UC Berkeley

Title

John Milhau's 1856 Hanis Vocabularies: Coos Dialectology and Philology

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/3m97877z

Author

Grant, Anthony P

Publication Date

1996

JOHN MILHAU'S 1856 HANIS VOCABULARIES: COOS DIALECTOLOGY AND PHILOLOGY[*]

Anthony P. Grant

University of Bradford, UK
e-mail: apgrant@bradford.ac.uk

ABSTRACT

Dr John Milhau, an army physician in Oregon after the Rogue River Wars of 1855, collected vocabularies of a number of languages of southwestern Oregon. Among these are lists in two dialects of Hanis, one of the two Coosan languages. This paper discusses Milhau's linguistic career, the documentation of the Coosan languages, and differences between the two Hanis dialects, for one of which Milhau's material is the only evidence. It also provides modern Hanis and Miluk Coos equivalents for Milhau's forms, which are reproduced in an appendix.

1. Introduction: The Coos Diaspora.

The Coos Indians lived in what is now Coos County, Oregon, south of the Siuslawan-speaking Lower Umpquas (sometimes known as Kuitshes in some ethnographic sources after the Lower Umpqua village name *quuíič*, or as Kalawatsets from qálwəc, the Tillamook Salishan word for 'southerner'), and west of speakers of Athapaskan (Tututni-Kwatami, Upper Coquille) or Kalapuyan (especially Yonkalla Southern Kalapuyan) languages. Coos-speaking tribes had evidently occupied much of the lower Coquille River basin until the late eighteenth century, when Upper Coquilles began to expand their territory, and the mouth of the Coquille River was still home to some Coos-speakers in the early nineteenth century.

The Coos spoke two languages. The northern two-thirds, from their border with the Lower Umpquas near South Tenmile Lake, as far as Empire (now part of the City of Coos Bay), spoke forms of Hanis, while the people living to the south of Empire, on the South Slough of Coos Bay and the mouth of the Coquille River (the *gʷsíya* or Lower Coquille Indians), spoke forms of Miluk. The languages shared much vocabulary and most structural patterns; no phonological changes exist which serve to separate Miluk from Hanis, but a considerable amount of the basic vocabulary and certain rules of cliticization differed in the two languages, and the two languages were not mutually intelligible. The Lower Coquilles were regarded as a different tribe from the South Slough people and the other Coos, although as farv as we can tell South Slough and Lower Coquille forms of speech were almost identical. This situation parallels that obtaining between the Lower Umpquas and their northern neighbors, the Siuslaws, who spoke dialects of the same language but who were different

political entities   who maintained external relations with different groups.

The period after 1851 saw the overrunning by White settlers of what had previously been territory where Indians were in the majority.   Land which had belonged to local tribes since time immemorial was divided up for the benefit of White expropriators, while the original inhabitants were assigned wretched parcels of land in treaties which the United States Senate never ratified.   The Indians were justifiably enraged. Clashes between Oregonian tribes (for instance the Takelmas and Chasta Costas) and well-armed White settlers had resulted in the series of attacks and skirmishes known as the Rogue River Wars, which took place in 1855.   These conflicts, in which the settlers were better armed, numerically superior and therefore victorious,   were to lead the deportation of the majority of coastal Oregon Indians to generally squalid camps in the northwest of the state (notably Siletz and Grand Ronde), though some of the ringleaders of the Rogue River Wars were deported to prisons in California.

The superintendent for the Coos and other tribes in the area, and the man whose task it was to negotiate the treaties on behalf of the Government, was Joel Palmer, who was appointed in the spring of 1853 under the command of General Joseph Lane.   Palmer is of interest   to Penutianists for his (poorly-transcribed) vocabularies of Chinook Jargon and Nez Perce (Palmer 1847: 147-157 and subsequent printings).   Palmer knew that the Coos had had no part in the Rogue River skirmishes, and sought to protect them from the fury of several bands of White vigilantes   who were committing atrocities against Indians in the area.   The Indians' predators   included the Crescent City Guard, another band of   volunteers at the mouth of the Coquille River, and Benjamin Wright, the psychotic agent to the Tututnis.   Wright   was chiefly known for his long curly black hair, for once in his ebriety stripping the clothes off an Indian woman and chasing her through Port Orford with a bullwhip, and for collecting buckskin thongs   festooned with fingers and ears of murdered Indians (in the spring of 1856 Wright was finally cornered and slain by Tututnis, who then performed a scalp dance, with his locks as *pièce de résistance*, see Beckham 1977: 140-141).

Palmer's actions may have been nobly motivated — the liquidation of the Indians of coastal southwestern Oregon (which is what many Whites wanted) was only narrowly averted by the removal of the Indians — but their immediate beneficiaries were the very people whose crimes had necessitated the departure of the Coos, since the Coos exodus left huge tracts of land in southwestern Oregon available for settlement by White opportunists.

The Coos were one of the few tribes to return in any great numbers to their ancestral lands. Upon being moved up the coast (largely on foot) in 1856, they were settled on the Coast Reservation in northwestern Oregon, and by 1859 were eking out a miserable existence near Yachats and Yaquina Bay in the Alsea Agency. This grim period lasted until 1875, when the Coast Reservation was closed and most of its land thrown open to White land-grabbers. The provisions and benefits which the unratified treaties had promised the Coos (including a school) had never materialized, and they had been reduced to a fraction of their original number through starvation, disease and despair. In time, most of the Coos trickled back to the Coos Bay area and settled near their ancestral lands. Some did not; a few Miluk-speakers, including some Lower Coquilles, remained awhile at Siletz; some Coos settled near Florence, in what had been Siuslaw territory (although the Lower Umpquas had shared the same fate as the Coos, the Siuslaws had never been deported). In the early twentith century there were individuals speaking one or other of the Coosan languages in localities more than two hundred miles north of traditional Coos territory.

2.   John Milhau and his Linguistic Work.

Dr John J. Milhau was the army physician at the old Fort Umpqua, in Lower Umpqua territory, southwestern Oregon, in 1856. Little is known of his background or of his life subsequent to his time in Oregon. To judge by his name, he was of French (perhaps Huguenot) extraction, and his transcriptional practice suggests that he was a speaker of a form of English which lacked word-final or preconsonantal /r/ (Milhau used postvocalic <r> as a way of marking vowel length), so he was probably an Easterner.

Milhau left Fort Umpqua on or around November 21 1856, having (with one Lieutenant Stewart) rescued his successor, Dr Edward P. Vollum, together with Vollum's wife, when their ship foundered and ran aground at the mouth of the Umpqua River; the ship was wrecked, and the other passengers were rescued by local Lower Umpqua Indians.

Milhau was able to see at first hand the depredations which the inhhuman conditions of deportation were wreaking on the Coos, and reported about the smallpox epidemic of 1856 (reproduced in Beckham 1977: 155):

The death of an Indian with this disease throws the whole village into a state of excitement and the Indians immediately proceed to kill off all the suspected doctors and make indiscriminate slaughter of all suspected persons until the disease disappears, so that between the disease and the means taken to prevent it a large number have been buried.

The 'doctors' were Coos shamans, possibly those known in Hanis as 'ilqxáyn, although some may have been the more powerful (and more feared) shamans, sometimes of non-Coos origin, known as mit'éedan. Some forms of curing, such as immersion in water, would.have helped to propagate the disease. The impact which this tragic episode must have had on the transmission of Coos curing and religious lore, and on the demographics of the Coos population, can only be guessed at, but the effects must have been very damaging. Other diseases afflicted the undernourished Coos population at this time; prominent among these was scrofula.

In this unhappy environment Milhau was able to offer some medical help. He also took the opportunity to collect linguistic data from several tribes uprooted from southern Oregon, with whom he came into contact. Milhau was the first person to collect any data on a Coosan or Siuslawan language; in addition to his Hanis data, he collected similar wordlists in Lower Umpqua, Alsea and Upper Umpqua (one of the few sources, and one of the longer ones, for this distinctive Oregon Athapaskan language). He was not the first person to collect Upper Umpqua or Alsea material – Horatio Hale had collected data on both in 1841 (Hale 1846: 570-629), but he had not ventured into southwestern Oregon. But apart from Hale and a couple of other collectors (William Fraser Tolmie, in Scouler 1841, and Samuel Parker: Parker 1838) who had gathered wordlists from tribes living along the Coast Range of mountains, Milhau was one of the earliest collectors of linguistic data from coastal Oregon, and by the time the next period of work on Coosan and Siuslawan languages began in the 1880s, these were in their final years of use as home languages; the 1880s saw the birth of the last speakers of these languages.

Milhau used a wordlist devised by George Gibbs (who himself collected Oregonian linguistic material, for example wordlists of Yamhill Kalapuyan and Molala), which was based on the one used by Hale, which itself was based on a 180-item wordlist used and circulated by Albert Gallatin (for instance in Gallatin 1836), which itself may have had its roots in lists used by Thomas Jefferson in his endeavors to collect Indian vocabularies (see Duponceau 1836 ms). Gibbs' wordlist used 180 entries (Milhau appends a few; Gibbs was later to extend it to 211 items by adding further kinship terms and numerals). Milhau did not use any semi-phonetic script of the sort Gibbs preferred, but employed a rough-hewn English-based spelling, although with some attempts at regularization (Buckley 1988: 10). His two lists of words of the 'Coos Bay' language were apparently collected near Umpqua City in November 1856, although he does not give the name of his consultants. These vocabularies form Bureau of American Ethnology ms 191a (BAE ms 191b is a transcription of these into a more standardised orthography by George Gibbs, using macrons rather than <r> to denote vowel-length, and so on).

Milhau's vocabularies of Alsea and Lower Umpqua were used, together with other available early materials, in the preparation by Frachtenberg of

vocabularies of these languages which he appended to his text collections (Frachtenberg 1914, 1920). Frachtenberg's aim was to retrieve from these earlier materials all the words which he had not himself been able to elicit from his consultants, although he did not use these vocabularies exhaustively even in this respect. For some reason he does not seem to have used Milhau's Coos vocabularies in the preparation of his *Coos Texts* (Frachtenberg 1913).

The National Anthropological Archives also houses vocabularies of a similar date and type covering Yuma and Mohave which Gibbs furnished and which were apparently collected with Milhau's assistance. I have not seen these lists. Clearly Milhau was in Arizona at some point, although details of his life after leaving Fort Umpqua are lacking.

3. Materials on Hanis and Miluk Coos.

Since Milhau collected two Coos vocabularies, and since one of them refers to Coos Bay as Melukitz, it might be supposed that one of these represents Miluk Coos while the other is Hanis. This is not the case, as a comparison of the lists with modern recordings of the languages will show. There is not a single word in either of the Milhau Coos lists which points unambiguously to Miluk affiliation. Such forms as resemble those in Miluk are paralleled by forms recorded for modern Hanis.

As stated above, Milhau's data comprise the first record of Hanis Coos speech. The only other record collected at a time when the language was still being passed on to children was George Bissell's 1880s schedule of words and phrases, housed in the National Anthropological Archives. More material, including texts, was collected by Harry Hull St Clair II, a student of Franz Boas, in 1903, while in the summer of 1909 Leo J. Frachtenberg secured even more plentiful material on Hanis, for which he published texts (including those collected by St Clair) with a glossary (the only one published so far) and later a grammar, which served as his doctoral dissertation (Frachtenberg 1913, 1922).

The other scholar to collect substantial material in Hanis was Melville Jacobs (1939, 1940), although he concentrated on retrieving Miluk. Subsequent data are largely unpublished. A little Hanis material was gathered in the 1930s by Joe and Alice Maloney, who worked with Lottie Jackson Evanoff, one of the chief consultants also of John P. Harrington, who worked with her in 1941-1942. There was only one speaker of Hanis alive after 1951, Mrs Martha Harney Johnson of Florence (1886-1972), who worked with Morris Swadesh and Robert Melton in 1953, with Russell Ultan, Victor Golla and especially Jane Sokolow in 1964-1965, and with Joe E. Pierce apparently a little later (these last data were deposited at Portland State College and have subsequently disappeared).

We have extensive textual (mythological, historical and narrative) and paradigmatic material for Hanis, in addition to over two thousand words of lexicon.   The chief sources of data are the collections of Bissell, Frachtenberg, Jacobs, Harrington and Sokolow, the others are minor collections although they contribute individual items to our knowledge of the language.

The identity of Milhau's and Bissell's consultants is unknown.   St Clair worked largely with Tommy Hollis, also known as   Tommy Miller; Frachtenberg worked with Frank Henry Drew (1871-1951), who had grown up along the Siuslaw River,   and Jim Buchanan (c. 1849-1933), the latter giving the texts.   Mr Drew worked a little with Jacobs, whose main consultant was Annie Miner Peterson (1862-1939).   Harrington worked with Lottie Jackson Evanoff (fl. 1942), the daughter of one of the last Coos chiefs and wife of an Aleut sealhunter resident in Coos Bay; he also worked with Mr Drew and a little with Martha Harney Johnson.   Thus the same few people worked with most of the investigators.

The material on Miluk Coos is largely from one person, Mrs Peterson, the woman who provided Hanis data for Jacobs.   She provided many superb texts, and also some paradigmatic and much lexical material.   Her native language was Hanis (she was related to Mrs Evanoff); her mother's mother had spoken Miluk and had passed it onto her granddaughter.   Her Miluk data are the best and fullest that we have. The first record of Miluk, just over a hundred words and a few grammatical forms, was collected by James Owen Dorsey in 1884 at the Siletz Reservation from an old man named Coquille Johnson.   St Clair collected some Miluk data from George Barney in 1903, but Frachtenberg (who collected no Miluk as far as we know) did not publish this, though he printed Dorsey's data in an appendix in Frachtenberg 1914.   J. P. Harrington collected a few dozen words in 1942, some from from Lottie Evanoff, but others from Laura Hotchkiss Metcalf (1862-1961), a semi-speaker of the language who had not used it for many years (her phonology seems to be colored by English), and who also served as a resource person for Morris Swadesh and Robert Melton in 1953.   The tape recording which they collected was the last recorded Miluk material.

The Hanis and Miluk material presented here is problematic with respect to transcription.   The best recorder of Miluk, and the man who made the most copious records of the language, namely Melville Jacobs, did not believe in the phonemic principle (Dell Hymes, personal communication, 1994), and presented his material in a segmentally accurate but quasi-phonemic system of transcription resembling a broad but not internally regularized system of notation.   Close analysis of his work shows that there are numerous instances of the same word being written in differing ways in Jacobs' texts.   Essentially he wrote down what he heard on a given occasion.

Transcriptional problems in Hanis are exacerbated by the fact that the same word was not always heard identically by St Clair, Frachtenberg, Jacobs and Sokolow, and it is hard to systematize these differences.

For instance, on many occasions when Frachtenberg heard (especially) word-final /q/, other people have heard /k'/ - for example in the numerals 'six' and 'seven', Frachtenberg has /-q/ and Sokolow /-k'/, and while Frachtenberg was a painstaking observer of Coos phonetic events, his use of numerous vowel symbols (which cover what is a five-vowel system of /i e a u ə/ plus length in the case of the first four) suggests that he could not always see the wood for the trees (and he was initially misled by St Clair's transcriptions, since the latter used a system of orthography which was obsolete when Frachtenberg began work). Jacobs is a much more disciplined observer, who seems to have heard the languages as being pronounced in a lenis fashion, with more deaspiration and voicing of stops, than other observers might suggest. Sokolow had the benefit of the most rigorous training in phonetics and phonological theory, although this was counterbalanced by the fact that Mrs Johnson had not used her maternal language (her mother, Jane Harney, who died in 1934, spoke no English) in nearly fifteen years.

In short, much of the detail of Hanis phonology is still guesswork, and one has to make decisions about the original shape of a word on the basis of its attestations in a couple of often widely diverging sources. (This is not the case with Miluk; since ninety-five percent of the Miluk morpheme lexicon is found mainly or exclusively in Jacobs' work, which can be phonemicized with respect to voicing of stops, the representation of uvular consonants and their separation from velars, and so on, problems only occur when one attempts to reconstruct a word which Jacobs did not record, or which sometimes contain gemination or another variable feature, and sometimes not.)

I would not wish to defend to the death all my decisions about my spelling of Hanis words. The time for a thorough overhaul of Hanis phonology (which has largely been carried out in Pierce 1971), together with a lexicon of phonemicized Hanis forms, is long overdue, and this article is not the ideal forum in which to carry out this task. I am especially uncomfortable about the distinction between /p/ and /b/, for instance in the word for 'sea' (none of these labial sounds are particularly common in Coos, incidentally, although their presence is certainly not explicable by reference to forms loaned from other languages), and to a lesser extent the distinction between other sets of voiced and voiceless stops, the recording of /q/ when it is pitted against /k'/ in differing sources, and general occurrences of voiced uvulars and labiouvulars. As far as the vowels are concerned, I doubt that I have been completely accurate in my phonemicization of Frachtenberg's instances of <î> (usually respelt as /ə/) and <ä> (usually respelt as /ee/, phonetically [ɛ:]). I offer the forms in these lists as

an attempt to suggest how the Hanis equivalents (and usually etyma) of Milhau's forms would have sounded like.

In short, the Miluk forms which I cite should be regarded as more reliable than the Hanis forms (which nonetheless are as reliable as I could make them). One thing which needs to be reiterated is that historical and diachronic conclusions should not be drawn from the discrepancies between Hanis and Miluk in these lists. The two languages differed considerably in lexicon (especially basic lexicon) and in certain aspects of grammatical strcuture; Miluk also made use of (usually word-final) voiceless nasals, /M N/, where Hanis had /m n/. Nonetheless, although a number of morphemes common to both languages assumed different shapes (for instance 'not' - Hanis /'in/, Miluk /'an/, usually shown with a voiceless nasal, thus: /'aN/), there are no one-to-one sound-changes of any great scope which serve to set the languages apart on the order of the Siuslaw retention of /l/ against Lower Umpqua's merging of /l/ with /n/. There is no Grimm's Law for Miluk, and in the two languages, the morphemes are usually recognizably cognate, or, else they are completely dissimilar and have different origins (and it is impossible to say whether Hanis or Miluk is the innovating language).

The system used in writing the Hanis and Miluk words given in this paper is set below in tabular form: the values of the letters conform to those of American Phonemic notation, except for the barred form *X*, which represents a dorsal voiceless fricative, and replaces the underdotted *x*.

HANIS AND MILUK CONSONANTS

p	t	tł	c	č	k	kw	q	qw	'
[p']	t'	tł'	c'	č'	k'	k'w	q'	q'w	
b	d	dl	dz	J	g	gw	G	Gw	
		ł	s	š	x	xw	X	Xw	h
		l			γ	γw			
m [M]	n [N]								
w	y								

HANIS AND MILUK VOWELS

i, ii   e, ee [ε, ε:]   a, aa   ə   u, uu

Jacobs' notation of Miluk uses geminated /mm nn ll/, which do not seem to occur in Hanis.

Milhau's own materials are usually of little help in unraveling the complications of Coos phonology. Even if he did mark stress with a macron over the stressed vowel, and although he did anticipate and attempt to represent the aural consequence of the glottalized /m/ in Alsea (Buckley 1988: 16), this is mostly due to luck. Indeed Milhau's lists are of very limited use without exegesis, and even then retain many puzzles. I have only seen one other of his lists, the one for Lower Umpqua (Smithsonian Institution/National Anthropological Archive ms 957), and that in a respelt version compiled by George Gibbs; it contains a number of words which Frachtenberg (1914) does not mention and which he evidently did not extract from it for his lexicon. The importance of Milhau's Hanis lists is that one of the dialects which he recorded is phonologically aberrant from the Hanis speech recorded from all the others. There are hints in Milhau's list of some sound-changes in this dialect which the better-recorded one had not undergone.

4. A Note on Dialectal Differentiation in Hanis and Miluk.

Both Hanis and Miluk are known to have had dialects. Considering the sizeable nature of Hanis territory on the one hand, and the differentiation between the South Slough Miluks (from whom Annie Miner Peterson was in part descended) and the Lower Coquilles, this is not surprising. However, we have little hard information on the nature of dialects in Coosan beyond recognition of the major Hanis-Miluk split.

I will first discuss the dialectal divisions in Miluk. The evidence for a distinction between the speech of the South Slough Miluks and that of the Lower Coquilles is scanty, and rests on a couple of lexical items [1]. Dorsey's material (reproduced discussed in Frachtenberg 1914: 141-149), and taken from an old man at the Siletz Reservation, is the only source of Lower Coquille Miluk that we have; all other data come from speakers with ancestral affiliations to the South Slough of Coos Bay. Some of the forms are these:

English	Hanis	South Slough Miluk	Lower Coquille Miluk
dog	q'wíyúus	yék'lu	lék'lu
coyote	yé'lis	yé'lis, yéilis	c'ёllik'a

The Hanis and South Slough Miluk form for 'coyote' is evidently Common Coosan, that is, it goes back to the ancestor language of Hanis and Miluk. The Lower Coquille form seems to be an innovation. On the other hand, the Hanis word for 'dog', which is found also in Lower Umpqua, is apparently a loan from Chinookan -kéewixš. [2]. Berman (n.d.) notes that

Jacobs' Miluk has the same words for 'muskrat' and 'skunk' which Hanis has, whereas Lower Coquille has different words: *dzən, qwə́lci* occur in South Slough Miluk and in Hanis in opposition to Lower Coquille Miluk (rephonemicized) *sə́š(t)l'e, *kənə́š(t)l'e. One other difference obtaining between Lower Coquille Miluk and South Slough Miluk is the formation of the numerals between 'six' and 'ten'; Lower Coquille speech counted down from 'ten' while South Slough Miluk counted up from 'five', thus 'six' in Lower Coquille Miluk would be phonemicized as *dzaawəx̌gə́iye (compare *dzawə́* 'four') while Jacobs' South Slough Miluk has *hič'ix̌gə́iye*, where *hič'i* is 'one'.

Given the extremely slender corpus of potential contrastive forms in Miluk, there is little that can be said about dialectal differentiation, except that it existed but not to a depth which would have impeded mutual intelligibility.

Evidence for dialectal differences within Hanis is a little more plentiful. One of Milhau's vocabularies represents a Hanis dialect which is different from the speech of all the Hanis-speakers who have ever been recorded (which in general is very uniform), and in that sense we have some indication of phonological and lexical differences (but not morphosyntactic ones) between different forms of Hanis. Even so, the degree of diference between the two Hanis dialects of Milhau should not be exaggerated. Of 181 forms recorded for both dialects, 112, that is 62% of the forms, are actually identical in spelling or are functionally identical, and the vast majority can be traced in later records of Hanis. The forms which are practically identical, which show only a couple of phonemes different, or which are phonologically almost identical but which have been given under different glosses in the lists, would bring the total of congruent forms in the two dialects to between 70 and 75 percent.

Otherwise, the evidence is scanty indeed. Frank Drew, who had grown up on the Siuslaw River, and who had lived north of traditional Coos territory, had no trouble in understanding the material which Frachtenberg gathered from Jim Buchanan, who came from the Hanis village of *wa'ə́'lač*. The speech of Martha Harney Johnson, who lived near Florence and who had gone to school at the village of Acme, also north of traditionally Hanis territory, does not diverge from the form of Hanis documented by Frachtenberg in his grammar and texts, except that her command of Hanis morphology seems to have atrophied after years of speaking English to her husband and daughter, with concomitant disuse of Hanis. That there were different ways of speaking Hanis is alluded to by Jacobs' tantalizing remarks (in Jacobs 1939, 1940) about 'Hanis village provincialisms', and the fact that Mrs Evanoff told J. P. Harrington in 1942 that there was 'a cute way of speaking' Hanis (though who used this form, and when, is not recorded).

Some later recordings of Hanis (and the Miluk material from Mrs Peterson, who, it will be remembered, was a native speaker of Hanis) illustrate a form of vowel harmony (discussed further in Berman n.d.), by which the vowels /a, aa/ and /e, ee/ cannot occur in the same word. A rule of regressive assimilation ensures that vowel length is preserved but that the vowel in the first syllable is shifted to that of the first syllable, so that /a-e/ sequences become /e-e/ sequences, while /e-a/ vocalism shifts to /a-a/. This rule was not operative when Frachtenberg worked with Mr Buchanan and Mr Drew, but occurs in the speech of Mrs Peterson and Mrs Johnson. It is not common in the Milhau recordings, which do not show any embargo on the use of /e-a/ or /a-e/ sequences.

5. The Contents of Milhau's Hanis Vocabularies.

Milhau's Hanis wordlists contain two dialects, which are not further specified as to provenience or source, though the anonymous ascription on the top of the first page of the vocabulary (a typed version which was presumably executed between 1913 and 1939) accurately notes that the right-hand dialect is somewhat closer to the Coos variety recorded by St Clair and Frachtenberg. No names are given to the dialects; I therefore will describe the lists as being representative of dialects known as M (= Melukitz, or *mílugwíč*) in the left-hand column and A (= Anna-sitch, or *háanisíč*) in the right-hand column, after their names for Coos Bay (that is, the inlet, rather than the city, which was known as Marshfield until 1945). Hereafter, a designation such as M134 will refer to the Melukitz form corresponding to gloss #134.

The unsystematic transcriptional habits which Milhau uses serve to make the lists look more different from one another than they really are. Milhau rarely spells out his transcriptional practices; his <-ar> represents /aa/, while his <-er> seems to do the same. His <-ah> sometikmes represents /aa/, and sometimes /ee/. His forms for 'neck' suggest a use of <q> to represent /kw/, while his <ch> can sometimes be /č/, as in M21, but sometimes /x/, as in #25 and #48. He nowhere represents glottalization, and the most that one can glean from his transcriptions about the lateral affricates and uvular stops in Hanis is that although he heard and apprehended the unusual nature (to anglophone ears) of these sounds, finding a way to represent them gave him problems, and he was unable to work out a consistent spelling system, working in an ad hoc manner word by word, without using rough spelling conventions.

Examples of the types of differences between the lists are given below. Several seemingly different forms are simply the same form heard in two different ways, or the same form given two different meanings, one correct, the other often erroneous (which is not unusual when collecting wordlists; we do not know which language Milhau used with the Hanis – probably Chinook Jargon or English – so some confusion is likely).

Thus glosses #23, #50, #95, #114, #115, #116 for both A and M represent the same word although the two recordings present different appearances. In the case of the last three forms, it appears that A has a prefixed *ta* 'that one', in the sense of 'that's red, that's a white one'. In the first example the difference between the recordings is one of vowel-length, in the next two cases we see differing apprehensions of lateral fricatives in what are the same words. The same is true of #21, 'nose', both forms of which can be identified with Hanis *šuuł*, although the divergent spellings do not make this link clear.

Other words which show phonological differences in identical underlying stems include #2, #4, #6, #7, #19, #22, #27, #47, and #154, while M5 is the same as A3, allowing for consonant symbolism (which was lexicalized and non-productive in Hanis). Forms #2, #47 and #154 each demonstrate apocope, with the change in #2 and #154 of /-mVs/ to /-mts/ (presumably the Melukitz form for 'woman' was pronounced something like /huumts/ or possibly /hüümts/). By contrast, #47 suggests a dialectal variation between /wálwal/ and */wəláwal/, one meaning 'knife' and the latter meaning 'iron' in Annasitch (form #A84), while the first syllable of the second form seems to have dropped off in #47 for Melukitz. Aphaeresis of the initial vowel is also likely in #152, the forms for 'three', which in Melukitz was apparently 8/psə́nə/, although forms for 'three' with the initial syllable /psVn/ are found in Coosan, Siuslaw, Alsea and Kalapuya; perhaps the modern Hanis form *yípsən* is a generalization of initial /yV-/ on numerals in parallel with *yíxéy, yuxwé*, Hanis for 'one, two'.

Other differences between the two dialects are lexical rather than phonological in nature. Some of these 'differences' are illusory. Sometimes the same stem was given in two interpretations, one for each dialect. Examples include M118 and A117, which would be accurate since Hanis *ksíłís* 'green' covers yellow and light blue. Words with the wrong meanings attached include M3, which means 'person, people', A13, which means 'eyebrow', M124, which means 'child', and M167, the Common Coosan form for 'water'. As the vocabularies indicate, there is also extensive confusion among the kinship terms which comprise the first part of the list.

Words whose etyma are untraceable include M37, M81, M85, M99, M100 and A174 (whose Melukitz equivalent is common Coosan). These words do not occur in later Hanis sources and are not recorded in Miluk. They do not seem to be loans, and are not amenable to etymological investigation.

In this connection one may note the form for 'tortoise, turtle'. The M form strongly resembles *bátki*, the Common Coosan form for 'wildcat', while the A form resembles *ník'in*, the word meaning 'stick, tree' and by extension 'hundred' (a metaphor found also in Hupa and Chinookan). The actual word for 'tortoise' does not seem to have been recorded for Hanis.

Possible loans are few: A108 may possibly be related to Siuslawan *hamúu'm* 'dove', or it may be a solitary attestation of a word for 'pigeon' in Hanis. M84 could just possibly be a misreading of <kla-pite>, the Chinook Jargon word for 'thread', with the term for 'iron' being glossed with the word meaning 'needle and thread', but this is not likely.

6. Conclusions.

Milhau's vocabularies do not provide much solid information about dialectal differentiation beyond a number of lexicla variations betwreen the varieties which I have called Annasitch 9the ancestor of the Hanis varieties subsequently recorded) and Melukitz. We have essentially no morphological data — verbs are usually given in an uninflected form. What we have are lexicla and phonological clues. We do not even know where the two varieties were spoken in relation to one anothedr. The translation of Coos Bay in the list as Melukitz may be a blind, since as I have said, there are no forms exclusive to this dialect and Miluk proper which are not found in Hanis. This dialect was evidently used in an area where it had been able to develop on its own. It may be the dialect used in Empire, it may be a variety used along the Siuslaw River, or among Hanis-speakers in a predominantly Miluk-speaking environment. We do not and cannot know.

All that one can say, once the mistranslations, misreadings and typographical errors have been noted, is that Milhau6s erratically-recorded data show that there was once a variety of Hanis which differed from the general form of the language which has come down to us, and this aberrant form showed a certain number of differences in lexicon, and some additional phonological rules (specifically relating to accelerated processes of vocalic syncope and apocope) which served to make it distinctive from the other 'village provincialisms'.

FOOTNOTES

and through them Scott DeLancey and Victor Golla, for enabling me to participate in the Comparative Penutian Workshop, held at the University of Oregon, Eugene, immediately before the Hokan-Penutian Conference at which this paper was presented, and to Victor Golla and Catherine Callaghan for comments during the oral presentation of this paper.

[1] While I was visiting the Coquille Tribal headquarters in Coos Bay in July 1994, Troy Anderson showed me a small docket of ethnological notes from Ida Ned Mecum, a Lower Coquille woman who lived in the earlier part of this century and who was ancestress to many members of the Coquille Tribe of Oregon. There was no information as to who had collected these notes, although the handwriting was not that of Melville Jacobs. These contained pen and ink illustrations and a few words (about ten) from some Native language which William R. Seaburg (on a typewritten page appended to the notes) had elucidated with references to the Hanis glossary in Frachtenberg (1913). I did not have sufficient time at my disposal to identify the forms conclusively as to their language. The forms could have been Hanis (which the Lower Coquilles are not known to have spoken, although this does not mean that some did not do so) or Miluk, in which latter case they constitute another sample of Lower Coquille speech.

[2] This could possibly have been an item in the regional variety of Chinook Jargon, though it is not attested for CJ; it is perhaps significant that terms for 'dog' varied in the Chinookan dialects – thus Kathlamet had -k'útk'ut for 'dog', and Wasco had itq'úcutîxlɘm 'dogs'– and further that one of the few Chinookan words in Chinook Jargon which we can suggest on phonological grounds that it apparently entered the pidgin through the intermediacy of white speakers rather than Native ones (as the Nootkan vocabulary did) is 'dog', kámuks, showing an unexpected White-style simplification of the original uvular fricative in Chinookan -ӿámuks 'dogs'; see Boas 1911 for the forms. Alsea and Siuslaw share a form for 'dog' (Frachtenberg 1914, 1920). Perhaps dogs were rare in the area before White settlement (as may have been the case in parts of Central California) and words for 'dog' were thus commonly diffused.

REFERENCES

Anderson, Troy. 1990. *Miluk Dictionary*. Unpublished MA Thesis in Anthropology, Stanford University.

Beckham, Stephen Dow. 1977. *This Land Was Theirs: The Indians of Western Oregon*. Coos Bay, OR: Arago Books.

Berman, Howard. n.d. Vowel Harmony in Coos. Unpublished manuscript, 9 pp.

Boas, Franz. 1911. Chinook. In: Franz Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 1*. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40 (1): 559-667. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Buckley, Eugene. 1988. Reconstructing the Sounds of Alsea. In: *Papers from the 1988 Hokan-Penutian Languages Workshop*. University of Oregon Papers in Linguistics. Publications of the Center for Amerindian Ethnography and Linguistics 1. Pp. 9-30.

Duponceau, Peter Stephen. 1836 ms. [Vocabularies of various Native American languages. Manuscript in the Library of the American Philosophical Society, Philadelphia.]

Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1913. *Coos Texts*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 1. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

——————————————————. 1914. *Lower Umpqua Texts, with Notes on the Kusan Dialects*. Columbia University Contributions to Anthropology 4. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

——————————————————. 1920. *Alsea Texts and Myths.* Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 67. Washington: Government Printing Office.

——————————————————. 1922. *Coos*. In: Franz Boas (ed.), *Handbook of American Indian Languages, Part 2*. Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40 (2): 297-429. Washington: Government Printing Office.

Gallatin, Albert. 1836. *A Synopsis of the Indian Tribes...* Transactions and Collections of the American Philosophical Society 2: 1-432.

Hale, Horatio. 1846. *United States Exploring Expedition During the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842, Under the Command of Charles Wilkes, U.S.A. Volume VI: Ethnography and Philology*. Philadelphia: C. Sherman.

Jacobs, Melville. 1939. *Coos Narrative and Ethnologic Texts*. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 8 (1): 1-126.

——————————————. 1940. *Coos Myth Texts*. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology 8 (2): 127-260.

Palmer, Joel. 1847. *Journal of Travels over the Rocky Mountains, to the mouth of the Columbia River, made during the years 1845 and 1846*. Cincinnati: J. A. and U. P. James.

Parker, Rev. Samuel. 1838. *Journal of an exploring tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, under the Direction of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. Performed in the Years 1835, '36, and '37*. New York: the author.

Pierce, Joe E. 1971. Hanis (Coos) Phonemes. *Linguistics* 75: 31-52.

APPENDIX

MILHAU'S ORIGINAL VOCABULARY LISTS

Below is a copy of a typescript of the vocabulary lists of the "Coose Bay Language" collected by Dr. John J. Milhau, November 1856 near Umpqua City, Oregon Territory. It has been made available to the author by Mr. Donald Whereat, Cultural Resources Coordinator of the Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians, in Coos Bay, Oregon. Milhau's original manuscript is in the National Anthropological Archives (BAE MS 191a), together with a copy in the hand of George Gibbs (BAE MS 191b). The provenience of the typescript is unknown.

No.	English		
1. man	hat-latch or der-metle		maah
2. woman	humetz one syllable		whom-miss
3. boy	mah		day-lotle
4. girl	guahke		guay-ack
5. infant	telookt —— quah-lee		ah-a-lagh
6. father	ah-que-latch		ah-quit-latch
7. mother	ah-natch		ah-a-natch
8. husband	hat-latch		der-mitle
9. wife	ah-nah-quatch		whom-miss
10. son	mit-que-atch		day-lotle
11. daughter	que-altch		guey-at-letch
12. brother	puy-atch	elder——	ah-hat-latch
		younger——	mit-low-que-atch
13. sister	hah-nook		gue-at-litch
14. Indians, people	kut-laltz		hat-tle-tow-oh-meh
15. head	wher-lew		wher-lew
16. hair	ke-nackt		Sche-nack
17. face	ahah the french aa		ahah
18. forehead	wunt		chin-ilt-chen
19. ear	quo-han-nass		quan-nass
20. eye	qual-wah		whal-a-wah
21. nose	chole		ghult
22. mouth	ghe-ass		ye-ass
23. tongue	hah-le-tah		hal-le-tah
24. teeth	kut-zah		kut-zah
25. beard	tsa-nacht		tsa-nacht

HANIS AND MILUK COOS EQUIVALENTS OF ENTRIES IN MILHAU'S LISTS

These are taken from materials by Jacobs (Hanis and Miluk), Frachtenberg, Swadesh and especially Sokolow (Hanis). Discrepancies in the sources between Hanis and Miluk forms (for instance in respect to glottalisation and voicing) have been preserved. Etyma are given where possible for entries in Milhau's lists if these differ from the usual glosses in Hanis.

	Hanis	Miluk
[1]	déemil	dáamil
[2]	húumis	húumis
[3]	díilul, tíllutl'	dilúul
[4]	kweis	kweis, kweik
[5]	'áala	k'ílka, híime
[6]	'ékwtlheč	'áatl
[7]	'éneč	'éne
[8]	[= man]	[= man]
[9]	t'éeneč	húumis
[10]	díiluul (mitlkwíiyəč = son)	k'ílka
[11]	kwayáasič	kwáya
[12]	hátleč (púuyač=pat. uncle) heíkwni	mitlgwíla
[13]	'ének	genhenúkwni
[14]	má; (kalális = subjects)	qah
[15]	xwíluw	sel
[16]	x̌nek	háamis
[17]	'a'a'	hal
[18]	wint (čínlčin = eyebrow)	kwatátkwan
[19]	qwhánnas	kwhánnas
[20]	xwálxwal	xwálxwal
[21]	čúul	tlínnek
[22]	yé'es	yeís
[23]	hélta	lé'ələ
[24]	qca'	qca'
[25]	cnáx̌	nícas

26.	neck	quntz	quntz
27.	arm	ket-lah	kate-lagh
28.	hand	kil-tsaht	kil-tsaht
29.	fingers	soh-way	tso-watle
30.	nails	glau-pet	glah-pet
31.	body	lock-e-met	luck-ah-met
✓ 32.	leg ⌠thigh	gill-etch	jil-atch
	⌡leg	kut-lah	kut-lah
33.	foot	ha-ha-cock	ha-ha-cock
✓ 34.	toes	so-welt	mah-ah-tits
35.	bone	lah-mahlt	lah-mahlt
36.	heart	il-lah-watch-us	il-lah-watch-us
✓ 37.	blood	kah-eye	wer-ten
✓ 38.	town, village	nah-en-te-hah	tki-ass
39.	chief	hat-hat-ter	hat-hat-ter
✓ 40.	warrior	kow-erltz	klick-che-ah
41.	friend	lah-erl-il-wartz	lah-erl-il-wartz
✓ 42.	house	muck-a-may	ich-how
✓ 43.	kettle	lah-ler	quah-mettle
44.	bow	quah-hut	quah-hut
45.	arrow	mel-luck	mel-luck
✓ 46.	axe	che-away-hat-lut	hah-hutle-hut
✓ 47.	knife	lah-wal	wal-wal
48.	canoe	ich like the german for I	ich
✓ 49.	shoes	key-looset	tzah-hah-nut-til-luck-met
50.	pipe	Squah-na	klick-quah-ah-nah
51.	tobacco	tah-ha	tah-ha
✓ 52.	sky	kyse	tackt-nitz
53.	sun	te-kaltz	te-kaw-litz
54.	moon	klo-warse	klow-warse
✓ 55.	star	yu-mah	yu-meh
✓ 56.	day	te-kaltz	tik-keltz
✓ 57.	night	quol-itch	kow-whah

[26]	kwanc	xwánxwan
[27]	k'íła	k'éła
[28]	[= arm]	[= arm]
[29]	súuwał	súuweł
[30]	súuwał tłápit	
[31]	tet (lúuqmił = torso)	pqáy (= back in Hanis)
[32]	jilée	jíle
	c'ílač	číili
[33]	ktła (? hak- to crawl)	qtła
[34]	[= fingers]	[= fingers]
[35]	láamak'	láamak'
[36]	'ilwálčas, lúwe	ləwé
[37]	wətn	wítin
[38]	tł'táayas	tł'táayas
[39]	hethéete	hethéete
[40]	tłəlčíyaa 'fighter'	
[41]	sla	sla'á'
[42]	yeec	yeec
[43]	kwámetł	nit'snátł
[44]	píilus, xwáaxatł	x̌uux̌wéel
[45]	míllaq, wispáaya	míllaq, wusbáya
[46]	xáatłxat	tłíxtłii
[47]	wálwal	wálwal
[48]	'ix, máax̌maax̌	łkúus, máax̌maax̌
[49]	qəlúusnii	háamič
[50]	łkwené'en	p'átał
[51]	t'áha	dáahay
[52]	qais	gaaháays
[53]	t'qú'əł	kwalé'es
[54]	łúuxw	metíianta
[55]	yúumii	yúumii
[56]	tík'ilc [daylight]	[= sun]
[57]	qwətłč	xátłən

✓ 58.	light	tkow	it-zhire
59.	darkness	quol-itch	quol-litch
✓ 60.	morning	tsi-her	au-chah-holy
✓ 61.	evening	heech-tah	tow-yāh-te-to-kah
62.	spring		kīgh-low
━ 63.	summer	te-slum	tslim
64.	autumn		hal-toe-titch
✓ 65.	winter	ky-low	ik-kay-na-new-eh
━ 66.	wind	tkto-wah-sis	tkto-wah-sis
67.	thunder	tsun-ner	tsun-ner
68.	lightning	lo-lo-weck	low-wark
69.	rain	kim-kim-mas	kīm-met
70.	snow	stlalts	stlah-less
71.	hail	qua-et-que	qui-atle-que
72.	fire	chu-etz	chū-etle
73.	water	te-hopt	harpt
74.	ice	quil-lah	quīl-lough
75.	earth, land	kck-tah	klick-tāh
76.	sea	mit-sis	mīt-slis
✓ 77.	river	lock-us	hil-lār-neck
✓ 78.	lake	itz-clase	hah-ā-lart
✓ 79.	valley	kil-ar-net	dtim-sit
80.	hill, mountain	qui-atz	ich-quī-ass
✓ 81.	island	kle-var-litz	itz-clāce
82.	stone	quil-ley	quīt-le-eh
✓ 83.	salt	kār-ka-tey	mīt-siltz
✓ 84.	iron	kla-pile	wal-lāh-wul
85.	tree	tsup-oock	nūck-quin
86.	wood	tke-yah	līch-ken
✓ 87.	leaf	pil-lart	tclin-nack
88.	bark	tze-ah	tzklah
89.	grass	tsark	tzark
90.	pine	pah-who-yah	tsūp-pook
91.	flesh, meat	tah-et	tah-et
92.	dog	tkoy-use	tkoy-yuse

[58]	k'wléeyis	
[59]	[= night]	héndləs 'dark'
[60]	txáyet	katłéenetł
[61]	k'áwa	g̃átq'ay
[62]	cłimiye	cłímye
[63]	cłəm	cłim
[64]	k'aluwíya	gelú'wiye
[65]	k'álu	gélu
[66]	tł'wéesas	gawá'si
[67]	cónna	cónna
[68]	lúuwakw	łúuwake
[69]	kómkəmi	císti
[70]	stłáahlas	stłáales
[71]		
[72]	šxwəl	hémelt
[73]	x̣aapq	x̣aap'
[74]	kíłlaw	kwé'ala, łáade
[75]	tł'taa	ltáayas
[76]	báłdič (míc'lis = salt)	baldíimis
[77]	šíčtii	šíčtii
[78]	stliihs (? hal- "enter harbor"	stł'iis
[79]	démsit	démist
[80]	qwaiyé'is	qwey⸴'is
[81]		dlá'a
[82]	klíiyax	łax
[83]	míc'lis	máacels
[84]		
[85]	kwmenéil	ník'in
[86]	ník'in	ník'in
[87]	tłnik	tłínik
[88]	c'xaa	dzéetłis
[89]	[= leaf]	[= leaf]
[90]	cəqw (jackpine)	
[91]	t'eht	téet
[92]	k'wiyúus	lék'lu/yék'lu

93.	buffalo	wush-wush	wush-wush
94.	bear	she-mitle	sher-mitle
95.	wolf	tklee-met	glee-mack
96.	deer	whit-soot	
97.	elk	chil-le-eh	jill-lee-eh
98.	beaver	te-chen-ner	
99.	tortoise	po-te-ke	te-chalt neh-kun
100.	fly	pey-atle-qua	
101.	mosquito	kar-loose	tsi-eye
102.	snake	hugh-wah-ess	
103.	bird	klo-pay-yah	
104.	egg	mar-ko-lah	
105.	feathers	yackck	wackle
106.	wings	klip-pah	
107.	duck	whit-tah-ple-ay	
108.	pigeon		ah-ah-muh
109.	fish	sut-lick	
110.	salmon	kul-lict	kal-lick
111.	sturgeon	may-kah-hah	mah-kaugh-hah
112.	name		klin-nass
113.	affection	lah-erl-il-wartz	
114.	white	kass	huck-kass
115.	red	kle-quilt	tkey-quilt
116.	black	key-lass	tkey-lass
117.	blue	key-lass	tkey-sullus
118.	yellow	key-sul-lus	tkey-quilt
119.	green	kah-te-kite	kluck-keh
120.	great	ham-mus	hem-mis
121.	small	kysh	tzi-who
122.	strong	ter-met-ley — ham-mus	her-lah-tes
123.	old	too-mekt	kar-lay-eh
124.	young	ol-lah	klar-nay-erh
125.	good	lur-ghe	lurgh-ghe
126.	bad	itz-tsus	In-taugh
127.	handsome	teh-hume-meh now-wert-sen	nah-ar-wert-sen
128.	ugly	itz-tsus	Itz-zas

[93]	múusmuus (cow)	
[94]	šximł	pélel
[95]	dlíimaakw	dlíimaakw
[96]	xwícxwət	xwícxwət
[97]	jilíiye	k'ic
[98]	t•číina	t•číina
[99]		
[100]	c'á'ay (gnat)	peyétkwn
[101]	[= gnat]	
[102]	xuwáayas	xuwáayas
[103]	cəcí	cáce
[104]	máatłaay	máatłaay
[105]	watł	wéetł
[106]	łpée	łpée
[107]		witłbíye
[108]		
[109]	léyik	
[110]	dəmsíwak, qályeq	qályaq
[111]	mqə́xa	mqáxan
[112]	tə́nnahs	'én8, san
[113]	txíil- (to love)	dúuhaya
[114]	xqas	xqas
[115]	tłkwíłt	tłkwəł
[116]	k'las	hámis
[117]	k'áanay	héndləs
[118]	k'isáawas	k'isáawas
[119]	k'sə́ltas	k'isəlis
[120]	hémmis	wáaga
[121]	k'ayš	'éekw
[122]	tímłi	tímłi
[123]	qálix	qeel
[124]	tł'áneex	ḡenéeč
[125]	lə́ɣi	gálax
[126]	'ínta	'ánwiyan
[127]	héwica	héewudzuun
[128]	níkičx 'I am...'	ijé'leis

✓	129.	alive	ich-hume-meh	glāh-a-wah
✓	130.	dead	lah-kow-wah	
		killed	tso-tso	
	131.	cold	kay-e-nah	
	132.	warm	hol-loose	
	133.	I	un-nah	
	134.	thou	an-nah	
	135.	he	klagh	khah
	136.	we	u-wah	Īs-nah
	137.	ye	it-sass	ish-e-nah
	138.	they	eye-meh	nŭck-quah
	139.	this	tay	day
	140.	that	tah	dah
	141.	all	nahnt	nahnt goose
	142.	many, much	goose	nāuh-aut
✓	143.	who	eye-meh	wōt-toe
	144.	near	e-alke	ēe-alk
✓	145.	to-day	tay-kay-sicht	dēet-sah
✓	146.	yesterday	eye-kise	nēh-qual-lay
✓	147.	to-morrow	nay-qually	hāl-may
	148.	yes	eheh (a grunt)	
	149.	no	in	
	150.	one	ya-hay	yāh-high
	151.	two	Īch-were	
	152.	three	pis-sun-ner	īps-sun
	153.	four	hash-tetle	hāsh-tittle
	154.	five	kah-tum-etz	kah-tūm-mis
	155.	six	high-wy-et	ich-hīgh-we-et
⁚	156.	seven	ich-war-er-wet	ips-sur-her-til
-	157.	eight	ee-wah-ah-wat	ich-her hāt til
	158.	nine	ich-high-a-hat	ich-high-queete
	159.	ten	klup-a-kon-net	klup-a-kōn-nay
	160.	eleven	ya-hay-u-kut-se	ich-high-u-kūt-seh
	161.	twelve	ich-were-u-kut-se	
	162.	twenty	ee-whar-a-ker	ich-whēr-a-ker
	163.	thirty	ip-sun-ner-ker	ipsūn-kah

[129]	tłéewe	dláawa
[130]	lagáwa	q'áyuu
	cúu[-cuu-]	
[131]	géeyne	géeyne
[132]	xálwaš	galxáawi
[133]	'ənnə	'śnne
[134]	'á'na	néw
[135]	xéke	'e
[136]	xwin	
[137]	sən	
[138]	lxéke	hémee
[139]	de'éy	
[140]	leł	'étə
[141]	kuus	kuus
[142]	naant	gatł
[143]	wútu	
[144]	'ihálx	nełč'úye 'to approach'
[145]	tíhsa	díixaaxaaya
[146]	néqwale	łínəkw
[147]	hélmi	'áamaa
[148]	ən	
[149]	'in	'an
[150]	yixéy	hič'íi
[151]	yuxwé	'ac'úu
[152]	yípsən	psinł
[153]	hestłč	c'aawá
[154]	kat'śmis	qənč'ínsi
[155]	yixéywieq	c'awáxkaiye
[156]	yuxwéwieq	psínłan
[157]	yəhay'aháł	'acúu'an
[158]	yixwé'aháł	hič'íi'an
[159]	tłəpqáni	t'íšči
[160]	tłəpqáni yəxáyəqwsi	t'íšči a hič'íi dəkwa
[161]	tłəpqáni 'ixweuqwsi	t'íšči a 'ac'úu dəkwa
[162]	yixwéka	'ac'uuk'cu
[163]	yipsánka	psinłk'iu

164.	one hundred	ich-high-nick-ken	ich-high-lick-ken
165.	one thousand	klop-kon-nen-nick-ken	klup-kon-ner-līck-ken
166.	to eat	wah-hiltz	glow-whēn
167.	to drink	harp	shē-it-zah
168.	to run	clay-oy-high	klo-ōñ-hun
169.	to dance	tol-ler	taūlt-zer
170.	to sing	may-kah-hah	tqŭoh-lān
171.	to sleep	ko-yah-tes	ah-kōw-skow
172.	to speak	kleese	
173.	to see	quo-nay-ah	quo-nāhm
174.	to love	toe-wire	tzō-lay-ote
175.	to kill	tso-tso	tzō-tzo
176.	to sit	it-sah	et-lōke
177.	to stand	as-toe	es-tōke
178.	to go	klagh	
179.	to come	at-chey	ātch-ee
180.	to walk	klagh-kley-ah-klit	chaw-ton
	a bed	yah-a-kitz	
	a tent	we-wot	
	Coose Bay	me-luck-itz	Haw-nay-setch
	Coose Bay Indians	Anna-sitch	Te-serch-may-ah-klit-tah
	sea otter	ghe-ow-ah	

The above vocabularies were obtained from two indians of the
Coose or Kowes tribe and appear to be different dialects of the
same language.

The Coose or Kowes language with many dialects was spoken
by all the indians inhabiting around Coose bay and its immediate
vicinity and also by those on Kowes river.

All these indians have been removed from their lands on to
the Reserve and the tribe now numbers about 300 all told. ——

John J. Milhau

note when the same word was given for the same thing by the two
indians, it has been omitted in the 2nd Column. ——

[164]	yixéy ník'in	hič'íi ník'in
[165]	tłəpqáni ník'in	t'íšči ník'in
[166]	tláyam	tləwíyam
[167]	šáyani, šííč-	nəqawác
[168]	tłaháy	xwítxwit
[169]	t'al	megénnis, dataltálli
[170]	kwəlíht [meqá'en "dance"]	haat'
[171]	qáaqat	ǧeegł, dlíikwtim
[172]	tłíiyis	tłeis; 'íldwa
[173]	tłuwít	hamáaq
[174]	dúuwaya	dúuwaya/duháaya
[175]	c'a'uwáht	
[176]	tłúwaqac	dlúgwa
[177]	stuuwq-	stuuwq-
[178]	tł'ííč-	hántł
[179]	héllaq, číi	'éji
[180]	c'a'át	čáačay
a bed	qátłqatł/tł'ayá'ast	q'étłq'el
a tent	[cf. wiwátkwa "pillow"]	
Coos Bay	háanisiič	
Coos Indians	céetiX máh tłta = people over there	
sea otter	kiyá'awa	giyéwe

REPORT 9

SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE HOKAN-PENUTIAN WORKSHOP

July 8-9, 1994
University Of Oregon, Eugene

And

July 5-6, 1995
University Of New Mexico, Albuquerque

REPORT 9

SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES

Proceedings of the Hokan-Penutian Workshop

July 8-9, 1994
University of Oregon, Eugene

and

July 5-6, 1995
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque

Victor Golla
Volume Editor

Leanne Hinton
Series Editor

INTRODUCTION

The papers in this volume were originally presented at the meetings of the Hokan-Penutian Workshops in Eugene, Oregon, July 8-9, 1994, and in Albuquerque, New Mexico, July 5-6, 1995. The 1994 Workshop was held in conjunction with a two-week invitational conference on Comparative Penutian Linguistics (the proceedings of which will be published in a forthcoming issue of the *International Journal of American Linguistics*) and was organized by the coordinators of that conference, Scott DeLancey and Victor Golla. The 1995 Workshop was one of a series of meetings on Americanist linguistics that formed part of the 1995 Linguistic Institute at the University of New Mexico, and was organized by Victor Golla under the auspices of SSILA.

A special feature of the 1995 Hokan-Penutian Workshop was a half-day session on the *Present Status of Hokan Linguistics* specially organized by Margaret Langdon and William H. Jacobsen, Jr. A substantial part of the present volume is given over to Appendices containing the bibliographies and short summaries of pronominal reference and case systems that were prepared for this session. Also included is the draft of a lexicon of Seri, prepared by Stephen A. Marlett and Mary B. Moser for Mary Ritche Key's "Intercontinental Dictionary Series," a lexical database designed to facilitate crosslinguistic research. The format of this database is derived from Carl Darling Buck's *Dictionary of Selected Synonyms in the Principal Indo-European Languages.*

This is the second volume of Hokan-Penutian Workshop Proceedings to be published by the Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley, as one of the *Reports* of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages, under the general editorship of Leanne Hinton.

<div align="right">

Victor Golla
Volume Editor

</div>

CONTENTS

PENUTIAN LANGUAGES

HOKAN LANGUAGES

APPENDICES

A. Hokan Bibliographies

B. Pronominal Reference and Case Systems in Selected Hokan Languages

C. Seri Contribution to the Intercontinental Dictionary Series (*Stephen A. Marlett & Mary B. Moser*)