-t-en* (/say-DRV-TR-1S.SBJ).

50. /tá[57] s/wét q-s/méy'-ɬ-t-n[58]
/NEG NOM/s.o. UNR-NOM/tell-RPL-TR-1s.SBJ
I would never tell anyone about it

51. s/tém' ɬu? i-s-n/χl'=s=núx^{w}
NOM/s.t. ADJ 1s.PSV-NOM-LCL/fear=face?=?
what I am afraid of.

52. šey' tl' še? /ʔenés /tá s/lk^{w}ú·k^{w}
DEM.CTD from DEM /proceed /NEG NOM/far·O.C
He [Skunk] went on not very far.

53. /čmí···š /nk'^{w}úʔ ɬuʔ i-s-n/χl'=s=núx^{w}
/only /one ADJ 1s.PSV-NOM-LCL/fear?=face=?
There is only one thing I really fear–

54. /nk'^{w}úʔ ɬuʔ i-s-n/χl'=s=núx^{w}
/one ADJ 1s.PSV-NOM-LCL/fear?=face=?
one thing I really fear.

55. k^{w}ent pn' /tá s/wét q-s/cúw-n
then CNTV /NEG NOM/someone UNR-NOM/say-TR.1s.SBJ
But I would never say it to anyone.

56. /tá s/wét q-s/méy'-ɬ-t-n
/NEG NOM/s.o. UNR-NOM/tell-RPL-TR-1s.SBJ
I would never tell anyone about it

[57]Sp forms negative clauses with the limited predicative */tá* NEG plus the *q* UNR particle and a nominalized (i.e., *s-* NOM prefixed) main predicative. Th similarly forms negative clauses with the limited predicative */té* NEG plus the *k* UNR particle and a nominalized (i.e., *s-* NOM prefixed) main predicative. E.g., */té teʔ k s/qeʔním-e-s* "he does not hear anything" (/NEG DEM UNR NOM/hear-DRV-3.SBJ). Sh shows similar /táʔ "it is not the case" [i.e., cognate /NEG] "followed by a nominalization [i.e., *s-* NOM prefixed] with the article *k* [i.e., Th cognate UNR] (Kuipers 1974:81). Tillamook forms negative clauses with the limited predicative */qeʔš* NEG plus the particle *qe* (or *qə*) and a nominalized (i.e., *s-* NOM prefixed) main predicative. E.g., */qeʔš qe s/tk^{w}=anáʔ-əw* "he does not hear" (/NEG UNR NOM/place=ear-MDL).

[58]Sp ditransitive suffix *-ɬ-* RPL (replacive) is an affix indicating action to a thing as it relates to a person. Sp has two ditransitive affixes, *-ɬ-* RPL and *-ši-* IND (indirective). Th has retained only the indirective *-xt-* (PS *x > Th *x*, Sp *š*). (Loss of *-ɬ-* RPL may reflect more broadly a N. Int./S. Int. isogloss.) Consider also Cr RPL *-ɬ-* "in behalf of, instead of"; IND *-ší-* "as favor to" or *-šíš-* "something, for someone" (Reichard 1938:626). The Cr IND *-šíš-*form might reflect diminutive infixation after the stressed vowel *-šíʃ·šʃ-*, a process perhaps also reflected with Sp IND *-šíʃ·šʃ-*. Th analogously shows diminutive infixation with the RCP (reciprocal) suffix *-wéʃ·wʼʃx^{w}*, (PIS * -wáx^{w}), with secondary glottalization of the infixed resonant *w*. (Th *-wéʃ·wʼʃx^{w}* apparently even has replaced Th *-wáxʷ* for some N. Th. speakers.) Kinkade (1980:35-36) discusses Cm *-xt-* IND and *-ɬ-* RPL, also commenting on the problem of analyzing cognate Cm IND *-xáx*, *-xíx*. Thompson and Thompson (1980:29) also discusses analytic problems with Sp IND *-šíš-*. The diminutive infix analysis is possible answer, although certain Cr examples apparently show unstressed but reduplicated IND *-šəš-* or *-šɛš-* (Reichard (1938:626) writes as *-cäc*), which poses problems for the diminutive infix analysis. That is, [·DIM] is infixed only after the stressed vowel of the predicative (i.e., C_nV[·C_n]); Cr examples apparently showing reduplication where the IND vowel is *unstressed* would not reflect [·DIM], absent perhaps some secondary stress reassignment not presently understood.

57. hoy tl' šeʔ ɛɬ/x^{w}úy
then from DEM again/go
He [Skunk] went on from there again.

58. /čmí···š /nk'^{w}úʔ ɬuʔ i-s-n/χl'=s=núx^{w}
/only /one ADJ 1s.PSV-NOM-LCL/fear=face?=?
There is only one thing I really fear.

59. s/téʔ /sesík^{w}[59]
NOM/s.t. /bobwhite
It is Bobwhite.

60. ʔa čn ɛɬ/ʔáwn
oh.no 1s.SBJ back/say
Oops, I told.

61. /tam i-s-č/c'óχ^{w} w ɛɬ/(ʔ)áwn
/not 1s.PSV-NOM-toward/intend and back/say
I did not mean to tell.

62. ʔa ƛ'x^{w}[60] /ʔemui[61] ? /č'=úleʔx^{w}[62] /tá s/wét
ah but ? /present? /gone=ground /NEG NOM/someone
Yes–but there is nobody around here

63. k^{w}u q-s/(s)éw=ne(ʔ)-mi-s
1s.OBJ UNR-NOM/hear=ear-RLT-3.SBJ
who could hear me.

64. šeʔ ɬuʔ i-s-n/χl'=s=núx^{w} ɬuʔ /sesík^{w}
DEM ADJ 1s.PSV-NOM-LCL/fear=face?=? ADJ /bobwhite
That is what I am afraid of, Bobwhite."

65. hoy tl' šeʔ /nté ɬiʔe /χ^{w}iχ^{w}yútšn
then from DEM /think ADJ /badger
Then after that Badger thought,

[59]Sp */sesík^{w}* is perhaps analyzable as *se·/sík^{w}* DIM·/whistle. Alternatively, the *Ce·* reduplication might represent C_1e· RPT (repetitive) reduplication. Vogt (1940:163) gives Ka *se·/sík^{w}-ən'* "whistle" (tranliterating his orthography into modern Salish and providing morphological marking). Vogt offers no corresponding simplex for "whistle."

[60]Compare possible Th cognate *ƛ'uʔ* PER[sistent], which can act as clause sequencing particle and often is translated as "but." Again, this may be a "false" cognate (PS *t' > Sp *t'*, Th *ƛ'*; PS *ƛ' > Sp *ƛ'*, Th *ƛ'*).

[61]Analysis of these segments, phonetically [ʔæmu(w)i], is not understood. My best guess is: *ʔe m u i*, representing the four morphemes *DEM FUT and special*. I do not know if that sequencing or collocation of particles here is possible or makes sense.

[62]Th cognate lexical suffix *=úy'm'x^{w}* "earth, ground" and Cr *=úlʔəmx^{w}* id. (Reichard 1959:165). PIS * =úlʔmɨx^{w} or =úl'm'x^{w} "earth, ground" ? Vocalization of the PIS *m(') segment in Sp would parallel vocalization of nasals elsewhere in Sp and more generally in Interior Salish).

66. **k^{w} /sx^{w}é?t(q)s ?**
2s.SBJ /adverse.consequences?
"You are in trouble now!"

67. **hoy tl' še? /?enés**
then from DEM /proceed
Then he [Skunk] went on from there.

68. **hoy /sí[·s]k^{w}-n-t-m**[63]
then /whistle[·DIM]-DRV-TR-IDF
Then he [Badger] whistled softly at him [Skunk].

69. **?i /ƛ'lí-p**[64] **u /su=núm'-t**[65]
immediately? /stop-INC and /listen=?-DT
Immediately he [Skunk] stopped and listened.

70. **/tá s/tèm' /séw=ne?-mi-s**
/NEG NOM/s.t. /hear=ear-RLT-TR.3.SBJ
He [Skunk] did not hear anything.

71. **u tl' še? /?enés**
and from DEM /proceed
He [Skunk] went on from there.

72. **heɬ/sí[·s]k^{w}-n-t-m**
again/whistle[·DIM]-DRV-TR-IDF
Again he [Badger] whistled softly at him [Skunk].

73. **/ƛ'lí-p ec/(s)u=nú···m'-t-i**[66]
/stop-INC ST/listen=?-DT-CTD
He [Skunk] stopped and listened (very intently).

[63]Compare Th */ṣík* "whistle softly." While Th */ṣík* and Sp */sík^{w}* very likely are not cognate, the onomatopoeic similarity of these words for "whistle" is interesting.

[64]Th shows two ways of forming inchoatives, depending on the type of root involved. "Strong" or stress-retaining roots show an infix [?] before the stressed vowel; e.g., */m[?]áɬ* "it gets light," */c[?]ék* "it gets cool." Th "weak" or stress-yielding roots form inchoatives with the suffix *-ép*. Sh shows the same pattern for forming inchoatives (Kuipers 1974:40). Sp forms inchoatives frequently (?) with cognate suffix *-p*, but the incidence of the infix [?] is much less prevalent than in Th (or Sh); e.g., */ƛ'[?]íc* "it gets strong," compare */ƛ'íc* "it's hard, set"; */q^{ʷ}[?]úc* "he gets fat," compare */q^{ʷ}úc-t* "he's fat" (Carlson 1972:117). Use of the inchoative infix [?] in Ok also is characterized as "rare" and "very sporadic." The [?] also is inserted after the stressed root vowel; e.g., */pá[?]x* "he begins to think" and */pú[?]x^{ʷ}* "it begins to blow" (Mattina 1973:65). Lack or rareness of the [?] inchoative may reflect a N. Int./S. Int. isogloss. Phonetically, the taped form here sounds like [ƛ'æl(l)ép], but Margaret later gave the form as [ƛ'líp].

[65]Analysis of */su=ním'(-)t* is unclear; it apparently contains root */sew* "hear," lexical suffix *=ním'*, and suffix *-t* DT. Carlson and Flett (1989:216). Carlson and Flett (1989:vi) also shows *-ním't* "ready." The material following the root might reflect that suffix, but the semantic extension of the gloss "ready" for the suffix in the form for "listen" would be unclear.

[66]MS also gives as reference: *čy ec/su=ním'-t-i* (1s.SBJ ST/listen=?-DT-CTD), "I am listening."

74. **ho···y tl' še? eɬ/?enés**
then from DEM back/proceed
Then he [Skunk] went on again from there.

75. **hoy /sík^{w}-n-t-m**
then /whistle-DRV-TR-IDF
Then he [Badger] whistled at him [Skunk].

76. **hoy /x^{w}íst /ƛ'áx-t /x^{w}íst**
then /walk /fast-DT /walk
He [Skunk] walked--he walked fast.

77. **hoy tl' še? eɬ/sík^{w}-n-t-m**
then from DEM back/whistle-DRV-TR-IDF
After that he [Badger] again whistled at him [Skunk].

78. **hoy /q'á[·q']c-lš**[67]
then /run[·DIM]-AUT
Then he [Skunk] trotted.

79. **hoy eɬ/sík^{w}-n-t-m**
then back/whistle-DRV-TR-IDF
Then he [Badger] again whistled at him [Skunk].

80. **hoy tl' še? /x^{w}uy /x^{w}tí-p**
then from DEM /go /run-INC
He [Skunk] ran from there.

[67]Th *-iyx* AUT is cognate with Sp *-ilš* (reduced here to *-lš)*; the term AUT[onomous] is used for th intransitive suffix. The diminutive infix here is one of two diminutives affixes evident in Spokan There apparently were two types of diminutive affixes in Proto-Interior Salish:

Type A: *C V́ -C (V)C ··· with stem-initial stress
Type B: *C V -C (V)C ··· ´ with later stress

Th developed the types into separate formations. The A type survived as the historic diminutive, whil the B type yielded the historic affective, which either never became very productive or lost its productivit The A type is the only productive means to form diminutives in Th; the B type apparently is th most productive means to form diminutives in Sp. The development of Th affective from an earlie diminutive correlates with Haas's (1973) finding that diminutives often show specialized meanings i the world's languages.

81. /tá s/lkʷú·kʷ hoy tł' še? eɬ/síkʷ-n-t-m
/NEG NOM/far·O.C then from DEM back/whistle-DRV-TR-IDF
Not too far and then he [Badger] again whistled at him [Skunk].

82. t n/x̌'x̣=cín
OBL LCL/loud=noise
with a loud sound.

83. x̌'m' /c'q'-mín-t-m[68] łu? /x̣ʷix̣ʷyútšn yetšʔé[69] ?
CMPL /throw-RLT-TR-IDF ADJ /badger on.the.side?
Immediately he [Skunk] threw Badger down on the wayside.

84. /q'á[·q']c-lš u /x̣t'í-p łu? /x̣x̣stéy'eʔ
/run[·DIM]-AUT and /run-INC ADJ /skunk
Skunk trotted and then ran.

85. u /ʔenés[70] n/q'c-lš=áqs /ʔenés n/q'c-lš=áqs
and /proceed LCL/run-AUT=road /proceed LCL/run-AUT=road
And he [Skunk] kept on running down the road–kept on running down the road.

86. hes/t'ú···kʷ-i /x̣ʷix̣ʷyútšn
ST/lie-CTD /badger
Badger was lying there (for a long time),

87. u /x̣ʷt'-ílš u /ʔác'x̣
and /stand.up-AUT and /look
And he [Badger] got up and looked about.

88. /č'úw łu? /č'úw łu? /č'úw łu?
/absent ADJ /absent ADJ /absent ADJ
"*He's gone. He's gone. He's gone.*

89. /č'úw łu? /x̣x̣stéy'eʔ
/absent ADJ /skunk
Skunk is gone."

[68]Use of the IDF here indicates a shift back to Badger. Badger also is mentioned specifically to remove any ambiguity of the referent.

[69]Analysis of *yetšʔé* "to the side" is uncertain. Vogt (1940:68-69) gives Ka *ye* "this, close to speaker," which cooccurs with several demonstratives. The form *yetšʔé* probably reflects such elements. The form is perhaps analyzable as *ye č'ʔe* (this toward-DEM) "to this place." Compare Vogt's (1940:69) Ka example *ye č'əʔé* "to this place."

[70]Th */x̌'ʔék* /proceed functions similarly to Sp */ʔenés* /proceed. Both occur as independent predicatives and as "co-predicatives" indicating continued action of the following predicative (often translated as "kept on ——"). Compare Th */x̌'ʔék /tɬʷ-íyx* "he kept on running" (/proceed /run-AUT).

90. č' /čén' /x̌'áx̣-t /x̣ʷtí-p
at? /where /fast-DT /run-INC
He [Skunk] ran off fast.[71]

91. x̣ʷa č' /čén' ec/wékʷ-i-st-i
SPTV at? /where ST/hide-DRV-RFL-CTD
He [Skunk] probably is still hiding somewhere.

92. šéy' u hóy[72]
DEM-CTD and then
That's it then [formulaic ending].

[71]I am not sure if this and the next sentence are intended to be interrogative or declarative.

[72]MS added the formulaic ending when we worked on the text. In the text itself she simply said *šéy'* "that's it." The Sp formulaic ending may be an innovation or truncated version of an earlier formulaic ending. Th and Cr show similar formulaic endings that may reflect a PIS pattern.
Compare Th *n/xʷət-p=ép* (LCL/finish-INC=bottom) "that's the end [of the legend]" with Cr (*hi?*) *n-xʷə·/xʷat-p=âl'qs* (LCL-DIM·/finish-INC=road) "that's the end of the road" (Reichard 1938:707).

Bibliography

Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A grammar of Spokan: A Salish language of Eastern Washington. University of Hawaii Ph.D. dissertation. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 4.4.

—. 1976. "The n-shift in Spokane Salishan." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 42:2.

—. 1978. "Coyote and Gopher." In *Coyote Stories*, ed. William Bright. *IJAL Native American Text Series* 1.

—. 1980. "Spokane -e-." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:2.

—. 1980. "Two-goal transitive stems in Spokane Salish." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46.1.

Carlson, Barry F. and Pauline Flett. 1989. *Spokane Dictionary*. Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 6.

Doak, Ivy G. 1983. *The 1908 Okanagan Word Lists of James Teit*. Missoula: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 3.

Edel, May Mandelbaum. 1939. "The Tillamook Language." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 10.1-57.

Haas, Mary. 1973. "The Expression of the Diminutive." In *Studies in Linguistics in Honor of George L. Trager*, 148-152, ed. M. Estellie Smith. The Hague: Mouton. Also in *Language, Culture, and History*, 82-88, ed. Anwar S. Dil. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1978.

Gibson, Jmaes A. 1973. Shuswap Grammatical Structure. University of Hawaii Ph.D. dissertation. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 5.5.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1980. "Columbian -xi, -ɬ, túɬ." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:1, 33-36.

—. 1981. Dictionary of the Moses-Columbia Language. Nespelem: Colville Confederated Tribes.

—. 1989a. "When Patients are Topics: Topic Maintenance in North American Indian Languages." *Working Papers for the 24th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*, 1-41. Steilacoom Tribal Cultural Center.

—. 1989b. "Inchoatives in Moses Columbian Salish." *Working Papers for the 24th International Conference on Salish and Neighboring Languages*, 114-118. Steilacoom Tribal Cultural Center.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. *The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Text, Dictionary*. JanL, Series Practica 225.

Mattina, Anthony. 1973. Colville Grammatical Structure. University of Hawaii Ph.D. dissertation. *University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics* 5.4.

Newman, Stanley. 1980. "Functional Changes in the Salish Pronominal System." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:3, 155-167.

Reichard, Gladys A. 1938. "Coeur d'Alene." In *Handbook of American Indian Languages*, ed. Franz Boas, 3.517-707. Gluckstadt-Hamburg-New York: J. J. Augustin.

—. 1959. "A Comparison of Five Salish Languages." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 25, 154-167.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. "Salishan and the Northwest." In *The Languages of North America*, eds. L. Campbell and M. Mithun, 692-765. Austin-London: University of Texas Press.

Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1980. "Thompson Salish -xi." *International Journal of American Linguistics* 46:1, 27-32.

—. Forthcoming. *The Thompson Language*.

—. Forthcoming. *Thompson-English Dictionary*.

—. 1990 ms. *Tillamook-English Dictionary*. University of Hawaii, Salish Lexicography Project.

Vogt, Hans. 1940. *The Kalispel Language*. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.