

## Languages and Dialects in Straits Salishan

Timothy Montler

University of North Texas

**0. Introduction.** Straits Salishan is a group of languages and dialects spoken in Washington, Vancouver Island, and the small islands around the Juan de Fuca, Haro, and Rosario Straits north and west of Puget Sound. It is a subgroup of the Central Coast Salishan language family bounded to the south, east, and north by other Salishan languages, Quinault, Twana, Lushootseed, Nooksack, and Halkomelem, and to the west by the non-Salishan Nitinaht, Makah, and Quilleute. Straits Salishan is composed of two languages: Klallam and Northern Straits. Each of these languages has dialect variation.

Klallam is spoken on the north shore of the Olympic Peninsula in Washington and across the Juan de Fuca Strait at Becher Bay on Vancouver Island. Northern Straits is a group of mutually intelligible dialects spoken on southern Vancouver Island and across the islands of the Haro and Rosario Straits to the Washington mainland near Bellingham. Although Northern Straits people recognize their linguistic similarity, they have traditionally identified themselves with one of five smaller ethnolinguistic/ethnogeographic groups: Sooke, Songish (also called Lkungen and names with various similar spellings in the literature), Saanich, Lummi, and Samish. A sixth, Semiahmoo, to the north of the Lummi area, was not documented before its disappearance.

The following outlines the major groups and dialects:

(1)

### I. Klallam (Kl)

- A. Western (WKl)
  - 1. Pysht, Clallam Bay
  - 2. Elwha
- B. Eastern (EKl)
  - 1. Jamestown
  - 2. Little Boston
- C. Becher Bay

### II. Northern Straits (NST)

- A. Sooke (So)
- B. Songish (Sg)
- C. Saanich (Sa)
  - 1. West Saanich (WSa)
  - 2. East Saanich (ESa)
- D. Lummi (Lm)
- E. Samish (Sm<sub>VU</sub>, Sm<sub>LD</sub>, Sm<sub>TB</sub>, Sm<sub>?</sub>)
- F. Semiahmoo

In the literature documenting Straits Salishan language and culture there has been some disagreement and confusing inconsistency in what the term 'Straits Salish' refers to and in which are languages and which dialects. What I hope to do here is 1) to clear up some of this confusion and show how Klallam and Northern Straits are alike and how different; 2) show that, although the Northern Straits dialects are all mutually intelligible, there is lexical, phonological, and morphological variety among and even within them so that descriptive statements about one may



refer to a linguistic unity, but only to the linguistic unity of those early villages and of what we call today Songish, not to all of Straits Salishan. It seems that Hill-Tout misunderstood this term as the Songish word referring to the linguistic unity of all of Straits Salishan. He came to this conclusion, no doubt, because of its phonetic similarity to Northern Straits *laq'əmfn'əy* and Halkomelem *halq'əméynəm* which refer to the linguistic unity of the Halkomelem dialect continuum.

It is clear that Hill-Tout's classification relied on anecdotal reports of language similarity and not first hand knowledge of the languages in question. His work shows knowledge of Songish structure, but he did not know Klallam at all. Hill-Tout shows his ignorance of Klallam by listing three villages at Becher Bay as Songish. The three village names are clearly Klallam words; the first, Nukstlaiyum, is obviously *nəx'əλ'dy'əm*, the Klallam word for 'Klallam'. The second, Tciánuk, is *čiyánnəx*, the Klallam plural of *čánnəx* 'salmon'. This was the name of one of the Klallam villages at Becher Bay and the current name for the Klallam Reserve at Becher Bay. The third, Teiwétsun, is *č'ix'icn*, the name of one of the largest of all the Klallam villages which was not at Becher Bay at all but across the Strait of Juan de Fuca. It is today the Klallam name for the city of Port Angeles, Washington.<sup>2</sup>

Boas and Haeberlin's (1927) landmark comparison of Salishan languages used Hill-Tout's data for the Straits group. They followed his classification and their work became the standard followed by Swadesh, Suttles, and others.

The term 'Straits' for this group was first used by Wayne Suttles in his 1951 dissertation on the culture of the peoples of the Haro and Rosario Straits, which is now the standard reference on this culture area. This work covers the Sooke, Songish, Saanich, Semiahmoo, Lummi, and Saanich in detail but barely touches on the Becher Bay Klallam. There is no discussion of the main body of the Klallam people on the south side of the Juan de Fuca Strait.

Suttles included Klallam as part of what he referred to as the 'Straits' language.<sup>3</sup> But although he clearly knew Northern Straits well and was the first to publish really accurate phonetic transcriptions of words from the Northern Straits dialects, he primarily focused on the culture of the peoples on the north side of the Juan de Fuca Strait.

Suttles exposure to Klallam language was that of the people of Becher Bay, whose Klallam dialect shows lexical and phonological influence from the Northern Straits dialects. Some of the transcribed cultural terms presented merely as 'Straits' are not even cognate with the Klallam terms. He knew enough Klallam to recognize Hill-Tout's mistake with the three village names, but his unfamiliarity with the main body of Klallam language is evident in that he did not recognize that the third was the name for the village at Port Angeles.

As for this third name, Suttles (17) comments that it is 'I believe, the name of the bay and possibly of a group who lived on it before the Klallam came.' The word *č'ix'icən* is clearly a Klallam word and has a transparent Klallam etymology. The root of the word is *č'əyəx* 'enter' and the suffix *-icən* 'back'. The whole refers to the position of the village at the base of (inside and behind from the point of view of the open strait) the spit at Port Angeles.

---

<sup>2</sup> Hill-Tout apparently did not make use of the work of Gibbs, Eells, and others who each identify *č'ix'icən* correctly. Gibbs lists this name as *Tai-whit'zen* with the correct gloss.

<sup>3</sup> Suttles (p. c.) has since come to the conclusion that Klallam and Northern Straits are not mutually intelligible and are indeed separate languages.

In the 1960's Laurence C. Thompson and M. Terry Thompson became the first to study the Klallam language in detail. They were also the first professional linguists to have direct experience with both Northern Straits, Lummi in this case, and Klallam. In Thompson and Thompson (1971) and in Thompson (1979) they state that Klallam is so divergent from the Northern Straits dialects as to constitute a separate language. For Thompson (1979) Straits is not a language but a subgroup of Central Coast Salishan comprised of two languages. In my work on Klallam in the 1970's and Northern Straits (Saanich) in the 1980's it also seemed clear to me that the two should be considered distinct languages, and I have declared this in print (Montler 1986:5).

These unsupported contradictory claims have led to such recent statements as that of Galloway (1990), who refers to the 'Straits language' as including Klallam, then two sentences later states that Northern Straits and Klallam comprise two separate languages. Jelinek and Demers (1994) use the term 'Straits Salish' in their title and throughout the paper, and much of what they say is relevant to all of the Straits group (and probably to neighboring Halkomelem and Lushootseed, as well), but much of the phonological and morphological detail is true only of Northern Straits and most of their data are strictly Lummi.

Suttles has also not been consistent in what he includes in Straits. In an article from 1960 (Suttles 1978:30) he excludes Klallam: 'The speakers of Straits are the Sooke, Songish, and Saanich of Vancouver Island and the Samish, Lummi, and Semiahmoo on the opposite mainland.' In another article from 1972 (Suttles 1987:103) he lists those dialects then continues: 'Clallam on the southern shore of the Strait of Juan de Fuca is either a divergent dialect of Straits or a closely related language.'

The problem is that, though the difference between Northern Straits and Klallam has been authoritatively asserted, it has nowhere been demonstrated. The Colville and Spokane Salishan languages of the interior, for example, have not been explicitly demonstrated to be distinct languages, but the distinction is never questioned. The distinct language status of Colville and Spokane need not be questioned or demonstrated because it does not suffer under the weight of the historical precedence and prominence of contrary declarations from the great pioneers like Boas and Suttles.

**2. On the degree of mutual intelligibility between Klallam and Northern Straits.** To test mutual intelligibility I have played clear tape recordings of Klallam narrative for Saanich speakers and tapes of Saanich and Samish for Klallam speakers. The reaction is typically first, "Oh, that's just like ours." But when asked to translate, they can only make out a word or phrase here and there.

One of my Saanich consultants is the former son-in-law of one of my Becher Bay Klallam consultants. For some time years ago the two men had lived and worked together. Each claims, from their experience of talking together, that Saanich and Klallam are mutually intelligible. But each, when played a recorded narrative in the other's language, was unable to provide a translation. Each commented something to the effect that if they could keep the tape and listen to it for a few days, they could figure it out for me.

This is how close the languages are. There are surely many common phrases that are nearly identical across all or most of the dialects. For example, *w'xčłt cn* 'I know it' and *?šwana nsxčłt* 'I don't know' are nearly the same across all dialects including Klallam. Connected text, however,

intended only for Saanich or Klallam ears with its full range of lexical, phonological, and grammatical differences magnifies the divergence enough to make them mutually unintelligible. On the other hand, Saanich speakers have no trouble translating even old, scratchy, Samish recordings.

Boas and Hill-Tout relied on the judgments of native speakers of Songish as to the degree of similarity among the Northern Straits dialects and Klallam. Such judgments are not reliable. The high degree of multilingualism, feelings of kinship, and other cultural factors account for the unreliability of native speakers judgments about what is and what is not the same language. My main Saanich speaking consultant insists that Cowichan, a dialect of Halkomelem, is closer to Saanich than Klallam is, but in any objective linguistic parameter aside from a few lexical items Saanich and Klallam are much more similar to each other than either is to Cowichan. Sally Thomason (p.c.) has observed a similar situation among her Flathead (Montana Salish) consultants. One of the native speakers she has been working with listed not only the expected Spokane as basically the same language but also Colville and even Nez Perce, which by any linguistic standard is a member of an entirely different language family.

**3. Lexical differences.** As a measure of lexical similarity, I have determined the percent cognate in Swadesh's 100 word list between each pair of dialects. Since the goal of using this word list is to indicate lexical similarity and difference and not glottochronology, I have counted as cognate those items that native speakers would recognize. Thus, for example, *st* 'we' in Klallam is probably historically related to *ha* 'we' in Saanich, but I did not count them as cognate. On the other hand, since one Klallam speaker<sup>4</sup> is aware of the *l/y/i* and *a/u* correspondences and can quickly figure out cognates differing in these sound,<sup>5</sup> I have counted such differences as the same. The results are shown in the following chart:

(2) Percent cognate in Swadesh 100 word list

	Kl	So	Sg	Sa	Lm	Sm <sub>VU</sub>	Sm <sub>LD</sub>	Sm <sub>TB</sub>
Kl	-	(87)	75	73	75	74	77	73
So	(87)	-	(92)	(92)	(84)	(90)	(89)	(86)
Sg	75	(92)	-	96	87	89	87	87
Sa	73	(92)	96	-	85	89	87	87
Lm	75	(84)	87	85	-	94	95	96
Sm <sub>VU</sub>	74	(90)	89	89	94	-	98	95
Sm <sub>LD</sub>	77	(89)	87	87	95	98	-	95
Sm <sub>TB</sub>	73	(86)	87	87	96	95	95	-

<sup>4</sup> This speaker is the one from Becher Bay mentioned in section 2, above. He probably should be considered bilingual in Klallam and Northern Straits.

<sup>5</sup> This speaker often makes comments such as 'It's *ld?* in Saanich? That would be *yu?* in Klallam.'

Sooke is the most underdocumented of the dialects. I've put Sooke percentages in parentheses because I could find only 63 of the 100 words in Sooke. So the Sooke numbers are probably unrealistically high.

Note that the Klallam percentages range in the 70's. This is certainly in the range of difference between two closely related languages. This difference is comparable to that between the two Interior Salishan languages, Colville and Spokane, which have 74% cognate.<sup>6</sup> The percent cognate among the other dialects range in the high 80's and 90's.<sup>7</sup>

**4. Phonological differences.** Phonologically the velar nasal is a very common sound and is distinctive of this group among the languages of southern British Columbia and northern Washington.<sup>8</sup> All dialects share *y* and the vowel *i* and the following consonants in cognates:

(3)	p	t	č		k <sup>w</sup>	q	q <sup>w</sup>	
	p'	t'	č'	χ'	k' <sup>w</sup>	q'	q' <sup>w</sup>	ʔ
		s	š	ʃ	x <sup>w</sup>	ɣ	ɣ <sup>w</sup>	h
	m	n	y		w			
	m'	n'	y'		w'			

with some variation in *ʔ*, *h*, the strength of the ejectives, and the presence or absence of laryngealization in the sonorants.

The phonetic differences are charted in the list of sound correspondences in (4). This chart differs from those given in Thompson, Thompson, and Efrat in that I am including rather narrow phonetic differences. Thompson, Thompson, and Efrat were interested in historical reconstruction. Here the intent is to display the dialect differences.

(4)	Differing Sound Correspondences								
	Kl	So	Sg	Sa	Lm	Sm <sub>VU</sub>	Sm <sub>LD</sub>	Sm <sub>TB</sub>	Sm <sub>T</sub>
	c	s	s/θ	s/θ	s	s	s/θ	s/θ	c
	c'	c'	c'	c'/t' <sup>θ</sup>	c'	c'	t' <sup>θ</sup>	c'/t' <sup>θ</sup>	c'
	y/i	y	l	l	l	l	l	l/n	l
	u	o	a	a/ɔ	ɔ/ɔ	a	a/u	ɔ/a	?
	a:	e	æ	e/æ	æ/e	e	e	a/æ	e
	Ø/a	ə	ə	ə	ə	ə	ə	ə	ə

<sup>6</sup>It may also help to put these numbers into perspective to note that Spanish and Italian share 82%.

<sup>7</sup>It should be noted that all of these percentages are somewhat higher than those given by Swadesh (1950:159). This difference is due to the different lists used. I have used here the basic 100-word list. Swadesh used a list of 165 words specifically selected for the Salishan languages. Some of the standard 100-word list were not in his Salishan list and vice versa.

<sup>8</sup>Native speakers are aware of the distinctiveness of the velar nasal. This is in part what accounts for the initial 'it's just the same' reaction mentioned in section 2. There is a popular Native American storyteller in the area who without actually knowing any of the languages does a remarkable job imitating the sound of various of them. What makes his 'Saanich' is a liberal sprinkling of velar nasals.

There are phonological as well as phonetic differences between Klallam and Northern Straits. In Klallam \*/l/ has undergone a context free merger with \*/y/, which merges with \*/i/ in most environments. In all the Northern Straits dialects, except Sm<sub>7</sub>, \*/c/ has at least partially in a context free pattern of variable change merged with \*/s/ (see Thompson, Thompson, and Efrat for discussion of this pattern). Phonologically these are the things that account for much of the lack of mutual intelligibility. Compare, for example, the forms in (5):

- (5) Sa ?é?læŋ : So ?é?yæŋ : Kl ?d?iy 'house'

Aside from differences in inventory there are differing patterns of phonotactics and phonological processes. In Saanich stressed vowels have very little variation. In Klallam stressed vowels are retracted (ɔ → ɔ̄, ɪ → ɪ̄, u → ū) before /h/ and /ʔ/, and for some speakers also before /y/ and /w/. Klallam stressed /é/ is not entirely predictable, so there is a partial merger of ə/a and i/e in these environments.

Klallam tolerates consonant clusters much more than the others. Whereas in Saanich one of the most common sounds is unstressed ə, in some varieties of Klallam it hardly appears at all. This absence of unstressed schwa gives Klallam, especially Western Klallam, many long consonant clusters with sonorant consonants often becoming syllabic. The cognates shown in (6) are examples:

- (6) Sa ?əttéləŋxʷ 'person' : Kl ?cítáyŋxʷ 'person, Indian'

In Saanich, with many consonant clusters broken by unstressed schwa, there is typically only one non-schwa vowel per word and this is the stressed vowel /i/, /e/, or /a/. In Klallam, on the other hand, because of the lack of unstressed schwa, /w/ most often surfaces as /u/, /y/ (from both Proto-Straits /y/ and /i/) becomes /i/, and schwa becomes /a/ before /ʔ/ and /h/. So Klallam words often have a number of non-schwa vowels. In Saanich the glides /y/ and /w/ do become /i/ and /u/, respectively in some uncommon environments but are never stressed and never undergo deletion or reduction as vowels. In Klallam, on the other hand, sometimes even non-schwa unstressed vowels including syllabic /y/ and /w/ are deleted:

- (7) WKl ɕʰxʷicn, EKl ɕʰixʷicn < ɕʰəyæxʷ-icn 'Port Angeles'

Loss of unstressed ə further amplifies the phonic difference between the two by giving Klallam difficult to hear oppositions like /kʰʷəns/ 'he looks at it' vs. /kʰʷənc/ 'look at me'.

There are other minor phonological differences. For example, Northern Straits, but not Klallam, has lost certain cases of intervocalic /ʔ/ and /h/ resulting in a surface distinction of length in vowels /a/ and /e/. The sum of these large and small differences gives Klallam an overall sound distinctly different from that of the Northern dialects.

**5. Grammatical differences.** There are a number of grammatical differences but most of these are less striking than the phonological differences. The basic person markers are listed in (8) - (10). The subjects are listed in (8), the objects in (9), and the genitives in (10).

(8) Subjects	1sg	1pl	2	3trans
KI	cn	st	cx <sup>w</sup>	-s
So	sn	ft	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs
Sg	sən	ftə	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs
Sa	sən	ftə	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs
Lm	sən	f	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs
Sm <sub>VU</sub>	sən	ftə	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs
Sm <sub>LD</sub>	sn	f	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs
Sm <sub>TB</sub>	sən	ftə	sx <sup>w</sup>	-əs

(9) Objects	1sg	1pl	2
KI	-c/-uŋ(ə)s	-uŋt	-c/-uŋə
So	-s/-aŋəs	-aŋət	-s/-aŋə
Sg	-s/-aŋəs	-əlx <sup>w</sup>	-sə/-aŋə
Sa	-s/-aŋəs	-al' x <sup>w</sup>	-sə/-aŋə
Lm	-əŋəs	-əŋət	-əŋəs
Sm <sub>VU</sub>	-s/-aŋəs	-al' x <sup>w</sup>	-sə/-aŋə
Sm <sub>LD</sub>	-s/-aŋəs	-aŋt	-s/-sə/-aŋə

(10) Genitives	1sg	1pl	2	3
KI	n-/nə-	-t	n' -/?ən' -	-s
So	nə-	-ft	?ən' -/hən' -	-s
Sg	nə-	-ftə	?ən' -/n' -	-s
Sa	nə-	-ftə	?ən' -/n' -	-s
Lm	nə-	-t	?ən' -/n' -	-s
Sm <sub>VU</sub>	nə-	-ftə	?ən' -	-s
Sm <sub>LD</sub>	nə-	-t	?ən' -/n' -	-s
Sm <sub>TB</sub>	nə-	-ftə	?ən' -/n' -	-s

The biggest differences are found in the objects. In this, Lummi differs most from the others in having completely homophonous 1st singular and 2nd person objects. In Songish and Saanich these objects are always distinct. In Klallam and Sooke they are homophonous in some paradigms and distinct in others.



As Jelinek and Demers 1983 first showed for Lummi there are restrictions on combinations of subject and object in basic transitive constructions. In Lummi transitive constructions having a third person subject and first or second person object are impossible. In these cases the passive must be used. As close as Saanich is to Lummi, it differs in this respect. In Saanich the passive is required only with the combination of third person subject and second person object.

Klallam is like Lummi in that it disallows a third person subject with both first and second person objects. However, Klallam goes farther than Lummi in that the third person subject marker is very rarely used and only occurs in a few of the transitive paradigms (see Montler 1996). In Klallam the passive is preferred with any third person agent. The chart in (11) summarizes the restrictions in the various dialects. A plus indicates that the combination is allowed in a transitive construction; a minus indicates that it is not allowed and the passive is required. Information on how Sooke and Songish work is limited.

(11)	Kl	So	Sg	Sa	Lm	Sm <sub>VU</sub>	Sm <sub>LD</sub>
3/1	-	?	?	+	-	+	-
3/2	-	?	?	-	-	-	-
3/3	+/-	+	+	+	+	+	+

There are a number of morphological differences. For example, each dialect has reduplicative patterns for plural, imperfective, diminutive, etc. but the patterns differ:

(12) Kl *qʷáqʷi* : Sa *qʷəqʷél* : Sm<sub>TB</sub> *qʷæqʷəl* 'talking'.

Klallam and Northern Straits both have complicated systems of demonstratives but the systems differ in a number of respects. Both have a feminine/non-feminine distinction but non-cognate forms: Sa *θ*- vs. Kl *ʔ*-. In Saanich and Songish a subordinator *kʷə* 'if, when' is distinct in form from demonstratives and enclitics. In Klallam *kʷə* represents three different morphemes: 'if, when', 'definite, invisible (demonstrative)', and 'informative (enclitic)'. The Klallam demonstrative system is much richer including non-obligatory plurals and unrealized/indefinite.

Other grammatical differences: Saanich, Sooke, and Songish have hortative *?isté*, for which there is no cognate in Klallam except in the Becher Bay dialect. Several different evidential particles occurring in Saanich are not found in Klallam and vice versa. Klallam has a number of prefixes not found or merged in Northern Straits such as *nuʔ*- 'similar', *tʃaʔ*- 'origin', *ʃa*- 'come from', etc. Northern Straits has *txʷ*- 'buy', *-əʔ* 'origin' and other suffixes that are unknown in Klallam. The position and form of the 'future'/'intention' with the 1st subject differs: Kl *caʔn* : Lm *səsən* : Sa, Sg, So, Sm<sub>VU</sub>, Sm<sub>TB</sub>, Sm<sub>LD</sub> *s(ə)nsəʔ*.

Aside from phonological and grammatical differences there are numerous idiomatic differences found in such as time expressions, comparison, customary story beginnings and endings, greeting, leave taking, thanking, etc.

**6. The problem of the Samishes.** Suttles (1951:iv) claimed that the last speaker of Samish died in 1948, and until the 1980's there was no reason to doubt this. Today we have in the literature four

varieties of Northern Straits speech referred to as 'Samish',<sup>9</sup> the differences among which are as great as the differences between any two of the Northern Straits dialects.

The variety of Samish that I've labeled with a subscript question mark, Sm<sub>?</sub>, is represented by two words in Thompson, Thompson, and Efrat's work on reconstructing Proto-Straits. They credit Suttles with supplying the Samish forms. There is one more word that probably is from this dialect, *sqáwac* 'potato', in Suttles 1987:144. This word has the *c* of Sm<sub>?</sub> but has *a* for expected *e*. It is surprising that the phonology of these few words is so different from more recent recordings of Samish.

These three words were all the published information on Samish until Galloway's 1990 sketch, which was based on three speakers. I've labeled these with subscript initials VU, LD, and TB.

Speaker VU, was an elder who had lived most of his life at East Saanich and was in fact the next door neighbor of my main Saanich consultant. The second speaker, LD is a monolingual introduced to Galloway by speaker VU living at Malabat, an area west of Saanich traditionally considered Halkomelem territory. The third, speaker TB, was found on a tape in the University of Washington Archives recorded by Leon Metcalf in 1953. Metcalf introduces the tape as 'Tommy Bob speaking Samish' and in the speech, Tommy Bob, himself says that he is speaking Samish. This tape contains a sermon and a substantial word list.

Speaker VU was a widely known professional orator and paid speaker at namings and other traditional ceremonies. He was considered by all to be a Saanich speaker, in fact a great Saanich speaker. I had the opportunity, thanks to Eloise Jelinek, to work with VU for a short time before he passed away in 1988. It is my impression that he was basically speaking Saanich, but making a few inconsistent dialect adjustments. It can be seen in the charts in (8), (9), (10), and (11) that this dialect is essentially the same as Saanich.

Speaker LD's dialect is certainly not Saanich. She is a very quiet person and spoke very little in the presence of VU's powerful personality when we were all together in 1988. I visited her again in 1991 and worked with her and her nephew (there are apparently 3 or 4 people at Malahat who speak this dialect). When I asked LD what the name of her language was she surprised me with *lak'wəpín'əp*, which is the native name for the Songish language. Others there call their dialect simply 'Malahat'.

Speaker TB's dialect is the most puzzling. Tommy Bob (also spelled Bobb) was a locally famous preacher and spirit dancer living at the Swinomish Reservation in Lushootseed territory where many Samish had settled. He was interviewed by anthropologist Marian W. Smith in 1938 (Smith 1949:339). Here his language is not identified, but he does use the Lushootseed word *sk'ədílłəč* rather than the Northern Straits cognate *sk'ənlíləč* for the name of his spirit power. He was also recorded in 1950 by ethnomusicologist Willard Rhodes as a Skagit speaker and singer, but even Rhodes extremely poor phonetic transcription shows that Tommy Bob was not speaking Skagit.

---

<sup>9</sup>There is actually yet another 'Samish' mentioned in the literature. Smith, writing in the concluding sections of Collins 1949, indicates that there were actually two groups of people referred to as 'Samish'. One she calls the Upper Samish 'spoke a Salish similar to that of the Lower Skagit', that is, a dialect of Lushootseed, not Straits at all. The other, living on the salt water, spoke Northern Straits. It may be this Upper Samish that Gibbs was referring to in his classification (see beginning of section 1).

When this tape first surfaced, Suttles suspected that Tommy Bob was actually speaking Saanich and asked me to try it on my Saanich consultants. I played the sermon recorded on the tape for them skipping the introduction and without commenting myself on what it was. Their immediate reaction was 'Is that Lummi?' Whatever it is it is definitely not Saanich, but the Saanich speakers were able to give a complete sentence by sentence translation of the speech commenting here and there on idiomatic and lexical differences.

Although the Tommy Bob tape is old and not the greatest quality, it is clear that he is producing a  $\theta$ . This is especially evident in Metcalf's careful and slightly exaggerated echoing of the words and in Tommy Bob's corrections of Metcalf's pronunciation. The puzzling thing about Tommy Bob's Samish is why does it have  $\theta$  rather than the alveolar affricate as recorded by Suttles or  $s$  as does most of Northern Straits. First of all, Suttles published transcriptions are always accurate. And secondly, as Thompson, Thompson, and Efrat show, the Saanich  $\theta$  is due to more or less recent diffusion from Halkomelem. In fact the closer one gets to Halkomelem territory the more thetas there are and the more prominently interdental they are. How did Tommy Bob's Samish get the  $\theta$  when neither Samish nor Swinomish territory are contiguous with Halkomelem?

The charts (4), (8), (9), (10), and (11) show that the differences among these varieties of Samish are as great as the differences between any two of the Northern Straits dialects. I doubt that there will ever be a satisfactory explanation for this variety of Samishes.

**7. Dialect differences within Klallam and within Saanich.** The differences among the Samishes are greater than the differences within any of the dialects. There are, however, differences to be found within Klallam and within Saanich.

The variety found within Saanich is mostly in minor phonological differences and a very few lexical differences. For example, older generation East Saanich [e] corresponds to West Saanich, and younger generation [æ], and the low back vowel is usually slightly rounded in West Saanich but not in East Saanich. A noticeable difference between East and West Saanich is in the articulation of the dental fricative, / $\theta$ /. In East Saanich it is a grooved spirant and not interdental. To my ear it is often difficult to distinguish between it and /s/. In West Saanich this fricative is clearly a slit interdental.

The differences between Eastern and Western Klallam are somewhat greater than those between the varieties of Saanich. Differences between Klallam from Port Angeles westward and Klallam from Jamestown eastward have been noted by Eells (1894) who reports the Klallam of 'Elwba, Pysht, and Clallam Bay [all west of Port Angeles] speaking, it is said, as if with thicker tongues than the others.' Native speakers today speak of Western Klallam as somehow 'rougher' or 'harsher' than Eastern Klallam. The Thompsons worked for several years with Klallam speakers from the Eastern areas Jamestown and Little Boston before working briefly with speakers from Elwba, where they became aware of marked dialect differences (M. T. Thompson, p. c.). Although there certainly are some lexical differences, the biggest difference between Eastern and Western Klallam that I have been able to determine is in the general lack of unstressed schwa in Western Klallam. This is very distinctive and surely enough to evoke the 'thick tongue' or 'harsh' impression. These differences are summarized and exemplified in (13).

- (13) ESa *e, a, ɛ* : WSa *æ, v, θ*  
 EK1 *pʰʂpəʂ* : WK1 *pʰʂpʰ* 'cat'  
 EK1 *hɑʔʰ* : WK1 *ʔɔy* 'good'

**8. Other complications.** Aside from the regional dialect differences there are other varieties that complicate the picture of the Straits Salishan subgroup. There are differences as great as those within a dialect found between generations within a single family. There are also slight differences between male and female speakers. However, the major variation to be seen is the differences between the language of the native speakers and revitalized language of those speakers whose first language is English and who have learned Klallam or Lummi as a second language.

**8.1. Generational differences.** There seems to be a tendency for younger (under 60 years of age) native Saanich speakers to have more of the characteristics of West Saanich even if they come from East Saanich families and live at East Saanich. This may have something to do with the social prominence of West Saanich and its school and very successful language program initiated by the late Dave Eliot, Sr. in the 1970's.

Phonologically, younger native speakers of Saanich have more interdental *θ* and *æ* for *e*. This may be due to influence from Halkomelem. There are actually more speakers of the Cowichan dialect of Halkomelem living on the Saanich reserves, especially the western reserves, through intermarriage than there are native speakers of Saanich. Several of the older children of one of my Saanich consultants actually speak Cowichan semi-fluently but speak almost no Saanich at all. There are thus also more Cowichan loans in the speech of younger speakers.

Grammatical leveling is evident among younger Saanich speakers. This can especially be seen in the reduplication patterns which are fewer and much more regular and productive among younger speakers. Younger speakers make much less use of lexical suffixes in both compounding and incorporation functions. Periphrastic forms are preferred. This may or may not be due to the influence of English. Among native speakers I can see, in general, very little English influence.

Less use of lexical suffixes and more periphrastic constructions are also found among younger native speakers of Klallam. Non-English external influence, however, is not found among younger native Klallam speakers, but the general internal tendencies of Klallam seem to be exaggerated. Younger Klallam speakers actually have fewer unstressed schwas and *more* consonant clusters than older speakers. They also have fewer glottal stops and laryngealized sonorants. The combination of these two phonological developments has produced the merger of the first and second person genitives for some younger speakers:

- (14) a. *nətán* ~ *ntán* 'my mother'  
 b. *ʔən'tán* ~ *n'tán* 'your mother'
- (15) *ntán* 'my mother/your mother'

The forms in (14) are those of older Klallam speakers. The loss of unstressed schwa, glottal stops, and glottalization produce (15) in younger native speakers.

**8.2. Male/female differences.** In Lummi, Saanich, and Klallam female speakers are more likely to use glottal stops and have stronger glottalization. For example, male Klallam speakers would tend to say *siám* while females would use *siʔám* 'boss'. I have found similar differences between closely related male and female speakers of Saanich as well. Bowman and Demers 1982 list a number of other differences found between a brother and sister native speakers of Lummi.

**8.3. Revitalized languages: New Klallam, New Lummi.** The most divergent varieties of Klallam, Lummi, and Saanich are those of people whose first or primary language is English and have learned or relearned the ancestral language as a second language. Many such speakers are young, but some are actually elders, have been speaking the tribal language for some time, and have achieved a high degree of fluency. They are able to give speeches, tell stories, and carry on limited conversation in the language.

Recent interest and efforts in the revival of the languages of the ancestors has generated a significant number of new speakers. For example, at spirit dances, canoe races, and various other intertribal gatherings Lummi is frequently heard. Yet there have not been any native speakers of Lummi for over ten years. The impression among members of neighboring tribes and the outside community is that there are many speakers of Lummi. There are indeed many Lummi speakers, but this due to the language policy of the Lummi Reservation and to the heroic efforts of a few individuals, especially William Arthur James, in the learning, teaching, and promoting the use of their language.

A language cannot exist without a purpose. Among a language's many functions it is the emblematic function that is the most needed, the most viable, in the Native American communities of the northwest. Knowing one's ancestral language functions as nothing more and nothing less than the singular emblem of pride in one's identity. Revitalization efforts that have focused on this function have been most successful.

Although the overriding goal for second language learners is to speak a form of the language as close to that of the ancestors as possible, this focus on the emblematic function puts perfection of matching the ancestors' pronunciation and grammatical construction into the background. These new varieties differ from the native speaker varieties as much or more than any of the native dialects differ from one another.

The grammatical systems of the new varieties are greatly simplified. Periphrastic constructions dominate to the near total exclusion of lexical suffixes. The transitive and intransitive paradigms are greatly leveled and aspect marking is very limited.

There are many neologisms. Some derive from native expressions such as Klallam *snúʔnəkʷ* *λ'úyqs* 'television', literally 'ghost box'. Others are lighthearted derivations from English such as Lummi *q'astno* 'casino'. Some new words are simply coined such as Klallam *ɛʔɛʔ* 'popcorn'.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>10</sup> This word may have had some outside influence. It was made up at a meeting of the Klallam Language Program participants in 1995. The purpose of the meeting was to come up with words for a list of modern things that had no

The most striking difference between the old and new varieties are phonological. There are wholesale phonological shifts under English influence. Consonant clusters are simplified or broken by vowels, glottalization is lost completely on sonorants and sporadically on obstruents, and most glottal stops are missing. A particularly obvious change is the replacement of the lateral affricate,  $\lambda'$ , by  $kl$  or  $k'l$ . This actually does little phonologically since there are otherwise no such clusters. Other non-English sounds are generally replaced:  $q$  becomes  $k$ ,  $\chi$  becomes  $h$ ,  $k$ , or  $x$ , and  $x''$  becomes  $hw$  or  $kw$ .

**9. Conclusions.** Most native speakers of Klallam, especially those of the main body of Klallam territory south of the Juan de Fuca Strait, consider their speech a distinct language from the Northern Straits dialects. The two are not mutually intelligible and the lexical, phonological, and grammatical differences between the two are on the order of a language difference. They should therefore be considered distinct languages.

Among the Northern Straits dialects the most similar are Saanich and Songish. As far as available data show, they are grammatically identical and phonologically as close as, say, standard American English and standard Canadian English, that is, hardly distinguishable. Sooke is certainly phonologically more divergent, while Lummi has some lexically and grammatically distinguishing characteristics. Of the four varieties of Samish  $Sm_{LD}$  is closest to Lummi,  $Sm_{VU}$  is essentially Saanich,  $Sm_{TB}$  shows lexical similarity to Lummi but phonological similarity to Saanich, and  $Sm_7$  cannot be placed.

There is some slight variety within the dialects based on region, generation, and gender, but the most dramatic differences are those found between the native speakers and the new speakers. As Bill James has pointed out, a living language is a changing language. It is necessary today to recognize and respect these new varieties as New Lummi and New Klallam.

#### References

- Boas, Franz. 1891. Second general report on the Indians of British Columbia. Report of the 60th meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science held at Leeds in September 1890. Pp. 562-715.
- Boas, Franz and Herman Haerberlin. 1927. Sound shifts in Salishan dialects. 4.117-36.
- Bowman, Elizabeth and Richard Demers. 1982. Some differences in the speech of a Lummi brother and sister. 17th International Conference on Salishan and Neighboring Languages. Portland.
- Castile, George Pierre, ed. 1985. The Indians of Puget Sound: the notebooks of Myron Eells. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Collins, June M. 1949. Distribution of the Chemakum language. In *Indians of the Urban Northwest* ed. by Marian W. Smith. New York: Columbia University Press.

---

traditional Klallam word. I was present, and when asked if I knew any Indian word for 'popcorn', I mentioned that the Alabama word for 'corn' is *čassi*. The New Klallam word appeared a few moments later.

- Eels, Myron. 1887. The Twana, Chemakum, and Klallam Indians, of Washington Territory. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution. Annual report of the board of regents for the year ending June 30, 1887, Pt. I, pp. 605-681.
- Efrat, Barbara S. 1969. A grammar of non-particles in Sooke, a dialect of Straits Coast Salish. PhD dissertation, University of Pennsylvania.
- Galloway, Brent D. 1990. A phonology, morphology, and classified word list for the Samish dialect of Straits Salish. Canadian Ethnology Service Mercury Series Paper No. 116. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Gibbs, George. 1863. Alphabetical vocabularies of the Clallam and Lummi. New York: Cramoisy Press.
- Hill-Tout, Charles. 1907. Report on the ethnology of the south-eastern tribes of Vancouver Island, British Columbia. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute* 37.312-63
- Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers. 1983. An agent hierarchy and voice in some Coast Salish languages. *IJAL* 49.167-85.
- Jelinek, Eloise and Richard Demers. 1994. Predicates and pronominal arguments in Straits Salish. *Language* 70.697-736.
- Mitchell, Marjorie Ruth. 1966. A dictionary of Songish, a dialect of Straits Salish. MA thesis, University of Victoria.
- Montler, Timothy. 1986. An outline of the morphology and phonology of Saanich, North Straits Salish. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics*, No. 4.
- Montler, Timothy. 1991. Saanich, North Straits Salish Classified Word List. Canadian Ethnology Service Mercury Series Paper No. 119. Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Montler, Timothy. 1996. Some Klallam paradigms. 31st International Conference on Salishan and Neighboring Languages.
- Raffo, Yolanda. 1972. A phonology and morphology of Songish, a dialect of Straits Salish. PhD dissertation, University of Kansas.
- Smith, Marian W. 1949. Additional biographical note. Appendix to John Fornsby: The personal document of a Coast Salish Indian by June M. Collins. In *Indians of the Urban Northwest* ed. by Marian W. Smith. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Suttles, Wayne. 1951. The economic life of the Coast Salish of Haro and Rosario Straits. PhD dissertation, University of Washington.
- Suttles, Wayne. 1987. *Coast Salish essays*. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1950. Salish internal relationships. *IJAL* 16.157-67.
- Thompson, Laurence C. 1969. Lummi classified word list. Unpublished ms.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1971. Clallam: a preview. *Studies in American Indian languages*, ed. Jesse Sawyer. University of California Publications in Linguistics, 65.251-294.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. 1987. Klallam dictionary. Unpublished ms.
- Thompson, Laurence C., M. Terry Thompson, and Barbara S. Efrat. 1974. Some phonological developments in Straits Salish. *IJAL* 40.182-96.