

FACT AND FICTION IN STRAITS SALISH (Review Article)¹

Aert H. Kuipers

Timothy Montler, An Outline of the Morphology and Phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. University of Montana, Occasional Papers in Linguistics 1986 No. 4 (pp. xiv, 264).

Id., Saanich, North Straits Salish Classified Word List. [To appear in] Mercury Series, Canadian Museum of Civilization.

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 *où 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'Alène:

"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),² 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 $X \rightarrow Y / _ Z$, 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 Lkungen, Saanich, Lummi, Clallam and at least two extinct dialects: Samish and Semiahmoo)³ consisted of a short but useful dictionary of Songish by M. Mitchell (1968; ca. 1100 headings, 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 transitives, 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" (l.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).

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

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 grammar". 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 presents an overall picture and not, as is usually done, a trivial generativist account of a limited body of data (often of a language about which nothing else is known), that he lays himself open to criticism. The latter is directed primarily against the theoretical fads currently rampant among linguists in general and Salishists in particular. Given the handicaps of the "assumptions of our age", it is astonishing that Montler produced an overall description at all.

3

5 - 11 THE BREAK WITH TRADITION

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 9 fn. 8).

4

just morphophonemic (this is the fatal difference). To give one example: on p. 14 the reader is confronted with "V^h hit". Since Montler uses the symbol V^h both in surface and in underlying forms (the latter written between double slashes) one is led to believe there is a surface form *h, but no such form exists in the language. The root should have been written // h // (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: C₁VC₂-C₁VC₂) 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-néw-néw they're in, which besides Characteristic is also said to contain the morpheme Resultive (read: ə/∅ → 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 Stative, 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 šésčən, 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 C₁A- reduplication (130f.) while ə/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 -əɬ, while the 17th s-q^hél word, a speech is included solely because of the vowel e in a root also found as V^hq^həl; the only other example of a Resultive without -əɬ is snéw^h above. In sq^hél the ablaut is old, cf. Sh q^hə-q^hl-út speak, ʔs-t-q^hél burst into speech, q^hél 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 re-

sultive, e.g., k^héčət WL lever up, pry loose and k^héčəsət WL unwind (cf. Sq V^hwač, wəč 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 stáləw 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 discarded as the word is stáʔləw (thus WL) and not an Actual form.⁶ In the case of semantically different but formally identical morphemes the assignment of individual items is sometimes arbitrary, e.g., š-čəm-čám-əčən 110 several bracelets (ščáməčən bracelet) is classed as Repetitive but s-ian-iéni? 104 women (sg. siéni?) as Plural. Since there is no semantic reason to class xəŋ-xén-əla? 110 hawk as Repetitive but číx^h-čəx^h 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 -əla? (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).⁸ 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 /-aɪnd/ have the past in /-aʊnd/ if they begin with a labial oral consonant or /r/ immediately preceding /-a/ ("oral" to exclude mined, "imm. 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(112):

"In monosyllabic stems with roots of the shapes CV, CVC, or CVCC or in multisyllabic stems where A) an underlying /í/, /é/, or /á/ is followed by either
"1) /ʔ/ or 2) one or no consonants, or B) /ə/ is followed by a resonant, the
"actual" is formed by the insertion of /ʔ/ after the stressed vowel."

This is not the way languages work. 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.

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 occur as paper bills. Moreover, "infixation" is found in suffixes as well as in roots (115 exx. 163-7, 125 ex. 216b, 185 ex. 148). Finally, on p. 95 Montler states:

"The third and least significant reason for grouping these processes together 'is convenience'".

Elsewhere the placement of an infix is said to be "crying out for a unified explanation", though the author limits himself to "simply describ[ing] its distribution" (138), more about which description in 12 below. Here it must suffice to point out that Ptolemy's theory of epicycles also resulted from the wish for a unified explanation, 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. And even when Montler mentions convenience he is thinking not of the language (descriptive convenience) or the reader ("easy reading is damn hard writing") but of the "ordering" of "processes", with the catastrophic results mentioned in fn. 6.

12 - 13 GLOTTALIZATION

12. A sequence ?R is said to be indistinguishable from R̥ (15-16) but in a number of cases ?R rather than R̥ is written: q̥é?ni? 70 WL maiden, stá?ləw WL river (earlier stá?ləw 100), ?é?lən 106 WL house, ?é?lənəx WL no. 1476 hear (but no. 1387 ?é?lənəx), çəçə?wəc 131 sit (but xʷçəwəc?çəh WL sit down), səsi?nistən WL scare, frighten; the plural infix is written -?lə- 106 exx. 91-96. There is a similar vacillation between l̥ and lʷ in the Actual aspect form of ?á?lə? 244 sent. 23 go aboard: ?á?l̥ə?l̥ə?, sent.

14, 17, ?á?l̥ə?l̥ə? sent. 15, ?á?l̥ə?l̥ə? WL. Such difficulties, known to all field workers in Salish, were noted by Vogt:

"Kalispel normally distinguishes between *amá, *a'má, am'á, and am'á, between *ám and á'm. There may be some differences between generations. With my old informants the distinction was clear, whereas J. Abrahamson seemed to have a tendency to merge the type ám in the type á'm" (1940a:12).

Montler's informants clearly had a similar tendency. Since some of the cases where ?R is written concern morpheme borders (as in ?é?l̥ə-nəx 113 ex. 125) or zero forms of roots ?VR (as in the reduplication ?é-?l̥ə-nə house, Ld ?á?l̥ə?l̥ə?), while in other cases related languages also have ?R (for q̥é?ni? cf. Sq q̥á?may, for stá?ləw cf. Sg stá?lu? Cw Ms stá?ləw?) there will be an optional distinction.⁹ Montler implies as much in listing q̥é?ni? together with ?é?lən as a "base ... V?C" (106), while t̥iləm 105 be singing (Actual aspect form of t̥iləm 118 sing) is listed under "stems ... hav[ing] /l/ or /l̥/ in C₂ position" (104). But stá?ləw (WL stá?l̥əw) is also listed in the latter class. The two classes just mentioned form the plural in different ways: reduplication in t̥əl-t̥iləm and s-t̥əl-t̥iləw but infixation of l̥ in ?é?l̥ə?lən, q̥é?lən?l̥. This means that the unanalyzable and phonemically parallel forms CĀ?RəR̥ in s-tá?l̥əw and q̥é?ni? (where -i? = əy̥, see p. 30) have plurals of different types, which is not at all surprising. But it also means that Montler's account of the distribution of the plural infix l̥ rests not only on a quite forgivable observational inadequacy (stá?l̥əw, not stá?ləw) but also on a less forgivable descriptive one: distinction ?R - R̥ denied but used as a basis for classification. Since both these aspects cause problems, it is just as well the author does not respond to the l̥-infix's cry for a unified explanation.

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, 111).¹⁰ Moreover, a number of roots CĀK- (K=obstr.) change to CĀ?K- (114). Montler treats ? as an infix here. But he also, very confusingly, speaks of an "infix" in cases like t̥iləm 118 sing → Actual t̥iləm 105 or t̥ə?l̥iləm 118, where the infix is said to merge with the resonant, so that here il̥ is glottalized because of the merger and il̥ because of the general glottalization rule for resonants. This is incorrect, even for underlying forms, as the Sa reflexes of *R̥ and *?R are not identical (see 19), and we have *R̥ here. And even without that, it is simpler not to speak of an infix but of post-glottalization of the vowel in CĀ?K- and to have one glottalization rule that changes ĀK ĀR əR to Á?K ÁR̥ əR̥. Exactly the same glottalization as in the Actual occurs in certain Diminutive forms (98-99), where in ex. 37 ?y is written in kʷəkʷé?yəl it's dawn, 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 $\dot{y}$ 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 SCHWA

14. The schwa is clearly phonemic in Saanich, cf. such minimal pairs as $\dot{t}\acute{o}m\acute{e}t$ hit vs. $\dot{t}\acute{o}m\acute{e}t$ 114 be hitting; 3rd pers. possessive -s 146 vs. 3rd pers. subordinate -as 152; 1st pers. sg. object -s vs. 2nd pers. object -sə 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 ə: (1) as reductions of full vowels in unstressed position: CĀC → CəC; (2) to break up consonant sequences, e.g., CC-V... vs. CəC-C...; (3) automatically occurring with resonants: phonetic $\#R\acute{e}C$, CəRC, CəR $\#$ to the exclusion of $\#R\acute{e}C$, $\#CRC$, $\#CR\#$; (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 and roots with ə are found unstressed before $\acute{V}$ both with and without ə, in other words, both CĀC and CəC can have either of the unstressed counterparts CəC- $\acute{V}$ and CC- $\acute{V}$. For instance, of $k^w\acute{e}s$ WL burn, scald there is on the one hand $k^w\acute{e}s$ - $\acute{i}n\acute{e}s$ 21 burn one's chest and on the other hand $k^w\acute{e}s$ - $\acute{i}k^w\acute{e}s$ 75 singe a hide;¹² of $\dot{c}\acute{i}p\acute{e}t$ WL squeeze $\dot{c}\acute{e}p$ - $\acute{i}q$ -t 85 squeeze head but $\dot{c}\acute{e}p$ - $\acute{a}l\acute{e}s$ -əŋ 77 close eyes; of $\dot{c}\acute{e}q$ 20 big $\dot{c}\acute{e}q$ - $\acute{e}w\acute{t}x$ 89 longhouse but $\dot{c}\acute{e}q$ - $\acute{i}q\acute{e}n$ 84 big-bellied; of $\acute{x}\acute{e}c$ -t 78 figure out $\acute{x}\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{e}l\acute{a}$? 50 nose around but $\acute{x}\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{e}l\acute{s}$ 78 nosey; cf. further $\dot{c}\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{e}l\acute{n}\acute{x}$ WL milk a cow but $\dot{c}\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{e}ŋ$ WL catch (animal in trap) (PS $\#p\acute{i}c$ squeeze, etc. SED 6); $\dot{q}\acute{e}t$ - $\acute{e}w\acute{t}x$ WL walk around the house but $\dot{q}\acute{e}t$ - $\acute{a}ŋ\acute{e}n$ WL walk along beach (cf? $\dot{q}\acute{e}t\acute{n}\acute{e}n$ WL pectoral fin); $\acute{l}\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{e}c\acute{e}n$ 72 belt but $\acute{l}\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{a}l\acute{e}s$ 77 tight weave, where no root-stressed form is available. The occurrence of ə in these forms is not determined by the suffix, cf. $\acute{i}k^w\acute{i}q$ 24 get hooked on the head ($V\acute{i}k^w$) vs. $\dot{c}\acute{e}p\acute{i}q$ -t quoted above. Now, since (a) there are independent cases of ablaut A/ə such as $\acute{y}\acute{e}n$ - $\acute{e}t$ 48 WL obey and x^w -s- $\acute{y}\acute{e}n$ - $\acute{e}l$ 48 obedient, $\acute{x}\acute{e}l\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ 107 it's a storm and $\acute{x}\acute{e}l\acute{x}\acute{e}l\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ 107 it's stormy (with plur. -l- twice), cf. also $k^w\acute{e}c\acute{e}t$, $k^w\acute{e}c$ - $\acute{e}ŋ$ in 8 above, and (b) both roots CĀC and CəC can appear unstressed as both CəC and CC, it is impossible to say in any particular case whether in CəC- $\acute{V}$, CC- $\acute{V}$ we are dealing with a reduced full grade or with a zero grade, i.e. a grade without full vowel of a root which under the stress could appear as CĀC. The causative derivative of $V\acute{t}\acute{e}k^w$ in $\acute{t}\acute{e}k^w$ - $\acute{e}l$ WL cross over is $\acute{t}\acute{e}k^w$ - $\acute{i}stx$ 174 get st. across, that of $\acute{t}\acute{a}k^w$ 9 go home is $\#t\acute{e}k^w$ - $\acute{i}stx$ as presupposed by 253 sent. 99 $\acute{t}\acute{e}k^w$ - $\acute{i}st\acute{e}n$ they brought them home. Cases like $\acute{i}k^w\acute{e}l\acute{t}\acute{e}n$ 63 and $\acute{i}\acute{k}^w\acute{e}l\acute{t}\acute{e}n$ WL be bothered, $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}t$ WL make sb. spiritually young and $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}c\acute{e}ŋ$ WL get power (- $\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ 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 CC will appear as CəC before a consonant (32), e.g., $\acute{t}\acute{s}$ - $\acute{e}t$ break, $\acute{t}\acute{s}n\acute{x}$ 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 RəC or CəR will keep this shape in all surroundings. Thus, removal of the stress can result in initial consonant groups in cases like $k^w\acute{e}s$ - $\acute{i}k^w\acute{e}s$, $\dot{c}\acute{e}q$ - $\acute{i}q\acute{e}n$ (see 15), but a ə always remains in cases like $n\acute{o}c$ - $\acute{a}l\acute{e}s$ 77 multicolored, $\acute{s}\acute{e}m$ - $\acute{i}k^w\acute{e}s$ 75 smallpox, $\acute{t}\acute{e}m$ - $\acute{i}q\acute{e}n$ 84 get hit on belly.¹³ 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 RəC. As to CəR, on p. 25 (on stress) and again on p. 127 (on the Actual aspect) mention is made of "a rule that inserts /ə/ 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 21). No rule is given for final CəR $\#$, in fact, Montler sometimes makes the impression of not having noticed the obligatory presence of ə 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 $\acute{y}\acute{e}l\acute{t}\acute{e}n\acute{e}n$ pick berries Act. $\acute{y}\acute{e}l\acute{t}\acute{e}n\acute{e}ŋ$ the ə between $\acute{n}$ and $\acute{n}$ cannot delete in Sa, and only exx. 172 $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}ŋ\acute{e}t$ be looking and 174 $\acute{y}\acute{e}m\acute{e}t$ be sleeping are relevant here.

17. As to 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 ə is dropped after a resonant: $\acute{l}\acute{e}m\acute{x}$ 216 to rain next to $\acute{s}\acute{i}\acute{e}m\acute{x}$ 17 WL rain; $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}y\acute{s}\acute{i}t$ 73 but $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}y\acute{s}\acute{i}t$ 171 WL refuse sb. st. A ə is often found before reflexive - $\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ in words with (exceptional) antepenult stress (all exx. from WL): $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}l\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ capsize, $q^w\acute{e}l\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ bail a canoe, $\acute{k}^w\acute{e}c\acute{e}ŋ$ unwind, $\acute{q}\acute{e}m\acute{e}ŋ\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ shortcut, $\acute{c}\acute{e}m\acute{e}ŋ\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ get wet ($\acute{c}\acute{e}m\acute{e}ŋ$ wet); a ə remains absent in (probable) Actual forms: $\acute{c}\acute{e}l\acute{e}ŋ\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ autumn ($\acute{c}\acute{e}l\acute{e}ŋ$ cold weather (expected $\acute{n}$, cf. $\acute{c}\acute{e}l\acute{e}ŋ$ 9 cold)), $\acute{c}\acute{e}q\acute{e}ŋ\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ decay ($\acute{c}\acute{e}q\acute{e}ŋ$ rotten (expected $\acute{a}$?)). It also remains absent after 3-cons. roots: $\acute{x}\acute{e}l\acute{e}c\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ untie, $\acute{q}\acute{e}l\acute{e}c\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ shelter, $\acute{q}\acute{e}l\acute{e}p\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ shrink (the root of which appears glottalized in the probable Actual $\acute{q}\acute{e}l\acute{e}p\acute{t}\acute{e}n$ have cramps (expected $\acute{n}$)). The cases with ə probably reflect - $\acute{e}t$ - $\acute{s}\acute{e}t$ (see 186), though reminiscent sandhi may also play a role here (e.g. in $\acute{c}\acute{e}m\acute{e}ŋ\acute{s}\acute{e}t$). For epenthetic schwas assumed by Montler see 30.

18 - 19 ALTERNATION

18. Of the alternations the most striking one is that of $\acute{c}$ k^w with $\acute{y}$ $\acute{w}$ (30f.); it results from the fact that $\#y$ $\#w$ but not their glottalized counterparts have changed

to obstruents in at least one component of the language. Hence alternations like čəq 20 big ~ čəyəq 117 getting big (reduplicated for Actual); čəkʷəsət 31 show off ~ čəwsət 31 showing off (glottalized for Actual). The author states that "there are many cases of /y/ and /w/ ... that never alternate with obstruents and ... many cases of /č/ and /kʷ/ that never alternate with resonants" (30), but it is not y w but č w that alternate with č kʷ. Since there are the three possibilities (a) č kʷ, (b) č y kʷ and (c) y w kʷ, it is impossible to describe alternating č kʷ as "underlying" //y// and //w// (thus p. 35).¹⁴ The three possibilities can be demonstrated on the following plain ~ Actual pairs:

- (a) kʷəcən ~ kʷəkʷəcən 118 yell skʷul ~ skʷukʷəl 42 (go to) school
 (b) nəcən ~ nəyən 31 (h corr.) laugh čəkʷəsət ~ čəwsət 31 show off
 (c) təyəl WL ~ təyəl 59 go upstream šiwəʔ ~ šəšiwəʔ 118 urinate

Montler writes an obstruent in //čq// 20 be big but a resonant in //čəw// 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 *ʔy vs. *ʔy, which are reflected as Sa ʔč and ʔ respectively, cf. Sa ʔáčən WL slowpoke < *ʔu-ʔy-, cf. Sq ʔuyumʔ slow; Sa sčəčəʔ 41 friend Cw syéʔyeʔ; cf. on the other hand Sa kʷəy 11 hungry Sq kʷayʔ. This yields a correction in the reconstruction of the PS word for crab, crayfish, which SED no. 157 is given as *ʔayʔx on the basis of the Sq and Cr forms; the Sa cognate ʔəčəx points to an old reduplication *ʔaʔyʔx. No corresponding data for *ʔw were noted. The status of kʷ in ʔəʔkʷəl WL weave basket is uncertain (cf. Ld ʔəqʷəl weave blanket).

20 - 22 CANONICAL FORMS

20. Montler'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 ʔ, and to distinguish for vowels A (full) and ə/zero. Montler lists as most common root shapes CV, CVC, CVCC, CCVC, 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 //čəʔ-// on, upon, high. On p. 141 séʔə-t is given as the Actual form of se-, and néʔə-t as that of ne- name, on p. 245 sent. 22 náʔ-ət as that of ʔa- eat, but on p. 164 leʔs = //leʔ-ət-s// fix me /-s/ up is given as plain, non-Actual. The WL gives set send sb. but séʔət command, let fix st. but leʔt repair (see fn. 11 above). It is possible that the WL 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 WL séʔəsət (sun)rise (-sət reflexive; in a phrase that may involve the Actual); Mitchell has here séʔet (clearly not Actual), Raffo 1970:4 gives sé- with Actual séʔə- (not quoted in Raffo 1972). Montler'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 nəʔét as a (questioned) Actual form, but p. 83 səʔét definitely as the Actual of set tell (order), a type different from Montler's néʔət, séʔət. The form with əʔé reoccurs in Raffo 1972:236, 239 nəʔétən "from /neʔ/ root: to name metathesized for aspect)". Note that Sq has roots CVh- in some of these cases: Sq Vnəh, na(?) name, Sq Včih, čəh, ča rise (Sa Včəʔ), Sq s-xʷəh-əyʔus dropoff (Sa xʷet WL bring st. down), cf. also Sq Vxəh, xa cry (Sa xʷaa-η 114, 174, xʷan WL), Sq ʔəh, ʔa- hurt, be sore (Sa ʔəh-énkʷəs 82 cowardly). These Sa roots, especially the doublets in WL, need clarification.

21. The positing of a type CC, as opposed to a type CVC with ə as V, results from the wish to give unified explanations but is untenable. On p. 20 the type CC is exemplified, among others, by //təm// be hit, the type CVC by //kʷən// see, //ʔəy// be good, etc. As was pointed out in 16 above, Vtəm will "on the surface" always have ə, just like Vkʷən, while ʔəy WL good also remains syllabic in its unstressed alternant ʔiʔ- (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 -naxʷ 164 non-control transitive, -staxʷ 165 causative, -tal 181 reciprocal and -sat 184 reflexive (in all four a is reduced to ə or zero in unstressed occurrences). Thus Montler quotes təm-naxʷ 165 hit, non-contr. vs. kʷən-naxʷ 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 təm-təl 162 182 hit e.o. (and not *təmtəl), ʔiʔ-təl WL get along well, ʔiʔ-sət WL improve, recover (and not, as predicted for a root CVC, *ʔəytəl, *ʔəysət). Montler's whole corpus yields only three instances of stressed roots CəC (all three CəR) with one of the above suffixes, viz. kʷənnaxʷ, təmtəl mentioned above and xənnaxʷ 245 sent. 30 say to (WL xənəxʷ, but cf. middle xənən 245 sent. 32, passive xənətən 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 CVCC is very rare and is not well illustrated with //məlqʷ// salmon heart (also uvula WL); the type CəRC with a nonglottalized resonant was elsewhere

noted only in $\text{təm}^w/\text{słēm}^w$ rain (see 17) and possibly təm^w WL flap wings.¹⁶ Very much more common is the type CāRāC : tān^w 9 earth, s-šāwēn 10 earrings, $\text{k}^w\text{šlāw}$ 11 skin, $\text{k}^w\text{šyāx-t}$ 18 stir, $\text{q}^w\text{šlāx-t}$ 120 peel, $\text{q}^w\text{šlāp-sət}$ 120 shrink (WL $\text{q}^w\text{šlāpsət}$), etc., and numerous examples in WL: šānās tooth, ʔān^w stop, tālāq splash, lāyāq shiner, etc. Since there is a common plain-Actual alternation $\text{CāRāC} \sim \text{CāRC}$, the latter type is frequent in Actual forms, e.g., šālq-t 9 sharing it (WL šālāq-tāl share out, -tāl recipr.). Occasionally the stress is on a final syllable: sāmāy 17 blanket, hāmāw WL pigeon.

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 segmental phonemes of a word, stress placement is fairly regular: "the first /i/, /e/ or /a/ (i.e. non-schwa) takes the main stress, and if there are only schwas, then the penultimate takes the stress" (WL 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 $//\text{xāi}//$ 23 feel bad is said to be a strong root, but on p. 181 there occurs the form xālnān , underlying $//\text{xāi-nax}^w\text{-ən}//$, with the non-control trans. suffix -nax^w , stressed only with vowelless roots, hence here the transcription $//\text{xāi}//$ without $//\text{ə}//$.¹⁷ As to suffixes, -as face is said to be weak on p. 25 in $\text{x}^w\text{-tām-as}$ get hit in the face but strong on p. 115 in $\text{x}^w\text{-šs-āʔs-t-ən}$ he's getting punched in the face (? in -āʔs- due to Actual). Since both tām- and šs- 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_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 tām-t , šs-t , to wit tām-at p. 127 exx. 220-225 and šs-at p. 121-2 exx. 198-211). Cf. also $\text{x}^w\text{-tām-āwāč}$ 88

get hit on bottom vs. s-šāč-ēwāč 88 cellar (deep-bottom, cf. šāč-at WL deepen, another member of the same weak-grade class).¹⁸

24. In a number of cases different stresses are found in the corpus: māsət 17, mās-at 9 WL fold st.; mālāqt 250, mālāqt WL forget; lāyāq^w 129, lāyāq^w WL smash up; šāčāp-s sx^w 181 (č corr.) you /sx/ tickled me /-s/, šāčāpt WL tickle sb.; šālāq-tāl 194 share with e.o., šālāqtāl WL divide; qāmāqāmət WL cut strips of skin, qāmāqāmət sən 107 (2nd m corr.) I cut it up; slāqānək^w WL level, slāqānək^w WL flat; qālāpsət WL shrink, qālāpsət 120 it shrank; $\text{k}^w\text{ēyāsīt}$ 175 WL ; $\text{k}^w\text{ēysit}$ 73 refuse sb. st.; with consequences for the vocalism: nāwēs 159, nāwēs 168 put inside; hāʔēlāq WL, hāyēlāq WL wave, swell. Cf. also the following words all containing $//\text{-niy-stax}^w//$ relation-al-causative (see p. 166 exx. 20-23): from šīlān stand šīlānəstx^w 169 WL put st. up, from ʔīlān 9 get dressed ʔāʔīlānəstx^w 166 get him dressed, but from ʔīlān eat ʔāʔlān-īstx^w 41 WL feed, from $\text{x}^w\text{īlān}$ WL return $\text{x}^w\text{īlānīstx}^w$ WL return st.; cf. also $\text{sāsi}^w\text{-nīstān}$ WL scare (sēysi^w 96 afraid). The different stress-placement in tāmāx^w vs. $\text{k}^w\text{ānnəx}^w$ (21) must be considered in the context of these alternative stresses.

25 - 30 THE ACTUAL

25. In the sections on the Actual aspect (111-130) the "infix ?", the "vowelless roots", the wish to link stem shapes with morphological processes and the quest for explanations have a cumulative impact, with the result that this part is the hardest to read in toto.¹⁹ However, numerous examples are given, viz. nos. 135-237 in sect. 2.3.5. Of these, nos. 196-7, 213-5 and 217-8 concern other forms, leaving over 90 examples of the Actual. This material can be accounted for as follows (note -at/-t trans., -ən middle; for glottalization in the Actual see 13 above):

I Stems with stressed full vowel (Ā)

- a. ...ĀK → ĀʔK exx. 143, 145-53, 163-7, 216
- b. ...ĀR → ĀŖ exx. 174-6
- c. ...Ā(?) → Āʔa(?) (Āʔa-Ŗ...) exx. 135-141, 144

II Stems not with stressed full vowel (with ē or unstressed)

- a. $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{KK-at (KKāK)}, \text{KK-ən} \\ \text{RāK-at (no ex.)}, \text{RāK-ən} \end{array} \right\} \rightarrow \text{CāK-t (CāKK)}, \text{CāK-ən}$ exx. 198-211, 226, 231, 235 (230)**
- b. $\text{CāR-at (CāRāK)*}, \text{CāR-ən} \rightarrow \text{CāŖ-t (CāŖK)}, \text{CāŖ-ən}$ exx. 154-7, 159-62, 219-25, 228, 232, (230)**

(* Alternative stresses. ** See 29 under 1))

III Special formations

- a. Ablaut ē → ēʔ (ēŖ) exx. 158, 168-73
- b. Reduplication: 1. $\text{C}_1\text{V-C}_1\text{əC}_2$ exx. 177-87; 2. $\text{C}_1\text{ə-C}_1\text{...}$ exx. 188-195

- c. Stress shift/metathesis in 3-cons. roots: C(ə)CÁC → CÁC(ə)C exx. 227, 229
 d. Preglottalization: CÁR → CəʔÁR exx 234, 235
 e. Isolated cases: ex. 142 xʷaən (WL xʷaən) cry → xʷáʔaŋ, ex. 237 páaŋ swell up → páhaŋ, ex. 236 ʔaaŋ go aboard → ʔáŋáŋi.²⁰

26. Montler attempts a "unified explanation", but in a very confusing way,²¹ by first combining the types II and IIb, with II applying to "vowelless" xč- know, etc., and IIb to roots CVC such as čəq big : "these bases [type II] do not form the actual by C₁ŷ- reduplication [type IIb] 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 /ə/ (examples 168-173 [i.e. type IIa])". Then once more II and IIb are combined: "Though the precise nature of the mechanism is as yet unclear, I would like to suggest that the 'actual' forms in these examples [type II] are functionally allied with the C₁ŷ- reduplicative form [type IIb]" (124). Whatever may be meant by "functionally allied", II and IIb 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 šapt → šaʔpt 114 ex. 143 whistle being included in one group with ʔənʔé → ʔənʔéʔa 113 ex. 137 come and separated from the rest of ...ÁK such as táqʔəŋ → táʔqʔəŋ 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 plúno rinse, kríno decide, pnéo blow, etc., but they have the regular reduplicated Perfects pépluka, kékrika, pépneuka (in Sa itself there are similar cases, see 29 under 4). In the second place there is reduplication in čəyəq 117 he's getting big, from the root quoted as vowelless on p. 20 (canonical CC, cf. 185 čəq-sát, čəqnaʔ, see 21 above), but now included in IIb which is said to have underlying /ə/. Here we have the same contradiction //čəq/ - //čəq/ as was pointed out in 23 for //xəŋ/ - //xəŋ/ in connection with the stress rules. In the third place, a root like št- walk whose vowellessness and consequent inability to reduplicate would explain the nonreduplicative Actual šəŋt-əŋ of št-əŋ 121 is nevertheless found in reduplicative formations, cf. šəŋšəŋ 100 take a little walk (see fn. 6).²²

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 C₁ÁC₂ → C₁C₂Á (cf. type IIIc) there is metathesis (CÁ → ÁC) or vowel reduction (*CACA having ə 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 kʷəsət scald it, kʷsətəs he /-əs/ scalded it with ex. 5 kʷəsínəs burn one's chest /-ínəs/, where the root vowel does not disappear but is reduced to schwa (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 kʷs-íkʷəs 75 singe a hide /-íkʷəs/ where in the same type of formation as kʷəsínəs the root vowel is "deleted", and on the other hand takʷetəŋ WL shine light on from a root *tew (Sq V̄tawʔ) bright, light in Sa found in stétəw, stéʔəw WL id., where the root vowel is reduced to schwa and not deleted as in kʷsətəs.²³ And Montler must adopt the *ACA alternative in underlying forms of bisyllabic roots and affixes such as //ʔitat// 22 sleep (ʔítat, ʔátat-), //-aşin// 87 mouth (-aşən, -şín).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 IIa, e.g. ts-at -- təs-t 122 break should be accounted for by starting from an underlying form //təʔsət//, itself the result of infixation of ʔ in //təsət//, from an underlying CəCə root, from which the non-Actual form tsət is derived by "a stress protraction rule mov[ing] the stress across a single obstruent onto the second syllable when it is followed by two consonants". In the Actual //təʔsət// "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 Lummi". The solution is said not to be viable for Saanich. Considering Montler's treatment of the real instances of Saanich ʔ and ə 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 -iŋč plant is said not to cause reduction of a root vowel, but cf. ʔas 20 four, s-ʔas-iŋč 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 IIa and Actuals of IIb, cf. p. 129 ex. 230 šəčəq-t → šəyq-t press down.

2) Type IIb2 overlaps with Ib: tīləm sing has the Actual (tə-)tīləm (p. 105 and 118). It also overlaps with IIa: nəč-əŋ 110 laugh has (nə-)nəy-əŋ (p. 110 and 31; ŋ corr.). The form nənəy-əŋ should be added as the ninth example announced on p.

117 for IIb2 (only eight are given). The author must have been perplexed here, as IIa nəyəŋ should have a vowelless root but IIb2 a root CVC.

3) The forms nəʔet, səʔet quoted in 20 are of type IIId, while Montler's néʔat from ne is Id. The material for roots ending in A(?) is not complete: Montler quotes in other contexts the Actuals ʔəkʷáʔ-sə 147 teaching you /-sə/ (WL ʔəkʷáʔt teach) and ʔəwáʔtəl 181 racing (-təl recipr., here glottalized for Actual) and these forms do not have -Vʔəʔ as do the examples in the chapter on the Actual. The claim made on p. 99 that in Diminutive reduplications like ex. 41 sqəxáʔaɪ little puppy (sqəxəʔ dog) the "infix ʔ" merges with a following ʔ whereas in the Actual it does not is therefore unfounded. In Montler's examples of the Actual, Vʔəʔ (VʔəR) occur only at morpheme borders (type Ic), and all the examples here have -eʔ or -iʔ; in the above cases with -aʔ there is the same "merger" as in the Diminutive, in other words, no extra ʔ (which is the real issue here, the following ə then being automatic). It is unlikely, however, that the character of the vowel makes a difference here, for there are exceptional cases where -ʔə- was recorded elsewhere, and there may well be an observational problem here, see 4).

4) Montler's examples of type IIb2 provide two instances (p. 118 exx. 188 and 195) where the Actual has an extra glottal stop before R: škʷam swim and xlem watch have the Actuals šəškʷam and xəxlem. 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 -VR change to -VʔəR, these two being the only available examples. But there are two similar cases on p. 64, not given as Actuals: besides nə-kʷim red and nə-qʷey grass green there are the forms kʷiməɪ yellowish orange and qʷeyəɪ bluish green. As the author says, they probably contain the suffix //-il// directional and have plausible literal meanings towards red/green. But they also look suspiciously like Actual forms *kʷiməl, *qʷeyəl meaning going towards red/green. In the WL qʷeyəl is indeed given in this form, while the other example has its m corrected to ɪ in kʷiməl pink, reddish (which in the Actual infix approach would mean that ʔ 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 ʔəʔ, ʔəR could well be hypercorrect forms produced when Actual counterparts of plain forms were elicited (note that there is no extra ʔ in the examples from other contexts).

30. 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 ʔəç-ɪnəstxʷ get him dressed, ex. 197 ʔəçənistəs she's getting him dressed the vowel of Vʔiç is said to be "carried rightward into the syllables of weak suffixes by main-

tenance of penultimate stress", and in fn. 13 on p. 139 Montler says: "I am assuming that examples 196 and 197 evidence metathesis with the apparently epenthetic schwas as yet unaccounted for". But on p. 166 ex. 20 ʔəçɪnəstxʷ is analyzed as //ʔiç-ɪnɪy-staxʷ-Ø// dress-relational-causative-(3 obj.) which for ʔəçənistəs implies //ʔiç-ɪnɪy-st-əs//, so that in ex. 197 on p. 119 the /i/ is that of relational -ɪnɪy- and not the stem vowel "carried rightward". On p. 173 the rules for the alternants of -ɪnɪy- are stated: /ŋ/ is dropped after a nasal, /i/ becomes /ə/ when unstressed and /y/ is dropped before a consonant; if all three conditions are met, only /ə/ remains. If one starts from underlying //ʔiçəɪnɪy-...//²⁶ then the two above forms are fully explained: in ʔəçɪnɪy-ə-stxʷ we have metathesis and -ɪnɪy- is reduced to /ə/; ʔəçəɪnɪy-st-əs the root is unstressed, and -ɪnɪy-, being stressed, is here /i/. That the ɪ in the form is that of ʔiçəɪn (and not that of -ɪnɪy-) is clear from the pair ʔiçəɪn eat, ʔəçəɪnɪy-st-əs 166 he fed it. No epenthetic schwas need to be assumed. The real difficulty in these cases is the stress: causative //-staxʷ//, which can drop its s after a cons. and loses its vowel when unstressed, can have an effect on the stress, e.g., in ʔənəxʷ WL to stop, ʔənəxʷtxʷ WL turn off (as radio), cf. also the examples quoted at the end of 24 above.

31 - 33 CONTROL

31. If glottal stop and schwa were Montler's Nemesis in the formal, generativist part of his work, then "control" plays the same role on the semantic side. But here the damage is much smaller as much of what is said can be simply ignored, without necessitating the solving of puzzles and reanalysis of the material.

The category of control in Saanich parallels that in Squamish (Kuipers 1969: 69f., 77f., 95f.); for both languages it is best to speak of a "non-control" vs. a "neutral" category. In both, the non-control forms have the transitivizer -nəxʷ (Sa stressed -nəxʷ), the neutral forms have trans. in -t. The noncontrol forms translate as "act accidentally", "manage to", "finally succeed in", Sq also "have acted", etc. As often happens in such cases, the neutral forms sometimes assume the complementary meaning, and this in turn leads to such neutral/non-control pairs as study/know, look at/see, Sq. also seize/hold. Montler, following Thompson (1979b), finds "(non-)control" everywhere: "This category cuts across the entire language" (161). As a result, the terms become either redundant or contradictory. Both cases can be illustrated with the very first function-element treated in the book, viz. the nominalizer s-. This is said to be "marked 'non-control'" (42) on the basis of the form s-ʔiçəɪn sən I'm getting eaten up (by insect pests). It suffices to say that the form here refers to the object, just like German das Essen, French le manger, Russian eda and American slang the eats. And on the same page the example s-kʷi-kʷi

sen 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 -ən, about which the author himself says: "There are a number of forms with /-ən/ for which neither control nor agency is evident" (178). Two examples are given: ǰáʔ-xʷəŋ thawing, melting and ǰčilən sink. But this list can be extended at will: ǰáilən 9 (be) cold, ǰəxən 9 sour, ǰéčən 9 go sour, ǰqən 121 drip, ǰéčən 191 dry up, to which any number of examples from WL can be added: hēsən sneeze, ǰáqʷən sweat, ʔət-átən 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 -(ə)t, these can refer to non-control events, e.g., qʷixʷət 196 miss (fail to hit),²⁸ mǎlǎqt WL forget (250 mǎlǎqt imperative), ǰxʷət 63 beat in contest, ǰǎlǎt WL win a contest (cf. games of chance like slahal).

33. In view of the above, the forms in -nanǎt 178 cannot be regarded as the non-control counterparts of middle -ən. Historically they are non-control reflexive forms (Kuipers 1967:136), and reflexives often have special semantic developments. The Sq forms in -numut 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 mǎkʷinǎnǎt sn I hurt myself unintentionally for Sooke). Curiously, Sa has borrowed the undoubtedly related form that yielded Sq -namʷut (Ibid.) in Sa words like niistǎnǎmǎt WL pretend to do st. lit. cause o.s. to be such, tsastǎnǎmǎt WL feel sorry for o.s., lit. cause o.s. to be poor.²⁹ On p. 192 ex. 18 should very probably read ʔǎwǎ kʷǎ ǰskʷən-nǎxʷstǎnǎmǎt 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 intentionally tore it accidentally but, as in ex. 22-4 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 (-sǎ-s me-he) would coincide with the 3-2 form (-s-ǎs thee-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 (*-umi'as vs. -c-as/-mǎ-as). 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, 93; 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 kʷǎn-ət is literally be one that looks at (the seagull), in 31 ǰǎʔ-ət-ǎs (there is something) which he is eating. The Obj.-Cent. forms whom/which I/you saw, ate can be guessed as they should have the suffixes -ən I, -ǎxʷ you, etc. (152). There is a morphophonemic difference between Sq and Sa in that the combination of -nǎxʷ non-control and -as (Sa -ǎs) is Sq -nǎxʷ-as but Sa -n-ǎs in the 3-3 finite form, which is identical to the Obj.-Cent. form whom he... (thus ǰǎʔ-ət-ǎs above as a finite form means he is eating it). A first desideratum here is a suffix-stressed paradigm (*tǎm-nǎxʷ-ǎs/*tǎm-nǎ-s ? There are other possibilities). On p. 157 only the exceptional root-stressed type kʷǎn-nǎxʷ (see 21 above) is given. The subordinate forms of kʷǎn- look, see would be as follows (note that trans. -t is dropped before -(ə)) [See top next page]. For 1. and 4. see above, for 2. and 3. see p. 154 exx. 36 and 37. Note the homonymy 1. kʷǎn-nǎxʷ and *6. kʷǎn-n-ǎxʷ. 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

1. kʰən-et /kʰən-nəxʷ ...him 4. kʰən-et-as /kʰən-n-as ...he...

2. kʰən-e-s /kʰən-n-áŋas ...me *5. kʰən-et-ən /kʰən-n-ən ...I...

3. kʰən-a-sa/kʰən-n-áŋə ...you *6. kʰən-et-əxʷ/kʰən-n-əxʷ ...you...

36. The transitivizer listed on p. 168 as */-əs/* should be corrected to *-es*, cf. the alternatives *nə́wes* 168 and *nə́wés* 159. On p. 148 Montler quotes *nə́wés* in subordinate forms which suggest that this element may not be a transitivizer: in *nə-s-ə́w nə́wés* my /nə-/ carrying it in, *s-ə́w nə́wés-ltə* 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 transitives having the subordinate subject suffixes combined with possessive prefixes (see comments on *hskʷənnəx* in 35). The Sa finite forms corresponding to the above are 159 *nə́wés sən* (1sg.-3), *nə́wés ltə* (1pl.-3). The corresponding 1-2 and 2-1 forms are suppletive: *nə́wninə sən* I put you

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 ?i? 192 is translated by everybody as "accompanying" ever since Thompson and Thompson 1971:262. There are two elements ?i, i?, 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: səlapu? tsə i? ʔétən? 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-əw yeʔ-s k'wəyək'w so he went fishing, where -s is glossed 3 possessive while in sent. 18 s-əw yéʔ s-k'wəyək'w is written and the second s- is glossed as the nominalizer.³¹ In sent. 37 q'w'ij-əs for him to get out of the canoe (WL q'w'ij) -əs is glossed as the transitivizer discussed in 36, but this is undoubtedly the 3rd pers. subordinate suffix, cf. sent. 49 ʔaal-əs for him to go aboard, where the correct gloss 3 subj. is given. There must be a error in either the form or the gloss of ləl-əs 50 (and) he went ashore, which cannot be 3rd poss. as this would be -s, not -əs. 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

38 - 40 CONCLUSION

38. Compared to theoretically sound grammars such as Nater's description of Bella Coola (1984; like Montler's, a doctoral thesis) the Outline is inconsistent, defective and full of irrelevancies.³² 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 Pāṇini (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 Montler 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. Montler 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

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 en 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. Dumézil for a number of years. When Dumézil'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 Dumézil, 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.³³

40. 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 fatuities and other modernisms such as the ubiquitous formula (Outline p. 27, quotation reproduced exactly):

"1.5.1. 1 → i / ___ ċ

" /1/ 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 high time for the universities to take appropriate measures, especially for the vanishing field of Salish, where it will soon be too late.³⁵

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 θt are replaced by $\$ \zeta$. -- A = full vowel, K = obstruent, R = resonant. References: simple numbers refer to pages of Outline, sometimes specified by ex(ample) or sent(ence) 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, Ld Lushutseed, M $\$$ Musqueam, PS Proto-Salish, Sa Saanich, Sg 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 Suttles (1960:3) "Straits is recognized as a single language by its speakers". The Thompsons (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 (1989: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 η is a typo for $\dot{\eta}$ (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 $C_1\text{-}$ reduplication and glottalization, and forms of this type are glossed as both Diminutive and Actual, e.g., $\dot{\text{š}}\text{əštə́nəsə́n}$ 60 wander around a little and $\dot{\text{š}}\text{əštə́n}$ on p. 100 ($\dot{\eta}$ corr.) be taking a little walk. C. $\text{stá}\dot{\text{l}}\text{əw}$ river must be corrected to $\text{stá}^{\text{h}}\text{ləw}$ and is not an Actual, and neither does $\text{státə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{əw}$ creek result from any "process", the word just has a plain and not a glottalized $\dot{\text{l}}$, as do the cognates Songish $\text{stá}^{\text{h}}\text{təlu}^{\text{h}}$ and Ld $\text{stú}^{\text{h}}\text{tə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{ək}^{\text{h}}$. D. It is totally unclear how a non-glottalic resonant could characterize a word as Diminutive. (As to point B above, Efrat 1969:92 gives a simplex $\dot{\text{š}}\text{tə́nəsə́n}$ go for a walk and WL a nonglottalized reduplication $\dot{\text{š}}\text{əštə́nəsə́n}$ wander around). -- Reduplications of ə /zero roots do not seem to be common in Sa. The word $\text{q}^{\text{h}}\text{əq}^{\text{h}}\text{ə}\dot{\text{l}}$ 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 -əla^{h} 175 in such words as $\text{px}^{\text{h}}\text{-əla}^{\text{h}}$ blow (of wind), $\text{wəs-əla}^{\text{h}}$ bark (of dog).

8) Here "stem" is used for $\text{px}^{\text{h}}\text{-}$, wəs- in fn. 7, which cannot be full words (V was to bark).

9) The same is true of $\dot{\text{R}}$ vs. R^{h} , e.g., $\text{ʔən}^{\text{h}}\text{é}$ 113 WL come but $//\text{ʔəne}/$ 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 $\dot{\text{š}}\text{əštə́nəsə́n}$ in fn. 6. In plural reduplications resonantal glottalization is maintained, cf. $\text{s-tə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{-tə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{nəx}^{\text{h}}$ 104 medicines and the pluralized Actual $\text{tə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{-tə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{əm}$ 105 they're singing (sg. plain form $\text{tə}\dot{\text{l}}\text{əm}$). However, $\dot{\text{l}}$ 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 $\dots\text{ʔK}^{\text{h}}$ vs. $\dots\text{ʔəK}^{\text{h}}$, cf. the parallel forms $\text{sé}^{\text{h}}\text{ət}$ 114 send sb. and $\text{le}^{\text{h}}\text{t}$ WL repair. This can cause problems in syntax, where the difference between the 3rd possessive and subordinate subject suffixes (-s , -əs) 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 qlíima^{h} 80 dirty, corrected to WL $\text{qəlíima}^{\text{h}}$.

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

15) Note the added complication here: the Sq cognate yəw-t to praise shows that both C_1 and C_2 reflect resonants here, but perhaps, unlike $\check{\text{č}}\text{əq}$ big, the root $\check{\text{čəw}}$ does not occur with reduplications involving C_1 (as does $\check{\text{čəy}}\text{əq}$ above, and $\check{\text{čəč}}\text{iqən}$ WL mink with a non-alternating $\check{\text{č}}$), so that besides $\check{\text{č}}\text{-č}$, $\check{\text{č}}\text{-y}$ there is $\check{\text{č}}\text{-?}$ (the same goes for k^{h}).

16) This word probably reflects the "recessive" transitive formation referring to sounds, flashes, etc. (Kuipers 1967:71). Other Sa examples are $\dot{\text{š}}\text{əpt}$ 20 whistle (Sq $\dot{\text{š}}\text{əpn}$ id. (corr. from $^{\text{h}}\text{whisper}$, see *ibid.* 324), $\text{haq}^{\text{h}}\text{t}$ WL gasp, lətət WL shake (from nervousness), which occurs in passive lətətən WL tremble, lətətən WL shiver (Actual), the voice status is uncertain in qətət WL shake (a rattle), cf. qətəx WL rattle.

17) WL has $\text{xá}\dot{\text{l}}\text{əq}^{\text{h}}$ headache.

18) In Sq zero-grade stems with trans. -t behave in the same way as the Sa ones: CK-át vs. CəR-t (Kuipers 1967:71-2).

19) If Montler had been consistent in his inconsistency with $\text{qé}^{\text{h}}\text{ni}^{\text{h}}$, $\text{ʔé}^{\text{h}}\text{lən}$ (see 25), 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 ʔáɫəi go aboard occurs, which corresponds to Sq ʔuy-uɪ id.; the form ʔəɪʔáɫəi 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]", whereupon the author continues "Now that these roots are out of consideration as having /ə/ in the underlying form..." The word "these" here refers to type IIIa 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 /ə/ 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 čəkʷ ~ čəw belongs in IIIa 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~w (if the data show any regularity here -- there is no regularity in the case kʷəs-ɪnəs vs. kʷs-ɪkʷəs). 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 cases in function of the stress, schwa being automatic in /Cʰ/, though there remain cases where its presence is unpredictable.

24) An alternant -ʃi- occurs before trans. -t in xʷməkʃiɪ 115 WL kiss, an alternant -ʃən in hačʃən WL finish eating (cf. end of fn. 14).

25) The last paper in which this reviewer ever studied the generative rules is Demers and Horn 1974. This treats certain common Sq stress types only; not covered and contradicting the rules is the trans. verb type CAC-n: ɬáɫ-n stop, lúp-n put away, čixʷ-n help out, etc., further reduplications like kʷáyʔkʷáy play hide and seek, kʷinkʷ(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 təkʷtúqʷ under A (təkʷtəqʷ is the Straits form), the word child is stawʔxʷɪ (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 *ʔiɬam everywhere, and this is the base for derivations such as

Sq ʔiɬam-s dress (caus.), Sh s-əɬm-ɪɬə baby blanket. Sa too has an underlying //ʔiɬən// in the rel.-caus. derivative. The Ld form čičab (Snyder) treats b as C₂. Montler's use of //ʔiɬ// 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 təs 243 sent. 11 get there (get corr.), ts-ət WL get close to; čte-ŋ 251 sent. 83 ask, čte-t-ən 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 mélaq-t sxʷ you forgot it. The Sq equivalent is the probably cognate may forget, máy-nəxʷ id., trans. non-contr., of which no t-form occurs. As it is unlikely that the Squamish and the Saanich 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 Lillooet xik-ən 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 ... and back we are with Lillooet xik-ən. Van Eijk's suggestion misses the point of the Salish noncontrol category so widely that it is a good reductio ad absurdum of the current Salishist control-mania, and ought to mark the end of it.

29) Another example, but with a different stress, is sčáʔəwstəhət WL sb. always volunteering, possibly containing čey 96 WL work (á and w unexplained).

30) Because of the above forms in -ŋiŋə(s), in the table of object-suffixes on p. 149 the alternants 1sg. -ŋəs, 2nd -ŋə should be added. In qʷəlŋət the suffix -ŋiy- is followed by -t, just like indirective -si- (158), and they go back to *-min-t-, *-xi-t-. But whereas -si-t takes the same object suffixes as -t, the forms with -ŋiy- take -ŋə(s), reminiscent of the non-control and caus. trans. forms with -aŋə(s)

31) Sent. 16 $k^w\acute{a}w\acute{y}k^w$ is glossed as the Actual form of $k^w\acute{a}w\acute{y}k^w$ 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 25 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 $k^w\acute{e}s\acute{e}t$ scald it! ~ $k^w\acute{e}s\acute{e}t\acute{s}$ he scalded it. The imperative is without 3 subj. - $\acute{s}$, 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 $\acute{x}i\acute{c}i$ ~ $\acute{x}i\acute{c}$ scratch. Raffo (1972:143) gives of the same pair the opposite interpretation ($\acute{x}i\acute{c}i$ is the Actual of plain $\acute{x}i\acute{c}$). WL has $\acute{x}i\acute{c}e\acute{t}$ scratch. In Montler's example on p. 96 translated in fn. 28 above $q^w\acute{e}x^w\acute{i}-t-\acute{s}$ he kept missing it is not glossed as Actual but is translated as such, and the parallel form $t\acute{e}m-t-\acute{s}$ he kept trying to hit it is an Actual and glossed as such. This would suggest that there is a plain ~ Actual pair $q^w\acute{i}x^w\acute{e}t$ ~ $*q^w\acute{e}x^w\acute{i}t$. 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 $\acute{e}$ 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 (1980:xii). Like others, he will by now have joined the Greens, a common but remarkable color shift, considering their former friends' appalling lack of concern for the environment. Yet now there is some hope that one day linguists will perhaps be as concerned about dying-out languages as people are about the spotted owl today.

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 IIa, where one or two examples and maybe 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. Huffmann 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".

References

- Carlson, B.F., P. Flett. 1989. Spokane dictionary. UMOPL 6. Missoula.
- Demers, R.A., G.M. Horn. 1974. Stress in Squamish. 9th ICSL:196-208. Vancouver.
- Efrat, B.S. 1969. A grammar of non-particles in Sooke. Ph.D. diss. U. of Pennsylvania.
- Eijk, J. van. 1990. Intransitivity, transitivity and control in Lillooet Salish. Unity in Diversity (Pinkster, Genée eds.):47-64. Dordrecht.
- Jelinek, E. 1990. Quantification in Straits Salish. 25th ICSNL:177-195. Vancouver.
- Kirtchuk, P. 1990. Compte rendu no. 140. BSL 85, 2:380-93.
- Kuipers, A.H. 1967, 1969. The Squamish Language. I-II. The Hague.
- , 1968. The categories verb-noun and transitive-intransitive in English and Squamish. Lingua 21:610-26.
- , 1970, 1982. Towards a Salish etymological dictionary. Lingua 26:46-72, Id. 57:71-92.
- , 1974. The Shuswap language. The Hague.
- , 1989. A report on Shuswap. Paris.
- Mitchell, M.R. 1968. A dictionary of Songish. MA thesis U. of Victoria.
- Nater, H.F. 1984. The Bella Coola language. Nat. Mus. of Canada, Mercury Ser. 92. Ottawa.
- Pidgeon, M.W. 1970. Lexical suffixes in Saanich. MA thesis U. of Victoria.
- Raffo, Y. 1970. Songish aspectual system. 5th ICSL 1-8. Spokane.
- , 1972. A phonology and morphology of Songish. Ph.D. thesis U. of Kansas.
- Suttles, W. 1965. Multiple phonologic correspondences in two adjacent Salish languages and their implications. Ms.
- Thompson, L.C. 1979. The control system: a major category in the grammar of Salishan languages. B.C. Prov. Mus. Heritage Record no. 4 (Efrat ed.) Victoria.
- , M.T. Thompson. 1971. Clallam: a preview. UCLA Publ. in Linguistics 65:251-94.
- , B.S. Efrat. 1974. Some phonological developments in Straits Salish. IJAL 40:182-96.
- Vogt, H. 1940a. The Kalispel language. Oslo.
- , 1940b. Salishan studies. Oslo.
- Newmeyer, F. 1980. Linguistic theory in America. New York.