Lillooet between Sechelt and Shuswap

Jan P. van Eijk
First Nations University of Canada

Although most details of the grammatical and lexical structure of Lillooet put this language firmly within the Interior branch of the Salish language family, Lillooet also shares some features with the Coast or Central branch. In this paper we describe some of the similarities between Lillooet and one of its closest Interior relatives, viz., Shuswap, and we also note some similarities between Lillooet and Sechelt, one of Lillooet's western neighbours but belonging to the Coast branch. Particular attention is paid to some obvious loans between Lillooet and Sechelt.

1   Introduction

Lillooet belongs with Shuswap to the Interior branch of the Salish language family, while Sechelt belongs to the Coast or Central branch. In what follows we describe the similarities and differences between Lillooet and both Shuswap and Sechelt, under the following headings: Phonology (section 2), Morphology (3), Lexicon (4), and Lillooet-Sechelt borrowings (5). Conclusions are given in 6. I omit a comparison between the syntactic patterns of these three languages, since my information on Sechelt syntax is limited to a brief text (Timmers 1974), and Beaumont 1985 is currently unavailable to me. Although borrowings between Lillooet and Shuswap have obviously taken place, many of these will be impossible to trace due to the close over-all resemblance between these two languages.

Shuswap data are mainly drawn from the western dialects, as described in Kuipers 1974 and 1975. (For a description of the eastern dialects I refer to Kuipers 1989.) Lillooet data are from Van Eijk 1997, while Sechelt data are from Timmers 1973, 1974, 1977.

2   Phonology

The core contingent of Salish phonemes can be tabulated as follows:[1]

---

[1] My chart is not meant to represent the Proto-Salish (PS) system, although all the phonemes given here were in all likelihood part of the PS system (*pace* Thompson's 1979 suggestion that labials may have been absent from the system). For a recent reconstruction of the PS system and its developments see Kuipers 2002, which builds on Kuipers 1970 and 1981. See also notes 3 and 4 in this respect.

(1) Consonants

p	t	c			k	q	kʷ	qʷ	
p'	t'	c'	ƛ'		k'	q'	k'ʷ	q'ʷ	ʔ
		s		ɬ	x	x̌	xʷ	x̌ʷ	h
m	n		l	y			w		
m'	n'		l'	y'			w'		

(2) Vowels

i		u
	ə	
	a	

Lillooet and Shuswap have made the following major changes to this stock:

(1) t' and ƛ' have merged into one phoneme, ƛ' in Lillooet, t' in Shuswap.[2] Compare Sechelt ƛ'álat 'to hold in one's hands' with Lillooet ƛ'ál-an 'to stop smt.' and Shuswap ʔəs-t'il 'stop, quiet,' and Sechelt t'əkʷ 'to burst (as boil)' with Lillooet ƛ'əkʷ-p 'to explode' and Shuswap t'k'ʷupt 'to burst (as egg).'

(2) The phonemes ɣ ɣ', ʕ ʕ', and ʕʷ ʕ'ʷ have been added, filling in the resonant gaps in the unrounded velar, unrounded uvular, and rounded uvular series respectively.[3]

(3) A series of retracted (velarized and tensed) phonemes has been added, parallelling existing phonemes: Lillooet has c̣ ṣ ḷ ḷ' ạ ị ụ ə̣, while Shuswap has ạ ụ ə̣ (written a o ʌ respectively in Kuipers 1974, while non-retracted a is written e).[4]

In addition, we find the following major changes:

(4) Sechelt has shifted k k' x to č č' š. Compare Sechelt čàɬás 'three' and -šn 'leg, foot' with Lillooet kaɬás and -xən, and with Shuswap kəɬés and -xen' (-xen).

(5) Lillooet has shifted y y' to z z'. Compare Sechelt yúmač 'spring salmon' with Lillooet zúmak, and Lillooet x̌zum 'big' with Shuswap x̌yum.

---

[2] Shuswap t' "is pronounced as a lateral affricate [ƛ'] or as a dental stop [t'], the former pronunciation being the more common one" (Kuipers 1974:21). See also note 10 concerning the relation between t and t'.

[3] Shuswap ʕ' is pronounced [ʔ], phonetically indistinguishable from ʔ (Kuipers 1974:20,21,33). Kuipers 2002 classes ɣ ɣ' ʕ ʕ' ʕʷ ʕ'ʷ as part of the PS system, in which case we have their deletion or merger with other phonemes in Sechelt, as described by Kuipers.

[4] Kuipers 2002 classes retracted ạ ị ụ ə̣ (but not c̣ ṣ ḷ ḷ') as part of the PS system. Within this analysis, the retracted vowels are deleted (or merged with their non-retracted counterparts) in Sechelt, while the retracted consonants are added in Lillooet.

In the case of shifts, i.e., in (1), (4) and (5) we find the unshifted phonemes as phonological residue, i.e., in borrowings or as variants of the 'new' phonemes. Thus, Lillooet has t̓ in t̓áqaʔ 'salal berry,' a borrowing from Halkomelem, Squamish or Sechelt, and it has y y̓ in yúnhana 'Carrier Indian,' yaxt 'long' ("baby talk" form of zaxt) and sáy̓səz̓ 'to play' (reduplicated form of √saz̓, with y̓ the expected form of z̓ before coronal s). Sechelt has k in skáškaš 'bluejay,' and k̓ in s-k̓amƛ̓ 'beaver.' (The origin of skaškaš is presently unknown to me, although it may be a borrowed form of Kwakwala *kwéskwes*, see Grubb 1977. For s-k̓amƛ̓ see Kuipers 2002:140.)

(6) A type of Grassmann's law deglottalizes a glottalized plosive or affricate in Shuswap if it is followed by another glottalized obstruent in the same root. Lillooet and Sechelt have no such restriction. For example, Sechelt has sk̓ik̓ák̓ 'crow,' and Lillooet has s-q̓áq̓paʔ 'sand,' the cognate of which in Shuswap is s-qéq̓pe. For the effects of deglottalization on reduplicative patterns in Shuswap see item (4) in section 3 below.

(7) Shuswap reduces unstressed i u (and often e as well) to schwa or deletes them, while Lillooet and Sechelt generally keep unstressed vowels unchanged. Hence we have Shuswap cases like x̌yum 'big' > x̌ym-étkʷe 'sea, ocean' (-etkʷe 'water') or piqʷ 'to look' > pəqʷ-él̓txʷ 'to look through or at a book' (-el̓txʷ 'sheet-like object'). Compare these cases with Sechelt ʔítut 'to sleep' > ʔitut-ám 'sleepy,' and Lillooet ʔúxʷalmixʷ 'Indian' > ʔuxʷalmixʷ-áz̓-am 'to pretend to be Indian.'

(8) Lillooet and Sechelt, but not Shuswap, allow schwa to occur as a stressed vowel, as in Sechelt q̓ʷ́ʷəl 'cooked, done, ripe' (q̓ʷ́ʷəl, s-q̓ʷ́ʷəl in Lillooet, but q̓ʷ́ʷel-t in Shuswap).

Thus, there are four phonological isoglosses (##1-4) which separate Lillooet and Shuswap from Sechelt, while there is one (#5) which sets Lillooet apart from Sechelt and Shuswap, and three (##6-8) which set Shuswap apart from Lillooet and Sechelt.[5] The first five isoglosses are the most significant ones, since they deal with the loss, addition or shift of phonemes, rather than with their redistribution, as in the last three isoglosses. In other words, the overwhelming body of phonological evidence (four of the five most significant isoglosses) unites Lillooet and Shuswap against Sechelt.

3   Morphology

The morphology of Salish languages is fairly constant throughout the family and does not show the same variety as, for example, Indo-European, which ranges from almost isolating, as in English, to strongly fusional, as in

---

[5] The isoglosses given are not exclusive to the three langues discussed here. For example, the merger of ƛ̓ and t̓ (#1) encompasses Thompson and Coeur d'Alene as well. For a catalogue of the major shifts and the languages they encompass see Kuipers 2002:3-9.

Russian or Latin. Throughout the Salish family we find rich patterns of affixation (mainly suffixation but some vigorous prefixation also) and of reduplication. A number of languages allow infixation as well. There is a rich system of lexical suffixation, such as Shuswap -elʹtxʷ and -etkʷe (see section 2). Transitive inflections are generally laid out according to a stem-object-subject pattern, as in Lillooet núkʼʷʔan-c-as 'he (-as) helps (núkʼʷʔan) me (-c).' However, there are some differences as well. With regard to the languages in question we may recognize the following patterns:

(1) Shuswap stands alone among the Salish languages in making a distinction between the inclusive and exclusive first person plural. This then unites Lillooet and Sechelt (and all other Salish languages) against Shuswap. For details on the structure and use of this distinction in Shuswap see Kuipers 1974, 1989. The possible origins of this distinction are discussed in Van Eijk 2002.

(2) Sechelt and Lillooet, but not Shuswap, have preserved an old distinction between two sets of object markers for the first person singular and the second person singular. The different forms can be tabulated as follows:

	Sechelt		Lillooet	
	(a)	(b)	(a)	(b)
1s obj.	-c	-umš	-c	-tumx
2s obj.	-ci	-umi	-ci	-tumi

For the the correspondence between š and x in -umš and -tumx see (4) in section 1. The t in the Lillooet (b) forms was originally part of the transitivizing complex, but has been reanalyzed as part of the object suffix. The distribution between the two sets in each language depends on the preceding transitivizer (of which both languages have several types), although the details differ. Examples of the use of these object suffixes are: Sechelt qanam-ít-c-č-xʷ 'you (-c-xʷ) listen (qanam) to me' (-it transitivizer) vs. qanam-n-úmš-č-xʷ 'you overhear me,' qanam-ít-ci-č-n 'I (-č-n) listen to you' vs. qanam-n-úmi-č-n 'I overhear you;' Lillooet cún-c-kaxʷ 'you tell me' vs. xʷitən-s-túmx-kaxʷ 'you whistle at me,' cún-ci-ɬkan 'I tell you' vs. xʷitən-s-túmi-ɬkan 'I whistle at you.'[6]

(3) Although Salish generally expresses pronominal subject and object relations through a verb-object-subject construction (see the examples in the preceding paragraph), Sechelt differs from both Lillooet and Shuswap in that in Sechelt the relationship "third person subject (singular or plural) – second person object (singular or plural)" is not expressed through this type of construction. We have passive forms instead, as in qanam-ít-ci-m (1) 'he listens to you'/'they listen to you,' (2) 'you are listened to,' qanam-it-ci-m-élap (1) 'he listens to you folks'/'they listen to you folks,' (2) 'you folks are

---

[6] For the historical background of pronominal subject and object marking in Salish see Davis 2000 and Newman 1979-1980.

listened to' (-m passive marker).[7] Compare these cases with Lillooet cún-cih-as 'he tells you' (cun-cih-ás-wit 'they tell you') vs. cún-ci-m 'you are told,' cun-tamáľap- as 'he tells you folks' (cun-tamaľap-ás-wit 'they tell you folks') vs. cun-tam-ɫkáľap 'you folks are told.'[8]

(4) The morphology of Salish employs a number of reduplicative patterns, serving a variety of semantic functions. One of these is a diminutive type, which in numerals indicates reference to animals (and occasionally people). In Sechelt, diminutive reduplication is the repetition of the first CV of the root (i.e., excluding prefixes). The vowel of the root itself is dropped in a number of cases, as in húpit 'deer' > hú-hpit 'fawn,' cílačis 'five' > cí-clačis 'five small animals,' or in pi-pq-aɫ-čayáš 'weasel' (no simplex given, but cf. pəq-ím 'white'). Sechelt also allows double diminutive reduplications, as in nát 'night' > ná-nat 'evening' > ná-na-nat 'dusk,' s-túmiš 'man' > s-tu-tu-tmíš 'little boy,' s-ɫánay 'woman' > s-ɫa-ɫa-ɫnáy 'little girl' (note the stress-shift in these last two sets).

Diminutive reduplication in Shuswap and Lillooet repeats the consonant before the stressed vowel and places the copy of this consonant after the stressed vowel, as in Lillooet twit 'good hunter' > twiwʼt 'boy,' pála? + -aqa? 'spike' > palʔ-á?qa? 'one year old buck' (with a regular shift of the stress to the suffix), s-pzu? 'wild animal' > s-pzúza? 'bird.'[9] Where the targeted consonant is the first one in a word, this reduplication resembles the Sechelt type, as in Lillooet pála? 'one' > pápla? 'one person.' In Lillooet the stressed vowel is often changed to schwa, as in pépla? 'one animal,' or naxʷít 'snake' > naxʷə́xʷt 'worm,' while a schwa is changed to i, as in sə́q-ən 'to chop up wood' > sísq-ənʼ 'to chop wood into smaller pieces.' We have a case of double reduplication in, for example, twiwʼt 'boy' > twə́wwʼət 'little boy.'

---

[7] The passive marker takes the slot of the subject marker and is therefore interpreted as an indefinite agent in the descriptions of some Salish languages (for example, Thompson and Thompson 1992). For an interpretation of this pattern as a traditional passive see Newman 1985.

[8] The marking of the 3subject-2object relation through the second person passive is also found in Squamish (Kuipers 1967:89-90). In Lummi, where the object suffix for 2 singular is identical to that of 1 singular, both 3subject-2object and 3subject-1object are replaced with passive forms (for second and first person respectively), see Jelinek and Demers 1983. Kinkade 1984 (1989) has an insightful discussion of the bar on 3subject and 2object interaction in Upper Chehalis, with references to other Salish languages. Generally, this type of barring ties in with the concept of hierarchy, as discussed by Jelinek and Demers, and Kinkade.

[9] The dropping of the second a in pála? when this is combined with -aqa?, and the insertion of a in s-pzúza? are part of a regular morphophonemic pattern. In the same way, Lillooet regularly inserts schwa in non-permitted consonant clusters where these would arise from reduplication, as in s-qlawʼ 'beaver' > s-qlə́ləwʼ 'little beaver' (*lwʼ# is not allowed).

Shuswap examples are pésəɬkʷe 'lake' > pépsəɬkʷe 'little lake,' mus 'four' > mums 'four animals.' Some Shuswap dialects apply this reduplication to forms that are cross-referenced with the first person singular, as a sign of humility, as in x̌lexʷ 'tooth' > m-kɬep y̭-n-x̌lelxʷ 'my (n-) tooth came out,' citxʷ 'house' > y̭-n-cictxʷ 'my house' (y̭ article). Where the reduplicated consonant is a glottalized obstruent, Shuswap deglottalizes the first obstruent, as per the rule given in (6) of section 2 above: pʼusmn 'heart' > y̭-n-pupʼsmn 'my heart,' cqʼeɬp 'fir, tree' > cqeqʼɬp 'small tree.'[10]

The stress-based reduplication pattern that is found in Shuswap and Lillooet is also employed by Thompson, and it seems limited to these three among the world's languages.

(5) Lillooet and Shuswap employ the infixation of a glottal stop to signal a type of aspect that generally translates as an inchoative or ingressive in Lillooet, but as a stative in Shuswap. In Lillooet the glottal stop is inserted after the (stressed) vowel of the root, in Shuswap before the vowel. Examples are: Lillooet nuʔqʷ 'it is getting warm (atmosphere, weather)' (cf. nəqʷ-núqʷ 'warm,' with CVC-reduplication), Shuswap pʔey 'cooled off' (cf. pey-n-s 'he cools it off'). This type of infixation does not seem to occur in Sechelt.

(6) Like other Coast Salish languages, Sechelt makes a distinction between two genders, feminine and non-feminine, the former marked with the article ɬ̭, the latter with ṱ, as in the legend ɬ̭ʔasxʷ ʔi ṱs-kʷʷətúʔ 'Seal and Raven' (where the former is female, the latter male, see Timmers 1974). Lillooet and Shuswap do not make this distinction.

Thus, within this section we have two isoglosses (#1-2) that separate Shuswap from Lillooet and Sechelt, and four isoglosses (##3-6) that separate Sechelt from Lillooet and Shuswap. A further investigation of the morphologies of these languages will doubtless reveal more isoglosses, but on the basis of the evidence so far one can expect that most of the cuts will be between Lillooet and Shuswap on the one hand, and Sechelt on the other.

4 Lexicon

The distribution of lexical items throughout Salish follows a complex pattern, due to massive borrowings (both within the family and from non-Salish sources), and to lexical innovation (as a result of word taboo and other factors).[11] A comparison between the numerals from 'one' to 'ten' in Sechelt, Lillooet and Shuswap may demonstrate the complexity of the pattern:

---

[10] In diminutive reduplications, t̉ [λ̉/t̉] is deglottalized as t, e.g., t̉éne 'ear' > y̭-n-tét̉ne 'my ear.' For deglottalization in reduplicative formations see also s-qéqʼpe 'sand' (main text, section 2).

[11] For the effects of taboo on lexical change in Salish see Elmendorf 1951 and 1970.

	Sechelt	Lillooet	Shuswap
'one'	pála	pála?	nk'u?
'two'	ťmšín	?án'was	səséle
'three'	čàɫás	kaɫás	kəɫés
'four'	mús	x̌ʷ?úcin	mus
'five'	cílačis	cil-kst	cil-kst
'six'	ťəx̌-ém	ƛ'áq'-əm-kst	téq'-m-kst
'seven'	c'účis	cúɫ-aka?	cúcɫ-ke?
'eight'	tə?áčis	pál?-upst	nk'ʷ?u?-ps
'nine'	téwixʷ	q'əm'p-álmən	t-mɫ-nk'ʷúk'ʷ?e
'ten'	?úpan	q'əm'p	?úp-əkst

Only 'three' and 'five' (and possibly 'six') have etyma across the board. In the other cases we have Sechelt siding with Lillooet in 'one,' but with Shuswap in 'four' and 'ten.' Lillooet sides with Shuswap in 'seven,' while we have a three-way split in 'two.' The numeral 'eight' is derived from 'one' in both Lillooet and Shuswap, while 'nine' in Lillooet anticipates 'ten' (-almən 'almost'). In Shuswap, 'nine' contains mɫ-, an alternant of mus 'four,' plus a reduplicated form of nk'ʷu? 'one.'

Certain differences between the lexical stocks of the three languages can be expected, such as items that reflect the natural environment of the speakers. For example, the Sechelt terms for marine biology are largely absent from Lillooet and Shuswap, and where they occur (as in Lillooet ?asxʷ 'seal' or qʷn'is 'whale') they are obviously borrowed from Coast languages (cf. Sechelt ?asxʷ and qʷénis respectively, or Squamish ?asxʷ and qwanís). Items that are present in all three languages show an uneven distribution with regard to their signifiers. A quick glance at various lexical sources (Timmers 1977, Van Eijk 1987, Kuipers 1974, 1975) generally reveals a greater similarity between Lillooet and Shuswap than between either of these and Sechelt. However, as the following rather randomly chosen items show, we also have three-way splits, as in the terms for 'black bear' and 'grizzly' (where obviously word-taboo is a factor) and we have shared items between Sechelt and Lillooet, such as the word for 'lake.'

	Sechelt	Lillooet	Shuswap
'earth, land'	s-wéya	tmixʷ	tmixʷ
'lake'	cəl'áɫ	cal'áɫ	pésəɫkʷe
'house'	ƛ'éms-tan	citxʷ	citxʷ
'grizzly'	máyukʷ	s-ƛaɫáləm	s-km'xís
'black bear'	s-čétxʷn	míx̌aɫ	knkéknm
'deer'	húpit	c'í?	c'í?
'mountain goat'	sx̌ʷíƛ'ay	s-x̌ʷiƛ'áz'	s-x̌ʷəťéy

	Sechelt	Lillooet	Shuswap
'dog'	s-č'énu	s-qáx̌aʔ	s-qéx̌e
'beaver'	sk'amƛ'	s-qlaw'	s-qlew'
'fish'	š-čáliɬtn	s-c'úqʷaz'	s-wewɬ

Many of these items extend, of course, well beyond the boundaries of these three languages. For an excellent study of the wave-like distribution of the terms for 'deer' and 'lake' in the Central Coast Salish area (but with implications beyond) I refer to Hess 1979. The Lillooet term for 'black bear' (míx̌aɬ) is shared with Squamish, Sliammon, Comox and Columbian, but does not seem to occur elsewhere.[12] An excellent source of information on this item, and many others in the above list, is Kuipers 2002.

Van Eijk et al. 1974 lists 36 lexical parallels that are essentially limited to Lillooet and Sechelt, although some occur in Bella Coola and Comox as well. As Kuipers (the main author of the article, although not listed as the first) observes, this points at a shared Sechelt-Lillooet dialect area, better explainable within a wave-model than within a tree-model. Of these parallel items, four are obvious borrowings (and all from Lillooet into Sechelt).

In spite of the complicated distribution of lexical items through Salish territory, the majority of recorded lexical items unite Lillooet and Shuswap with Sechelt, reinforcing the status of these languages as more closely related to each other than to Sechelt.

5   Lillooet-Sechelt Borrowings

A complicating factor in historical-comparative research is the massive borrowing that tends to occur between contiguous languages, especially over a long period of time, and especially when relations between the speakers of both languages are friendly, as they traditionally have been between the Lillooet and the Sechelt (see Teit 1906:200 in this respect). Bloomfield (1933:318-319, re Greek *kannabis* and English *hemp*) provides a cautionary tale about the perils of relying on items that seem to prove relationship but ultimately go back to borrowing. Where older written records are lacking, separating common origin from borrowing becomes even more difficult (Bloomfield at least could fall back on Herodotus). However, unusual phonology is a dead give-away that a word has been borrowed, especially when this is coupled with the fact that the item in question can only naturally occur in the environment of one language (which then is the donor). We have already seen one such case, viz., Lillooet t'áqaʔ 'salal berry,' with a t' that is unusual within Lillooet phonology, and a lexical item referring to a berry that does not naturally occur in the Lillooet bioclimatological zone and was mainly obtained by trading (see Turner 1978:208). On the other hand, Lillooet s-x̌ʷús-um 'soapberry' was borrowed

---

[12] Similarly, the Lillooet term for 'four' (x̌ʷʔúcin) has cognates in Squamish and Halkomelem, but not elsewhere.

into Sechelt as s-x̌ʷuš-um. According to Turner 1978:133, this berry does not grow in humid Coastal forests, which cover a good portion of the Sechelt homeland. There is nothing peculiar about the phonology of the Sechelt term, except that on the basis of Salish historical phonology we would have expected the root of the Sechelt form to have been x̌ʷus, not x̌ʷuš, Sechelt s being the etymological equivalent of Lillooet s. The fact that Sechelt has š here is due to the fact that Lillooet s is phonetically [š], and this sound is available in Sechelt, although it goes back to Proto-Salish x (see section 1).

As is mentioned in section 4, Van Eijk et al. 1974 list four obvious borrowings from Lillooet into Sechelt. These are Lillooet p'ústən' 'rye-grass' – Sechelt p'úštn 'grass used for decorating baskets' (obviously rye-grass—JvE), Lillooet cwás-əm 'to bet' – Sechelt číš?m 'to gamble,' Lillooet s-wac 'excrement' – Sechelt wáč *id*., Lillooet s-kíy?amx 'porcupine' – Sechelt skéy'amx *id*.[13] To these we can add the word for 'soapberry' discussed in the preceding paragraph. The donor in these cases was the southern dialect of Lillooet (variously listed as the Lower, or Mount Currie, or Pemberton dialect), but the items borrowed into Sechelt occur in the northern (Fountain) dialect as well.

6   Conclusions

In this paper I have discussed a number of isoglosses that mark Sechelt, Lillooet and Shuswap off against each other. Most of these isoglosses unite Lillooet and Shuswap against Sechelt, and of these the phonological isoglosses (##1-4 in section 2) are the most convincing, as they affect a good portion of the vocabulary in each language and change the composition of the phonological systems, rather than merely rearranging the distribution of the individual phonemes. On the other hand, there are strong overlaps between Sechelt and Lillooet as well, and Kuipers (in Van Eijk et al. 1974) is entirely justified when he observes, with regard to Swadesh 1950, that "Lillooet and Sechelt are closer to each other than is suggested by Swadesh's results."

In most borrowings between Sechelt and Lillooet, it is apparently Lillooet that is the donor. This is partly due to the fact that the Lillooet live in a

---

[13] Transcriptions in the original source are corrected here on the basis of later sources on these languages. The fact that the term for 'porcupine' was borrowed from Lillooet into Sechelt is supported by the fact that the porcupine is widely distributed in "The forested areas in all parts of the Province, but infrequent in coast forest" (Cowan and Cuiguet n.d.:246). Of course, the presence of x in the Sechelt item also marks it as a borrowing. In the same way, the presence of č and š in the Sechelt forms for 'rye-grass,' 'to gamble' and 'excrement,' where Lillooet has c and s, is explainable on the basis of the fact that Lillooet c is [č], and s is [š]. The Lillooet form p'ústən' is listed as 'decoration on basket' in the original source, but basket decorations is what rye-grass is used for.

bioclimatological zone that produces some trade items that the Sechelt lack, viz., rye-grass and soapberries. (Rye-grass is limited to the dry Interior of British Columbia [Turner 1979:138]. On pp. 141-142, Turner comments on two subspecies of rye-grass as a trade item between the Lillooet [and Thompson], and their Coastal neighbours, including the Sechelt.)

There was also widespread Sechelt-Lillooet bilingualism among the Sechelt, but not among the Lillooet, due to prevailing marriage and settlement patterns. Or, to quote Teit 1906:200:

> The Pemberton band intermarried so much with the Squamish of Howe Sound, and with the Sechelt of Jervis Inlet, that there were very few families who did not have relatives among these tribes. It is said that in former days many families of both these tribes spoke the Lillooet language among themselves. The Pemberton men and women who married members of these tribes settled among them; but no Coast men, and very few Coast women, settled among the Lillooet.

Of course, the borrowing that unites Sechelt and Lillooet postdates the separation between these languages, and should be kept separate from lexical (and other) similarities that hint at an ancient Sprachbund between these languages. Of particular interest in this respect is an item like 'spring salmon' (zúmak in Lillooet, yúmač in Sechelt) which is limited to these two languages and a few others (see Kuipers 2002:230 for details). If this item was borrowed from one language into the other, the borrowing must be of great antiquity, due to the fact that two sound changes are involved here: z > y in Lillooet, and k > č in Sechelt. It is more likely that it is a hold-over from a time when these two languages shared this item with each other and only a few other languages.

References

Beaumont, Ronald C. 1985. *She Shashishalhem, the Sechelt Language: Language, Stories and Sayings of the Sechelt Indian People of British Columbia*. Penticton, B.C.: Theytus Books.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. London: George Allan & Unwin.

Cowan, Ian McT., and Charles J. Cuiguet. N.d. *The Mammals of British Columbia*. British Columbia Provincial Museum Handbook, no. 11. Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum.

Davis, Henry. 2000. 'Remarks on Proto-Salish Subject Inflection.' *IJAL* 66:499-520.

Elmendorf, William W. 1951. 'Word Taboo and Lexical Change in Coast Salish.' *IJAL* 17:205-208

———. 1970. 'Word Taboo and Change Rates: Tests of a Hypothesis.' Pp. 74-85 of Earl H. Swanson Jr. (ed.), *Languages and Cultures of Western*

North America: Essays in Honor of Sven S. Liljeblad. Pocatello: Idaho State University Press.

Grubb, David McC. 1977. *A Practical Writing System and Short Dictionary of Kwakw'ala (Kwakiutl).* Ottawa: National Museum of Man Mercury Series, Canadian Ethnology Service Paper, no. 34.

Hess, Thom. 1979. 'Coast Salish Words for *Deer*: Their Wave-Like Distribution.' *IJAL* 45:5-16.

Jelinek, Eloise, and Richard A. Demers. 1983. 'The Agent Hierarchy and Voice in Some Coast Salish Languages.' *IJAL* 49:167-185.

Kinkade, M. Dale. 1984. 'Some Agent Hierarchies in Upper Chehalis.' Working Papers of the *Linguistics Circle of the University of Victoria,* vol. 4, no. 2:236-240 (preprints to the 19th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages). Republished in 1989 as pp. 213-218 of Mary Ritchie Key and Henry M. Hoenigswald (eds.), *General and American Ethnolinguistics: In Remembrance of Stanley Newman.* (Contributions to the Sociology of Language 55.) Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. *The Squamish Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary.* The Hague: Mouton.

——. 1970. 'Towards a Salish Etymological Dictionary.' *Lingua* 26:46-72.

——. 1974. *The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary.* The Hague: Mouton.

——. 1975. *A Classified English-Shuswap Word-List.* Lisse, The Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press.

——. 1981. 'On Reconstructing the Proto-Salish Sound System.' *IJAL* 47:323-335.

——. 1989. *A Report on Shuswap, with a Squamish Lexical Appendix.* Paris: Peeters/SELAF.

——. 2002. *Salish Etymological Dictionary.* University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 16.

Newman, Stanley. 1979a. 'A History of the Salish Possessive and Subject Forms.' *IJAL* 45:207-223.

——. 1979b. 'The Salish Object Forms.' *IJAL* 45:299-308.

——. 1980. 'Functional Changes in the Salish Pronominal System.' *IJAL* 46:155-167.

——. 1985. 'Reinterpreting the Data: The Salish Passive.' *IJAL* 51:521-523.

Swadesh, Morris. 1950. 'Salish Internal Relationships.' *IJAL* 16:157-167.

Teit, James A. 1906. *The Lillooet Indians.* The Jesup North Pacific Expedition, Vol II, Part V. Leiden, The Netherlands: Brill.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. 'Salishan and the Northwest.' Pp. 692-765 of Lyle Campbell and Marianne Mithun (eds.), *The Languages of Native America: Historical and Comparative Assessment.* Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson. 1992. *The Thompson Language.* University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 8.

Timmers, Jan A. 1973. 'Sechelt Verb Forms.' Pp. 6-7 of 'Contributions to the Study of the Salish Verb' (co-authored with Aert H. Kuipers, Jan P. van Eijk, and Henk F. Nater), in *Dutch Contributions to the 8th International Conference on Salish Languages*. Leiden: University of Leiden Printing Office.

——. 1974. 'A Sechelt Text.' In *Dutch Contributions to the 9th International Conference on Salish Languages*. Leiden: University of Leiden Printing Office.

——. 1977. *A Classified English-Sechelt Word-List*. Lisse, The Netherlands: Peter de Ridder Press.

Turner, Nancy J. 1978. *Food Plants of British Columbia Peoples, Part 1/Coastal Peoples*. British Columbia Provincial Museum Handbook, no. 34. Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum.

——. 1979. *Plants in British Columbia Indian Technology*. British Columbia Provincial Museum Handbook, no. 38. Victoria: British Columbia Provincial Museum.

Van Eijk, Jan P. 1987. 'Dictionary of the Lillooet Language.' MS.

——. 1997. *The Lillooet Language: Phonology, Morphology, Syntax*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

——. 2002. 'On the Origin of the Inclusive vs. Exclusive in Shuswap.' *University of British Columbia Working Papers in Linguistics*, no. 10:137-153 (Proceedings of WSCLA VII).

Van Eijk, Jan P., Aert H. Kuipers, Henk F. Nater, and Jan Timmers. 1974. 'Lillooet-Sechelt Lexical Parallels.' In *Dutch Contributions to the 9th International Conference on Salish Languages*. Leiden: University of Leiden Printing Office.

Jan P. van Eijk
Department of Indian Languages, Literatures and Linguistics
First Nations University of Canada
1 First Nations Way
Regina, SK
S4S 7K2
CANADA

jvaneijk@sifc.edu