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1 - 4 INTRODUCTORY

1. Hans Vogt's description of Kalispel (1940a), produced after only eleven weeks in the field in 1937, is the best introduction to Salish ever written. This is in large part due to the author's genius, further to the fact that working conditions were ideal (old informant monolingual, alert 16-year-old Joe Abrahamson good in Kalispel and with just enough English) and last not least to the fact that the author worked in a Saussurean structuralist framework (Vogt somewhere refers to "the assumptions of our age"). This approach was empirical, regarded language as a whole ou tout se tient (Meillet), saw form and meaning as "two sides of the same sheet of paper" (Saussure), started from an analysis of signs and their distinctions, and did not reject tradition, cf. Vogt's words on Reichard's pre-structuralist work on Coeur d'Alene:

"During my work I had the good fortune of reading through Miss Gladys Reichard's "grammar of the Coeur d'Alène language, in manuscript. Kalispel and Coeur d'Alène are distinctly different languages, but it gave me a good idea of what to "expect in the field in the way of general structure." (1940:9)

The assumptions of the dominant trend in linguistics of our present age are quite different. In detail they are perpetually shifting and loosely founded (if at all),

but the general preoccupation is with an "underlying" reality governed by ordered, preferably cyclical rules "explaining" a "surface structure". A logic-scientific attitude is assumed ("I shall argue that...", "our rules predict..."), use is made of formulas such as $X \rightarrow Y / \_ \_ \_ 2$, of trees of derivation, metrical grids or whatever the latest fad demands. There is an almost complete break with tradition. All this, combined with the concentration on a presumed "explanatory" aspect besides and to the detriment of the observational and descriptive ones, has had disastrous consequences for Salish linguistics: most of the languages are dying out (some already have) without having been adequately recorded and described. For not a single one of them anything resembling a linguistic philology has been developed.

2. Given these circumstances, Montler's work on Saanich is a welcome and valuable contribution to our knowledge of Straits Salish, and one is grateful to the University of Montana and to the Canadian Museum of Civilization for making such material available. So far, our information on Straits (comprising Sooke, Songish or Llungen, Saanich, Lummi, Clallam and at least two extinct dialects: Samish and Somiahboo) consisted of a short but useful dictionary of Songish by M. Mitchell (1968; ca. 1100 headwords, with numerous examples) and on L.C. and M.T. Thompson's preview of Clallam (1971), which materially adds to Mitchell's grammatical introduction. There is further a treatment of lexical suffixes in Saanich by M.W. Pigeon (1970), by its very nature limited in scope, and doctoral theses on Sooke (Efrat 1969) and Songish (Raffo 1972), interesting mainly for the material they contain. Montler's Outline goes on a number of points in more detail, is on the whole better organized and gives more insight into the language than the theses of his predecessors in Straits. The table of contents (v-ix) makes it easy to find information on specific points, and the book contains that rarest of all Straits items: subject-object paradigms of transitive tenses, a feature not found in any previous treatment. On this point the Thompsons say:

"Such paradigmatic material is extremely difficult to elicit, although experience with several other difficult categories where forms finally emerged suggests "that the forms do exist" (1971:284).

Since no such difficulties were encountered in Salish languages with a more complex transitive morphology than Straits, it is possible that due to the very small number of the speakers the languages have been dying out if not yet finally with, then gradually in the speakers. This might also explain the relatively small and apparently declining number of lexical suffixes (Outline 68f.) and the somewhat repetitious though far from simple syntax. If so, this has made Montler's work both more difficult and more urgent.

3. The Thompsons' sketch of Clallam (1971) has put its mark on all subsequent publications on Straits, not excluding Montler's. Though interesting and informative, it makes Clallam out to be much more mysterious than it is. In particular, the notions "transitive", "passive", etc., are rejected and replaced by "involvement", "responsibility" and "control" (I.c. 279). Thus it is said about the transitivizer -t:

"From the point of view of, say, English, one naturally takes {t} as a transitive indicator. Such a view, however, would assign overt representation to the "wrong category -- a goal or object, rather than the controlling entity" (280)."
But the element in question, like any transitivizer, does no more than express a two-place relation, the slots of which can be filled by subject as well as object pronominal suffixes. About the passive forms in "-on:

"this sort of form is then easily taken for a passive" (281).

But all languages must have means to express relations, and many (not all) have regular means to express (a) an asymmetric -- c.q. initiator-goal -- relation and (b) its converse. It is perfectly legitimate to use the traditional terms "active" and "passive" for the two types in Salish, as long as one remembers that the use of the forms thus labeled may differ from language to language, just as the use of the Perfect Tense in English differs from that in German. The alternative would be to have a separate grammatical terminology for each individual language.

Montler wisely employs the traditional terms (163f., 179f.) but does not escape "control"; in addition, his work is severely marred by what has been called "generative acrobatics" or "degenerative acrobatics". Nevertheless, if, like the present writer, one has learnt to skip these passages, one can read Montler's work with much pleasure and instruction. It is only when one studies the irrelevant parts (often more complex and always less rewarding than the language itself) that one feels a keen regret that the author has spent so much effort in useless directions while leaving many inaccuracies and obvious and unnecessary gaps in his description of Saanich. Producing a language description requires protracted and intensive labor. One has to pay attention to a mass of separate details, while at the same time these details have to be seen as parts of an overall picture, a picture which in turn can only emerge during the work itself (as mentioned above, analyses of related languages can help). And in Salish even observational adequacy is hard to achieve. As the assumptions of our age have diverted ca. 50% of Montler's concentration away from the language data, his work contains a rather large number of inconsistencies and wrong conclusions. It is the business of this review to make critical comments. But let it be emphasized that these in no way detract from the author's positive contribution. It is just because he has spent so much effort in useless directions while leaving many inaccuracies and obvious and unnecessary gaps in his description of Saanich that the system shows multiple correspondences with the related languages, e.g., PS *q'ay' yen are reflected as Sa č č n and as Sa p p m; PS *wv wv as Sa č k'á and Sa yv. The language clearly has several components, a circumstance which also tends to make analysis more difficult.

5 - 11 THE BREAK WITH TRADITION

6. The break with tradition is apparent in Montler's work first of all in a certain lack of historical perspective and of a grounding in Salish. In several cases the author refers to "p.c." - or to unpublished work where he could have found his information in the literature, e.g., the suffixes -wi and -min (35, 173) can be found in Vogt 1940a:54, 59 and subsequent sources, while *k'ay for Sa č (34) is proved wrong by the very Sa forms (see 19). A better grounding in the literature could have prevented a number of wrong etymologies: k'ay'can 73 grizzly bear (k'á corr.) does not contain V'k'ay unable, etc., but *k'ay' grizzly, frosty (SED 87); xes'can 73 blood does not contain the suffix -čan but is an old reduplication *cecyan (SED 34-5, Ce spāc'yan); č'ay'cap 73 ashes does not contain c'uy dead (5q c'uy die) but PS c'uy black (SED 116, 5q c'uy poot); čix'cap' 98 fishhawk can have nothing to do with V'čix' piv (see SED 43).

6. In the introduction to the Morphology (36-7) the break with tradition leads to new and useless definitions of such terms as "base" and "stem". Traditionally, a stem is a word minus inflectional affixes such as person, number, etc. It may consist of a root or of a root plus one or more derivational affixes; accordingly, one speaks of primary, secondary, etc., stems. Sometimes it is useful to have a term "base" for a particular type of stem. To Montler, a base is "any form that includes a root and may undergo further morphological processes, but is not necessarily a full word. If a base is a full word it is also a stem" (37). But then the definition of "stem" coincides with that of "word" and the term is unnecessary. In fact, the terms "root" and "base", or "stem" and "base", are used indiscriminately (e.g. 105-6, 112-3). No use is ever made of the distinction called "useful" on p. 37 and explained, not very clearly, on the basis of the presence or absence of a zero object suffix. And "stem" is later used for units that cannot be full words (see 2 fn. 8).

7. More seriously, the break with tradition makes itself felt when the author fails to apply the descriptive techniques developed largely by American linguists in the thirties and forties, and especially where he fails to heed their warnings ("keep your levels apart", "start from form, not from meaning"), designed to avoid the messiness and/or fuzziness of language descriptions so easily sink into. The failure to keep the phonemic and morphophonemic levels apart makes Montler's text misleading in places. The "underlying" forms assume a life of their own, and they are more than
just morphophonemic (this is the fatal difference). To give one example: on p. 14 the reader is confronted with "V=t hit". Since Montler uses the symbol V both in surface and in underlying forms (the latter written between double slashes) one is led to believe there is a surface form *t, but no such form exists in the language. The root should have been written // "hit" (it is irrelevant at this point that setting up such a root is itself unjustified, see 21).

8. In many cases the author goes by (not always clear) semantic criteria in setting up morphological categories. And once such a category has been set up, any word exhibiting the appropriate form is included in the category. As a result, Montler is repeatedly forced to state either that in some examples the semantic feature is "obscure" (98) or "not evident" (178), or that he is unsure which semantic feature is involved in a particular morphological formation (100, 118, 131), the latter when the forms of different morphemes are identical (like Engl. -ing 1. participle, 2. gerund). The semantic definitions of these "morphemes" or "processes", as they are called, are not enlightening. For instance, on p. 96 the morpheme Characteristic (read: C, WC) is described as "emphasizing a characteristic trait, tendency or disposition", which merely says what one already knows about the meaning of "characteristic" (there are many such superfluous explanations in the book) and is contradicted by the very first two examples afraid (and not *timorous), embarrassed (and not *shy), while it is also hard to see what is characteristic about the third example s-im-saw they're in, which besides Characteristic is also said to contain the morpheme Resultive (read: s/ = a or e). As to the latter, since practically all states exist as a result of things having got into them, and must have some duration, the morphemes Static, Resultive, Durative can be readily identified whenever the formal correlate is present in a word. In the case of affixation this causes no difficulties (except in a case like pós'cm, see 5). But reduplication, glottalization and ablaut cause problems, some of which will be discussed later. Here we consider the Resultive, which happens to be a case where two formally different types are combined under one semantic heading: roots with full vowels are said to have C,W reduplication (130v), while a/zero roots express the same category by ablaut (see above) 5. Of the 17 examples of the latter type (132) 16 also have the Durative suffix -aɪ, while the 17th s-q'el word, a speech is included solely because of the vowel æ in a root also found as V; while the only other example of a Resultivewithout -aɪ is snem¿ above. In sq'el the ablaut is old, cf. Sh q'q'í-úr speak, ʔs-t-q'el burst into speech, q'el discuss, and though it is possible to regard a word or speech as a result of speaking, setting up a morpheme Resultive on the basis of such a word and identifying it with a reduplicative type exemplified by such words as sitting, standing, lying down (131) is not convincing, especially as there are cases of ablaut that cannot be interpreted as resultive, e.g., k'q'el ML lever up, pry loose and k'q'el ML unwind (cf. Sq V-wal, wá id.). To Montler it suffices for a form to exhibit an established pattern (as Engl. matter rhymes with the comparative of fat) to be included in the semantic category connected with it. This leads to complex difficulties on p. 100, where štán river is said to contain the morpheme Actual (because of the glottalized resonants; there is no corresponding simplex). The comments following this example can be dismissed as the word is štán (thus ML) and not an Actual form. In the case of semantically different but formally identical morphemes the assignment of individual items is sometimes arbitrary, e.g., ʔ-s-lú-a-án 110 several bracelets (šd'kwac bracelet) is classed as Repetitive but s-lú-lmi? 104 women (sg. lmi?) as Plural. Since there is no semantic reason to class gán-gén-ala? 110 hawk as Repetitive but ŋán-šox' 98 fishhawk as Characteristic, to the reader the semantic designations simply become redundant alternatives for formal ones. 7

9. The (difficult) notion "productivity" is not handled consistently by Montler. About the suffix -ala? (see fn. 7) it is said that "though this suffix is quite common, it is uncertain how productive it is" because "the meanings of forms with this morpheme are not entirely predictable from the meaning of the stem" (175). On the other hand, the Characteristic is said to be "fairly productive" (96), but whereas e.g. for the Plural corresponding non-plural forms are quoted for all examples, for the Characteristic only roots are quoted when they are available at all. The type CVC-CVC is simply not productive, though there are many words of this type.

10. A preoccupation with rules has the effect that Montler repeatedly tries to account for non-homogeneous morphological processes by specifying which root- or stem-type requires which variant. A simple analogue: he would say that English monosyllabic verbs in -end/ have the past in -end/ if they begin with a labial oral consonant or /t/ immediately preceding -a/ ("oral" to exclude minded, "im. prec." to exclude blinded). This leads to very inelegant rules, some of which do not hold, or are premature (suppose one had not yet recorded grind - ground), or can be replaced by something much simpler. That the above illustration is not a caricature can be seen from the following rule(12):

"In monosyllabic stems with roots of the shapes CV, CVOC, or CVCC or in multisyllabic stems where A) an underlying /l/, /s/, or /s/ is followed by either "l/ or 2) one or no consonants, or B) /s/ is followed by a resonant, the "actual" is formed by the insertion of /s/ after the stressed vowel." This is not the way language works. True to generativist form, the rule itself rather than the Saanich language becomes the subject of a lengthy and complex discussion, which in turn will be discussed in 25-30 below.

5
11. Montler's linguistic credo is hinted at here and there in the text. In organizing his morphology he sensibly treats modifications of the root such as glottalization, reduplication, etc., before dealing with affixation. So did this reviewer (1974:37), without fuss. But Montler uses a whole page justifying this procedure. First two invalid reasons are given (94). The first is semantic and vague: the "radical morphological processes . . . all seem to indicate an allied set of notions: diminutive, collective, distributive, repetitive, continuative, resultive, etc." which are said to refer to "the internal temporal constituency of a situation". Since such notions as "durative" and "persistent", which more naturally belong to such a set than "diminutive" or "collective", are expressed by suffixation and not by modifications of the root, this argument is meaningless. The second argument is formal: all the radical processes such as infixation, ablaut, etc., also have reduplicative allomorphs. But ablaut as such is not treated, only such instances as are forcibly linked with reduplicative formations by the author, see 8 above about the Resultive. And it would be strange to classify a collection of coins according to whether or not their denominations also denote "infixation", and that it was descriptive convenience that made Copernicus' system preferable to the Ptolemaic one. Better to learn from science than to just go through the motions of being scientific.


"Kalispel normally distinguishes between *m?m, *a?m, m?m, m?m, between *s?m and ?m. There may be some differences between generations. With my old informant the distinction was clear, whereas J. Abrahamson seemed to have a tendency to merge the type *s?m in the type ?m" (1940a:12).


13. Such an explanation is attempted in the sections on the Actual aspect, which will be discussed separately below. Here one more point about glottalization must be raised. In the Actual all noninitial resonants are said to be glottalized (31, 110). Moreover, a number of roots C?K- (K-obstr.) change to C?K- (114). Montler treats ?R as an infix here. But he also, very confusingly, speaks of an "infix" in cases like ?a?l?Wax 118 sing → Actual ?a?l?Wax 105 or ?a?l?Wax 118, where the infix is said to be merged with the resonant, so that here ?R is glottalized because of the merger and ?R because of the general glottalization rule for resonants. This is incorrect, even for underlying forms, as the Sa reflexes for ?R and *?R are not identical (see 19), and we have *?R here. And even without that, it is simpler not to speak of an infix but of post-glottalization of the vowel in C?K- and to have one glottalization rule that changes A?K AR or to A?K AR. Exactly the same glottalization as in the Actual occurs in certain Diminutive forms (98-99), where in ex. 37 ?R is written in k*?R *?R it's damn, which even if it had been given as an underlying form (as it should have been) would
be incorrect. In Montler's next section (2.3.2.2) the "infix" is said to coalesce with a resonant, and in ex. 39 ĭ is written. On p. 99 the Actual infix is said to behave differently from the Diminutive, but this is not the case, see 29.

14 - 17 SCWA

14. The schwa is clearly phonemic in Saanich, cf. such minimal pairs as čemát hit vs. čet 114 be hitting; 3rd pers. possessive -s 146 vs. 3rd pers. subordinate -as 152; 1st pers. sg. object -s vs. 2nd pers. object -as 149. The schwa differs from the full vowels in not occurring with length and in being automatic in a number of positions.11 In general, in Salish one can distinguish at least four types of occurrences of ĭ: (1) as reductions of full vowels in unstressed position: Ċč -Čč; (2) to break up consonant sequences, e.g., Ċč-V ... vs. Ċč-C-C ...; (3) automatically occurring with resonants: phonetic ĊčRč, ĊčRč, ĊčRč to the exclusion of *ččRč, *ČčRč, *ččRč (4) others.

15. The status of type (1) is questionable in Sa, in spite of Montler's assertion on p. 28 (sect. 1.5.4). The reason is that both roots with (stressed) full vowels or roots with ĭ are found unstressed before č both with and without ĭ, in other words, both Ċč and Čč can be either of the unstressed counterparts Ċč-V and Ċč-V. For instance, of kešiWL burn, scald there is on the one hand keš-ìnsas 21 burn one's chest and on the other hand keš-ìnsas 35 singe a hide;12 of čefiWL squeeze čef-ìq-t 85 squeeze head but čef-ålas-on 77 close eyes; of čaq 20 big čaq-ệt'tx' 89 longhouse but čaq-ìqan 84 big-bellied; of čač-č 78 figure out čač-alā;13 go across but čač-èles 78 nose; cf. further čaq-ånex WL milk a cow but čač-ḥ 78 WL catch (animal in trap) (PS čač-ånee, etc., SED 6); čač-ệt'tx' WL walk around the house but čač-åmsWL walk along beach (cf? čač-åms WL pectoral fin); čač-ån 72 belt but čač-ålas 77 tight weave, where no root-stressed form is available. The occurrence of ĭ in these forms is not determined by the suffix, cf. čač-ìq-t 24 get hooked on the head (Včiik') vs. čačq't quoted above. Now, since (a) there are independent cases of ablaut A v A such as čen-at 48 WL obey and xč-s-gen-at 48 obedient, čač-åsan 107 it's a storm and čač-ålasat 107 it's stormy (with plur. -1- twice), cf. also kčč-at, kčč-asat in § above, and (b) both roots Ċč and Čč can appear unstressed as both Ċč and Ċč, it is impossible to say in any particular case whether in Ċč-V, Čč-V we are dealing with a reduced full grade or with a zero grade, i.e., a grade with full vowel of a root which under the stress could appear as Ċč. The causative derivative of Včč'k' in Ċč'k'-al WL cross over is čč'k'k' 174 get st. across, that of čč'k' 9 go home is čč'k'k'- as presupposed by 253 sent. 99 čč-åstan they brought them home. Cases like čč-åtan 63 and čač-åtan WL be bothered, čč'-šat WL make sb. spiritually young and čč-åsasat WL get power (-sat reflexive) raise the question whether at least in some cases there may be free variation.

16. Type (2) of 14 shows the usual pattern in Sa: a root found as Ċč will appear as Ċč before a consonant (32), e.g., čs-śt break, čšmax' 165 id., non-control. A word-initial sequence CCC can occur only if the first C is a prefix.

Type (3) applies fully in Sa and has here the following peculiarity: a root Rač or Rač will keep this shape in all surroundings. Thus, removal of the stress can result in initial consonant groups in cases like čč-s-ik'es, čč-åqan (see 15), but a ĭ always remains in cases like čč-ålas 77 multicoloored, čč-s-ik'es 75 smallpox, čč-åqan 84 get hit on belly.14 This simple fact is not pointed out in the phonology. A section 1.5.12 referred to in fn. 14 on p. 35 was omitted and should be added on p. 15; this covers the case Rač. As to Rač, on p. 25 (on stress) and again on p. 127 (on the Actual aspect) mention is made of "a rule that inserts /a/ between a [root]-initial obstruent and a following resonant". Note the word "inserts": the vowel is always there but is taken out by the author for part of his underlying forms, so that it has to be put back in by a rule (more on this in 23). No rule is given for final Rač, in fact, Montler sometimes makes the impression of not having noticed the obligatory presence of ĭ here. On p. 115-6 six examples (nos. 171-6) are said to be exceptional in that "the schwa preceded by the 'actual' infix and a resonant [Read: by a resonant glottalized for 'actual'] does not delete". But in the Actual form of ex. 171 čač-åtan pick berries Act. čač-ålan the a between ĭ and ĭ cannot delete in Sa, and only exc. 172 čč'sat be looking and 174 čč-åtan be sleeping are relevant here.

17. As type (4), except for the cases mentioned at the end of 15 "irrational" schwas seem to pose no serious problems in Sa. There are a few examples where ĭ is dropped after a root: čač-ås 216 to rain next to slánæx 17 WL rain; čč'sit 73 but čč-ås 117 WL refuse st. A ĭ is often found before reflexive -sat in words with (exceptional) antepenult stress (all exc. from WL): čč-sat capsize, čč-sat bail a canoe, čč-sasat unwind, čč-sasat shortcut, čč-sasat get wet (čč-sat wet); ĭ remains absent in (probable) Actual forms: čč-sasat autumn (čč-sat cold weather (expected ĭ, cf. čč-sat 9 cold)), čč-sasat decay (čč-sat rotten (expected ĭ)). It also remains absent after 3-cons. roots: čč-sasat untie, čč-sasat shelter, čč-sasat shrink (the root of which appears glottalized in the probable Actual čč-sasat have cramps (expected ĭ)). The cases with a probably reflect -at-sat (see 180), though reminiscent sandhi may also play a role here (e.g. in čč-sasat). For epenthetic schwas assumed by Montler see 30.

18 - 19 ALTERNATION

18. Of the alternations the most striking one is that of č č with ĭ (30f.); it results from the fact that *č č but not their glottalized counterparts have changed
to obstructions in at least one component of the language. Hence alternations like ṣeq 20 big ~ ṣeqq 117 getting big (reduplicated for Actual); ṣeq'osat 31 show off ~ ṣeq'ot 31 showing off (glottalized for Actual). The author states that "there are many cases of /y/ and /w/ ... that never alternate with obstructions and ... many cases of /u/ and /k'/ that never alternate with resonants" (30), but it is not y w but j w that alternate with k'. Since there are the three possibilities (a) k', (b) ʃ y k'-u and (c) ʃ y w-j, it is impossible to describe alternating k' as "underlying" /y/ and /w/ (thus p. 35).14 The three possibilities can be demonstrated in the following pairs:

(a) k'v'as - k'o k'asat 118 yell sk'au - sk'k'asat 42 (go to) school
(b) nə'cə - nə'yə 31 (_reply) laugh k'osat - k'osat 31 show off
(c) tə'yə ML - tə’yə 59 go upstream ši'yə? - ša’si’? 118 urinate

Montier writes an obstruent in /ši’/ 20 big but a resonant in /’o/ 31, the root in show off. Both are of type (b) above, so that the underlying notation is neither adequate nor consistent.15

19. The Saanich data witness to an old distinction *ə y vs. ə y, which are reflected as Sa əc and ə respectively, cf. Sa ṣə?can ML slowpoke *ə?u-ə-y, cf. Sq ṣəyə? slow; Sa ṣəʔə? 41 friend Or syəʔyə?; cf. on the other hand Sa k'əʔ 11 hungry Sq k'əʔy. This yields a correction in the reconstruction of the PS word for crab, crayfish, which sed no. 157 is given as *əʔəy by the basis of the SQ and CR forms; the Sa cognate ʔəʔək points to an old reduplication *əʔəyə. No corresponding data for *w were noted. The status of k' in ʔəʔək ML weave basket is uncertain (cf? Ld ?aq’sl weave blanket).

20. Canonical forms

Montier's treatment of canonical root shapes (20f.) is too sketchy and sparsely illustrated. In Salish it is useful to specify not just C and V but to split C into K (obstr.), R (res.) and ?, and to distinguish for vowels A (full) and ə/zero. Montier lists as most common root shapes CV, CV'C, CCV, CV'C, all exemplified by underlying forms. The last of these is rare and need not be discussed; the others raise problems.

The type CV (there is only CA) is exemplified by/se/- bid to do, send sb., while one of the examples of CVC is /xe/- on, upon, high. On p. 141 səʔa-t is given as the actual form of se-, and nəʔa-t as that of ne- name, on p. 245 sent. 22 əʔaʔ- as that of na- eat, but on p. 164 leʔʔ- = /leʔʔ-ə/w/ fix me /-s/ is given as plain, non-Actual. The ML gives set send sb, but səʔa command, let fix st, but leʔ repair (see fn. 11 above). It is possible that the ML lists plain forms in the first members of these pairs and Actual ones in the second, but it is also possible that there are variable roots Ce(?)-. Besides se- quoted above there is a homophone se(?)- lift up in ML səʔaʔsat (sumrise - set reflexive; in a phrase that may involve the actual); Mitchell has here səʔet (clearly not actual), Raffo 1970:4 gives səʔ with actual səʔaʔ- (not quoted in Raffo 1972). Montier's root ne- name is given by Mitchell as neʔ be named, sneʔ name; Efrat 1969:185 has ne- to name and 188 sne name, with p. 185 naʔet as a (questioned) actual form, but p. 83 səʔet definitely as the actual of set tell (order), a type different from Montier's səʔaʔ, səʔat.

The form with aʔə reoccurs in Raffo 1972:236, 239 naʔetan "from neʔ/ root: to name metaphorized for aspect"). Note that Sq has roots CVh- in some of these cases: Sq V’nah, naʔ(’ name, Sq V’app(h), Şah, Şa rise (Sa V’p), Sq s-x’ah-y’us dropoff (Sa x’et ML bring st. down), cf. also Sq V’jah, Şa cry (Sa x’jaʔ-g 114, 174, x’an ML), Sq ʔəh, ʔa- hurt, be sore (Sa ʔa- j’k’es as 23 cowardly). These Sa roots, especially the doublets in NL, need clarification.

21. The positing of a type CC, as opposed to a type CVC with a as V, results from the wish to give unified explanations but is untenable. On p. 20 the type CC is exemplified, among others, by /təʔi/ be hit, the type CVC by /k’uʔn/ see, /ʔaʔ/ be good, etc. As was pointed out in 16 above, V’jah will "on the surface" always have a, just like V’k’ən, while ʔaʔ ML good also remains syllabic in its unstressed alternant ?aʔ- (p. 30). The class of "vowelless roots" is set up in first analysis on the basis of the fact that they "are the only roots that allow the stress to fall on [certain] suffixes" (123). These suffixes are -nax 164 non-control transitive, -stax 165 causative, -taʔ 181 reciprocal and -sat 184 reflexive (in all four a is reduced to ə or zero in unstressed occurrences). Thus Montier quotes təʔ-nax 165 hit, non-contr. vs. k’əʔ-nax 162 see, id. The vowelless class is then used to "explain" other facts of the language such as stress placement (see 23) and the formation of the actual (see 26). But even for the four suffixes just mentioned the data do not allow setting up such a category, cf. the stress in ih-tal 162 182 hit e.o. (and not *təʔnəl), ?iʔ-tal ML get along well, ?iʔ-taʔ ML improve, recover (and not, as predicted for a root CVC, ʔəʔtəʔ, *ʔəʔsat). Montier's whole corpus yields only three instances of stressed roots CVC (all three GER) with one of the above suffixes, viz. k’əʔnax, ih-tal mentioned above and ʔəʔnax 245 sent. 30 say to (ML ʔəʔnax, but cf. middle ʔəʔn 245 sent. 32, passive ʔəʔnət 250 sent. 72). Far from explaining other facts of the language, these forms themselves need clarification, see 23 and 24 below. The generative derivational schemes on p. 127-8 can be discarded and the schwa-insertion rules (25, 35, 127) are unnecessary.

22. The type CVC is very rare and is not well illustrated with /məlq’/ salmon heart (also uvala ML); the type CVC with a nonglottalized resonant was elsewhere...
23 - 24 STRESS

23. Little can be retained of the treatment of the stress, which suffers from a preoccupation with rules, to the detriment of attention to the data. Given the segmented phonemes of a word, stress placement is fairly regular: "the first /i/, /a/ or /u/ (i.e. non-schwa) takes the main stress, and if there are only schwas, then the penultimate takes the stress" (p. 6). But the presence of a full vowel usually depends on the element containing it being stressed, and an attempt is made to give rules about which element will be stressed, starting from underlying forms. For this purpose roots are divided into three classes as to stress-valence: strong, weak and vowelless, and the suffixes into four. Since the vowelless roots are a fiction (21) the rules cannot be correct. The author realizes, that

"In order to determine the valence of a root it must be observed with a variety of suffixes. And the stress properties of these suffixes need to have been "seen in a number of different stems" (25).

As these requirements are not met, underlying forms of roots are "not prejudiced as to stress valence" (26). Nevertheless, and somewhat surprisingly, a system is presented which "accounts for only the most common stem shapes" (23). It does not, not even for the very few forms given to exemplify it. The very first example //kši/ / 23 feel bad is said to be a strong root, but on p. 181 there occurs the form kšná, underlying //gš-x-max-a/-, with the non-control trans suffix -max, stressed only with vowelless roots, hence here the transcription //gši/- without //a/- (23). As to suffixes, -as face is said to be weak on p. 25 in x\textsuperscript{2}-to\textsuperscript{a}s get hit in the face but strong on p. 115 in x\textsuperscript{2}-q\textsuperscript{a}s-t-an he's getting punched in the face (\textsuperscript{2} in -\textsuperscript{a}s- due to Actual). Since both tô\textsuperscript{a}- and ġ\textsuperscript{a}- belong to the same, to Montler vowelless root class, the different stress placement in the two words must be due to other factors, such as the fact that C\textsuperscript{2} is R in the first and K in the second (a factor taken into account by Montler for the plain counterparts of the Actuals tô\textsuperscript{a}-, ġ\textsuperscript{a}-, to wit tô\textsuperscript{a}- at p. 127 exx. 220-225 and ġ\textsuperscript{a}- at p. 121-2 exx. 198-211). Cf. also x\textsuperscript{2}-tô\textsuperscript{a}-a\textsuperscript{a} 88
c. Stress shift/metathesis in 3-cons. roots: C(a)C cà C à C(a)C exc. 227, 229
d. Preglottalization: CàR à Cà?àR exc 234, 235

26. Montler attempts a "unified explanation", but in a very confusing way, 21 by first combining the types II and IIIb, with II applying to "vowelless" ?aâ- know, etc., and IIIb to roots CVC such as ?aâ big : "these bases [type II] do not form the actual by C?â- reduplication [type IIIb] because there simply is no underlying root vowel" (122). Then, on p. 124 it is said that "the underlying distinction is between roots with no vowels (examples 198-211 [i.e. type II]) and roots with underlying /a/ (examples 168-173 [i.e. type IIIa]""). Then once more II and IIIb are combined: "Though the precise nature of the mechanism is as yet uncertain, I would like to suggest that the actual forms in these examples [type II] are functionally allied with the C?â- reduplicative form [type IIb]" (124). Whatever may be meant by "functionally allied", II and IIIb are together again. The whole section on the Actual (except the examples and their categorization in II and III) is a waste of considerable effort, not least on the part of the reader, who needs no better proof that the author was serious in his claim to give descriptive convenience a low priority. On p. 112 there appears the tortuous rule quoted in 10, as inelegant as its results such as ?aâpt à ?aâpt 114 ex. 143 whistle being included in one group with ?aâpt à ?aâpt 113 ex. 137 come and separated from the rest of ...?aâ such as ?aâqen à ?aâqen 114 ex. 149 cough. The vowelless root hypothesis fails on all counts. In the first place it is unclear why lack of an underlying vowel should make reduplication impossible. In classical Greek the initial consonant groups are never separated in ãntiç rinse, k?âml decide, ãmâ blow, etc., but they have the regular reduplicated Perfects ãmâla, k?ârika, ãpêmâk (in Sa itself there are similar cases, see 29 under 4). In the second place there is reduplication in ã?âqen 117 he's getting big. From the root quoted as vowelless on p. 20 (canonical CC, cf. 185 Câq-sât, ã?âqen, see 21 above), but now included in IIIb which is said to have underlying /a/. Here we have the same contradiction ã?âqen /-ê/ /ã?âqen/ as was pointed out in 23 for //ã?âqen// /-ê/ in connection with the stress rules. In the third place, a root like ât- walk whose vowellessness and consequent inability to reduplicate would explain the nonreduplicative Actual ât-âh of ât-an 121 is nevertheless found in reduplicative formations, cf. ãât-sât 100 take a little walk (see fn. 6). 22

15

27. In the course of the long section on the Actual Montler discusses "solutions" that have been proposed for other dialects. These discussions are in part a matter of unnecessary words, in part generativist mythology. An example of the first is the question whether in cases like Câ-Câ Câ-Câ (cf. type IIIa) there is metathesis (C à C) or vowel reduction (Câ having ã or zero in the unstressed segment). Since the formula says it all, no words are necessary, certainly not in a first description of a language. But Montler opts for metathesis on the basis of an invalid argument in his phonology: on p. 26 he compares ex. 4 ãkâs-sát scald it, ãkâs-sát be /-as- scalded it with ex. 5 ãkâs-sânas burn one's chest /-ânas/, where the root vowel does not disappear but is reduced to ãsâ (cf. also fn. 14 on p. 35: "If this is not metathesis, why is the root-vowel deleted in 4b but not in 5?"). This is like saying "Heads I win, tails don't count", cf. 15 above, e.g., on the one hand ãkâs-ikâs-sâs 75 sing a hide /-ikâs-sâs/ where in the same type of formation as ãkâs-sânas the root vowel is "deleted", and on the other hand takâst-nâl shine light on from a root *tew (Sâ V tâw?) bright, light in Sa found in stâtâ, stâtâ W L id., where the root vowel is reduced to ãsâ and not deleted as in ãkâs-sâtas. 23 And Montler must adopt the AÇA alternative in underlying forms of bisyllabic roots and affixes such as /-tât/ // 22 sleep (ãtât, tât-), /-asâ/ 87 mouth (ã-mân, -mâ). 24 The game is not worth the candles.

28. An example of the second type of discussion, viz. mythology, is the question (120) whether the alternation of type Ia, e.g. ã-tâ -- tât 122 break should be accounted for by starting from an underlying form /êbâst/ /-, itself the result of inflexion of ? in /êbâst/, from an underlying CâCa root, from which the non-Actual form êst is derived by "a stress protraction rule moving the stress across a single onset into the second syllable when it is followed by two consonants". In the Actual /êbâst/ // "the unstressed schwa is then deleted, and all glottal stops between schwas and obstruents are deleted". This is said to be Demers' "elegant solution for Lumîi". The solution is said not to be viable for Saanich. Considering Montler's treatment of the real instances of Saanich ? a this is just as well. His book contains too many instances where rules receive more attention than facts. To give a simple example without further implications, on p. 29 the suffix -îe plant is said not to cause reduction of a root vowel, but cf. ãsâ 20 four, -s-îe-îc âs 78 four trees. In general the generativists are the opposite of scientists, for whom factual evidence is the touchstone for any hypothesis. 25

29. A few remarks are necessary about the Actual forms as classified in 25 above.

1) Cases with the alternation discussed in 18-19 have plain forms of Ia and Actuals of IIb, cf. p. 129 ex. 230 âsâ-t à âsâ-t press down.

2) Type IIIb2 overlaps with Ia: êlîm sing has the Actual (ã-t)-êlî âlh (p. 105 and 118). It also overlaps with IIa: nàâ-ãh 110 laugh has (na-)-nàâ-ãh (p. 110 and 31; ê corr.). The form ãnàâ-ãh should be added as the ninth example announced on p.
was recorded elsewhere, and there may well be.

3) The forms naʔet, saʔet quoted in 20 are of type IIIId, while Montler’s neʔet from ne is Id. The material for roots ending in V_R (1) is not complete: Montler quotes in other contexts the Actuals to teaching you /-sa(-) (ML kaʔeʔt teach) and ʔawâxal rac-ing (-tal recip.), here glottalized for Actual) and these forms do not have -Vʔa? as do the examples in the chapter on the Actual. The claim made on p. 99 that in Diminutive reduplications like ex. 41 sqeʔqVʔa? little puppy (sqeʔqVʔ dog) the “infix Vʔ” merges with a following ? whereas in the Actual it does not is therefore unfounded. In Montler’s examples of the Actual, Vʔa? (Vʔaʔ) occur only at morpheme borders (type Ic), and all the examples here have -e? or -i?; in the above cases with -ʔa? there is the same “merger” as in the Diminutive, in other words, no extra ? (which is the real issue here, the following ? then being automatic). It is unlikely, however, that the character of the vowel makes a difference here, for there are exceptional cases where -ʔa? was recorded elsewhere, and there may well be an observational problem here, see 4).

4) Montler’s examples of type IIIb2 provide two instances (p. 118 exx. 188 and 195) where the Actual has an extra glottal stop before k^m?aw swim and ʔiʔaw watch have the Actuals (16) k^m?ʔaʔ and ʔaʔiʔaʔ. These forms contradict the author’s statement on p. 16 that “the insertion of the infix in the environment V_R is never accompanied by the insertion of schwa.” Montler’s material could be covered by a rule that has word final -ʔaʔ change to -ʔʔaʔ; these two being the only available examples. But there are two similar cases on p. 64, not given as Actuals: besides naʔ?m red and naʔqVʔo? grass green there are the forms k^m?ʔomʔ yellowish orange and qVʔeʔo? bluish green. As the author says, they probably contain the suffix -ʔʔ/1/ directional and have plausible literal meanings towards red/green. But they also look suspiciously like Actual forms k^m?ʔo? (qVʔeʔo?) meaning going towards/red/green. In the ML qVʔeʔo? is indeed given in this form, while the other example has its m corrected to n in k^m?ʔoʔ pink, reddish (which in the Actual infix would mean that n is inserted twice here). These two color designations are very likely parallel forms, so that here an observational question remains to be settled. Given the facts as known at present, all the cases with -ʔa?, -ʔʔa? could well be hypercorrect forms produced when Actual counterparts of plain forms were elicited (note that there is no extra ? in the examples from other contexts).

5. Finally, in the sections on the Actual facts more difficult and less understood than the Actual itself are adduced to explain it. On p. 119 in the forms ex. 196 “ Qualcomm” get him dressed, ex. 197 “Ambassador” she’s getting him dressed the vowel of Vʔaʔ is said to be “carried rightward into the syllables of weak suffixes by main-
son I'm going to school is given, where "initial /s/ ... is ... treated as an /s/- "nominalizer". We would not say that English nominalizations in -ing are "non-control" because in a (large) building the object is referred to, especially not if we also find a (large) following.27

32. It would carry us too far to point out all the instances where "control" is redundant or contradicted by the facts; it must suffice to mention the "control middle" in -an, about which the author himself says: "There are a number of forms with /-an/ for which neither control nor agency is evident" (176). Two examples are given: ĉaʔ- ʃ̓aʔ meltings, melting and ʃ̓el̓Ian sink. But this list can be extended at will: ʃ̓aʔ 9 be cold, ʃ̓eʔan 9 sour, ʃ̓eʔan 121 drip, ʃ̓eʔan 191 dry up, to which any number of examples from Wl. can be added: həsəʔ sneeze, ʃ̓aʔʔan sweat, ʔat-ʔən be sleepy, etc. In "control middle" the word "control" is not only redundant but contradicted by the facts of the language. One might as well say that all North Americans are males, and then mention that one has a number of acquaintances, such as Ann and Mary, for whom masculinity is not evident. As for the trans. forms in -(a)t, these can refer to non-control events, e.g., qʷəʔət 196 miss (fail to hit)28 məłəkt Wl. forget (250 məłəkt imperative), ʔəxʷət 63 beat in contest, ʃ̓əlat Wl. win a contest (cf. games of chance like slalal).

33. In view of the above, the forms in -nəʔat 178 cannot be regarded as the non-control counterparts of middle -an. Historically they are non-control reflexive forms (Kuipers 1967:136), and reflexives often have special semantic developments. The Sq forms in -nəmət mean not only act on o.s. accidentally but also get a chance to act; the Sa forms convey finally manage to (Efrat p. 95 quotes məkʔənəmət sn I hurt myself unintentionally for Sooke). Curiously, Sa has borrowed the undoubtedly related form that yielded Sq -nəmət (Ibid.) in Sa words like niləməntəm Wl. pretend to do st. lit. cause o.s. to be such, tsəntənəmət Wl. feel sorry for o.s., lit. cause o.s. to be poor.29 On p. 192 ex. 18 should very probably read ʔəwa kʷə ʔəxʷənəʔməkʷənəʔmət he ignored you, where caus. -st- seems to modify the whole preceding phrase, see 35 below.

With all this, the illustration of (non-)control on p. 163 is not made very clear. The translation of ex. 4b is not "I accidentally tore it accidentally but, as in exc. 24-4 on p. 148, I was acting on purpose and got it torn" (e.g. my shirt while rubbing up against something to scratch an itch). The comparison to English "accidentally on purpose, but without the humorous connotations" misses the point: the Sa sentence refers to two different events, the Engl. expression to one and the same act (whence the humorous connotation). This sort of example, the author says, "makes one think at first that the informant is working too hard". Montler's whole treatment of control shows rather a linguist working too hard here. He is not the only one.

34 - 36 TRANSITIVES

34. Montler's account of transitives gives for the first time bipersonal paradigms for Straits (157-9). They are incomplete but a great step forward nevertheless. In Sa, as in Sq, the 3-2 subj.-obj. forms are replaced by passive ones (153) so that he sees you is expressed you are seen. In Sa the 3-1 sg. form (-sə-əg me-he) would coincide with the 3-2 form (-sə-əs tə-he), but this is not the reason for the use of the passive in the 3-2 case, for the phenomenon is not limited to Straits, and in Sq the non-occurring 3-2 finite forms would be distinct from the 3-1 ones (*-uməs vs. -əs-əs/-əs-əs). Any explanation for the state of affairs in Coast Salish must take into account the fact that in Sh it is the 1 pl. subj. forms for which passives are used, i.e., we see you/him is expressed you are / he is seen.

35. Though Montler says that in his book syntax "is everywhere important" (3) and that "any accurate discussion of syntax must be informed by an accurate understanding of the formatives of basic predicates" (4), he is inaccurate in claiming that "in attributive constructions that translate as relative clauses the subject is always third person" (154). It has been known for some time that the Salish verb has so-called Subject-Centered forms (who hit me/thee/him, etc.) and Object-Centered ones (whom I/you/he etc. hit), see Kuipers 1967:88, 95; 1974:83; 1968:621ff. and 1989:240.

Of the Sa Object-Centered forms only 3rd pers. subj. ones occur in Montler's text (242-257). A good example of the contrast between the 3-3 Subj.- and Obj.-Centered forms is found in sentences 30 Look at the seagull 31 He's eating something. In 30 kʷənət is literally one that looks at (the seagull), in 31 nəʔət-atəs (there is something) which he is eating. The Obj.-Cent. forms whom/which I/you see, ate can be guessed as they should have the suffixes -ən j, -əxʷ you, etc. (152). There is a morphophonemic difference between Sq and Sa in that the combination of -nəxʷ non-control and -as (Sa -as is Sq -naxʷ-as) but Sa -nəs in the 3-3 finite form, which is identical to the Obj.-Cent. form whom he... (thus nəʔət-atəs above as a finite form means he is eating it). A first desideratum here is a suffix-stressed paradigm (*tət-naxʷ-as/*tət-nə-s ? There are other possibilities). On p. 157 only the exceptional root-stressed type kʷənəxʷ (see 31 above) is given. The subordinate forms of kʷənə- look, see would be as follows (note that trans. -t is dropped before -s(a)) [See top next page]. For 1. and 4. see above, for 2. and 3. see p. 154 exc. 36 and 37. Note the homonymy 1. kʷənəxʷ and 6. kʷən-nəxʷ. These forms are important not only for syntax but for morphology itself. In the first place there is also what might be called a Fact-Centered paradigm his seeing him / that he sees him, where
Saanich Subordinate Forms (*conjectured)

subj. and obj. can also be 1st or 2nd person. These forms are found here and there, e.g., p. 240 ex. 29 k’s na-s-n-a-t (n-a-t corr., cf. 245 sent. 32) I don’t eat it, lit. not the case /Saq/ is that /k’/ I eat it /my eating it, p. 41 ex. 5 na- s-?a-ha-so my /na-/ presenting thee /-sa/ (with it) (here very curiously given as a main predicate); a form derived from the Factual one in p. 255 sent. 108 na-sx-?aai-t-?a the reason why I put you aboard, lit. my-why-go aboard-causing-thee (the Sa counterpart of Sq 1-clauses type IIa, see Kuipers 1967:197).

The Sa form your seeing him / that you saw him, if parallel to the Sq one, would be *k”a’-s-k’-n-ax” (cf. *6. above), with the 2nd pers. expressed twice: k”a’-your, -ax” thou (subord.). The form quoted in 35 (end of 1st par.) probably does not contain -nax” (which refers to a 3rd pers. object) but -n-ax” as in *6., so that the literal translation of the phrase is he caused himself to be one whom you did not see. The notion “ignore” may have come up in a context like “he knew you’d disapprove or be shocked seeing him do it, but he ignored your presence”.

In the text, forms with -nax” translated he X-ed it occur in constructions with a nominalized clitic both without and with possessive -s; without in s-nax” sent. 8, 9, 61, and with in s-?a/s-?a X-nax”-s sent. 30, 82. In addition, he X-ed it occurs as k”a’l X-n-as (sent. 25, 80), which is the form given in the paradigm on p. 157, where -nax” is given only followed by subject clitics san I, itsa we, sx” you. Montler has not exhausted the morphological material available, and it should not be difficult to obtain forms with persons other than 3rd (e.g., a report in 1st pers. then I saw…) and a complete factual paradigm.

36. The transitive listed on p. 168 as //as// should be corrected to -es, cf. the alternatives n’avos 168 and n’aves 159. On p. 148 Montler quotes n’aves in subordinate forms which suggest that this element may not be a transitive: in na-s-aw na’aves my /na-/ carrying it in, s-aw na’ves-ita our id, the possessive paradigm is applied to the combination of clitic and full word, as in Sq (Kuipers 1967:92ff.), and in Sq this is the type for intransitives, the transitive having the subordinate subject suffixes combined with possessive prefixes (see comments on tk”a’-nax” in 35). The Sa finite forms corresponding to the above are 159 na’ves san (1sg.-3), na’ves its (1pl.-3). The corresponding 1-2 and 2-1 forms are suppletive: na’vesa san I put you inside, na’vesa sx” you id. me contain Relational -niy”, but this has its own 1-3 form in q’axinat san 172 I gave him a talking to (cf. noxes san above). Separate paradigms of root- and suffix-stressed transitive with -niy- must be obtained (p. 169 quotes qa-ni-?a san I put you outside, qa-ni-?as sx” you id. me, as with na- above; all forms quoted elsewhere combine -niy- with caus. -stax”). The difficulties with -es remain to be solved; it does not quite behave like a transitive but there is a middle na’m 157, cf. also c’tan, pass. c’tan in fn. 27. Moreover, besides ian W. come off (as button) there is la’nes 113 pull out (nail), for which Mitchell quotes la’nes pluck out (eyes) and in a phrase parallel to Montler’s quoted above, but without clitic: na-s-?a’pas ca’laqas my /na-/ plucking out his eyes (glaqan eye, -s his, ca article), without the Oblique case marker ʔa, so that here la’pas acts like a transitive. The treatment of transitives leaves many syntactic problems and the paradigms are crying out for completion.

37 PARTICLES AND SYNTAX

Montler gives an extensive account of the difficult subject of pre- and post-predicate particles and of demonstratives, of which Sa has an exceptionally large number. Many interesting examples are given, but much work remains to be done. There are cases where the semantic interpretation is unconvincing, e.g., the particle ?a 192 is translated by everybody as “accompanying” ever since Thompson and Thompson 1971:262. There are two elements ?a, ?a, etc. in Coast Salish, one meaning and, the other one here, close, etc. (for Sq see Kuipers 1967:158, 208). Its first occurrence in the 1971 source is in the opening of a story: salaʔa tsa iʔ ʔatam? there was Slapu (the witch) walking along: here a deictic setting the stage makes more sense than an element meaning accompanying activity, situation or entity (i.e. and). Morphological details remain to be cleared up, e.g., the nominalizations which include particles (see the examples in 35 and 36 above). The glosses in the text are sometimes inconsistent, e.g., sent. 16 contains the phrase s-aw yeʔ-ʔe’-s k”aʔoʔ-ʔyak so he went fishing, where -s is glossed 3 possessive while in sent. 18 s-aw yeʔ k”aʔoʔ-ʔak is written and the second s- is glossed as the nominalizer. In sent. 37 ʔaʔaʔaʔ-as for him to get out of the canoe (W. ʔaʔaʔi) -as is glossed as the transitiveizer discussed in 36, but this is undoubtedly the 3rd pers. subordinate suffix, cf. sent. 49 ʔaʔaʔ- as for him to go aboard, where the correct gloss ʔaʔaʔ is given. There must be an error in either the form or the gloss of 161-as 50 (and) he went ashore, which cannot be 3 poss. as this would be -s, not -as. The difficulties are considerable because of cases of homophony such as -s 3 poss., s unrealized, s nominalizer. But first of all the morphology needs to be completed; one cannot describe the syntax without a clear idea of Subj.-, Obj.- and Fact-Centered forms and of the transitive or intransitive status of suffixes. On the other hand, the material obtained needs
a more rigorous and exhaustive analysis. For instance, the subordinator k's 239 is said to have been recorded with two kinds of complements: 1. nominalized with possessive affixes for subject, 2. not nominalized and with subordinate subject suffixes. In the first place, Montier's examples show a semantic difference, 1. meaning simply my doing it, while 2. means rather for me to do it / if I do it. In the second place, the text contains instances of k's glossed subordinate with a nominalized complement without possessive affix: sent. 14 k's-k'1 ʔałlʔaloś that he was aboard (but sent. 15 k' s-k'1 ʔałlʔaloś-s, with 3 poss. -s), also sent. 38 k's-s-k'5lən (the one) that flew away, where k's would have a non-factual form as complement -- the correct reading may be k'sa (s)k'5lən (as in k'sa q4łq̓ələn 226 ex. 2 the barbecue). The puzzles presented by Salish syntax are subtler and much more interesting than those dreamt up by theoreticians.

38. Compared to theoretically sound grammars such as Nater's description of Bella Coola (1984; like Montier's, a doctoral thesis) the Outline is inconsistent, defective and full of irrelevancies. But the inconsistencies are mostly in the irrelevant parts (one regrets only that the underlying forms do not even represent the morphophonemics accurately, the more so as linguistic science has been able to handle such matters ever since Pāfnezi (300 BC)). Yet the Outline is a great advance in Salish. Read selectively it gives a recognizable picture of a highly interesting variation on the theme Coast Salish. And the Word List gives over 2800 items, a thousand more than suggested in the original list, to which it also adds 177 geographical names, many times more than are known for any other Salish language. If for a long time one finds little but fool's gold, one is willing to go to the trouble of placer mining to get some of the real stuff. And Montier has done enough refining to make it accessible without too much effort -- the generative dross must be taken to boot. If it was possible to make corrections here and there, then this is thanks to the fact that the author has ordered the material and identified the elements. The value of the work is greater than might appear from the above critical comments which, let it be repeated, are directed more against the present academic aberrations than against the author, who was bred to generativism and anyway had no choice but to fulfill the requirements of the times. And let it not be said that the Outline is just a bad example of the current approach: no generativist has even attempted to give, besides his or her trivial schemes, an account of a Salish language as a whole. Montier has tried to serve two masters: the Saanich language and the MIT mandarins. But it would not be true to say the author has succeeded in neither, for his work is unquestionably an important and valuable contribution to our knowledge of a so far little understood subgroup of Salish, and is more significant than the combined production of all the generative theoreticians in the field of Salish. It is very desirable that Montier continues his work on Saanich so as to end up with a fuller, no-nonsense grammar, a dictionary and a body of texts. The unintended but nonetheless considerable secondary significance of the Outline consists in showing clearly that to achieve such a goal all generative acrobatics will have to be abandoned.

39. The closest European analogue of the Salish languages is found in the northern Caucasus, where several of the ca. 35 indigenous languages are limited to a single village, like Bella Coola. The speakers of one small group, the Ubykh, emigrated on masse to the Ottoman empire when their country was conquered by the Russians in 1864. Like the Indians in the mission schools, they were forbidden to speak their native language after the Turkish revolution. There are three grammars, all with texts and dictionary, of this now extinct language. The last surviving speaker Tevfik Esenç collaborated with the French linguist G. Damézil for a number of years. When Damézil's health no longer permitted field trips to Turkey, Hans Vogt, of Kalispel fame among cognoscenti, took over and brought Mr. Esenç to Oslo, producing a dictionary with a grammatical introduction and a number of texts. Then Damézil, disagreeing with some of Vogt's notations, got Tevfik to Paris and produced a detailed study of the Ubykh verb and additional texts. The combined text collections now amount to well over 700 pages. There are a number of special studies. All of this material is published and accessible worldwide.

Mr. Esenç was a Turkish, not a French or Norwegian citizen. It does not speak well for North American society in general and for its universities in particular that so little attention is paid to the local minority languages. There is something faintly ridiculous but also profoundly disturbing about a university hall full of "Salishists" discussing self-made schemes best compared to Sunday-supplement puzzles right in the middle of the territory where the languages from which they derive their professional designation, and for which they should feel some responsibility, are dying out without adequate record.

This deplorable state of affairs is due to several causes, a chief one being the generative trend, which at the universities plays the same role nowadays as until recently historical materialism in East European societies as a whole. In both cases there is (was) the same arrogance and the same insufferable jargon, one has (had) to toe the line, dissidents are (were) consigned to the outer darkness, and in both cases the theories proved failures in practice, with the alleged beneficiaries the victims. For the poorly documented Salish languages, the very state of the art speaks volumes.
As Montler's work shows, even at this late stage it is possible to salvage quite a lot. For several languages old speakers can still be found. And it is urgent to locate tapes and to work on these while there are still people about who can understand them. As to publication, it will be easier to create possibilities if linguists can relearn to state the facts in the most economical way, and if they avoid generative futilities and other modernisms such as the ubiquitous formula (Outline p. 27, quotation reproduced exactly):

"1.5.1. 1 \rightarrow \hat{i} / \_\hat{c}"

"/i/ becomes glottalized preceding a glottalized consonant."

Using a formula doesn't make you a scientist (if you are naive enough it may make you feel like one). Scientists use formulas to dispense with words. Using both needlessly increases publication costs. Not only could Montler's Outline be reduced to less than one quarter its size without loss of information, but in this way the information would have been more readily accessible.34 Another desideratum, more difficult to fulfill, is that descriptive linguistics be given its necessary place at the universities. It is quite possible to train at least some students to produce acceptable language-descriptions. Others can specialize in lexicography, toponymy, etc. Anyone can be trained in collecting and transcribing language data, though texts will require collaboration with a competent grammarian. The difficulty here is not only that there are few people left who can teach the subject but also that this will go against the vested interests of the generative mandarins and mandarinettes (to coin another affirmative neologism), whose parlor games, though entirely parasitic on descriptive work, have by now grown out to a scholasticism as little relevant to reality as the well-known discussions on the Doctrine of the Incarnation, the Status of the Trinity and the Nature of Angels, entities here replaced by less interesting ones such as the Obligatory Contour Principle, the Universal Association Conventions and Clash Avoidance Rules. It is time for the universities to take appropriate measures, especially for the vanishing field of Salish, where it will soon be too late.

As UNESCO may intervene where languages are threatened with extinction if the next congress of linguists (Quebec 1992) makes a suitable recommendation, now is the time for one or more younger linguists to initiate an imaginative and vigorous program. If not, then what remains of Salish will continue to be buried under the generativists' ever-growing mountain of pretentious failure.

Footnotes

1) Transcription: Montler's \( \theta \) are replaced by \( \tilde{g} \). \( \tilde{g} \) = full vowel, \( K \) = obstruent, \( R \) = resonant. References: simple numbers refer to pages of Outline, sometimes specified by ex(ample) or sen(tence) number. Errata in words quoted are corrected, this is indicated by "corr." Abbreviations: WL = Word List (where Saanich items are listed alphabetically), SED = Kuipers 1970, 1982 (numbers are those of etymologies). Language names: Cr Coeur d'Alene, Cw Cowichan, LI Lushootseed, Ms Musqueam, FS Proto-Salish, Sa Saanich, Sq Songish, Sq Squamish.

2) Cf. Kirtchuk (1990:387): "Comme il est de coutume dans les travaux de cette école, celui-ci aussi abonde en phrases telle 'Assuming, as is usually done...', '...if we can assume that...as we customarily do assume to be the case', '...we assume that...', '...we assume here, as is usually done...', 'It seems more reasonable to assume...', etc., et jusque dans la conclusion: '...we assume that...’ (all on pp. 201-211 containing an article by L.M. Jeanne and K. Hale).

3) In the literature there is some confusion about status and relationship of the languages making up the Straits group. According to Sutcliffe (1960:3) "Staats is recognized as a single language by its speakers". The Thomsons (1971:25), starting from Clallam, say that "Sooke... is quite similar, and it in turn is close to Saanich... Rather different is... Songish... which is close to Lummi". To Montler's main informant Mrs. Elsie Claxton Lummi seems closer to Saanich than Songish and Sooke, and native speakers of Saanich are said to be unable to understand Clallam (Outline 2, 5). And Raffo (1972:18) says that "Saanich is one of the dialects most closely related to Songish." Montler (ibid. 1) speaks of Samish as an extinct dialect while Jelinek (1990:170) says her analysis "is based on field work with speakers of Lummi and Samish". - For comparative Straits phonology see Thompson et al. 1974.

4) Though Montler (268ff.) lists publications on several Interior Salish languages among his references, Vogt's Kalispel grammar is not mentioned; neither is Mitchell's Songish dictionary, which could have been a great help in his fieldwork, especially in its initial period. The most striking example of the break with tradition is Carlson and Flett (1983:vii): "Readers wishing more information about Spokane, Kalispel, and their grammar are referred to the following works:" - there follow 7 titles by Carlson, one by Carlson and Thompson (on Out-of-Control, not found in Vogt), and one by Thompson. One is reminded of Sappho's poem about "the sweet apple reddening at the top of the topmost branch: the apple-pickers forgot it... no, they didn't forget it, they couldn't reach so high". Such deviations from common standards of scholarly
behavior in part explain the present state of Salish linguistics.

5) This is but one example of the author's tendency to try and link different morphological processes to different root- or stem-shapes, a tendency which leads to inconsistencies (see 12) and even to the unwarranted assumption of different underlying root shapes where the surface forms provide none (see 21).

6) The difficulties on p. 100 show the negative impact of generativism on descriptive work: the author wishes to establish an ordering for his processes and in trying to do so is distracted from his data, which require all his concentration. Several things went wrong here: A. In exx. 45 and 46 1 is a typo for $\bar{A}$ (or 46 is not an actual form; for 45 cf. p. 121 ex. 206). B. Both Diminutive and one type of Actual are described as having C$\bar{a}$- reduplication and glottalization, and forms of this type are glossed as both Diminutive and Actual, e.g., $\bar{S}$tālāk $\bar{s}$tālāk 60 wander around a little and $\bar{S}$tālāk on p. 100 ($\bar{A}$ corr.) be taking a little walk. C. stālāk river must be corrected to stālāk and is not an Actual, and neither does stālāk result from any "process", the word just has a plain and not a glottalized $\bar{1}$, as do the cognates Songish stā?talu and Ld stū?talK. D. It is totally unclear how a non-glottalized resonant could characterize a word as Diminutive. (As to point B above, Efrat 1969:92 gives a simplex stā?nā̱ go for a walk and Wl a nonglottalized reduplication stā?nā̱̄nā̱̄ wander around). -- Reduplications of a/zero roots do not seem to be common in Sa. The word qâ?ā̱k 117 is interpreted as an example of the Actual and translated he's saying it, but there is no plain counterpart and in Montler's text (256 sent. 114) the word is used for he said (in answer to a question).

7) It is therefore irrelevant whether or not these designations are appropriate, cf. Structured Activity for -ala? 175 in such words as px*-ala? blow (of wind), was-ala? bark (of dog).

8) Here "stem" is used for px*- was- in fn. 7, which cannot be full words (V was to bark).

9) The same is true of $\bar{A}$ vs. R, e.g., ?an?e 113 Wl come but //?ā?e// 21, the opposite of what one would expect. But this inconsistency causes less confusion.

10) Though this statement is made repeatedly, there are so many exceptions to it that they cannot all be typos. In the section on the Actual 5 of the first 10 examples have plain resonants in the part of the word before the stressed vowel, so that one reformulates "all postaccentual resonants". But sometimes preaccentual resonants are glottalized, e.g., in $\bar{S}$tā?nalāj 6 in fn. 6. In plural reduplications resonantal glottalization is maintained, cf. s-čal-čalpex* 104 medicines and the pluralized Actual čal-čila? 105 they're singing (sg. plain form čila?). However, $\bar{1}$ is said to be come glottalized before glottalized cons. (27), though here, too, there are exceptions.

11) There is an observational difficulty with the distinction of word-final ...$\bar{K}$ versus ...$\bar{A}K$, cf. the parallel forms sē?at 114 send sb. and 1e?t Wl repair. This can cause problems in syntax, where the difference between the 3rd possessive and subordinate subject suffixes (-s, -as) is important.

12) These examples invalidate Montler's argument in favor of metathesis as against stress shift on p. 35 fn. 14, see 27 below.

13) The only exception noted is qilímà 80 dirty, corrected to Wl qalímà?

14) On p. 35 fn. 15 the Thompsons (1971) are quoted as saying that "cognates [sc. of $\bar{A}$ k] alternating with $\bar{A}$ $\bar{K}$] in other Coast and Interior Salish languages consistently show resonants", but they only say that in many cases Straits $\bar{A}$ k corresponds to y w in other languages. Cx regularly has d g\"< y w (see Vogt 1940b:15) and Ld has mostly 3 g\". Curiously, Sa k\"intel ~ k\"ontal 31 flight has cognates with k$\bar{A}$ in Sq and Halkomelem. -- In word-final position y is preserved in hay Wl finish, quit (cf. hačit Wl stop working on st., Sq hay be finished) and this may be the rule, in which case Sa also has an alternation ɛ ~ y and (possibly k$\bar{A}$ ~ w).

15) Note the added complication here: the Sq cognate yow-t to praise shows that both C1 and C2 reflect resonants here, but perhaps, unlike Sa big, the root čow-does not occur with reduplications involving C1 (as does čūpoq above, and če?le? Sa mink with a non-alternating ĝ), so that besides č-e, č-y there is č-i (the same goes for k$\bar{A}$).

16) This word probably reflects the "recessive" transitive formation referring to sounds, flashes, etc. (Kuipers 1967:71). Other Sa examples are čapt 20 whistle (Sq ~uŋ id. (corr. from *whisper, see ibid. 324), haq"t Wl gasp, ĭā?t Wl shake (from nervousness), which occurs in passive ĭā?t Wl tremble, ĭā?t Wl shiver (Actual), the voice status is uncertain in ĭā?t Wl shake (a rattle), cf. ĭā?t Wl rattle. Wl has ĭā?q? headache.

17) Wl has čašcq? headache.

18) In Sq zero-grade stems with trans. -t behave in the same way as the Sa ones: Cx-čt vs. Cā-r-t (Kuipers 1967:71-2).

19) If Montler had been consistent in his inconsistency with $\bar{A}$?ni? (cf. 23), he could have given a much simpler account of the Actual. -- A term like "progressive" or "continuative" (thus Efrat) would be better because "actual" suggests some nonactual counterpart like "hypothetical", "possible", "past", etc.
20) On p. 244 sent. 23 a simplex ḡałał go aboard occurs, which corresponds to Sq ḡy-ul ḡd.; the form ḡaḷʔálał 245 sent. 14, 17 is a glottalized CVC-CVC reduplication of this simplex. It is unclear how this can be an actual form.

21) A first reading is not facilitated by the fact that on p. 123-4 mention is made of "the set of roots exemplified in 198-211 [i.e. type IIa]", whereas the author continues "Now that these roots are out of consideration as having /ov/ in the underlying form..." The word "these" here refers to type IIa mentioned earlier (exx. 168-173), not to IIa, which is part of the "vowelless" category.

22) The fact that ablaut is the same in "roots with underlying /ov/ and vowelless roots" (131) underscores the spuriousness of the distinction. — From Montler's example nos. in 25 above it can be seen that his classification is useful except for type I. The only classificatory error is ex. 158 on p. 115, which because of the alternation čak' ~ čak belongs in IIa rather than in IIb.

23) For the second counter-example it would be possible to have a sub-rule specifying reduction to ə in roots with kʷ-ə (if the data show any regularity here — there is no regularity in the case kʷ-os-lnas vs. kʷ-s-ik̕'os). But it is much more important to study the data carefully than to worry about such rules. As in any science, first observational adequacy has to be achieved. Next, it is clear that ə is not on a level with the full vowels. It may well be possible to describe its appearance in certain groups of function in the stress, schwa being automatic in /C/, though there remain cases where its presence is unpredictable.

24) An alternant -ș- occurs before trans.-t in xʷmokšít 115 ML kiss, an alternant -șan in hașșan ML finish eating (cf. end of fn. 14).

25) The last paper in which this reviewer ever studied the generative rules is Dammers and Horn 1974. This treats certain common Sq stress types only; not covered and contradicting the rules is the trans. verb type CVC-ŋ: ḡq̕-n stop, ḡp̕-n put away, ḡq̕-n help out, etc., further reduplications like k̕̕şy̕̕šay play hide and seek, k̕̕šn̕̕ki̕̕ (i)n how many, and many other cases. Due to its limited scope, this account does not run into such difficulties as Montler's, though even so errors creep in. The word red codfish on p. 200 should be listed as t̕̕w̕̕t̕̕ under A (t̕̕w̕̕t̕̕ is the Straits form), the word child is staw̕̕x̕̕ (p. 206). This does not affect the rules, but for the forms selected these rules are more complex than the language itself. The authors announce a more comprehensive treatment, which this writer has not seen. There is no overall account of Lummi, not even a preview or sketch.

26) The element meaning blanket, dress, etc. (SED 146) as a root (not a suffix) seems to appear as *tyl̕̕am everywhere, and this is the base for derivations such asSq *tyl̕̕am-s dress (caus.). Sh s-w̕̕am-íle baby blanket. Sa too has an underlying //tyl̕̕am/ in the rel.-caus. derivative. The Ld form č̕̕al̕̕ (Snyder) treats b as C. Montler's use of //tyl̕̕am/ exemplifying canonical CVC is therefore not felicitous (20, eliminate "un" in the translation).

27) The proliferation of "control" seems to have had as its starting point the fact that many Salish roots allowing transitive extensions by themselves refer to the (trans.) object or the (intrans.) bearer of a quality, the trans. then having a causative meaning, though not necessarily a caus. form. This has nothing to do with control, and the opposite type — root referring to subject — also occurs, cf. Sa tas 243 sent. 11 get there (get corr.), ts-á̕̕ ML get close to; čte-ŋ 251 sent. 83 ask, čte-t-on 249 sent. 63 be asked (pass.).

28) It is amazing how imaginations can be fettered by orthodoxy or fashion. It is not just Montler who thoughtlessly glosses miss in he kept throwing rocks at the dog: but kept missing it as "control transitive"; such glosses are now the rule, e.g., Jelinek (1990:189) does the same with forget in melaq-t sxʷ you forgot it. The Sq equivalent is the probably cognate may forget, máy-nax́ li曦., trans. non-contr., of which no t-form occurs. As it is unlikely that the Squamish and the Saañich have very different notions "forget", a neutral and a marked category are indicated (cf. English a bit vs. German diminutive ein bisschen). Van Eijk (1990:57) has at least seen there is a problem here, but he outdoes everyone by explaining that Liloool x̕̕ik-'an miss has the control transitivizer because missing a target is "entirely within the control of the agent. Tell that to Tell! If only it were entirely within our control never to cause an unintended effect, never to step on toes, or at least just miss being caught doing so! By this reasoning there could only be non-control forms for such notions as forgetting, fainting, falling asleep, but not for any positive act the non-performance of which can be intended, such as breaking a glass, or hitting your son instead of the apple on his head..." This does not affect the rules, non-control forms for such notions as forgetting, fainting, falling asleep, but not for any positive act the non-performance of which can be intended, such as breaking a glass, or hitting your son instead of the apple on his head... This does not affect the rules, but for the forms selected these rules are more complex than the language itself. The authors announce a more comprehensive treatment, which this writer has not seen. There is no overall account of Lummi, not even a preview or sketch. But whereas -ši-t takes the same object suffixes as -t, the forms with -ńiy take -ńa(s), reminiscent of the non-control and caus. trans. forms with -ńa(s etc.)
31) Sent. 16 kʰa'wəyəqʷ is glossed as the Actual form of kʰəwəyəqʷ sent. 18, WL and is not covered by the rules for the Actual, which are limited to 2- and 3-cons. roots. The stress pattern is the opposite of that of type II in 32 above.

32) As to gaps, a major one is the absence in the section on the Actual of words of the type CAC ~ CCA (26) such as qʷəsat scald it! ~ qʷəsatəs he scalded it. The imperative is without 3 subj. -as, and Montler ascribes the alternation in the root to the tendency to penult stress. The Thompsons (1971:276) give three examples of plain ~ Actual pairs like qʷət ~ qʷət-scratch. Raffo (1972:143) gives the same pair the opposite interpretation (qʷət- is the Actual of plain qʷət-). WL has qʷət-scratch. In Montler's example on p. 96 translated in fn. 28 above qʷəqʷət-as he kept missing it is not glossed as Actual but is translated as such, and the parallel form təm-t-as he kept trying to hit it is an Actual and glossed as such. This would suggest that there is a plain ~ Actual pair qʷəqʷət ~ qʷəqʷət-as. In any case, forms with full vowels should be kept apart from cases with only schwas, where there is no "metathesis" as stress shift will entail an automatic ə in the stressed segment. Much confusion has resulted from the fact that everyone treats schwa on a level with the full vowels.

33) As a matter of curiosity it may be mentioned here that the historian of generative linguistics F. Newmeyer informs us in his introduction that he is a Marxist (1980xii). Like others, he will by now have joined the Greens, a common but misguided response of contemporary linguists who are looking at language in a responsible way.

34) It will be clear from the above that much in the Outline is superfluous. But the informative parts, too, could have been presented in much less space. For instance, a full page (121-2) is used to exemplify the type Actual Ia, where one or two examples and a listing of other roots with the same pattern would have sufficed. The two sets of object suffixes (149) could have been printed side by side, saving half a page. Yet Montler is an improvement on Raffo 1972 where one morpheme per line is printed (passim).

35) No more damning proof could be given of generativism's total failure. This is beginning to be realized by scientists who have points of contact with linguistics, and through them by the public at large, see Scientific American Oct. 1990 p. 17 col. 2, Id. Feb. 1991 p. 5, where A. Hufnagel points out that "the basic tenets of Chomsky's view of language can be traced back to Aristotle, and the bulk of its intellectual baggage was built up before the scientific revolution", that this trend "has failed markedly to relate to observable linguistic phenomena" and that "the strident voices of Chomsky and his followers have drowned out those of the minority of contemporary linguists who are looking at language in a responsible way".
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