

**Mengarini Revisited: A Translation and Analysis of Selections from *Grammatica
Linguae Selicae***

Prooemium

Rudimenta linguæ Selicæ nunc primum scripta traduntur. Idiomatica indica a linguis scriptis et jam doctis toto cœlo distare, ex iis, qui vel paululum inter Indos versati fuerint, nemo est qui nesciat. Cum igitur nova prorsus sit natura linguæ indicæ, novo etiam ordine in ea exponenda opus fuisset nisi difficultati difficultatem superaddere, quin potius, ex eo ispo quod jam per se laborem præbeat, operæ pretium existimavi linguas notas ponè sequi, tum ut difficultatem lenirem, tum ut diversitas in comparatione linguarum primo intuitu deprehenderetur.

Quod ut etiam facilius obtineatur, totum opusculum in tres partes dividetur partes, quorum prima Rudimenta simplicia, secunda dilucidationes in Rudimenta, tertia verò Introductionem ad Syntaxim complectitur, ita ut facilioribus ad difficiliora gradus fiat, sicque erit ut neque memoria distentetur, neque voluntas despondeat.

Cuilibet regulæ concisè expositæ exempla pauca et brevia adnexi; curavi enim ut quam brevissimus essem, quin tamen perspicuitati obessem.

Licet autem pro viribus octo circiter annis huic operam naverim, atque ex iis, quæ mihi necessaria visa sunt, nihil admodum prætermiserim, plurima tamen certissime desunt (neque enim octo neque octodecim sufficient anni ut linguam indicam vel unam Europæus intime noverit) multa etiam lapsu temporis mendosa forte deprehendetur; verum, vel quibus jam datum est, vel si aliis multis, quod in votis est, datum fuerit audire: "Ite et vos in vineam meam;" eorum erit tum quæ desiderantur addere, tum quæ mendosa sunt corrigere; mihi enim in præsentiarum satis est, si labor hic qualiscumque et ad Gloriam Dei propogandam cedat atque animarum profectui aliquomodo benevertat.

Preface

Now, for the first time, rudiments of the Salish language have been passed down in written form. There is no one of those who have spent even a little time among the Indians who is unaware that the Indian idioms are different from the languages written and now taught in the whole rest of the world. Since, then, the nature of the Indian language is utterly new, it might have been necessary to set it forth in a new way also; but if I am not mistaken, this would have been nothing else except piling difficulty upon difficulty; rather, from the very fact that this already is an arduous task, I have adjudged it worthwhile to follow in the model of known languages, in some places to lessen difficulty, in other places so that the difference in comparing the languages could be perceived at first glance.

So that this might be more easily obtained, the whole work is divided into three parts, of which the first encompasses simple rudiments, the second elaborations on the rudiments, and the third an introduction to syntax, so that the progression proceeds from the easier to the more difficult, and thus it will be that neither will memory be strained, nor interest lost.

I have added a few brief examples to any rule that is concisely laid out; Indeed I have seen to it that I should be as brief as possible, but without sacrificing clarity.

Although I have devoted my energies to this work for about eight years, and that of the things which to me seemed necessary, I have completely overlooked nothing; nevertheless much is most certainly lacking (indeed neither eight years nor eighteen years is sufficient for a European to learn deeply even one Indian language) and many things will perhaps be found, after the passage of time, to be wrong; but, whether some people or many others have been granted what they wished for, may it be granted to them to hear: "You too, go into my vineyard;" then it will be their task to add the things that are desired and to correct the things that are wrong; but for me it is enough at the present moment if this work, whatever quality it has, enhances the spreading of the Glory of God and to some extent benefits the progress of souls.

It has been more than 150 years since Gregory Mengarini wrote the *Grammatica Linguae Selicae*, and since then it has remained untranslated and unanalyzed. This paper provides an analysis of Mengarini's phonemic description of the language and of selected portions of the nominal system in his grammar. I continue by providing thoughts on the use of the Latin language in the composition of the grammar. Finally, using three original manuscripts of the grammar transcribed by different copyists, I consider the reasons for inconsistencies in the original texts and the published version and what effects these might have had on the analysis of the language, especially with regard to accent markings.

I. Introduction

The *Grammatica Linguae Selicae*, written by Father Gregory Mengarini of the Society of Jesus and published in 1861 in *Shea's Library of American Linguistics v. II*, is the first written analysis of the Montana Salish language. This grammar is based on his third attempt at a grammar; Mengarini reports that the first manuscript of the grammar was the most accurate but that it and the second copy were destroyed (Mooney 1911). There are three original manuscript copies of the grammar, all by different copyists, and all of which contain subtle differences. One copy, written in 1855 by Father Joseph Joret, includes several comments in the margins; another copy in was made in 1865 by Father D'Ataste, and a final copy, which is undated, by an unknown author (Oregon Province Archives).

Each of these manuscripts is slightly different in their account of Mengarini's grammar. There is no information available about which was used to create the published version. It is most likely not based on the work of the unknown copyist, since that manuscript leaves off on what is page 49 of the published manuscript (out of 122 pages).

Father Joset's copy uses *chin-* in place of *tn-* for the first person subject particle. This is closer to *čn-*, the modern transcription of the prefix, but inconsistent with the published version. The manuscript which is most consistent (though not entirely so) with the published version is Father D'Ataste's copy. This is also the most difficult to read of the manuscripts, especially with regard to accent marking (discussed in Section III). This also poses a chronological problem, since Father D'Ataste's manuscript is from 1865 and the grammar was published four years earlier in 1861. The published grammar contains unique elements from each of the manuscripts, but it is impossible to say that it is based solely on one of the copies.

Accounts of many of the expeditions of the Jesuits and their Native American missions have been compiled, including Mengarini's own memoirs (Lothrop 1977). However, nearly 150 years later, Mengarini's grammar remains untranslated and unanalyzed with regard to the accuracy of his observations or to how the language may have changed since his grammar was written. With the last generation of native Montana Salish speakers growing older, it is necessary to revisit the early studies of this language. I first provide a history of the Jesuits' work on the Native languages of the Americas and discuss the structure of this specific grammar, laying out the points made by Mengarini based on the translation of selected portions of the text (provided in Appendix A). In Section II, I focus on Mengarini's ability to capture the phonemes of Montana Salish with the alphabet he uses, as well as how well his descriptions of the phonemes, largely based on European languages, capture elements of the Salish language. I continue, in Section III, with an analysis of the accent markings Mengarini uses, his description of their use, and their consistency throughout the grammar. Section IV looks into methods for

pluralization in Montana Salish and Section V discusses augmentatives, diminutives, and pejoratives. Finally, Section VI looks at the the role of Latin as the language in which Mengarini chose to write the grammar, focusing on the Latin grammatical categories that he uses to describe Montana Salish.

The Society of Jesus was founded by Ignatius of Loyola in 1534. The Society, whose followers came to be known as Jesuits, has a history of missionary work throughout the world. It was suppressed in 1773 by the Catholic Church, but the restoration of the Society in 1814 allowed the Jesuits to continue their missionary work. They travelled to several different parts of the United States, working with the Potawatomi, tribes of the Iroquois, and several other tribes. In 1838 the Jesuits set up their first mission in the Oregon territory, which included the home of the Salish people, or Flatheads as they came to be known by the Jesuits. This mission was established at the request of the Salish people and their neighborins who sought a “Black Robe”, the Natives’ name for priests. The first priest was Father Pierre Jean De Smet, who, after a short trip back to Missouri in 1841, returned to Montana with Father Gregory Mengarini, who was only thirty years old at the time.

Mengarini, born in Italy in 1811, began his preparation for the Jesuits at the age of seventeen. With an interest in language, and having heard about the Flathead mission in a letter from Bishop Rosati, he was an ideal candidate to work in the Oregon country. Father De Smet also commented on Mengarini’s mastery of language, as well as of music and medicine.

Mengarini’s Salish grammar does not seem structured in a logical way. It begins with a short introduction, followed by the *pars prima*, which includes several

chapters that explain the basic components of the language. The grammar continues with the *pars secunda* (seven chapters), which elaborates on the basic components laid out in the *pars prima*; this is followed by the *pars tertia* (twelve chapters), which provides an explanation of the syntax of the language. The grammar finishes with an Appendix which contains an assortment of additional information about the language. A table of contents is included in Father Joset's copy of the manuscript, but it is in small print and not easily legible, so I have included one here for reference.

Pars Prima

Chapter 1	Beginnings	1
Chapter 2	Nouns	2
Chapter 3	Adjectival Nouns	5
Chapter 4	Numbers	6
Chapter 5	Pronouns	9
Chapter 6	Verbs	12
Chapter 7 (misabeled as 6)	Adverbs	57
Chapter 8	Prepositions	60
Chapter 9	Interjections	60
Chapter 10	Conjunctions	61

Pars Secunda

Chapter 1	Pronunciation	62
Chapter 2	Substantives	64
Chapter 3 (misabeled as 4)	Adjectives	67
Chapter 4	Numerals	72
Chapter 5	Pronouns	73
Chapter 6	Verbs	73
Chapter 7	Adverbs	77

Pars Tertia

Chapter 1	The Particles <i>u</i> and <i>tu</i>	79
Chapter 2	Substantives	82
Chapter 3	Adjectives	86
Chapter 4	Numerals	87
Chapter 5	Pronouns	88
Chapter 6	Verbs	89
Chapter 7	Adverbs	100
Chapter 8	Prepositions	104
Chapter 9	Interjections	105
Chapter 10	Conjunctions	105

Chapter 11	The Composition of Verbs	106
Chapter 12	The Differences of Certain Words	114
Appendix		
Kinship terms		117
Pronunciation of Gallic proper names		119
Of the division of time		120
Of dialects		120
The Lord's Prayer		122

In this paper I analyze selected portions of the grammar dealing with the nominal system of Montana Salish as described by Mengarini. This is not meant to be a definitive description of the language, rather an investigation into how it was perceived 150 years ago. With the dwindling number of speakers, there is no doubt variation among speakers in Thomason's fieldnotes, which may be the cause for some inconsistencies with Mengarini's text. The goal of this paper, however, is of a broader scope and does not dwell on trifling issues.

The relevant translations of his text are found in Appendix A. Copies of the original manuscripts have not been included in the appendices, since they are not entirely legible. I have done my best to provide an accurate analysis of them where relevant in this paper.

II. Phonology

Mengarini describes the Salish alphabet as being comprised of seventeen letters. However, whether by accident or by design, he lists only sixteen letters: a, e, i, o, u, c, g, h, k, l, m, n, p, s, t, z. With these letters, he created an orthography for the language, largely based on sounds from European languages, mainly German, French, and Spanish. Whereas today our IPA-based orthography allows us to provide a different symbol for

each phoneme, missionaries often used self-derived orthographies. The missing letter in Mengarini’s list is probably *ʃ*, the voiceless lateral fricative, which may have been left out because it is not part of the Roman alphabet that Mengarini’s readers would be familiar with. Mengarini’s description of the formation of the *ʃ* consonant is interestingly accurate, given the difference in classification system for phonemic qualities at that time. He states that it “sounds like *l*, but it is pronounced with the tongue attached to the palate and extended” (p. 1). The phonemic system of Montana Salish is actually much more complicated than this. In fact, modern Salish has 38 different consonants, listed in Table 1 below (from Thomason 2008b).

p	t		c	č	(k)	k ^w	q	q ^w			ʔ
p'	t'	ʃ	c'	č'		k ^w	q'	q ^w			
		ʃ	s	š		x ^w	χ	χ ^w			h
m	n	l		y		w			ʕ	ʕ ^w	
m'	n'	l'		y'		w'			ʕ'	ʕ ^w	

Table 1: Montana Salish consonant phonemes.

Mengarini does not give a thorough description of very many consonants. In fact, the only qualitative description he provides besides that of the *ʃ* is to say that a consonant is *dura* (‘hard’ or ‘harsh’), which he uses in describing *z* and *ck*. With only a one-sentence description of each of these letters, I further analyze some specific

consonants: *ck*, *k*, and *g*, that Mengarini uses in his orthography. Each of these represents multiple phonemes, all of which are symbolized by different letters in the modern IPA-based orthography of the language.

Mengarini does not discuss the *k* phoneme at length; rather he simply states that “*k* sounds like *c* on its own; but *ck* is especially hard” (p. 1). Montana Salish does not have a voiceless velar plosive except in two words, *kapí* ‘coffee’ and *kapó* ‘coat’, both of which are borrowed from French; so this is probably not what Mengarini’s *k* refers to. Salish has a labialized velar plosive *kʷ*, as well as labialized and non-labialized uvular plosives *q* and *qʷ*. To add even more possibilities, each of these three consonant phonemes can also be glottalized or not, making a total of six phonemes which Mengarini’s *k* could represent. I show below that the letter *k* he gives in his orthography on pp. 1-2 of the grammar does not provide all the necessary information to determine which phoneme is intended on its own; rather the following vowel allows the reader to distinguish certain factors about the consonant, namely placement and, to a certain extent, glottalization.

The Latin word *dura* that Mengarini uses to describe the *ck* is not easy to translate into English, and it is harder yet to ascribe to phonemes. With the closest translations being “hard” or “harsh”, it would make sense that *ck* would indicate a glottalized and possibly a uvular plosive, since uvular consonants do not occur in the Romance languages and may have seemed more exotic –harsher– to Mengarini. In fact, comparing the data in the grammar to modern data shows that the only thing Mengarini’s *ck* examples have in common is that they are all uvular. The examples in (1) illustrate

this, giving Mengarini's representation followed by modern phonemic transcriptions (Thomason 2009b), and an English gloss:

(1)	a.	nackoèmen	naq ^w ém'n'	<i>thief</i>
	b.	esmkòck	esmq ^w móq ^w	<i>mountains</i>
	c.	ies màckam	iesmáqm	<i>I am preventing it</i>

The word-final *ck* in (1b), for instance, is a glottalized labialized uvular plosive, while the *ck* in (1c) is a non-glottalized non-labialized uvular plosive. This, however, is not the only way he represents uvular plosives. The *k* in the middle of (1b) is also a glottalized labialized uvular plosive, the same as the *ck* at the end of the word. More examples of *k* representing uvular plosives are given in (2):

(2)	a.	kokoméus	q ^w q ^w †té	<i>yearling horse</i>
	b.	kottàgoe	q ^w táχ ^w eʔ	<i>lice</i>
	c.	nkokosmíchnschin	nq ^w q ^w osm'í ¹	<i>dog</i>

One pattern which does stick out, especially in these examples, is that labialized uvular and velar plosives are typically, but not consistently, followed by an *o* or *u* in Mengarini's orthography. In examples containing both *k* and *ck*, this holds true not only

¹ Most speakers of Montana Salish now deglottalize all but the final ejective in a sequence of ejective stops and affricates. These forms may therefore be a transcription error in Thomason's fieldnotes. That is, for instance, *nq^wq^wosm'i* may actually be pronounced [nq^wq^wosm'i].

for uvulars in most of the examples above, but also in the examples in (3), in which the *k* represents a velar plosive:

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|------------|---|----------------------|
| (3) | a. | kukúsem | k ^w k ^w úsm' | <i>star</i> |
| | b. | †kukuiúme | † k ^w k ^w i? ma ¹ | <i>little people</i> |
| | c. | kutkuíteps | k ^w t ^w k ^w i(t'ps) ¹ | <i>fleas</i> |

Not only do these examples provide a basis for the prediction of labialization in Mengarini's representation, but they also highlight a way of distinguishing uvular and velar plosives. When referring to a nonglottalized velar plosive, which is virtually always labialized in Salish and thus followed by a rounded vowel in Mengarini's grammar, the *k* is always followed by *u*, whereas the labialized uvular plosive is followed by *o*. This is presumably caused by the relative height of each vowel and consonant pair: since *u* is a high vowel, it is closer to the velum than *o*, which is closer to the uvula. Mengarini is not always consistent with regard to glottalization, though, as is described below and illustrated by the examples in (4).

The one distinction Mengarini does not appear to make in all cases is between glottalized and nonglottalized plosives. He does mention in his *pars prima* that "an apostrophe ' denotes a certain interruption of the voice between the first and second letter" (p. 2), which would appear to indicate a closed glottis. The apostrophe, however, only rarely occurs after a plosive, and thus most likely does not indicate glottalization. It could be that *ko* represents a glottalized consonant when it indicates a velar plosive, as in the examples in (4):

(4)	a.	esmílko	esmílk ^ʷ	<i>all, the whole</i>
	b.	nko	nk ^ʷ úʔ	<i>one</i>
	c.	skokoi	sk ^ʷ úk ^ʷ iʔ	<i>father's sister of a male</i>

This means that the *ko* could correspond to one of three possibilities in modern representation: *q^w*, *q^w*, or *k^w*. There are few examples in Mengarini's grammar of *ko* indicating a velar plosive, but all of the examples are glottalized. The *ku*, on the other hand, can be a nonglottalized consonant as in *k^wk^wús m'* (3a) or a glottalized consonant as in *ʔk^wk^wiʔma* (3b).

To sum up the spelling of uvular and velar plosives in Mengarini's grammar, *ck* always represents a uvular plosive. We have also seen that labialization is normally, but not always, indicated by a rounded vowel letter following the plosive. There are, however, exceptions in which the rounded vowel letter does not always immediately follow, as in *esm q^wmó q^w* (1b). Using just Mengarini's grammar, though, and not other missionary writings from the same time period, there is not sufficient evidence to propose a pattern for this exception. Generally, a following letter *u* represents a labialized velar plosive which can be either glottalized or nonglottalized, whereas a following letter *o* represents a labialized uvular plosive or a labialized glottalized velar plosive. If there is no following rounded vowel letter, thus making a non-labialized consonant, a letter *k* must represent a uvular plosive. It is then obvious that, though Mengarini only describes these phonemes with one letter (with a brief mention of the diagraph *ck*), he was able to

make some distinctions among /k^w k^{'w} q q' q^w q^{'w}/. His system does not cover all the phonemic distinctions with regard to dorsal plosives in Salish, and also does not consistently distinguish word-final plosives, but it provides evidence that, although all of these pronunciations were represented by one letter in the grammar (pp. 1-2), Mengarini was able to partially distinguish them in other ways that he does not explain in his description of the sound system.

The next step is to see if the pattern holds for the dorsal fricatives, both uvular and velar. Mengarini represents these with the letter *g*, saying that “it is guttural and sounds as in the Spanish *g* or *j* as in *general* and *jabili*” (p. 1). The *g* is similar to the *k*, since it is represented with one letter but represents multiple pronunciations. Montana Salish has both a labialized and a non-labialized uvular fricative, as well as a labialized velar fricative, making three possibilities for pronunciation (*x*, like *k*, does not occur unlabialized). In order to compare these to the plosives, I give three data sets. The examples in (5) are instances of *g* with the following vowel *o*, examples in (6) illustrate *g* with the following vowel *u*, and examples in (7) show *g* with any other following vowel. I have chosen examples that have an unrounded vowel as part of the root to show more clearly that the vowel letter following the *g* is used by Mengarini to indicate labialization (in 6a below, the relevant fricative is at the end of the word):

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|---------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|
| (5) | a. | go†goà† | χ ^w †χ ^w á† | <i>bighorn sheep</i> |
| | b. | goèit | x ^w ? í† | <i>many</i> |
| | c. | goàkoi | χ ^w áq ^{'w} | <i>grind</i> |

(6)	a.	geùlégu	χʔ úlex ^w	<i>rattlesnake</i>
	b.	guáguáligu	χ ^w aχ ^w aá	<i>fox</i>
	c.	gu†guí†t	x ^w lx ^w ílt	<i>debt</i>
(7)	a.	stgèñch	stχéñč	<i>entrails</i>
	b.	getgeítne	χtχéytne	<i>dagger</i>
	c.	gmgèmt	χmχémt	<i>heavy</i>

In the *pars secunda* of the grammar, Mengarini elaborates on *g*, saying “The consonant *g* is guttural, but much smoother than the Spanish or Arabic *g*, especially before *u* and *t* it sounds like *ch* or the German *g* in König...the guttural *g* is barely heard,” (p. 62). This description is slightly different from his description in the *pars prima*, since there he likens the *g* in his orthography to a Spanish *g*, while in the *pars secunda* he seems to try to distance it from Spanish. This description also does not necessarily indicate labialization or placement, as with the dorsal plosives, since examples (5) - (7) show that a following letter *u* can denote either a velar (as in 6a and 6c) or a uvular (as in 6b).

The examples in (8) show that a letter *t* following a letter *g* does not necessarily indicate a place of articulation, as he implies in the *pars secunda*. Because, in these cases, the *g* is not followed by a rounded vowel, it should consistently represent a nonlabialized consonant, so it is unlikely that represents labialization. Also, because the following *t* is produced near the front of the mouth, it is equally unlikely that it denotes the place of

articulation for the preceding *g*. The examples in (8) show that the *gt* combination does not produce a consistent phoneme for *g* as Mengarini suggests.

(8)	a.	tlágt	λάχτ	<i>fast</i>
	b.	ttúgt	t'úx ^w t	<i>he flew</i>
	c.	suígt	swíχτ	<i>crack</i>

Because these were the only examples with the *gt* combination, it is possible that (8b) could have been a transcription error. It is also possible that the quality of the *g* is determined by the immediately preceding vowel in this setting, just as in the examples in (3) and (6) where a *u* generally indicates a velar, labialized quality, and in (7) when an unrounded vowel represents a nonlabialized, uvular quality. Without further data, though, it is difficult to be sure.

Judging by these examples, the same pattern for labialization occurs with the dorsal fricatives as with the plosives: when the dorsal fricative is followed by a rounded vowel letter, it is labialized. The pattern for judging whether the fricative is velar or uvular holds, but it is less consistent. When *g* is followed by the letter *o*, it generally represents a labialized uvular fricative. In the word x^w?ít (5b) this pattern may be violated because of the glottal stop immediately following the fricative. Similarly, when *g* is followed by the letter *u*, it generally represents a labialized velar fricative. The word χ^waχ^waá (6b), however, does not follow this pattern. This may be because it is more difficult for a listener to distinguish the placement of dorsal fricatives. However, the fact that Mengarini uses a similar system to show labialization and placement in both dorsal

plosives and fricatives suggests that, although he provides a series of single letters for each of these phonemes in his initial description of the consonant system (pp. 1-2), his orthography is closer to the language's phonemic system than it appears in his initial explanation of each letter.

To provide one final note on the pronunciation of the language, in his *pars secunda*, Mengarini talks about the pronunciation of the *z* at length. He regards Salish as different from other Indian languages, because Salish cannot use *z* to indicate the *ts* sound as other Indian languages can. In Salish, *t* is often followed by *s*, and their separateness allows them to function individually in the syntax of words. Using IPA, the difference in sounds is /*ts*/ and /*t͡s*/. Mengarini states that this is an especially important distinction when referring to the nominative case and the ablative of instrument, both of which are Latin categories. The use of Latin categories to describe Montana Salish is further discussed in Section VI.

III. Accents

In his grammar, Mengarini makes a distinction between grave and acute accents for vowels. He states in his *pars prima* that “an acute accent ´ denotes a vowel pronounced with a closed mouth, a grave accent ` denotes a vowel pronounced with an open mouth. Moreover, either (accent) distinguishes long vowels from short ones” (p. 2). While Mengarini's accents in his examples seem to line up with the stress accents in Thomason's (2009b) dictionary files most of the time, it is not immediately obvious which contexts call for the use of a grave or an acute accent. Some examples are given in (9):

- | | | | | |
|-----|----|-----------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| (9) | a. | èkun | ʔ ék ^w n | <i>fish eggs</i> |
| | b. | sntepséus | esnt'p'séw's ¹ | <i>joint</i> |
| | c. | sglgált | sχłχá(lt) | <i>day</i> |
| | d. | goàkoi | χ ^w áq ^w (i) | <i>grind</i> |

Further, in his discussion of pejoratives in Chapter 3 of the *pars prima* grammar (p. 5), Mengarini never uses the same accent marking for the word ‘evil’ more than once. After originally giving the form *tèie*, gives the examples listed in (10):

- | | | | | |
|------|----|----------------|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| (10) | a. | teìè skaltnígu | t'éyeʔ sqłtní(x ^w) | <i>bad man</i> |
| | b. | teìe s'm'è̀m | t'éyeʔ smʔ é̀m | <i>bad woman</i> |
| | c. | téìe sménugu | t'éyeʔ sméńx ^w | <i>bad tobacco</i> |

Mengarini goes on to describe the accents in more detail in his *pars secunda*, saying

“Accents, whether grave or acute, distinguish long consonants from short ones... A word of multiple syllables (not conjugated) generally has one accent wherever you please... Conjugated words retain their own accent from the original words” (p. 63).

The Latin word used in this passage, *quodlibet* ‘that which is pleasing’ suggests that there may not be a specific rule for the use of grave and acute accents and that their use was up to the author’s discretion.

To better understand Mengarini's use of accent marks, we can look at his own native language, Italian, which also uses grave and acute accents. Their primary use in Italian is to differentiate open and closed vowels, specifically *e* and *o*, making the distinction between [ɛ] and [e] as well as between [ɔ] and [o]. If Mengarini was using grave and acute accents in this way for Montana Salish, then he was making a distinction that is not phonemic in modern representations of the language. It is difficult to say, however, whether what he was hearing was a part of the language that has since disappeared, or whether his perception of the language was somehow affected by his previous inclinations towards the openness and closeness of vowels which is present in his native Italian.

Another possibility is that some of the accents are used to disambiguate words. In his *pars secunda*, Mengarini provides a list of words which are similar in pronunciation but have different meanings, saying that "Lest anyone should be easily deceived by certain words, either in speaking or in writing, because of similarity, here they are exposed in a clear orthography" (p. 64). He compares, for example, *ès kòlkei* 'he is planting' to *eskolchèi* 'a picture' (in modern transcription *esq^wól'tqi* and *esk^wtq'éy*, respectively). This is another example showing that Mengarini's accents line up with the stress accents of modern Salish. However, there are other phonetic characteristics besides accents that distinguish the words despite their similar pronunciations. Both words have the *ko* combination, but they are phonemically distinct. One possibility is that the accent shows that the *o* is part of the root *sq'wól* in *ès kòlkei* (*esq^wól'tqi*) and not in *eskolchèi*

(*esk^wʔq'éy*) where the *o* is unaccented. The roundedness of the letter *o* indicates labialization, and the accent mark over it indicates that it is part of the root.

Apart from this possible indication of an accented rounded vowel as part of the root and not just a labialization marker, I have not found a hint of any rule for Mengarini's use of accent markers. This is one area which will require further research and a larger sample of examples to determine a rule, if one exists. From what this analysis has shown, though, especially considering the examples in (10), I venture to say that there is no consistent rule for the use of grave and acute accents in Mengarini's grammar.

IV. Pluralization

In the first part of Chapter 2 of his *pars prima* (p. 2-3), Mengarini describes the rudiments of several ways to pluralize nouns in Montana Salish. In this section he lists five ways: reduplication of the root, reduplication of the root with a dropped vowel, a reduplicated consonant in the middle of the word, the addition of the prefix *uʔ-*, and the use of an entirely different form to indicate plurality. He then goes on to say that there are nouns which only appear in the singular and others which only appear in the plural (lists of these nouns are in Appendix A). Other elaborations on pluralization that he covers in the *pars tertia* are also discussed below.

The reduplicated root is a common form of pluralization in Salish. It is described by Thomason (2009a) as C(V)C reduplication, since the onset and the coda are reduplicated. Montana Salish speakers, however, tend to eliminate the vowel in a syllable

if it is unstressed. This accounts for the first two forms of pluralization that Mengarini lists.

For his third form of pluralization he states “Some nouns reduplicate the consonant in the middle of the word, such as: *skòlchemús*, ‘cheek’; *skòlchammús*, ‘cheeks’” (p. 2). Because it is only the second consonant of the root being reduplicated, Thomason classifies this as C2 reduplication. Although the significance of C2 reduplication has not been exhaustively studied, Thomason (2009a) analyzes it as an inchoative, meaning that something is undergoing or has undergone a change of state. Two examples Thomason gives of inchoative C2 reduplication are: *u qe esč’sé qe qammín* ‘And we both fell down’ and *čn k^wúl’l’ t ltk^wú* ‘I turned into an otter’ (Thomason 2009a). Mengarini’s example of C2 reduplication as a plural formative does not have an equivalent form in Thomason’s fieldnotes, but a similar example is *sčč’máqstšn* ‘leg, shin’; *sčč’mmáqstšn* ‘both legs, both shins’. This contains the same reduplicated *m* as Mengarini’s ‘cheek’ example. Thomason also notes that speakers rejected her suggestion of *sčč’mč’máqstšn*, which would be the C(V)C reduplication which generally indicates plurality. There is not enough data from Mengarini or Thomason to show that this formation is a rule for certain plural body parts, but Thomason’s ‘leg, shin’ example shows that Mengarini’s ‘cheek’ example was neither an isolated example nor a transcription error.

The fourth plural formation that Mengarini puts forth is the addition of the prefix *u†-*. Modern studies recognize this prefix as a collective prefix. It indicates a collection of things denoted by a noun, which does not necessarily mean that the noun is pluralized. For example, *u†Čoní l Malí tu mí?inm* ‘Johnny and Mary shook the bones

against each other' does not mean that there are multiple Johnny's. Rather, it means that Johnny is part of a collective group which also includes Mary. In other instances, however, a collective *uʔ-* is equivalent to a plural marker, as in *uʔχmáʔn* 'flies'. Still other examples have both *uʔ-* and a plural formative, e.g. *uʔisq^wsq^wsé* 'all my sons' where *i(n)-* is the first person singular possessive marker and the singular form is *sq^wsé* 'son'.

The fifth form of pluralization in the grammar is the use of a completely different form for the singular and plural form of the noun (in some instances this is true for verbs as well, but this analysis focuses on the nominal system of the language). He gives for example *es'schíte* 'tree' and *szlzlíl* 'trees, forest'. English has similar examples (person/people). Mengarini also gives examples of words which only occur in the singular and others which only appear in the plural. Some of his examples may appear such because of a required plurality, such as *gusguístin* 'stilts' always appearing in the plural (it's hard to use only one stilt). Others seem to need the reduplication of the root is to produce the desired meaning. For example *getgeítne* 'dagger' (*χχéytne* in modern transcription) comes from the root *χít* 'jagged'. Thus, multiple jagged edges make up a serrated dagger. Another example is *sglgált* 'day', which reduplicates the root *χál* 'light'. This does not mean, however, that 'day' and 'dagger' cannot be pluralized as 'days' or 'daggers', since the singular forms of these words also use C(V)C reduplication, as per the first pluralization form Mengarini mentions. These forms remain reduplicated in a pluralized form and the listener uses context to determine the plurality.

Finally, Mengarini makes a note concerning special plurals, saying that words that end in *-àus* change to *-àlis* to form the plural, and words that end in *-èus* change to

-*èlis*. According to Thomason (2009a), these are lexical suffixes. The *-éw*'s suffix, sometimes pronounced *-áw*'s, indicates 'half' or 'middle', which fits Mengarini's examples: *ès 'chschilàus* 'something that hangs' and *sntepséus* 'joint'. The *-àlis* and *-èlis* plural suffixes, though, do not necessarily seem to match up. The *-àlis* suffix does not appear in Thomason's files and the *-èlis* suffix simply indicates a plural object.

Mengarini's last example in this note, *kokoméus* 'yearling horse', does not fit the plural formation, however, just as it also does not fit semantically with the 'half' or 'middle' suffix, suggesting that there may be a connection between the 'half' and plural object forms.

V. Augmentatives, Diminutives, and Pejoratives

Augmentatives and pejoratives, according to Mengarini, are formed by adding what seems like an adjectival stem before a noun. If they are in fact separate categories within the language in and of themselves, then the Adj N word order for both of these forms does not seem very different from an ordinary adjective-noun pairing, as shown by the examples in (11). Although it is possible that these categories were influenced by Mengarini's own linguistic background, there is some evidence within his data which show that these categories could have their own unique qualities, though this evidence is never overtly pointed out in the grammar.

For augmentatives, Mengarini adds the adjective *kutunt* 'big' (*k^wtúnt* in modern representation) before the noun. He also recognizes that the form sometimes changes to *kuti* (*k^wti*) before an *s* or *ʃ*. Some of Thomason's (2009a) data illustrate modern examples of this.

- (11) a. *k^wtunt tu čoní sp'əsá* 'Johnny has a big nose'
b. *k^wti ttw'ít* 'boy after age of puberty'

Both examples in (11) have the word for 'big' followed by *t*, but only (11b) follows the morphophonemic rule that *n* changes to *i* before an *s* or *t*. This is because the root form of the word for 'big' is *k^wtun*. Thus in (11a), the *-t*, a stative suffix, blocks the morphophonemic rule from occurring. In (11b), however, the *-t-* serves as a compounding affix, so there is no need for a stative suffix. In (11a) the following *t* is part of the secondary marker *tu* and is not a compounding affix. If the stative suffix *-t* was not there, though, the morphophonemic rule would still apply and it would surface as *k^wti*. Compounds, then, follow a pattern that is typical Adj N word order, and includes morphophonemic features that are also found in a two-word adjective-noun phrase. Additionally, adjective-noun pairs are written as two separate words, whereas compounds are written as one word. I do not want to take this into account when analyzing Mengarini's grammar, though, since he only gives one example of two separate words (*kùti skàgae* 'a big horse'), and this does not give sufficient data to make a comparison about spacing. There is also no known semantic category which requires compounds rather than two-word phrases. Rather, the decision of using one form or the other is left up to the speaker.

Mengarini also states that “Certain augmentatives also receive the preposition *ch*” (p. 5). This prefix *č-* could serve one of two functions: to denote a person in quantity expressions, or it could be a locative prefix meaning ‘on, to, at’. Mengarini does not make clear when this prefix is or is not used in addition to the augmentative stem for compounds like that in (11b). The *č-* prefix does not have any connection with the augmentative in Thomason’s (2009a) files, however the suffixes that occur with this prefix are most likely lexical suffixes of the same kind that are shown in the pejorative examples in (12).

The pejorative category is similar. According to Mengarini:

“pejoratives are formed from the adjective *ches* (for *chès*, *bad*) and the corresponding composition form of the substantive ... If the substantive should have no corresponding form, or even if it should have one, ... the adjective *chès* does not occur, rather the Salish adjective *tèie*, *evil* (occurs). Because these substantives are used absolutely, indeed they have no corresponding composition form” (p. 5)

These are *č’és* ‘bad’ (Mengarini includes the stative suffix *-t* in his explanation) and *t’éyeʔ* ‘evil’, which we saw earlier in Section III about accent marking. With these two possibilities, Mengarini makes a very clear distinction: the root *č’és* appears in compound words, while the word *t’éyeʔ* is the adjective which appears in adjective-noun phrases. In this sense, it is identical to the type of construction used for the augmentative, however there is no morphophonemic rule that the stative suffix would block.

When Mengarini refers to a “corresponding form” for the compounds, he is referring to lexical suffixes which the *č’és* can occur with. Examples he gives are shown in (12):

- | | | | | |
|------|----|-----------|---------------------|-------------------|
| (12) | a. | ches-élgu | č’sélx ^w | <i>ugly house</i> |
| | b. | ches-ós | č’sús | <i>ugly face</i> |
| | c. | ches-àlka | č’sáq | <i>foul smell</i> |

When Mengarini says that “*tèie* can be used absolutely”, he means that any noun can take that adjective before it. This includes nouns which can take lexical suffixes and those which can’t.

The diminutive is probably the most different of the forms given in Chapter 2 of the *pars prima*. Mengarini recognizes that it is marked by the prefix *ʔ* which occurs after the *s*- nominalizing prefix and, unlike the augmentative and pejorative, occurs with roots and not with lexical suffixes. He also states that “it consists of the reduplication of either a vowel or a consonant, or of the entire root” (p. 4). This is a very accurate observation, although any or all of these phenomena that he mentions can occur in the same word.

Also, although Mengarini does not indicate it, all of the resonants following the *ʔ* prefix (if it is used in the formation of the diminutive) become glottalized. Some examples of the Montana Salish diminutive are given below in (13):

(13)	a.	‡ l̥u	‡ ʔ éw	<i>short father (sc. short in stature)</i>
	b.	s‡ kókoi	s‡ k ^w k ^w uy	<i>short mother</i>
	c.	stítichíne	st'it'iʔ č'íme	<i>puppy</i>
	d.	‡ kukui mélgu	‡ k ^w k ^w nélx ^w	<i>small house</i>

Mengarini states incorrectly that the use reduplication to form the diminutive can occur on any part of the root, when in fact it only occurs on the first consonant of the root (C1 reduplication). Interestingly all of his examples show this reduplication correctly, as in (13b). He also gives examples with the adjective *kukui* ‘small’ as a compound to represent the diminutive, as he did with ‘big’, ‘bad’, and ‘evil’ in the other categories, as shown in (13d). Mengarini shows this example as a two-word adjective-noun phrase, but the lexical suffix for house is the same suffix as č'sélx^w in (12a), where he recognized the pejorative as a compound. So, each one of these categories (augmentative, pejorative, diminutive) has a form that can take a lexical suffix as well as other forms to express them.

Also when discussing diminutives, Mengarini gives a list of what he claims are irregular diminutive forms. Looking more closely at these, we see that they are not irregular. Rather, they come from different root words. For example, he gives *nkokosmíchnschin* ‘dog’ and *stítichíne* ‘puppy’ (13c). The word ‘dog’ comes from the root for ‘dog’, but the word puppy comes from the root *t'ič'* ‘young’. Although Mengarini makes insightful observations for diminutives, the rules as they are now understood are only slightly different than the way he describes them. He was right to discuss augmentatives, pejoratives, and diminutives in the same section; however, he

could have gone further into his analysis of lexical suffixes to show a closer connection between the forms. Chapter 11 of his *pars tertia* (yet untranslated for this paper) contains a list of what appear to be lexical suffixes. Perhaps when future work is done on the grammar, a better connection can be made between these two parts, since Mengarini does not overtly point out a connection.

VI. Latin as a Lingua Franca

Mengarini wrote his grammar in Latin primarily so that it could be used by missionaries (Mooney 1911), since it was written in a time when Latin was still used extensively by the Catholic Church. The use of the Latin language, though, does not seem to have been a barrier for Mengarini in describing the language. In fact, because Latin had long served as a language of scholarship, it may have been better suited for the grammar than other European languages, although other languages (French, German) are used when Latin proved inadequate (e.g. in phonemic description) or ambiguous, for example: *kulkuílt*, ‘purpura, de l’ecarlare’; the Latin *purpura* could represent a wide range of colors from red to purple to blue, but the French *de l’ecarlare* indicates that it is a brighter red. The use of other languages, however, may not have been entirely of Mengarini’s choosing as they are not consistent across the three copies of the manuscript. The word *getgeítne* ‘dagger’, for example, is glossed in Father D’Ataste’s work as ‘gladius anceps, une dague’, but in Father Joset’s version it appears as just ‘gladius anceps’, and in the unknown copyist’s work as just ‘une dague’. It is likely, given Mengarini’s words in the first paragraph of his preface, that he did use secondary

languages in his work, but the places they appear in the manuscripts and the published copy seem to be more of a decision of the copyists and publishers.

Because the grammatical categories in Latin are radically different from those in Montana Salish writing the grammar in Latin carries with it the danger of exerting an external influence. This danger, however, would be true of using any language other than the one being described. Thus, writing the grammar in Latin with the aid of other languages when needed made it accessible to a wider audience, as was Mengarini's intention (Mooney 1911), and was probably no worse than writing it in any other language other than Montana Salish itself.

One problem with the use of Latin is its phonology. The Roman alphabet, like any other alphabet, has a limited number of sounds that can be represented, and they do not cover all of the sounds of Salish. In some cases, Mengarini directly recognized Latin's phonological inadequacies, as with the *ʃ*, and he gave instruction on how this sound should be pronounced. In other cases, as with the dorsal plosives and fricatives, he does not directly state the different ways they should be pronounced, but he marks some differences in labialization and placement with differing following vowel letters. So in using Latin as the language of the grammar, he was using the language of an intended audience rather than another language that would have been more conducive to portraying the sounds of Salish - although, as mentioned above, he did use other languages of Europe to describe certain phonemes. These other European languages were better known languages such as Spanish and German, which his learned readers would be expected to be familiar with.

Probably the biggest problem, if one can call it that, with this grammar is its categorization. Mengarini used categories that he was familiar with to describe a language that his readers were certainly unfamiliar with. The augmentative, diminutive, and pejorative appear as grammatical categories in other languages. Spanish, for example, uses the augmentative suffix *-ón* and the diminutive suffix *-ito/a*. This does not mean, however, that these are universal categories that appear in all languages. One thing that modern studies of Salish have done is examine the language to determine what categories the language actually uses, such as the difference between the plural and the collective, or the existence of an oblique particle. The problem is not the language, but the portrayal. The general problem of a lingua franca is its “feature-centricity”, so to speak, in that it can only describe other languages in relation to its own features. Writing in a minority language greatly decreases the intended audience size, whereas writing in a lingua franca can create inaccuracies, or at least limitations. It is a balance that has no single solution, but ought to be considered, especially in the case of Mengarini’s grammar, since understanding this balance will help us understand how to interpret his work.

VII. Conclusion

This analysis has only scratched the surface of the complexities within Gregory Mengarini’s *Grammatica Linguae Selicae*, and significant work remains to be done even with just the phonemic and nominal systems. I have at least partially decoded Mengarini’s use of a pre-IPA orthography in the writing of his data samples. I have used

primary source manuscripts to attempt to decipher the use of grave and acute accents in the grammar. Although no truly systematic rule was found for accent markings, I have considered possible influences on their use. Finally, after elaborating on Mengarini's description of pluralization techniques, as well as the augmentative, pejorative, and diminutive, I have considered the choice to write the grammar in Latin and the reasons for and consequences of doing so. With further study of this grammar, my hope is that it may be used to help reveal changes that have occurred in Montana Salish over the past 150 years, and at the very least that it will help create a more comprehensive body of literature about the language spanning the entirety of its study, from the mid-nineteenth century to the modern day.

Appendix A

Selections from *Pars Prima*

The Grammar of the Salish Language
Part One
Chapter One (pp. 1-2)
Beginnings

The Salish people have seventeen letters, five of which are vowels: *a, e, i, o, u*—the rest (are) consonants, *c, g, h, k, l, m, n, p, s, t, z*.

Therefore they lack the consonants *b, d, f, r, v*, which are more common to European languages, and which, indeed, if sometimes they occur in foreign words, shift into *p, t, p, l, p*, thus:

Benoit	they say	Paneà
Adéle	they say	Atal
François	they say	Plansoà
Vincent	they say	Pensa

The Sounds of the Letters

The vowels are entirely common to Germanic, Hispanic, Italic, and French, except for *u*, which sounds like (the French) *ou*.

- g* is guttural and sounds like the Spanish *g* or *j* as in the words *general* and *jabili*.
- h* sounds aspirated.
- k* sounds like *c* on its own; but *ck* is especially hard.
- ʃ* sounds like *l*, but it is pronounced with the tongue attached to the palate and extended, and must be perceived by its use rather than by its written form.
- s* always is hard or hissed, and here the French *s* between two vowels does not occur.
- z* is hard like the Germanic custom.

The remaining consonants are ordinary.

- ch* sounds the same as in the English *church*, or the Spanish *muchacho*.
- sch* sounds the same as the French *ch*, or the Italian *scia, sce, sci*; whether a vowel follows or not. But if there is an apostrophe ' between *s*' and *ch*, then they must be pronounced separately.

An acute accent ´ denotes a vowel pronounced with a closed mouth, a grave accent ` denotes a vowel pronounced with an open mouth. Moreover, either (accent) distinguishes long vowels from short ones.

An apostrophe ' denotes a certain interruption of the voice between the first and second letter; Likewise even if this should be the beginning of the following sound or of another word.

Note. All of the letters, whether vowels or consonants, must be pronounced separately and distinctly, which results in the Salish speaking exceedingly slowly.

Chapter 2 (pp. 2-5)
Nouns

All nouns, whether substantive or adjectival, are confined to a single type, seeing that they distinguish neither gender, of which there is one, nor cases, which are generally conveyed in verbs or pronouns, but only number and person or relation, as will be said below. Thus the use of absolutely simple nouns is very simple.

skalmígu	<i>a man</i>
skaleu	<i>a beaver</i>
lúk	<i>a stick, piece of wood</i>

But the difficulty emerges for an absolute number of a multitude, of which the formation varies just about infinitely, and does not depend on the singular practice: to such a degree that scarcely any rule can be supplied, rather by use and practice the plural of the nouns must be provided. Indeed:

1. Certain nouns form plurals by reduplication of the root, such as: skoi, *mother*; pl. skoikoi, *mothers*.
2. Certain nouns drop the vowel of the root in reduplication, such as: skaltmigu, *man*; skkaltmigu, *men*; esmòck, *mountain*; esmkmòck, *mountains*.
3. Some nouns reduplicate the consonant in the middle of the word, such as: skòlchemús, *cheek*; skòlchammús, *cheeks*.
4. Some nouns form the plural by placing the syllable u† in front and they are generally substantive or animate adjectives, such as: nackoèmen, *thief*; u†nackoèmen, *thieves*; konkoínt, *poor man*; u†konkoínt, *poor men*.
5. Finally, certain nouns drop the root of the singular in the plural number, and they assume an entirely different form and they are called truly irregular, and they are:
Es'schíte, *tree*, pl. szlzlíl, *trees, forest*.
Skukuímlt, *young* (adject. Not old man), pl. sz'zmélt.

Note. This irregular adjective is derived from a likewise irregular diminutive †kukuiúme, *small* (sing.), pl. †z'zimet, *small* (plur.).

†mkuéut, *neck*, pl. †mkomkotúlègu, *necks*.

S'm'èm, *woman*, pl. pèlp†gui, *women*, and derived as sgu'sm'èm, *full sister*, pl. sgu'pè†p†gui.

Note 1. Nouns ending in *àus* or *èus* form the plural by changing *àus* into *àlis* and *èus* into *èlis*, as in: *ès'chschilàus*, *that which hangs*, pl. *es'chschilàlis*; *sntepséus*, *joint*, pl. *sntepsèlis*. Except *kokoméus*, *yearling horse*, pl. *koikomeùs*.

These which follow have two plurals.

Esngalèus, *bridge*, pl. *esngalelis*, or *esngalgalléus*.

Note 2. Certain substantives are only used in the singular, and they are:

<i>èkun</i> ,	<i>fish egg.</i>
<i>geùlégu</i> ,	<i>rattlesnake.</i>
<i>gettzin</i> ,	<i>pet.</i>
<i>kaimíntn</i> ,	<i>something written.</i>
<i>kòmkan</i> ,	<i>animal fur, hide.</i>
<i>kottàgoe</i> ,	<i>small foot, louse.</i>
<i>nchàumen</i> ,	<i>prayer.</i>
<i>nkokosmíchschin</i> ,	<i>dog.</i>
<i>pítchel</i> ,	<i>foliage.</i>
<i>spèntich</i> ,	<i>year.</i>
<i>suènt</i> ,	<i>fish.</i>
<i>spúm</i> ,	<i>hair.</i>
<i>s'chènsch</i> ,	<i>stone.</i>
<i>stgènych</i> ,	<i>entrails.</i>
<i>u'ússé</i> ,	<i>egg.</i>

Or only in the plural, namely with reduplication, as in:

<i>getgeítne</i> ,	<i>dagger.</i>
<i>gòtgoàt</i> ,	<i>sheep.</i>
<i>guáguáligu</i> ,	<i>fox.</i>
<i>gutguítt</i>	<i>debt.</i>
<i>gusguístin</i> ,	<i>stilts.</i>
<i>jkulikúáli</i> ,	<i>corn.</i>
<i>kalkaláks</i> ,	<i>tadpole.</i>
<i>kulkuílt</i> ,	<i>bright red.</i>
<i>kukúsem</i> ,	<i>star.</i>
<i>kutkuíteps</i> ,	<i>flea.</i>
<i>ttmâtâmàie</i> ,	<i>frog.</i>
<i>tttuèlze</i> ,	<i>thorn.</i>
<i>npptpetkàks</i> ,	<i>pig.</i>
<i>olólím</i> ,	<i>iron.</i>
<i>s'chuaupús</i> ,	<i>tears.</i>
<i>sglgált</i> ,	<i>day.</i>
<i>sgúguie</i> ,	<i>ant.</i>
<i>skpkèpèné</i> ,	<i>sand.</i>
<i>tlotlènie</i> ,	<i>bat.</i>

Of the Declensions of the Substantives
Diminution, Augmentation, Pejoration

1. Almost all substantives can be made into diminutives and are frequently so used. While the diminutive is formed either by placing the consonant † before the root of the word, as in:

olólím, *iron*, dimin. †olólím, *a small piece of iron*.
sgutíp, *coast*, dimin. s†gutíp, *small coast*.
l'èu, *father*, dimin. †l'èu, *short father (sc. insignificant height)*.

Or in addition to the consonant †, the root of the substantive undergoes a change; this modification is not subjected to any rules, not so different from the plural of substantives, and it consists of the reduplication of either a vowel or a consonant, or of the entire root.

esmòck, *mountain*, dimin. es†mmòck, *a small mountain*.
gòlko, *wheel*, dimin. †goglko, *small wheel*.
lùk, *wood*, dimin. †lúl'lk, *small piece of wood*.
skoi, *mother*, dimin. s†kókoi, *short mother*.
sípi, *rope*, dimin. s†sísipi, *small cord*.
s'm'è'm, *woman*, dimin. s†m'è'm, *small woman*.

Certain substantives form the diminutive by adding a(n) (diminutive) adjective †kukui úme, *small*, placed before the substantive, as in:

†kukui mélgu, *small house*, in place of †kukui ûme zítgu, *small house*,
†kukui míze, *small cloak*, in place of †kukui ume sízem, *small cloak*.

Irregular are:

stí'ichmísh, *girl*, dimin. schèschútem, *small girl*.
nkokosmíchnschin, *dog*, dimin. stitíchíne, *puppy*.
†m†amáie, *frog*, dimin. kalkalaks, *small frog*.
stomchelt, *daughter*, dimin. schutmélt, *little daughter*.
stipèis, *rain shower*, dimin. luèis, *light rain*.

2. Augmentatives are formed by placing the adjective kùtn (from kutunt, *large*), or kuti before an s or a †, before an original substantive or the corresponding word composition.

schnlzàskàgae, *horse* (in the skagae combination), hence kùti skàgae, *big horse*.

zitgu, *house* (in the è†gu combination), hence kutn-elgu, *large house*.

sm'òt, *smoke*, thus kuti-sm'òt, *big smoke*.

skeltich, *body*, kuti-skèltich, *large body*.

†chèp, *pot*, kuti-†chèp, *large pot*.

Note. Certain augmentatives also receive the preposition *ch* (toward, outside, around, etc.) placed before the adjective kutùnt, as in:

ch-kutn-èus, *he who has a big belly*, èus in the combination instead of olio, *belly*.

ch-kut-ène, *he who has large ears*, from tènè, *ears*.

ch-kutn-ús, *large fire* (ùs in the combination in place of solschiztin, *fire*).

3. Pejoratives are formed from the adjective ches (for chèst, *bad*) and the corresponding composition form of the substantive, thus:

ches-élgu, *ugly house*.

ches-ós, *ugly face*.

ches-àlka, *bad smell*.

Note that the adjective chest is not Salish but S'chizuum (commonly Cœur d'Alène), which the Salish people only use in composition instead of the Salish adjective tèie, *bad*.

Note. If the substantive should have no corresponding form, or even if it should have one, nothing should be used except the basic substantive, and in that case the adjective chès does not occur, rather the Salish adjective tèie, *bad*, thus it will be said:

teie skalrmígu, *a bad man*.

teie s'm'èm, *a bad woman*.

téie sménugu, *bad tobacco*.

Because these substantives are used absolutely, indeed they have no corresponding composition form. One can even say teie zilgu, *ugly house*, instead of chès-élgu, etc.

Selections from *Pars Secunda*

Of Pronunciation Rules (pp. 62-63)

The Salish language abounds with consonants, and not seldom does it happen that four or five or even seven and eight consonants are found in one word, without any

intermediate vowel, which, although at first consideration can seem disagreeable, yet in practice there is no difficulty, as will become clear from the rules.

Concerning the pronunciation of the consonants, the following is to be observed.

1. The consonant *g* is guttural, but much lighter than the Spanish or Arabic *g*, yet particularly before *u* and *t* it sounds like the German *ch* or *g* in the word *könig*, etc., thus: *skaltmigu*, *man*; *suígt*, *notch in wood*; *tlágt*, *quick at running*; *ttúgt*, *he flies*, etc., the guttural *g* is hardly heard.

2. The consonant † is entirely singular to Salish: but this consonant, inasmuch as it has presented a strange difficulty, being unknown to many Europeans, and some wanted it pronounced as the English *thl*, others as *tl*, others as *gl*:

nevertheless none of these can be admitted, since the Salish † is strictly and only palatal (see pg. 1); since this consonant is characteristic of the diminutive, whether of a noun or of a verb, it should be pronounced very lightly.

3. The consonant *m* at the end of words, if another consonant precedes, is pronounced *ëm*, particularly in indicative active verbs, thus: *iêskóm*, *I do*, pronounced *ieskólëm*; *iesgalítm*, pronounced *iesgalítëm*; *iesníchm*, *I cut*, pronounced *iesníchëm*, etc.

Likewise, *m* between two consonants sounds like *ïm*, particularly if the preceding consonant is *s*, thus: *smgeích*, *bear*, pronounced *sïmgeichn*; *smlich*, *salmon*, pronounced *sïmlich*, although after an *m* a consonant does not follow but the *m* has an apostrophe (') as in, *s'm'em*.

4. What is said about the consonant *m* also should be observed for the consonant *n*, whether it be at the end of a word or between two consonants. Hence however often *n* occurs with another consonant after the characteristic *tnes* or *chnes* etc. of verbs, it is pronounced as *ïn*, thus: *tnesntelsi*, *I think*, pronounced *tnesïntelsi*; *asnziam*, *you dig up earth*, pronounced *asïnzikam*.

But the characteristic *tn* or *chn*, whether a consonant or vowel follows, is always pronounced *tën*, *chën*, or *chïn*, thus: *tnesnkuèni*, *I choose*, sounds like *tënèsinkuèni* or *chinèsinkuèni*; *tnólschiztm*, *I lit a fire*, sounds like *tënólschiztëm*, etc.

In the same manner, also, all verbs that have the force of a passive participle, thus: *szmól*, *water that has been drawn*, sounds like *sžïnmól* (from *tnesmóli*, *I draw water*); *sžntkús*, *that which is added*, sounds like *sžïntkús* from *tnesntkúsi*, *I add*.

5. The consonant *z* is hard as in the German manner. Perhaps it will not be disadvantageous that those who have committed Indian languages to writing all eliminate the consonant *z*, for whose place the consonants *ts* suffice; but these consonants, whatever might be their status in other languages, beget a very great inconvenience for the Salish language; For since the composition or the syntax of words often requires a *t* before an *s*, as in the nominative case and the ablative of instrument, not only the pronunciation but also the meaning would be rendered faulty on account of the ambiguity and orthographic error.

6. Any consonant with an apostrophe assumes the sound of the following vowel; thus: tnes'chgut'telsi, *I become angry*, is pronounced tenès chgultètélsi; l'eù, *father*, is pronounced lē èù; s'm'èm, *woman*, is pronounced si me èm. You could say the same thing of the plural of nouns, when the root is reduplicated without a vowel: luk, *wood*, pl. lklúk, sounds like lkùluk; kutunt, *big*, pl. ktkutunt, pronounced kùtkutúnt. Also in reduplicated verbs: iesplpolstm, *I kill many*, sounds like iespòlpòstm; iesnmett̄m, *I mix*, iesnmt̄mett̄m, *I mix many*, pronounced iesinmèt̄lmèt̄t̄m.

In general concerning the removal of all difficulty in pronunciation, the following can be said: that however often two or more consonants come together in a word, especially if they are neither stops nor liquids, the sound of an intervening *e* or *i* vowel should always be heard (halfway voiceless as in the French word *parcèque*), thus: ésp̄lpt̄schín, *barefooted*, sounds like ésp̄èlp̄èt̄l̄schín, or esp̄ìlp̄ìt̄l̄schín; iespt̄tkum (reduplicated), *I hit many times*, sounds like iesp̄ìtp̄ìtkùm; tnesps̄ma, *I betrotte*, pronounced t̄nès̄p̄èsp̄mà, etc.

Of accents (pp. 63-64)

Accents, whether grave or acute, distinguish long consonants from short ones (page 2); the word of multiple syllables (not conjugated) generally has one accent wherever you please: mómkozin, *swallow (bird)*; lkoíkoko (diminut.) *bull calf less than six months*.

In the plural of nouns and in reduplicated words, if the root is reduplicated with an accent, then the accent is repeated, thus: stí'ichmísch, *girl*, pl. stí tí íschemísch; chílélgu, *bark*, pl. chíchílélgu; ies'azgam, *I see*; ies áz ázgam, etc.

Conjugated words retain their own accent from the original words:

tnes'kukuièzmi, *I speak in a quiet voice* (*e* instead of *u*: it came from kùkuiùmi, *small*); tnes'chlelkèschini, *dash against with foot*, ex iestelkém, *I attack someone with spurs(?)*.

The extension of a grave or acute accent attributes a great strength of speech and an emphasis, and it denotes either the length of time of the action, or the quality or quantity as it is experienced, and it is especially in use, thus:

Hipè~~~~~is, instead of simply Hipèis, *it had rained* (preterite perfect), it says more than if the adverb goeit, *much* or kasip, *for a long time*, were added.

ingamènch, *I love* (see Part III, piece 16); ingamè~~~~~nch, *I love with an incredible love*.

tnaímt, *I was scorned*; tnaí~~~~mt, *I was especially scorned*.

This emphasis through the extension of the accent, however, not only has a place in nouns and verbs, but in whatever part of speech you want.

When truly the emphasis reflects back on the personal pronoun of the 1st and 2nd person, it is pronounced through repetition of the same but free pronoun (see chapter 5, piece 1).

Lest anyone should be easily deceived by certain words, either in speaking or in writing, because of similarity, here they are exposed on account of clear orthography:

és schi it, *first*; és chíte, *tree*.
ès kòlkei, *he is planting*; eskolkei, *a picture*.
gmgèmt, *heavy*; kmkèmt, *silent*.
geúlègu, *rattlesnake*; goeúlègu, *many places*.
gamít, *it is dry*; kamip, *he calms down*.
kulkúílt, *bright red*; gulguílt, *debt*.
kuènt, *listen*; kue'ènt, *bite*; kuèmt, *additionally*.
spkamí, *swan*; spkaní, *sun*.
tàpskèligu, *he shoots*; tàepskèligu, *it is no one*.
tnèsgoàkoi, *I polish*; tneszkoákoí, *I weep*.
tnèspogtuílschi, *I grow up*; tnèspogtuílschi, *I get old*.
tntł lil, *I have died*; itntł il, *I rest*.
tnès sústi, *I drink*; tnès ústi, *I sink*.
iestelím, *I destroy*; iesttelím, *I cut*; ieste ł ím, *to smear with mud*.
iestipím, *I get something*; ièsttipim, *I give generously*.

References

Bischoff, William N. *The Jesuits in Old Oregon*. The Caxton Printers, Ltd. 1945, pg. 64-

83

Lothrop, Gloria Ricci. *Recollections of the Flathead Mission: The Memorie of Father Gregory Mengarini, S.J.* The Arthur H. Clark Company, 1977.

Mengarini, Gregory. "Mengarini's Narrative of the Rockies: Memoirs of Old Oregon, 1841-1850, and St. Mary's Mission." ed. Albert J. Partoll. *Historical Reprints: Sources of Northwest Territory*. Montana University.

Mooney, James. "Gregario Mengarini." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 10. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1911. 8 Dec. 2009
<<http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/10188a.htm>>.

The Oregon Province Archives of the Society of Jesus Indian language collection. The Pacific Northwest tribes. Film 13063, Reel 16. Gonzaga University.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2008a. *Montana Salish: typological checklist*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, ms.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2008b. *Montana Salish: phonemes and alphabetical order*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, ms.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2009a. *Reduplication Patterns in Montana Salish*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, ms.

Thomason, Sarah G. 2009b. *Salish-Pend d'Oreille dictionary*. Ann Arbor. University of Michigan, ms.