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ABSTRACT

This thesis represents an attempt to draw attention to the rhetorical structure inherent in a traditional Lushootseed oral narrative. Until recently, elements of narrative style have been neglected in favor of attention to accuracy in transcription and gloss (Hess 1996:139). Among the few researchers who have examined Lushootseed narrative structure are Langen and Bierwert (1996), who have analyzed the literary content and form of Lushootseed texts, and Beck (1996, 1998), who has focused on the formal prosodic organization of a number of stories told by Martha Lamont. The present study attends to the discourse structure of Lushootseed narrative using Woodbury's (1985, 1987) model of rhetorical structure, which treats all natural discourse as composed of five modular systems that shape the text each in their own way. These include prosodic phrasing, pause phrasing, syntactic constituency, adverbial-particle phrasing and global form-content parallelism. This thesis applies Woodbury's model to discover these types of rhetorical organization and examine their interrelationships in Suzie Sampson Peter's narrative, Nobility at Utsaladdy.
# CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title Page</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>ii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table of Contents</td>
<td>iii</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation</td>
<td>vii</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Chapter 1. Introduction**

1.1 Methodology
1.2 Background on Lushootseed
1.3 Data Collection
1.4 Data Analysis
1.5 Organization of the Thesis

**Chapter 2. Prosodic Component**

2.1 Intonational Phrasing
2.1.1 Lines
2.1.2 Groups
2.1.3 Sections
2.2 Pause Phrasing
2.3 Interaction of Prosodic Components

**Chapter 3. Morphosyntactic Components**

3.1 Syntactic Constituency
3.1.1 Lushootseed Grammar
3.1.1.1 Constituents of the Clause
3.1.1.2 The Clause
3.1.1.3 Pragmatic Constructions
3.1.2 Interaction of Syntax and Prosodic Phrasing
3.1.2.1 One-to-One Alignment
3.1.2.2 Many-to-One Alignment
3.1.2.3 One-to-Many Alignment
3.1.3 Alignment of Prosodic Phrasing and Sentence-Internal Constituents
3.13.1 Prosody Ignores Syntactic Boundaries 41
3.13.2 Prosody Reinforces Syntactic Boundaries 44
3.13.3 Syntax Ignores Prosody 45

3.2 Adverbial Particle Phrasing 47
3.2.1 Sentential Adverbial Particles 48
3.2.2 The Enclitic -axw 48

3.3 Form-Content Parallelism 52
3.3.1 Form-Content Parallelism in Lushootseed 53
3.3.2 Interaction of Prosody and Form-Content Parallelism 56
  3.3.2.1 Numerical Patterning of Content 59
  3.3.2.2 Alignment Patterns of Numerical Form-Content and Prosody 62

Chapter 4. Conclusions and Future Directions 65

Bibliography 67

Appendix 1: Nobility at Utsaladdy: an Intralinear Prosodic Segmentation 72

Appendix 2: Nobility at Utsaladdy: a Prosodic Transcription 78
List of Tables

Table 1. Patterning of Sentential Adverbial Particles 51
List of Figures

Figure 1. Contour-Pause Interaction 28

Figure 2. Numerical Patterning in the Dialogue of Steller's Jay and Magpie 62

Figure 3. Interaction of Form-Content Parallelism and Prosodic Units 64
The shift from spoken to written narrative is nowhere complete; there is always a voice, and in the case of exemplary novelists there is only the voice, coaxing us on to another page. . . . When we turn, however, to works markedly nearer the beginnings of writing . . . we experience a dismay, a disorientation, for which the lucid epics of Homer and the oft-retold chronicles of the Bible have not quite prepared us. We do not know the language, the code of mythology and tradition, and feel oppressively confused, as when we look at the Tibetan pantheon arrayed on a thank-ka, while an equally populous mural of say, the Last Judgment or the Battle of Waterloo, quickly sorts itself out. There is always a code, and oral narrative disconcertingly assumes that we know it.

(John Updike 1989:119)
1. INTRODUCTION

This thesis seeks to uncover the rhetorical structure of a Lushootseed oral narrative by following a discourse-based approach to the analysis of the prosodic and morphosyntactic components. It represents an attempt to draw attention to the rhetorical structure inherent in a traditional Lushootseed oral narrative, which until recently, has been neglected in favor of attention to accuracy in transcription and gloss (Hess 1995:139).

Among the few researchers who have examined Lushootseed narrative structure are Langen and Bierwert (1996), who have analyzed the literary content and form of Lushootseed texts, and Beck (1996, 1998), who has focused on the formal prosodic organization of a number of stories told by Martha Lamont.

The present study attends to the discourse structure of Lushootseed narrative using Woodbury's (1985, 1987) model of rhetorical structure, which treats all natural discourse as composed of modular systems of organization, prosodic phrasing, pause phrasing, syntactic constituency, adverbial-particle phrasing and global form-content parallelism, which shape the text each in their own way.

The inspiration for the attempt has been the tireless efforts of the linguistic and cultural anthropologists who study the disappearing literatures of Native American languages. The situation in which many of them find themselves is elegantly summarized by Hymes:

The mode of cultural interpretation most actively pursued today is the interpretation of texts . . . Much more remains to be disclosed: structure and meaning that can only be found through close control of the language in
texts . . . Although most of the poetics have been lost, much remains to be recaptured. Such work is a prime example of service both to scholarship and to Native American communities themselves. Often the narrative tradition has been disrupted, and scholarship is necessary to bring to life again the oral artistry hidden in old print. (Hymes 1965. Cited in Chafe 1976:19)

1.1 Methodology

The analysis follows the framework of Woodbury (1987), who argues for the modularity of five rhetorical components: intonational phrasing, pause phrasing, syntactic constituency, adverbial-particle phrasing, and global form-content parallelism. These components carry out major communicative functions as modular organizations in their own right.

Moreover, their interaction is communicatively significant. For example, whereas Hymes (1980) argues that the prime organizing principle of Native American narratives is global form-content parallelism, he notes that pause and adverbial-particle phrasing creates a further expressive dimension when it operates in counterpoint to global parallelism. Tedlock (1972), who considers pause phrasing as the fundamental organizing principle in Zuni and Quiche oral narratives, nevertheless points out the value of the interaction of all five types of rhetorical components mentioned.

If interaction is meaningful, then it does not make sense to concentrate on one type of organization at the expense of the others, as some researchers have done. As Woodbury (1987: 178) points out, "Interaction presupposes communicative unity among formally distinct and logically separate types of organization." Therefore, in order to fully appreciate the organization of natural discourse in general, and traditional narratives in particular, one needs to approach the analysis with the following assumptions.
1. There are at least five potentially independent types of organization on which the representation of verbal artistry of narrative performance can be based: pause phrasing, prosodic phrasing, syntactic constituency, global form-content parallelism, and adverbial-particle phrasing.

2. Each of the hierarchic organizations is recurrent.

3. They do not necessarily have to coincide with one another. In many oral texts one type of organization may predominate; in other cases the researcher may be forced by the medium to choose one type of organization over the other. For example, when there are no audio recordings of the narrative(s) one has to rely on syntactic constituency and form-content parallelism to organize the text.

4. Each type of organization carries out major communicative functions. For example, pause phrasing and pitch movement can provide texture and ambience for the performance. Intonational phrasing and syntactic constituency introduce cohesion and disjunction. Pause phrasing can also function to regulate interactive discourse, and global form-content parallelism functions on the level of the logic of narrative action.

5. These different organizations can interact with one another to create further expressive dimensions.

This thesis accepts these assumptions and attempts to analyze these types of rhetorical organization and their interrelationships in Nobility at Utsaladdy.
1.2 Background on Lushootseed

Lushootseed Salish was chosen as a research language because its structure has been exhaustively described and an extensive collection of traditional material exists both in recorded and written form.

Lushootseed, a Coast Salish language represented by a number of dialects spoken in the beginning (aboriginally) by people living in the eastern coastal regions of Puget Sound and its adjacent river valleys, is one of 23 distinct Salish languages. Swinomish-Skagit, the dialect of the speaker who contributed the text analyzed in this work, is one of the northern varieties of Lushootseed.

1.3 Data Collection

The text is one of a large corpus of stories provided by Suzie Sampson Peter (SSP) to Leon Metcalf in 1951. Suzie Sampson Peter was monolingual and the oldest recorded speaker of Lushootseed. Blind during her last decades, she kept telling herself the old stories so as not to forget them.

From the recording it is apparent that Lushootseed speakers were present and reacting to the story. Thus the setting in which the recording was taken was not completely unnatural. Metcalf's recording of the text was transcribed years later by Vi Hilbert, another Skagit speaker trained by Thom Hess to write her native language using a phonetically based writing system. Hess has carried out research on Lushootseed dialects since 1962 and his extensive work is the source for the grammatical description in this thesis.
1.4 Data Analysis

Identifying *lines* is the starting point for any analysis of the rhetorical structure of discourse. But the process is problematic, because there are several criteria on which to define a line. As Carleton points out, "ideally an analysis of a text . . . should be able to recognize a categorical distinction between the smallest unit in a variety of organizational modules" (1996:24). Here a line is based on prosodic criteria, specifically terminal intonation contours.

The audio recording was transferred or *captured* to a digitized format using the Multispeech program with a frame length set at 20-25,000 samples per second. The unit of capture was based on the pause; segments of the text divided by pauses were captured digitally and copied to diskettes. However, because the computer system had a limited capacity for capturing long strands of continuous speech, units sometimes had to be defined by syntactic criteria (sentence breaks). The digitized text was analyzed for pause durations.

Next, a pitch analysis was carried out on each *pausal* unit by identifying distinctive terminal pitch contours which break the text into lines. At this point, the "lines" were examined for their characteristic rise/fall patterns, leading to the distinction of A lead (high/high falling) and B core (low/low falling) contour end points (Woodbury 1987).

As far as I am aware, this is the third attempt to analyze a Salish text using prosodic criteria.1 The first was that of David Beck, who attributed the prosodic organization of Lushootseed narratives to the pause (1996). Subsequently, Beck (1998) examined the

---

1There have been a number of studies of Salish texts considering rhetorical structure using other criteria, in particular morphosyntactic and content-form parallelism. See Mattina (1985) for Colville, Kinkade (1983, 1984, 1987) for Upper Chehalis, Kroeber (1995) for Kalispel, and Langen (1996) and Bierwert (1996) for Lushootseed.
intonational structure of a number Lushootseed narratives for its organizational role in rhetorical structure. In this thesis I examine both intonational phrasing and pause phrasing for their independent contributions to the organization of the text, and for the ways in which they interact with each other. This approach is consistent with the current view of Woodbury, who stresses the interrelationships of components in narrative:

Investigators should study each prosodic element . . . on its own terms to see what determines its patterning, rather than to attempt to discover 'the' prosodic hierarchy for a new language . . . If a prosodic hierarchy exists for a given language the above methods would be likely to lead to a convincing proof, since they would allow for the interdependences among prosodic elements to be established. (Woodbury, n.d.)

1.5 Organization of the Thesis

The thesis begins with an overview of two major rhetorical components: prosodic phrasing and syntactic constituency. Chapter 2 will examine two subcomponents of the prosodic component: intonational phrasing and pause phrasing. The two components will be examined in isolation, and then for their interaction with each other. Chapter 3 will investigate syntactic constituency, determine its role in the organization of rhetorical structure, and examine its interaction with the prosodic component. Subsections 3.2 and 3.3 will consider two other components: adverbial-particle phrasing and form-content parallelism, respectively. The conclusion will consider the findings, and suggest future directions for this research.

---

2 The prosodic hierarchy theory (Hayes 1989; Nespou and Vogel 1986) treats prosodic elements as coordinated by a single, formal hierarchy which consists of discrete, categorically distinct levels, that is, phonological word, (clitic group), phonological phrase, intonational phrase, utterance, (paragraph).
2. PROSODIC COMPONENT

Prosody is a term that refers to "patterns of sound that range more or less freely and independently over individual sounds and individual words" (Bolinger 1986:37). Pitch, stress, rhythm, and silence are some of the vocal effects that extend over an utterance. Others include duration and tempo (for a full description of prosodic features, see Crystal 1969:128-131). In some recent approaches to phonology, the term sentence prosody is used to group these and other more general features of prosodic phrasing within a larger prosodic component (Crystal 1997:314).

The prosodic component is viewed here as an independent system within which is subsumed a cluster of distinct prosodic systems with their own formal and functional characteristics. Features within some of these prosodic sub-systems are categorically distinct, a finding that has propelled extensive research in intonation and advanced the relatively new theory of intonational phonology (Pierrehumbert 1980). Thirty years ago Crystal (1969) argued for a system-within-system theory to describe the independence of prosodic features and their interaction with each other. In his framework pitch direction, pitch range, and pause are among several prosodic systems; the others are tempo, duration, loudness, and rhythm (1969:131).

Woodbury exploits this notion of systems in his rhetorical model, pointing out that

Rhetorical structure consists of linguistically significant units and systems, often aggregates of disparate formal features. ... [A] single meaningful affective contour can involve difference in pitch, voice quality, and loudness all at once; a line can involve contour sequence, final lengthening, or "clear" intonation breaks. Where such aggregates are at issue, Tedlock's system may fail to put together all of what is linguistically significant from among the infinite range of acoustic values perceptible in any sample speech. (1985:165)
Each of these prosodic features plays an important role in the organization of discourse. However, the present study will concentrate on the form and function of intonation and pause phrasing only. There are two reasons for this: (1) they are two rhetorical components that vie for special status as the central organizing feature of Native American Indian narratives; and (2) it is assumed that these two prosodic features organize speech into prosodic units that are autonomous from, but explicitly relatable to, surface syntactic constituency (Hayes 1989; Selkirk 1984). In the next sections intonation and pause will be examined separately in order to determine their independent status within the prosodic component. To avoid confusion, the term *intonational phrasing* will be used to refer to the intonation system and *prosodic phrasing* will be used to refer to both intonational and pause phrasing.

### 2.1 Intonational Phrasing

Intonation plays an important role in communication, marking portions of speech "as being coherent according to criteria other than purely syntactic, these criteria being of a more semantic and pragmatic nature" (Bruce 1982:274, cited in Carleton 1996:89). Strictly speaking, the term refers to the mere fact of there being one or more pitch accents in a stretch of speech. Generally, however, the term is used to refer to the overall landscape, the wider ups and downs from one accented syllable to the next. This rise and fall, fall and rise of the landscape creates its own impression; it is the final pitch movement (rise or fall) however, that is of particular interest, because it conveys the moods, emotions, and attitudes of the speaker (Bolinger 1986:10-11).

Another significant feature of terminal pitch movements is that they signal breaks in the stream of speech. Bolinger (1978) refers to these as *horizontal breaks*, as opposed to
vertical breaks, his (1958, 1986) term for prominence-lending accent peaks. Other terms for terminal pitch movement are tail (Crystal 1969) and boundary tone (Pierrehumbert 1980). All these terms imply that the major function of intonation is to partition discourse into intonationally marked chunks—intonation phrases (Pierrehumbert 1980), tone groups (Halliday 1970), and other related terms. This intonational unit is the epicentre of all intonational research (experimental or theoretical); it is also the starting point for this analysis of SSP's intonational phrasing.

This section attempts to provide a means for encoding the organization of terminal pitch events into layers of representation. The procedure involves Woodbury's approach of identifying the horizontal breaks in the intonation contours of utterances, using these breaks to cue a hierarchy of prosodic units according to terminal pitch sequences. Such a procedure has advantages over the approach that uses pausing as a cue to narrative segmentation, because often boundaries of prosodic units are not always marked by pauses.

Using terminal pitch contours as his guide, Woodbury (1985) has identified at least four different levels of representation in Central Alaskan Yupik (CAY) discourse: the line, (sub)group, complex group, and section. These levels have also been identified in Lushootseed by Beck (1998), although his terminology and his interpretation of these units differs from Woodbury's. Although Beck's analysis provides important insights into the rhetorical structure of Lushootseed narrative, I use Woodbury's model because it is a more general, less theoretically constrained framework, and is more effective as a discovery procedure. In the following sections, narrative levels of representation are defined and illustrated with examples from the Lushootseed narrative.

3 There are other phonetic cues to the division of speech. As Ladd points out, "Prosodic constituents have various phonetic properties, both segmental and suprasegmental... Intonation has no privileged status in signalling prosodic structure" (1996:10).
2.1.1 Lines

The line is the starting point in any analysis of the rhetorical structure of discourse. I follow Woodbury, who uses terminal intonation contours to segment oral narrative into a hierarchy of prosodic units: lines, subgroups, complex groups and sections. As mentioned above, lines are stretches of speech demarcated by horizontal breaks, characteristic pitch sequences which are usually, but not always, followed by pauses (Woodbury, 1987:182). Lines may consist of one or a few words but rarely, if ever, contain a full sentence. Lines do not pertain to any one level of syntactic constituency. This is illustrated in SSP's Subgroup (1) which consists of three lines. Pause length between lines is given within angled brackets.

(1) (= Subgroup 1)

A<0.> A<0.> B<0.5>

Storytelling [and in this story it is said]  as usual that  nobility lived there.
time

In Example (1) the three lines display intonational contours that rise and fall, terminating in either a high (A) contour or a low (B) contour. The former type is called a lead contour, indicating that the speaker has more to say, whereas the latter type is referred to as a core contour, indicating that nothing more need follow in the line. Woodbury (1985,1987) symbolizes lead and core contours as A and B, respectively.
Lead and core contours may have the additional feature of attenuation. Attenuated contours display diminished pitch and loudness over the entire contour, and mark supplemental information and constituents that have been postposed by syntactic movement. In Woodbury's framework, attenuated core contours are symbolized as B^0.

An example is in Subgroup 46, repeated in Example (2).

\[
\text{(2) (= Subgroup 46)}
\]

![Graph showing pitch and loudness over the contour]

```
!A<0.> B<0.08> B^0<0.820>
```

There are two further types of contours: low leads (A_) and emphatic cores (B+).

Low lead (A_) contours also display a diminished pitch over the contour. Although they may be confused with B contours, "low leads are A-type contours which introduce shifts in time or action, and often occur with initial adverbial and expressive particles" (Woodbury 1987:183). Example (3) illustrates a low (A_) contour.
(3) (= Subgroup 2)

There they lived at Utsaladdy.

Emphatic core (B+) contours occur at the end of the group. In comparison with plain B cores they display a steeper fall in pitch and are preceded by a larger than ordinary rise. They serve to signal the closure of the group (or larger unit) or introduce direct speech.

(4) (= Subgroup 11)

Stop it now
Steller's Jay.
Stop it!
2.1.2 Groups

In all these examples, lines with these four intonation contours obey an ordering condition put forward by Woodbury (1987:183):

$$(A_\_A^* - B(+)^* - B^0^*)$$

(*) indicates any number of instances, including zero, of contour X).

This condition states that a well-formed group will consist of "any number of lead lines followed by core lines and attenuated core lines" (Woodbury 1987: 158). Terminal pitch is higher on earlier lines than it is on later ones, reflecting down-drift, the successive lowering of pitch and decay in amplitude and pitch range.

Groups are of two types: simple and complex. Simple groups (henceforth called subgroups) comprise lines ordered according to the well-formedness condition. They usually correspond to one sentence, but may correspond to two or three. Examples of subgroups have already been illustrated above.

Complex groups contain two or more subgroups groups that are bound together by intonational parallelism, rhythm, and down-drift (Woodbury 1987:184). A new complex group is signaled by a high pitch reset.\(^4\) Consider SSP's Complex Groups 3 and 4, repeated in Example (5). The pitch reset occurs at line 18.

---

\(^4\) Pitch reset involves an "upward shift of the pitch register to the register of the preceding initial pitch peak, and in addition interrupts a normal downward trend" (Carleton 1996:89).
Now, then, was a hunter Bobcat. He would hunt. And would talk Steller’s Jay. She would talk.

2.1.3 Sections

Above the level of the complex group is the section. The section is comprised of groups of lines, the last of which typically terminating in a very long pause. Section boundaries may be introduced by an initial low level (A_) lead contour, marked by a final emphatic (B+) contour, a sudden slowing in tempo (or lengthening), or comprise groups of short lines that terminate in intonationally attenuated (B^0) contours. Functionally, the section displays a unity of content comprising short episodes that are frequently introduced by sentential (adverbial) particles, e.g., *(and)then, now (then)*, etc. The following excerpt illustrates the division of a portion of the text, showing where one section ends and the next begins. Note the longer pauses between complex groups, and the extremely long pause at the end of the section.
Then, IRR.-7 the warriors were terrorized. Then they got into their canoes. Then they travelled away. Their people did not get put on board.

Then she said to Magpie, "Did you find out Magpie?"

I didn't get headsnached. I didn't get headsnached.

I just pretended to be a dog, just and scared the warriors."

Oh, the poor thing. She sure helped us out.

"I won't scold you anymore Steller's Jay no more," she said to this so-called Steller's Jay.

5 The double dash here represents a false start, due to an interruption by one of the listeners. SSP pauses before continuing. Bieler considers such false starts as "valuable performance markers . . . , contributing to the narrative rhythm" (1996:40). Moreover, she believes that their distribution may be indicative of "not only structures but driving powers of language, growth points of the storytelling" (1996:40).

6 <beat> indicates a very brief interruption in the stream of speech.

7 IRR represents the irrealis prefix tu-.
In sum, the foregoing represents a beginning in the analysis of the prosodic component of the Lushootseed narrative. Thus far, I have identified the levels of intonational phrasing discussed in Woodbury (1985, 1987). It remains to be seen if this framework is adequate for other Lushootseed narratives, and whether there might be other aspects of Lushootseed rhetorical structure that would expand Woodbury's framework. A comparison of two versions of the same narrative by two different Lushootseed speakers might provide further insights.

Pausing behaves similarly to intonation by dividing discourse into units, in addition to its attitudinal and grammatical function. The next section we examine pause phrasing and its organizational role in rhetorical structure of Nobility at Utsaladdy.
2.2 Pause Phrasing

Pause is usually treated as a prosodic feature (Fónagy and Magdics 1963: 323) although it is in a sense segmental, working in sequence with segmental units (consonants, vowels). It has traditionally been studied along with other suprasegmental elements such as intonational features, loudness, and lengthening. Attempts to give a precise account of the distribution of pauses and to draw conclusions about their function in discourse point out that the pause plays an important role in organizing speech (Goldman-Eisler 1961, 1968, 1972). Not surprisingly, research on the structure of oral narratives (Chafe 1980; Scollon & Scollon 1981; Gee & Grosjean 1984; Gee & Kegl 1983; Rosenfield 1981) has found that pausing marks the boundaries of narrative units. And some ethnopoetic approaches regard pauses as a key feature signalling the basic poetic structure of Native American narratives (e.g., Tedlock, 1972, 1977, 1983).

The tendency has been to categorize pause phrases as either short or long. Brown and Yule (1983:160-4), for example, argue that in English very short pauses (less than 1 sec.) tend to be hesitations, whereas medium and long pauses indicate successively larger prosodic units. However, as Woodbury points out, the problem with this conclusion is that pause phrasing tends to reinforce higher level prosodic units Brown and Yule were testing (Woodbury 1987:235, fn. 7). Woodbury has found that in CAY narratives, pauses both offset and cross-cut intonation phrasing at lower levels of prosodic phrasing.

More importantly, Woodbury found that pause length is gradient, arguing against a discrete hierarchy of pause phrasing which, at the lowest level consists of pause phrases separated by short pauses, and at higher levels groups of pause phrases separated by long pauses (Woodbury 1987:186). Rather, he found that pause phrasing is a *nondiscrete*
hierarchy involving "a rather loose clustering of pause phrases" with internal organization, but "well defined to a greater or lesser degree in every discourse" (Woodbury 1987:186).

Moreover, pause phrasing varies from culture to culture, and may thus be an artefact of the raconteur and his listeners' expectations. For example, Woodbury found that CAY speakers typically use pauses "that are long by English standards, giving English listeners an impression of slowness" (Woodbury 1985:186). It would be not be surprising to find that Lushootseed narratives have unique pause phrasing as well. Pause phrasing in SSP's narrative is examined, and attempts are made to analyze its interaction with intonational phrasing. Before turning to the analysis, a summary of Woodbury's pause default criteria for CAY narrative is given below, which will provide the starting point for the analysis of the Lushootseed narrative.

Woodbury has developed a model of rhetorical structure using texts from CAY. For this language he proposes default criteria (1987:186-7) as the basis on which to interpret the organizational role of pause phrasing and its interaction with intonation.

1. In the default case, line and pause will correspond to one-to-one; when more than one line occurs in a pause it will create an impression of rapidity, leading to a variety of special interpretations in context.

2. In the default case, subgroups and well-defined pause-phrase clusters will correspond one-to-one; that is, the pauses between lines within a subgroup will be roughly equal to each other but shorter than the pauses at the subgroups' edges. In non-default cases, unusually short pauses will create cohesion while unusually long pauses will convey disjunction or, in connection with A [terminal] contours, dramatic anticipation (especially section initially).
These defaults imply that certain pause-prosody alignments will correspond one-to-one, making the information unit neutral or expected by the audience. Thus, nondefault cases are marked, motivated, and communicatively significant (Woodbury 1987:187).

Woodbury's defaults need to be revised for Lushootseed. He bases his defaults on CAY narrative which shows, for the most part, pauses at the ends of each line. Lushootseed pause phrasing is different. Most often lines within subgroups do not end in a pause. For this text, at least, a revised default statement would have to say that,

3. in the default case lines within subgroups will not end in pauses. When pauses occur after lines within a subgroup, special communicative effect is conveyed.

4. Subgroups and well-defined pause phrase clusters will correspond one to one. This default might be expected to extend beyond subgroups to higher levels. The pause at the end will be longer than the pauses within.

This revised default criteria makes it possible to account for both the continuity and disjunction in Nobility at Utsaladdy. The introductory section of SSP's narrative (Subgroups 1-13) contains examples of defaults 3 and 4. A section of that introduction is given below.
(9) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Subgroup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>ḥabu::?</td>
<td>A &lt;0.&gt;</td>
<td>Story-telling time^8 [and in this story it is said] as usual that nobility lived there.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ḥabu? k'wət] sixw g̣wəl</td>
<td>A &lt;0.&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:4</td>
<td>?əstəfiil ṭiʔə? səʔ'a?</td>
<td>B &lt;.05&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>A &lt;.0.&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:7</td>
<td>?əstəfiil ṭiʔə? səʔ'a?</td>
<td>A &lt;.798&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>?əstəfiil ṭiʔə? p'əč'əb</td>
<td>A &lt;.855&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:9</td>
<td>?əstəfiil ṭiʔə? kay'kay'</td>
<td>B &lt;1.46&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ḥbac a</td>
<td>B &lt;0.&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>ḥbac a</td>
<td>B &lt;0.&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:11</td>
<td>ṭiʔə? adad</td>
<td>B &lt;0.&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:12</td>
<td>ṭiʔə? p'əč'əb</td>
<td>B &lt;0.982&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:13</td>
<td>ḥbacss.</td>
<td>B &lt;2.08&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Complex Groups 1 and 2 both defaults are obeyed by the lack of pauses between lines in Subgroups 1, 2, and 4, and the presence of pauses at the ends of each subgroup. As well, the pauses within the complex groups are shorter than the pauses at the ends of the groups. A significant change in the narrative pace occurs in Subgroup 3, violating default 3 by pauses between lines. The pause creates disjunction, isolating each character for highlighting purposes. The original pace resumes in Subgroup 4 in which default pausing returns. The very long pause at the end of Subgroup 5 signals the boundary of a larger unit, the Section.

Consider next Example (10), which continues to describe the main characters.

Complex Groups 3 and 4 display significant structural parallelism. The intonation contours

---

^8 This is a rough translation of the word used in this context. ḥabu? is encouragement that listeners call out to the storyteller. It is used here as a discourse marker announcing that the story has begun. It could also be translated as "traditional story begins now" or "gather 'round."
are identical (i.e., A B B B0) and each shows a default violation (a lack of pause between subgroups).

(10)  (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

| Time | Subgroup   | Speaker | Transcript   | Duration
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4:8:18</td>
<td>:8:19</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>gwa? adgwa?</td>
<td>And would talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:8:18</td>
<td>:8:20</td>
<td>B0</td>
<td>gwa? adgwa?</td>
<td>She would talk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:8:20</td>
<td>:8:21</td>
<td>B0</td>
<td>gwa? adgwa?</td>
<td>She would talk.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this excerpt, the intonational parallelism is disrupted by the pause at the end of line 20, which is not matched by a pause at the end of line 16. The impression of rapidity created by the lack of pause between Subgroups 6 and 7, and 8 and 9 may express a variety of communicative effects. In this excerpt it seems to convey the characters' obsessive behaviour—Bobcat's tiresless diligence and Steller's Jay's incessant chatter.

Subgroup 9 violates the default in 4 with different effect: it emphasizes how tedious Steller's Jay's chatter really is. Notice also that the pause phrasing in Subgroup 9 further violates the default in 3 by containing a pause that is longer than the pause at the end of the subgroup. The shorter pause occurring at line 21 may be linking Subgroups 9 and 10.

---

9 This interpretation takes its cue from Lushootseed (and other Native American cultures) rules of appropriate social conduct. That is, hunting is worthwhile but chattering is not.
In Section 3 Steller's Jay's chattering gives rise to Magpie's following admonition. It contains only a single default violation: lack of pause after line 25 in Subgroup 11.

(11) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

| [3] | 5:10:22 gʷəl ɑ'urnished?ə | B <0.> | And cautioned her to stop it this Magpie. |
| :23 | tsiʔə? adəd | B <.724> | |

| 11:24 ɑ'uhuyəxʷ | !A <0.> | Stop it Steller's Jay! |
| :25 kay'kay' | B <0.> | |

| 12:26 ɑ'uhuyəxʷ | B+<1.8> | Stop it!! |

| 13:27 ti dəgʷi gʷəl əxibəčəʔ?ə | A <0.> | You're the one who would be kidnapped by the warriors, if they get hold of you." |
| :28 kʷi tubšəda[d] | B <0.> | |
| :29 gʷəkʷəxibitəxʷ | B <2.40> | |

Whereas the lack of pause in the previous examples communicated diligence and tediousness, the lack of pause between subgroups 11 and 12 in this example seems to communicate Magpie's exasperation with Steller's Jay. The pause at the end of Magpie's warning is the longest encountered thus far. Functionally, it not only links the subgroups into a larger unit, but may serve to signal a major narrative division.

Another violation of the default in 3 occurs in the following subgroup, represented in Example (7), in which there is a pause at the end of line 47. The pause provides emphasis: "she would be like that."
(7) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

9:22:45 ʔacas  
:46 gʷasʔistəʔ  
:47 tsiʔa? diʔa?  
:48 gʷədəxʷsudəʔabəs  
:49 gʷəwɨxɨcəbəs  
:50 ʔə kʷi tubșədə[ʔ] B <beat>

Indeed
she would be
like that,
if she were called
if she were
by the
warriors.

Default 3 is also overturned within Subgroup 31 by the pause at the end of line 67.

(8) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

:31:66 ʔahaxʷ
:67 ?asʔwədiʔaʔub ʔixʔaʔ  
:68 ?asʔwədiʔubəxʷ  

There now
they had them sitting,
sitting now
as slaves.

Under Woodbury’s default 1, pause phrasing in the example above would not be
communicatively significant and we would miss the irony of the situation: nobility sitting as
slaves. Here, the pause adds dramatic effect by creating a disjunction between lines 67 and
68, placing emphasis on “sitting now as slaves.”

In the body of the narrative (Subgroups 14-end) the manipulation of pause phrasing
changes the pace of the narrative over a complex range or scale. Longacre (1996) has
emphasized the significance of unit size in a narrative. Pause phrasing is used creatively to
regulate the pace of the narrative. For example, frequent pausing chops up the narrative
into smaller, crisp units, as in the example below.
(12) ([Section]: Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

  :70  saxwabaaxw tsi?a?
  :71  kay'kay'
  !A <0.>  Now
  B <.59>  ran away this
  B <.661>  Steller's Jay.

  :33:72 ηgwañaxw
  :73  dxwañaq
  !B <.844>  (She) climbed up high!
  !B <.386>  That's why she is the way she is now.

  :34:74 tudaxwastistasaaxw
  B <1.42>

  :76  gwubaxw:.....:10
  !A <0.>  Now
  B <1.8>  she barked.

  :36:77 saq'w
  :78  ëgwañdagwap
  !B <.554>  Flew among the trees down low
  B <0.>  and again she barked.

  :79  gwñbñlaguub
  B <.47>

BARK—BARK

Suspending pauses between lines and larger units creates a run-on effect. This is
demonstrated in the following example where pauses are suspended between lines 59 and
60.

(13) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

  :59  kwadabitañ
  A_ <0.>  Then
  B <0.>  they were kidnapped!

  :29:60 ëisabaxw [h]alwña?
  ?a
  B <0.>  Came now (to kidnap) them
  AGT.

  :61  ti?a? tubšñad[a]d
  B <beat>11  the warriors,

  B <1.80>  to Utsaladdy.

10 The extreme rhetorical lengthening occurring here is represented by a string of lengthening marks (::).
Rhetorical lengthening is also accompanied by a creaky voice.
11 The speaker is interrupted by a listener at this juncture.
This rapid-fire delivery created by the suspension of pauses serves to heighten the surprise attack. Contrast this with the following example, which violates the default in 3 by slowing the pace to accentuate the individual victims.

(14) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c}
11:30:63 & k^w\text{ada:bitabax}^w & \text{They took this uh—,} \\
\text{tsi?a? sta?—} & A <1.75> & \text{Robin!} \\
:64 & sk^w\text{ak}^w\text{aqiq} & !A <\text{beat}> \\
:65 & k^w\text{adabitab tsi?a? yay'qa?} & B <2.47> \text{They took this yay'qa?}.^12 \\
\end{array}\]

Finally, a significant violation to achieve a special communicative effect is demonstrated by the extremely long pause occurring within Subgroup 46 (line 101). In conjunction with the repetition in the following line and accompanying pause, this may foreshadow the supernatural nature of Steller's Jay's power song.\(^13\)

(15) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

\[\begin{array}{c|c|c}
17:46:100 & x^w\text{i?} & \text{I didn't} \\
:101 & g^w\text{ads\text{\textipa{1}}b\text{\textipa{1}}t\text{\textipa{1}}\text{t}\text{\textipa{1}}b} & A <0.> \text{I didn't get headsnatched.} \\
:102 & x^w\text{i?} g^w\text{ads\text{\textipa{1}}b\text{\textipa{1}}t\text{\textipa{1}}\text{t}\text{\textipa{1}}b} & B <2.08> \\
:47:103 & x^w\text{ul'ul' \textipa{1}c\text{\textipa{1}}d} & B <0.820> \text{I didn't get-headsnatched.} \\
\text{?uq}^w\text{aq}^w\text{ab\textipa{1}acut} x^w\text{ul'} & B <.410> \text{I just pretended to be a dog, just} \\
:104 & g^w\text{al"ux\text{\textipa{1}ac ti} & B+ <0.> \text{and scared the} \\
:105 & tub\text{\textipa{1}ad}\text{\textipa{1}d[d]} & B^0 <\text{beat}> \text{warriors."} \\
\end{array}\]

\(^{12}\)Today no one knows what kind of bird this is.

\(^{13}\)Barry Carlson (personal communication, 1999) says that the Jay is important in Salish cultures throughout British Columbia and Washington State. Certain members of Salish communities, especially in the Interior, were considered to be human embodiments of Jay. Because they possessed magical powers and a knowledge of medicine, they were treated with caution and respect.
The examples above show that special cohesive and disjunctive effects are created by the alignment and misalignment patterns of pause and intonational phrasing. This supports the predictions of Woodbury's framework by showing that the interaction of rhetorical components is communicatively significant. Not explicitly stated in Woodbury (1985, 1987) is that contour patterns themselves may create cohesion and disjunction and that pause phrasing reinforces this. In the following section this interaction is examined, showing that repeated contour patterns display a cohesive function, while divergence from the established pattern displays a disjunctive function.

2.3 Interaction of Prosodic Components

Turning back to Section 1, we see the AAB pattern repeated three times. Once in Subgroup 1, a second time in Subgroup 2, and a third time in Subgroup 3.

([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

1: 1:1 habu::? A <0> Story-telling time
   :2 [habu? k'wal] sixw g'wal A <0> [and in this story it is said] as usual that
   :3 ?estalil ti?e? s'la? B <.05> nobility lived there.

   :2:4 ?a A _<0> There
   :5 ?estalil ?al A <0> they lived at


   :4:10 ?ibac ?e B <0> Grandson
   :11 tsit?e? aed B <0> of Magpie
   :12 ti?e? p'at'elab B <.982> (was) Bobcat.

The first two AAB patterns are contained within Complex Group 1, the third in Complex Group 2. Although the content represented by identical contour patterns are also repetitions (with some elaboration), these contour patterns spread across two complex groups, which are disjunctive units if we consider that a high pitch reset creates disjunction between prosodic units. On the content side, we see that lines 7, 8, and 9 expand on what is said in the previous three lines: introducing the main characters. Thus the unity of the topic of nobility, although carried across two complex groups, is preserved by maintaining the AAB contour pattern.

Disjunction is created by a shift from the expected AAB pattern to a BBB pattern in Subgroup 4, even though Subgroup 4 is linked with Subgroup 3 within Complex Group 2. Keeping these two subgroups together is desirable, because the narrator is still introducing the main characters. However, she is also focusing on Bobcat's relationship to Magpie. As mentioned earlier, divergence from expected patterns is communicatively significant. And shift in focus is disjunctive. Figure 1. illustrates narrative cohesion and disjunction reflected by contour patterns, which are offset and cross-cut by pause phrasing. The connectiong bar on the right of the Lushootseed text indicates the point at which cohesion is sustained by the contour pattern across two complex groups.
Figure 1. Contour-Pause Interaction

Reinforcing the disjunction created by the shift in contour pattern in Subgroup 3 is the violation of the intonation-pause default in Subgroup 3. As mentioned earlier, the disjunction that pausing creates isolates the information contained within the pause phrase, serving to focus on each named character. The return to the default case in Subgroup 4, however, cross-cuts the unexpected BBBB contour pattern. In this case, the contour pattern is communicatively significant whereas in the former case, pause phrasing is communicatively significant.

The foregoing has demonstrated the interaction of prosodic elements. In this narrative, intonation and pause phrasing are autonomous components that organize the structure of the discourse in their own ways. Pauses do not necessarily require intonational breaks, and intonational breaks do not require pauses. Moreover, the parallelism between
content and prosodic form seems to support Hymes's claim argument for form-content parallelism in Native American narrative. There are other patterns in the narrative, those I have examined serve to illustrate some of the possibilities. A more comprehensive analysis of form-content parallelism operating in Nobility at Utsaladdy is provided in Section 3.3.
3. MORPHOSYNTACTIC COMPONENTS

3.1 Syntactic Constituency

Exploring the relationship between syntactic/semantic and prosodic structure has been a major area of research in prosody for at least two or three decades (e.g., Chen 1987; Croft 1995; Downing 1970; Halliday 1967; Langendoen 1975; Nespor and Vogel 1982, 1983, 1986; Selkirk 1981, 1984, 1986; Steedman 1991). Researchers are primarily concerned with the existence of a broadly grammatical system underlying prosodic phrasing, and thus attempt to explain, or explain away, any misalignments of prosodic and syntactic constituents. But a theory of rhetorical structure, like Woodbury's, tries to account for the misalignments by treating prosody and syntax as separate systems that organize the narrative in different ways with different communicative effects.

The following presents the interaction of intonation structure, pause structure and syntactic constituency in SSP's narrative. It will show that prosody and syntax often diverge from expected one-to-one alignment, displaying other types of (mis)alignment, such as many-to-one alignment (in which different clauses, or parts thereof, occur in the same prosodic subgroup), and one-to-many alignment (in which the same clause occurs over more than one prosodic subgroup). Their divergence from the default case (one-to-one alignment) signals special cohesion and disjunction.

The current discussion is organized as follows. First, a general description of Lushootseed syntax will be presented. This will be followed by (1) examples showing the interaction of prosodic features at clause boundaries, and (2) instances within sentences
where prosodic phrasing overrides syntax, where it reinforces syntax, and where it is overridden by syntax.

3.1.1 Lushootseed Grammar

Lushootseed is a verb-initial language. Like other Amerind languages, Lushootseed builds sentences by linking morphemes around a predicate nucleus. Its complicated morphology allows for simple syntax. In the *Lushootseed Reader Vol. 1* (hereafter LRI), Hess (1995:82) points out, "Good Lushootseed style prefers fairly simple syntax, packing complexities into the verb morphology."

The grammar comprises a hierarchy of syntactic constituents from lexical categories (nouns, demonstratives, verbs, and so on) to maximal phrasal projections (VP, NP, etc.) to clauses. Clauses comprise the predicate and optional complement(s); unlike in English and many other languages, a well-formed sentence need only consist of the predicate. The following describes each major constituent.

3.1.1.1 Constituents of the Clause

*Predicate.* A sentence may consist only of a verb, or, to be more precise, a predicate. Lushootseed sentences are often verbless.\(^{15}\) Other word classes, such as adverbs or nouns, may occupy the position normally assumed by the verb. For this reason, the term predicate is used to refer to the position itself, and will be used throughout

\(^{15}\) I adopt Hess’s (1995:81) definition of a verb, which is a stem to which (a subset of) aspectual prefixes may be attached.
this discussion, except where the focus is on VP. Examples of verbless predicates (underlined) are provided below.

(16) ̨wtdi? ta duk'wibat.  "Way off there is Charger."
  ̨tiʔa? ta ̨č'TL'a?.  "This is the rock."
  rus?ab ti tudsč'istx̂W.  "My former husband was a man of rank."
  
Any remaining item in the clause is either a complement, adjunct, or augment.

Complements. There are two types of complements in Lushootseed: the direct complement and the oblique complement. The direct complement is a noun phrase consisting of a demonstrative and a noun. In the examples above, the portion not underlined is the direct complement. The direct complement may also be the agent or the patient of the clause, depending upon the particular ending that the predicate bears: If the predicate ends in -b the direct complement is the agent, whereas if it ends in -d or -tx̂W, the direct complement is the patient.16 Finally, direct complements may also be a wh-word or a demonstrative, e.g.,

(17) ̨x̂Wul' ̨čad gWəc'ut ̨a tiʔa?.
       DEM.  "I would just sound like this."

or

(18) tatsus gWasʔista? ̨a tiʔa?.
       DEM/fem.  "She would truly do this."

(Nobility at Utsaladdy)

Nominalized subordinate clauses function as patients, e.g.,

(19) ̨ułaxdxWəxW ̨tiʔH tushuy ̨a tiʔH c'iixč'iix
       patient  had done
       "[He] remembered what Fish Hawk had done"

(LRI:111)

16 When a personal pronoun is the direct complement, it is always the agent, regardless of whether the predicate ends in -d,-tx̂W or -b.
When the direct complement occurs, it accompanies the predicate in forming the core of the Lushootseed clause.

Peripheral to the predicate and the direct complement are the oblique complement, the adjunct, and the augment. The oblique complement expresses the agent of a predicate. It differs from the direct complement in that it expresses the agent of predicates ending in -tub, -tab, -dub, -cub, and -sab, which mark a change in voice of the predication which is somewhat similar to the passive of English. ?a-, an all-purpose preposition, is used to introduce the agent, as in the following example.

(20) Ɪukʷəda.taʔ ?a tiʔaʔ pís.pís ti sʔuladxʷ  Lit: "The salmon was taken by the cat."  

(20) Ɪukʷəda.taʔ ?a tiʔaʔ pís.pís ti sʔuladxʷ  Lit: "The salmon was taken by the cat."  

(LRI:82)

Not all ?a-phrases function as oblique complements, however. Noun phrases introduced by ?a- may serve other semantic roles, such as instrument and patient. Examples where ?a indicates the two roles are provided in Examples (21) and (22).

(21) Ɪpupusutəb ?a ti č’ač’aʔas tiʔaʔ sqʷəbayʔ ?a ta č’TL’aʔ. "The boy threw at the instrument dog with a rock."  

(21) Ɪpupusutəb ?a ti č’ač’aʔas tiʔaʔ sqʷəbayʔ ?a ta č’TL’aʔ. "The boy threw at the instrument dog with a rock."  

(LRI:84)

(22) Ɪuʔəxʔ ?a ta biax. "[Someone] ate the meat."  

(22) Ɪuʔəxʔ ?a ta biax. "[Someone] ate the meat."  

(LRI:85)

?a-phrases may also function as adverbials, as in

(23) Ɪuyayus Ɪa tatìb "[Someone] worked hard."  

(23) Ɪuyayus Ɪa tatìb "[Someone] worked hard."  

(LRI:85)

---

17 See fn.3 in Bates 1997, "Person Marking in Lushootseed Subordinate Clauses" the unrevised version of a paper presented at 32nd ICSNL, Port Angeles, WA., August 7-9.
Finally, ?a-phases mark possessive relations, e.g.,

(24) ḳibac ʔa tsiʔa? adad tiʔa? p’oč’ab "Bobcat was the grandson of Magpie."
    possessor    possessed

(Nobility at Utsaladdy)

Adjunct. The adjunct comprises any material left in the clause, that is, material other than the predicate, direct and oblique complements, or augment. The adjunct may be a single word or a prepositional phrase introduced by either ?a or ?al. For example, in the following two sentences, the first underlined adjunct is a single word, whereas the second underlined is the ?al phrase, e.g.,

(25) ḳa’tax̱ab dəw̱t’aq’ [pp dəw’al tudiʔ ?alʔal.] "It was spread up [pp toward yonder house.]"
    adjunct    ?al-phrase

(LRI:82)

According to Hess (LRI) ?al— and its derivatives, tulʔal from, dəw’al toward, until, in order to and lifʔal by way of, by means of— are lexical items that are free with respect to their position in the sentence (LRI:84).

In short, ?o-phrases and ?al-phrases are integral syntactic constituents, like English prepositional phrases, which cannot be parsed into smaller syntactic constituents.

Augment. The augment is a single word that expresses locative or temporal notions that are not part of any other constituent, e.g.,

(26) tulaʔibaš tiʔat baščab lifʔal.ʔal "Mink was travelling along the shore."

(LRI:82)
3.1.1.2 The Clause

A Lushootseed sentence is composed of at least one independent, or matrix clause. Sentences with more than one clause are either compound or complex sentences. The former contains two (or more) main clauses conjoined by an a-vowel suffixed to a çad-word (described below), when first or second persons are involved (LRI: 114). The latter contains at least one subordinate (embedded) clause. Subordinate clauses express the motivation or reason for an act or state conveyed in the main clause; they express a range of attitudes including tentativeness, vagueness, uncertainty, and, in the case of relative clauses, they modify particular nouns.

Distinguishing the independent and subordinate clauses in Lushootseed involves identifying certain morpho-syntactic forms that the subordinate clauses assume. One feature that identifies a subordinate clause is the presence of a complementizer preceding the predicate of the embedded clause. Complementizers are lexical items that head an embedded sentence. They include interrogative words, such as stab what, gWat who, çad where, çal how. The subjunctive prefix gWæ/-gW- is used in subordinate clauses that express doubt or denial, or question something.

In addition to complementizers, there are other morphosyntactic patterns involved in subordinate clauses. The most salient of these is the occurrence of the type of person marker the clause has in its predicate. There are three different sets of subject person marking patterns: çad-words (or person particles), person clitics, and nominalized person markers (LRI: 108). The first set comprises free standing pronouns. These patterns occur in main clauses, and in one type of relative clause (LRI: 110). The second and third set of person markers are used to form subordinate clauses. The person clitic pattern is used to form conditional, habitual, or jussive clauses (LRI: 110). The third set of person markers is
used in nominalized clauses—clauses which are preceded by demonstratives, such as tiʔə? this, tiʔət that.

There are several other configurations that subordinate clauses take. Discussion of these constructions is beyond the scope of the present analysis. The above is meant to provide enough background on Lushootseed for the analysis of the interaction of syntactic constituency and prosodic phrasing of SSP’s narrative.

3.1.1.3 Pragmatic Constructions

All languages have syntactic devices to focus on specific elements of the sentence. In Lushootseed, these devices include special word order and the position of demonstratives with respect to the topicalized element(s), e.g.,

(27) wiw’su tiʔə? ?učalad tiʔə? sqʷəbay?
    Topic    DEM.
"The children are the ones who chased the dog."
(LRI:98)

Special person markers (e.g., ʔəca I am the one) are used to focus pronominal subjects, as are special person marking affixes (see LRI:104) and the verbal prefix, daxʷ- (LRI:103). Interrogative words, inherently focusing, are another means of directing focus on an element within the sentence (e.g., who can help me?). The interaction of these syntactic patterns of focus with intonational phrasing and pause phasing will be examined.
3.1.2 Interaction of Syntax and Prosodic Phrasing

Prosodic phrasing is an independent component of the rhetorical structure of SSPs' narrative. It is also partly predictable from syntactic constituency. Furthermore, there are cases where prosodic phrasing is overridden by the syntax, suggesting that syntactic constituency may also comprise an independent component in the organization of the narrative. Woodbury (1985:189-90) made two generalizations about the interaction between prosody and syntax.

1. In the default case, a sentence and a prosodic subgroup will correspond
   one-to-one;

2. In non default cases,
   (i) different sentences (or parts thereof) will occur within the same subgroup,
       showing a many-to-one alignment giving rise to special cohesion;
   (ii) the same sentence will span more than one subgroup, showing a one-to-many alignment that creates special disjunction.

3.1.2.1 One-to-One Alignment

Most subgroups in SSP's narrative adhere to the default rule. Some examples are provided below.

(Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

(28) 1: 1 [həbuː?] A <0.>
     : 2 [həbuʔ kʷəʃ] six[w gʷəl A <0.> 
      : 3 ?əstaʃil tʔaʔ sTLʔaʔ B <.05> 

Storytelling time [and in this story it is said] as usual that, nobility lived there.
There they lived at Utsaladdy. Grandson of Magpie (was) Bobcat. Her grandson. Now then, was a bunter Bobcat. And would talk Steller's Jay. And cautioned her to stop it this Magpie.

These passages above are good examples of a clear one-to-one correspondence between sentence and subgroup. But one-to-one alignment does not always occur, as seen when the default is overturned by the alignment of more than one sentence with one subgroup.

3.1.2.2. Many-to-One Alignment.

Examples of a many-to-one alignment which creates cohesion follow.

(Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

(29) 2:4 ʔə A_ <.0>  
: 5 ʔəʔəʔil ʔəl A <.0>  they lived at 
: 6 tiʔil ʔəcaladi B <1.8>  Utsaladdy.

(30) :4:10 ʔəbɛc ʔə  B <.0>  Grandson 
:11 tiʔəʔ adad  B <.0>  of Magpie 
:12 tiʔəʔ p’əɛ’əb  B <.982>  (was) Bobcat.

(31) :5:13 ʔəbacs.  B <2.08>  Her grandson.

(32) 3:6:14 ʔə: gʷəl təsʔəbədi A <.0>  Now then, was a hunter Bobcat. 
:15 tiʔəʔ p’əɛ’əb  B <.0>  

(33) 4:9:18 gʷəl ə’uɡʷədɡʷə B <.0>  And would talk Steller's Jay. 
:19 tiʔəʔ kəy’kəy’  B <.0>  

(34) :12:22 gʷəl ə’uɡʷədəb ʔə  B <.0>  And cautioned her to stop it this Magpie. 
:23 tiʔəʔ adad  B <.724>  

(35) 2:3:7 ʔəʔəʔil tiʔəʔ ə’əʔa? A <.798>  Nobility lived there. 
: 8 ʔəʔəʔil tiʔəʔ p’əɛ’əb B <.855>  Bobcat lived there.
Now then, was a hunter this Bobcat.
He would hunt.

She would talk.
She would talk.

They took this uh--.
Robin!
They took this ymay qa?

Then the warriors were terrified.
They got into their canoes.
Then they travelled away.

I didn't get head-snatched.
I didn't get head-snatched.

In Example (41) below, many-to-one alignment is used to create non-default *enjambment*, a process of incorporating different sentences within a single line. This occurs in line (116), which contains an entire sentence and the last part of the previous sentence.
Now it is the very spirit-power song she sings. Her spirit-power song.

The spirit power of this Steller’s Jay was what she used to overpower the warriors.

Another interesting aspect of Example (41) is that the pause occurring at line 116 disrupts the prosodic cohesion created by the succession of A contours. The insertion of a pause here violates the default in 4, which states that subgroups and well-defined pause-phrase clusters will correspond one to one. The insertion of a pause here not only creates disjunction, but, in connection with an A contour, creates dramatic anticipation (Woodbury 1987:187).

3.1.2.3 One-to-Many Alignment

Disjunction is also created by spreading a single sentence over more than one subgroup. There are no examples of this type of alignment in this narrative, however.

3.1.3 Alignment of Prosodic Phrasing and Sentence-Internal Constituents

This section looks at the interaction between prosodic phrasing and syntactic constituents within the sentence. The sentence is composed of a hierarchy of syntactic constituents which can be decomposed into increasingly smaller components, e.g., sentence -> subject + predicate, predicate -> verb phrase + noun phrase, noun phrase -> determiner + noun, etc. Syntactic dependency refers to the relationships holding between
minor elements that comprise a syntactic constituent. These are represented in dependency trees, "sets of nodes whose interconnections specify structural relations" (Crystal 1997:109), e.g., preposition + noun form a prepositional phrase (PP), determiner + noun form a determiner phrase (DP), modifier + noun form an adjective phrase (AP), and so on.

Within the Lushootseed sentence there are some fairly rigidly observed rules of prosodic phrasing. In prosodic phrase formation, prosodic (W)ords and adjacent (C)litics group together to form (C W) sequences. In sequences with two clitics (W C C W), the first clitic will incorporate with the preceding word becoming a suffix, while the second clitic will join the word to its immediate right. The result of this process yields two prosodic phrases (W+C) (C W). In cases where the grammar creates three successive clitics (W C C C), phonological processes segment the string into (W+C) (C C+W) (Beck 1996, 1998).

Prosodic phrasing in Lushootseed appears to be largely independent of syntactic constituency. However, there are cases where intonational phrasing and pause phrasing coincide with syntactic boundaries, and other instances where prosodic phrasing is overridden by syntax and discourse (see also Beck 1996:51). The next three sections present examples of the alignment patterns involving intonational phrasing, pause phrasing, and syntactic constituency.

3.1.3.1 Prosody Ignores Syntactic Boundaries

Prosodic phrasing frequently ignores the boundaries of syntactic constituents. This is most evident in lower level phrasal constituents and syntactic dependencies. Prosodic phrasing seems particularly insensitive to ?a- and ?al-phrase constructions, inserting an intonational break (A or B terminal contour) and occasionally a pause between the phrasal
particle (?a-, ?al- and the head.) In Examples (42) and (43) the prosodic phrasing intervenes between the particle marking the agent and the noun phrase.

(Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

(42)  8:17:35  xwi:
       gwadskwa?abyitab  ?a
       kwistiub{ada[d]  B  B  NEG. would be kidnapped by

       :36  B  B  the warriors.

(43)  :29:60  tisbaxw
       [h]algwa?  ?a
       ti?adarub{ada[d]  B  B  Came now (to kidnap)

       :61  B  B  them AGT. 18
       :62  B  B  the warriors

Prosodic phrasing may override the boundaries within other ?a- phrases that express a variety of other relationships, such as that which relates possessor to possessed item in Example (44), and that which designates the patient of a subclass of agent-oriented verbs in Example (45).

(44) Possessor and possessed item (Subgroup: Line)

       4:10  ?ibac  ?a
       :11  tsi?adarub{adad  B  B  Grandson of

       9:20:41  "xwul'  čad  B  B  Magpie

(45) Patient (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

       9:20:41  "xwul'  čad  A  B  "I would just
       :42  gwacut  ?a
       :43  ti?adarub{adad  B  B  sound like

       9:20:41  "xwul'  čad  A  B  "I would just

The boundaries of ?al-phrase constituents are also regularly interrupted by prosodic phrasing, as in (46).

18 AGT. represents ?a the preposition used to mark the oblique agent.
Elements within the DP are also frequently separated by intonation breaks and pauses, as the following examples illustrate.

In all the examples above, prosodic phrasing appears to be oblivious to the boundaries of syntactic constituents. The junctures that the intonational breaks create within the constituents also seem to violate Selkirk's (1984) sense unit. There also does not appear to be any special communicative effect conveyed by the prosodic-phrasal patterns here, and this weakens Woodbury's argument that misalignment among rhetorical components creates special cohesion or disjunction in the narrative.

Furthermore, the lack of incorporation of the demonstrative (ti?ə?/tu?ə?) with the preceding word violates the prosodic patterning of words and clitics described above. Beck (1996) has also noted and suggested two possible explanations: (1) there is no phonological process which allows demonstratives to incorporate with a preceding word; and (2) this construction allows the demonstrative itself to function as a (phonological)

---

19 Selkirk proposes a sense unit condition on intonational phrasing which states that prosodic phrasing is ultimately to be attributed to the requirement that it makes a certain kind of semantic sense (1984:286).
word. Beck says that "This might be expected for demonstratives based on their status as potential predicates" (1996:58). The pauses occurring in Subgroups 30 and 32 above serve to reinforce the separation of the two elements. Section (3.1.3.3) includes a discussion of the possibility that these constructions have a topic-setting function.

3.1.3.2 Prosody Reinforces Syntactic Boundaries

Prosodic phrasing may reinforce higher level syntactic constituent boundaries. For example, in (50) and (51) the boundary between the predicate and its complement is reinforced by an intonation break (A contour.)

(Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

(50) 3:6:14 ?a: gʷəl tus?ubədi A <0.> Now then, was a hunter
     :15 t'iʔə? pʔəʔəb B <0.> Bobcat.

(51) 4:8:18 gʷəl kʷu?adgʷə? A <0.> And would talk
     :19 ts'iʔə? kəy'kəy' B <0.> this Steller's Jay.

Prosodic phrasing may also reinforce the boundaries between the verbal predicate and adverb, as illustrated in Examples (52) and (53).

(Subgroup: Line)

(52) :33:72 gʷə:kəxʷ B <.844> Climbed,
     :73 dxʷšəq !B <.386> up high!

(53) :36:77 saqʷ B <.554> Flew,
     :78 l̓i̓gʷədəgʷəp !B <beat> among the trees down low.
Finally, the prosodic-syntactic alignments in (54) demonstrate the reinforcement of a subjunctive clause (line 46) and two subordinate clauses (one beginning at line 48, and the other at line 49.)

(Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

(54) 10:22:45 ?acas

:46 gWas?ista? A <0.>
:48 gWadaxWsuda?abses B <1.49>
:47 gWatuxile?abses ?a B <0.>
:50 kWitubšadad[d] B <beat>

Indeed she would be like that, if she were caught by the toe if she were head-snatched by the warriors.

3.1.3.3 Syntax Ignores Prosody

Prosodic (intonational) phrase boundaries may also be overridden by syntax and discourse, as in vocative expressions. In the examples below I use Beck's notational method, W = Word C = Clitic. Here discourse overrides prosodic phrasing by forcing an intonational break (indicated by a double slash) between the second clitic and word, resulting in the disruption of the expected prosodic pattern (W + C) (C W).20

(55) ( W C C ) // ( W )

?uhaydxW čaxW ?u ?adad find out you INT.21 Magpie
Did you find out, Magpie?

---

20 Hess (personal communication, 1999) points out that this particular sequence would always be W + C + C; both Cs incorporate.
21 INT. represents the interrogative marker ?u.
As mentioned earlier, demonstratives are frequently separated from their noun heads by intonational breaks (and sometimes pauses). It was suggested that the lack of the incorporation of the demonstrative with the adjacent word may have either a phonological or syntactic/pragmatic explanation. The result of this construction is to emphasize the following noun and make the demonstrative word act as a resumptive pronoun or the left-branching equivalent (Beck 1996:58), e.g., "Mary, I know her" (Crystal 1997:332). Consider the following example which is recast using a different notation to show the change in the syntactic status of the components. (The notation includes intonational breaks (/) and intonational contour type (A) followed by pause duration, indicated within angled (<>) brackets).

(56) a. Input (from Example 47)

```
( W    C   )  A<1.75>  !A <beat>
  k^wada:bitabax^w  tsita?  sk^wak^waqig
They took    this        Robin
```

b. Change

```
(W)          (W)  //    (W)
  k^wada:bitabax^w  tsita?  sk^wak^waqig
They took    this (one)    Robin
```

The examples in this section have shown that the interaction of syntactic structure with pause phrasing and intonational phrasing creates a network of alignments (or default relationships) and misalignments which establish the stylistic flow of the narrative. The narrator uses the relationship between these rhetorical components to move the story along, always manipulating the cohesive and disjunctive possibilities in creative ways. The following section considers a fourth component available to the narrator, adverbial particle phrasing.
3.2 Adverbial Particle Phrasing

Dell Hymes is a pioneer in the field of ethnography, especially in the subdiscipline of the ethnography of speaking. His analyses of Native American oral performances have laid the foundation for countless linguistic and anthropological investigations into the structure of Native American narratives. He has long appreciated the inherent poetic nature of Native American oral performances. His analyses of Chinookan narratives revealed recurrent patterns that organized the texts into verses and lines, the division of which he found to be conditioned by repetitions and relationships among words and grammatical features. He noted the frequency with which sentential particles introduced lines and verses and marked the passage of time and turns at speaking.

The main function of *sentential particles* (SAPs)\(^\text{22}\) is to introduce shifts in the narrative, creating disjunction between narrative units. They interact with the prosodic and syntactic components, and their role in the rhetorical organization of SSP's narrative will be investigated. I will examine the system of sentential particles and demonstrate that their distribution is partly conditioned by intonation and pause phrasing, and partly conditioned by syntax. Woodbury found this to be the case in CAY narratives and concluded that: "...adverbial particles are by nature syntactic, yet serve to introduce prosodic units in addition to syntactic ones" (Woodbury 1987:192). The most common sentential particles are translated as *and, then, and next*, but others include *but, however, so it happened, well, now then, as time passed, it is said, indeed*, and interjections such as *Oh!, My!*

\(^{22}\) These particles are also referred to as *sentential adverbials* and *adverbial particles*. To avoid confusion, I refer to them as SAPs.
3.2.1 **Sentential Adverbial Particles (SAPs)**

Lushootseed uses a small set of SAPs. The most common are \(g^w\alpha l\) \((g^w\alpha?)\) *and*, *but*, *or*, *huy* *then*, *next*, and *hay* *next*. These particles are often combined into the sequences, *huy g^w\alpha l\), *g^w\alpha l* \((h)u y\), *hay g^w\alpha l\), which all roughly mean *and then*. Another SAP used by some speakers is \(?a?ay\) (variant of *hay*) *located, be (there)*, which may also be used in combination with one of the others (LRI:122). There are also adverbial predicates in this narrative which function in the same way as SAPs by introducing the sentence or cueing the direction of the narrative. These include: \(k^w(\alpha)l\), *it is said*, *tilab instantly* and \?asus* *indeed*.23 These last two convey an evaluation the speaker makes of the narrative's subject matter. Table 1 shows SAPs frequently used in this narrative. For the most part they introduce syntactic sentences and higher level prosodic units, i.e., sections and complex groups.

As the pattern in Table 1 indicates, syntactic constituency conditions the placement of SAPs. In this data all the SAPs occur clause or sentence initially. Since the beginnings of sentences usually coincide with the beginnings of prosodic units, they too are introduced with SAPs. Although separate from either the syntactic or the prosodic component, SAPs nevertheless tend to reinforce constituent boundaries, providing the cue that a shift has occurred in the narrative.

3.2.2 **The Enclitic \(-\alpha^W\)**

The enclitic \(-\alpha^W\) *now* has a special function within discourse. It designates a change in the situation, indicating that a new act or condition is now in effect (LRI: 68). It

---

23 \?asus may be a variant of \?k\(\alpha c\) *be located right there* (Hess 1976:639) and the sentential adverb \?ah (LR1:122).
also organizes the narrative, either independently or in combination with SAPs and prediccations. Usually, but not always, it signals larger prosodic units (i.e., groups and sections), creating disjunction within the narrative. To see how -aXW organizes the narrative, consider its distribution in the excerpt below. It appears to organize the narrative by reinforcing the function of SAPs. It may do this by attaching directly to predicative words or to SAPs. In either case, it reinforces the disjunction.

(57) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

Then they were kidnapped!
Came now (to kidnap) them AGT.
the warriors,
there at Utsaladdy.

Then
They took
this uh--,
Robin!
Another bird was taken.

Now they had them sitting,
sitting now as slaves.

Now ran away this
Steller's Jay.
(She) climbed up high!
That's why she is the way she is.

Then she barked.

Then
she whistled!
Then
she whistled.
Then Steller's Jay whistled.
As Woodbury (1985:172-3) has pointed out syntax, prosody, and particles create linguistically significant units which a narrator can use to reinforce discourse units or to create special patterns of cohesion and disjunction. Lushootseed particles have been shown to introduce or reinforce prosodic units, such as sections and complex groups, which align, in most cases, with syntactic units. Their disjunctive function is to show shifts in action, place, or time. A fifth component, considered next, is form-content parallelism.
| Patterned Pattern of Sentential Adverbial Particles (includes adverbs and particles) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line) |                                |                  |                  |
|                                           | [1] 1:1:1                      |                  |                  |
|                                           | :2 (k'wal)                     |                  |                  |
|                                           | :3                              |                  |                  |
|                                           | 3: 6:14 [?a:: gwal               | now:: then       |                  |
|                                           | :15                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | [2] 4: 8:18 [gwal                | and              |                  |
|                                           | :19                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | [3] 5:10:22 [gwal                | and              |                  |
|                                           | :23                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :31                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :32                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | 9:22:45 [?asus                  | indeed           |                  |
|                                           | :46                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :47                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :48                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :49                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :50                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :59                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :29:60                          |                  |                  |
|                                           | 12:32:69 [huy                   | now              |                  |
|                                           | :70                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :71                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :76                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | 14:38:84 [huy                   | then             |                  |
|                                           | :85                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :39:86 [huy                     | then             |                  |
|                                           | :87                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :40:88:88 [huy                  | then             |                  |
|                                           | :89                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :92                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :93                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | :94                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | 16:44:96 [huy                   | then             |                  |
|                                           | :97                             |                  |                  |
|                                           | 18:48:106 [?u:::                | oh:::             |                  |
|                                           | :49:107                         |                  |                  |

Note: [ ] = sentence boundaries; items in parentheses ( ) = translator's insertions
3.3 Form-Content Parallelism

The analysis of the rhetorical structure of this Lushootseed narrative has thus far, uncovered an organization based on lines, groups of lines, and sections. These divisions were found to be defined by intonational phrasing, and frequently reinforced by pause phrasing, particularly at higher levels of prosodic organization. Syntactic constituency also tended to reinforce intonational phrasing, but just as often it could be cross-cut by intonational phrasing. In very few cases did syntactic constituency override either intonational or pause phrasing; when it did, it served a discourse purpose. Finally, SAPs, although these are not strictly part of either the prosodic or syntactic components, consistently reinforced these junctures.

This section examines another component, which Hymes believes to be at the core of narrative verse in Native American languages. It lies deeper than either pause phrasing or particles, depending upon "a conception of narrative action as fulfilling a recurrent formal pattern" (1981: 8). He calls this pattern form-content parallelism. It follows from a very simple premise.

... sequences of action will satisfy one or another of two basic types of formal pattern. In Zuni, Karok, Takelma, and Tonkawa, the formal pattern is built up of pairs and fours. In the Chinookan languages, and in the neighboring Sahaptin and Kalapuyan languages, the formal pattern is built up of threes and fives. (1980: 8-9)

For Hymes, studying the covariation of form and meaning, which relates nonphonological linguistic units to a recurrent cultural number pattern, leads to the discovery of a hierarchy of rhetorical units that correspond with poetic divisions, viz., line, verse, stanza, and so on.
Some researchers of Native American languages (e.g., Mattina 1987) criticize Hymes’ method as being too subjective, raising the methodological question as to whether one can be sure that the recurrent patterns are present in the text and not a construct of one’s own mind. Other researchers have had mixed results with Hymes’s analysis. Bright (1982) found that Northern California Karok narratives displayed the requisite kinds of numerical patterning but that those of some Southern California groups (specifically, Cahuilla and Diegueno) did not. Woodbury found discrepancies even within a single language. CAY displayed patterning based on the cultural pattern five in a few traditional tales and dance performances, but this was absent in other genres (1985:168-169).

3.3.1 Form-Content Parallelism in Lushootseed

Hymes’s numerical pattern does emerge in our Lushootseed narrative. It coincides with and reinforces levels of organization that have been forged by the prosodic and syntactic components. For example, in Section 2 of the Lushootseed narrative, repeated in (58) below, lines referring to activities (16 and 17; 20 and 21) repeat in their Subgroups. Moreover, there is a larger pairing: two characters, two activities.

(58) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

| [2] | 3:6:14 | ?a:: gwal tus?ubadi | A <0.| Now then, was a hunter |
| :15 | ti?a? p'ac'ab | B <0.> | Bobcat. |
| :16 | 'uxw'ixwil | B <0.> | He would hunt. |
| :17 | 'uxw'ixwil | B0<1.09> | He would hunt. |
| 4:8:18 | gwal 'ugwadgwa? | A <0.> | And would talk |
| :19 | tsit'a? kay'kay' | B <0.> | Steller’s Jay. |
| :20 | 'ugwadgwa? | B <1.06> | She would talk. |
| :21 | 'ugwadgwa? | B0<.667> | She would talk. |
Another passage repeated in Example (59) demonstrates uniform repetitions of four, showing identical intonational contours and nearly identical pause phrasing as well, thus illustrating the congruence of form-content parallelism and the prosodic component. SSP makes use of a repetition of three to heighten expectation for the listener and to focus attention on the activity, before stating its purpose. The fourth iteration expands the predication. 24

(59) (Subgroup: Line)

:22:47 'xWul' čad gWəʔuḵWiw' B <.229> "I would just whistle.
:23:48 xWul' čad gWəʔuḵWiw' B <.272> I would just whistle.
:24:49 xWul' čad gWəʔuḵWiw' B <.335> I would just whistle.
:25:50 gWəhuyud čad-

Woodbury points out that Hymes's theory has both a specific and a general claim (1985:167). The general claim is that there will be all kinds of recurrent patterning, not just those according to even or odd numbering. SSP's narrative typically displays patterning of twos and fours, but it frequently organizes the text in threes. An example is provided in (60), where the predication is repeated three times.

(60) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

2:3:7 ?astəłılıl tiʔa? sk'a?
 :8 ?astəłılıl tiʔa? p'ač'ab A <.855> Bobcat lived there.
 :9 ?astəłılıl tiʔa? kay'kay' B <1.46> Steller's Jay lived there.

---

24 Bierwert (1996:40) refers to this narrative strategy as elaboration. It also corresponds to the boundary of a weighted circular figure described by Langen (1996:55-56). See fn. 4, pg. 51 for definition of this device.
Although the expected cultural pattern is four in Lushootseed, the narrative often displays a combination of different numerical patterns, especially at the level of the line. In Example (61) below, Subgroup 34 is organized into twos, Subgroup 35 is organized into threes, and Subgroup 36 is organized into fours. Moreover, Complex Group 15 is organized into two subgroups and Complex Group 16 is organized into three subgroups.

61) (Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

| 15:31:67 huy | !A <0.> Now ran away this Steller’s Jay. |
| :68 saxa'baxa'tsi'ya? | B <.59> |
| :69 kay’kay’ | B <.661> |

| 16:34:73 huy | !A <0.> Now she barked. |
| :74 gwuubaxaw::: | B <1.8> |

| 32:70 ngw'alexaw | !B <.844> (She) climbed, up high! |
| :71 dxw'saq | !B <.386> |

| 35:75 saq’w | !B <.554> Flew, along the bottom, and again she barked. |
| :76 ligw'adagwap | B <0.> |
| :77 gw'al balagwub | B <.47> |

| 36:78 lnx’w | !A<0.> (She) went to DEM. |
| :79 dxw'al ti'ya? | A<0.> |
| :80 dadč’u? swatixw’tad | B <0.> yet another tree |
| :81 gw'al bə[a]l kwí basugwuubs | B <.862> and there she barked some more. |

Further research must be done with Lushootseed texts and different narrators before deciding on the preferred traditional patterning and determining its scope in different genres.

25 Kim has noted the use of threes instead of the Lushootseed culture number four in another traditional narrative. He suggests that "the raconteur has made a small adaptation to the dominant Anglo culture" (1995:89, fn.2). However, this cannot be the case for SSP, because she did not speak English.

26 DEM refers to demonstrative, which in this case is ti'ya? this.
3.3.2 Interaction of Prosody and Form-Content Parallelism

Whereas Hymes's method deals almost exclusively with higher level narrative units, such as acts and episodes, Woodbury extends the analysis to lower levels (prosodically defined units: sections, groups, lines). This analysis, focusing on these lower levels, illustrates form-content parallelism occurring there.

Woodbury (1987:209) posits a working hypothesis which suggests that there will be one-to-one alignments between units of form-content parallelism and prosodic units. He clearly believes this to be a rule with few exceptions, at least at higher levels (i.e. the section). He goes on to say that, "At a lower level, prosodic grouping operates within a rather broadly defined default relative to units of form-content parallelism, conveying special meaning with nondefault alignments" (1987:214). In other words, we expect to see form-content parallelism reflected in groupings of lines, subgroups, and complex groups.

The following represents a partial analysis of form-content parallelism operating at several levels of prosodic organization in Nobility at Utsaladdy. A thorough examination will have to be put aside for the present. In Example (62), the two subgroups repeat the A-A-B intonational pattern.

(62) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

```
(1)  1: 1  habu::?  A <0.>
     2  [habu? k'wəl] sîx w  gʷa1  A <0.>
     3  ?əsəyətəl tiʔa? səʔa?  B <.05>
         [and in this story it is said] as usual that nobility lived there.
     2  4  ?a  A <.0.>
     5  ?əsəyətəl ?a1  A <.0.>
     6  tìʔətəcələdə  B <1.8>
        there
         they lived at Utsaladdy.
```
The predication ?əstaNib? they lived there expressed in the first subgroup is repeated in the second subgroup, creating cohesion by linking the two subgroups within a larger unit. Pause phrasing reinforces form-content parallelism by the lack of pauses between lines, and by the long pause at the end of line 6, adding closure to the complex group.

Example (63) below shows correspondence between form-content parallelism and prosody at the level of the subgroup.

(63) (Subgroup: Line)

| :4:10 | ?əbacs ?a | B <0.> | Grandson                  |
| :11  | tsi?ə? adəd | B <0.> | of Magpie                  |
| :12  | tiʔə? p'əčʔəb | B <.982> | (was) Bobcat.              |

?əbacs grandson introduces subgroups 4 and 5, its recurrence within a short span links the two groups, creating a cohesive unit. This cohesion is reflected in the intonation phrasing as well by displaying a sequence of four B contours. The extremely long pause at the end of line 13 reinforces the cohesion by adding closure to Section 1 repeated in Example (64).

(64) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

| [1]   | 1:1 : habu::? | A <0.> | Story-telling time  |
| :2    | [habu? k'wəj] sixw gʷəj | A <0.> | [and in this story it is said] as usual that  |
| :3    | ?əstaNib? tiʔə? səʔ'a? | B <.05> | nobility lived there. |

---

27 I believe that Langen (1996) would refer to this type of Lushootseed narrative configuration as a *circular figure*, wherein the first line of the first subgroup and the first line of the second subgroup (also constituting the last line of the complex group) are statements that echo each other (1996:55).
There are several other instances where form-content parallelism and prosody align at the level of the subgroup. One has already been provided and other examples are found in Appendix 2 (Subgroups 1-2; 11-12; 15-16; 17-18; 22-27; 35-37).

Alignments between form-content parallelism and prosody also occur at the level of the line. One example has already been given, and two more are given in Examples (65) and (66) below.

([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

(65) 7:16 \( \lambda^{'ux\text{wi}\text{ti}x\text{wi}} \) B <0.> He would hunt.
      17 \( \lambda^{'ux\text{wi}\text{ti}x\text{wi}} \) B<0.> \( \lambda^{'ux\text{wi}\text{ti}x\text{wi}} \) B<0.> He would hunt.
      16 20 \( \lambda^{'ug\text{adg}\text{a}w\text{a}} \) B <1.06> She would talk.
      21 \( \lambda^{'ug\text{adg}\text{a}w\text{a}} \) B<0.> \( \lambda^{'ug\text{adg}\text{a}w\text{a}} \) B<0.> She would talk.

(66) 7:17:35 \( x\text{wi} ? \) I wouldn't be
      g\( \text{adsk\text{adabyit\text{a}a}} \) B <0.> kidnapped by
     :36 k\( \text{w}\text{i}\text{tub}\text{\text{a}a[d]} \) B <0.> the warriors,
      :37 \( x\text{wi}\text{t} \) !B <1.19> nope!
In Example (66) Steller's Jay's protestations are iterated twice within the same Subgroup (lines 35 and 37). The cohesion of Subgroup 17 is further reinforced by the lack of pauses between lines and the long pause at the end of the group (line 37). Disjunction between Subgroups 17 and 18 is created by the pause occurring at line 37. The emphatic !B contour here further reinforces the boundary. Functionally, Subgroup 18 seems to elaborate the denial.  

3.3.2.1 Numerical Patterning of Content

An example of the scope of form-content parallelism is illustrated in Section 4, repeated in Example (67) below. Additional notations indicate turn taking, and hence disjunction in the monologue of each character. The single arrow indicates Steller's Jay's direct quote and the double arrow Magpie's inner thoughts (or the narrator's asides). Each "aside" interrupts the rhythm of Steller's Jay's speech, but comes at regular intervals.

---

28 According to Bierwert (1996:40), elaboration is one of four common Lushootseed narrative configurations; the others include repeating and carrying on, rephrasing, and throwing a word in the gap.
(67) ([Section] Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

[4] 6:14:30 ti:lab A <0.> Instantly
    :31 lucut k\text{w}si A<0.> replied this so-called
    :32 kay'kay' B <.559> Steller's Jay,

> 15:33 "\text{\textlambda}'u B+ <.997> "No.

16:34 \text{\textlambda}'u !B+ <2.04> No!

7:17:35 "x\text{\textw}? I wouldn't be
    gw\text{\textadskw}dabiyt\text{\texta} B <0.> kidnapped by
    :36 kw\text{\texti} tub\text{\texts}\text{\textd}a[d] B <0.> the warriors,
    :37 x\text{\textw}? !B <1.19> nope!

:18:38 "x\text{\textw}?: \text{x\textw}?': \text{\textc}\text{\textead}
    gw\text{\textaq}w\text{\textiq}\text{\textw}abq\text{\textw}abycut
    \text{x\textw}?" B <1.0> "Nooo I just
    tub\text{\textaq}wayq\text{\textw}abq\text{\textw}aybicut
    g\text{\textw}\text{\texta}\text{\textk}'as B <0.>
    :40 kw\text{\texti} tub\text{\texts}\text{\textd}a[d] B <.469>
    just sound like a dog
    just sound like a dog
    the warriors.

> 8:20:41 "x\text{\textw}?l' \text{\textc}\text{\textead}
    A <0.> "I would just
    :42 g\text{\textw}acut \text{\texta} B <0.> sound like
    :43 ti?\text{\texta}? B+ <0.> this!"

21:44 BARK — BARK — BARK
    BARK — BARK — BARK
    BARK

>> 9:22:45 ?ac\text{\textas}
    A <0.> Indeed
    :46 g\text{\textw}\text{\textas}\text{\textk}'ista? A<0.> she would be
    :47 ts?\text{\texti}? di?\text{\texta}? B <1.49> like that,
    :48 g\text{\textw}\text{\textad}\text{\textw}suda?\text{\texta}\text{\textes} B <0.>
    if she were caught by
    :49 g\text{\textw}\text{\textatuxil}\text{\textc}\text{\textbas} B<0.>
    if she were
    :50 \text{\texta} kw\text{\texti} tub\text{\texts}\text{\textd}a[d] B <beat>
    head-snatched
    by the warriors.
This Lushootseed narrative consistently displays the form-content parallelism described by Hymes. It organizes the narrative at both lower and higher levels. Furthermore, the organization that form-content parallelism creates corresponds with prosodic phrasing. Figure 3 shows alignment of form-content parallelism and prosodic phrasing in Section (4). The content of the section is divided into eight predications, which can be distilled into four basic types: protestation, repetition/expansion, elaboration, and synopsis. Each speaker has three turns and a basic pattern is established through a back-and-forth dialogue that involves Steller’s Jay’s comments (repeated and elaborated) and Magpie’s repetition and synopsis of Steller’s Jay’s comments.

In addition, Steller’s Jay voices two strategies to scare the warriors, barking and whistling. Her first strategy of escape comprises a set of four narrative "moves": protest (the possibility of capture), repeat/expand the protest, elaborate, and a further elaboration...
by demonstration (she barks). She presents her second strategy, whistling, in three identical statements and a fourth, expanded form of the previous ones. Magpie volleys three asides: the first coming between Steller's Jay's first and second elaboration; the second coming at the end of her second elaboration; and the third at the end.

Finally, the organization of Steller's Jay's speech is more in accord with the Lushootseed traditional number four. Magpie's single statement links with Steller's Jay's repeated protests and elaboration, providing a fourth part (Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>protest</th>
<th>repeat/expand protest</th>
<th>elaboration</th>
<th>repeat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td>Steller's Jay</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;I would bark&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;She would bark&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Numerical Patterning in the Dialogue of Steller's Jay and Magpie

3.3.2.2 Alignment patterns of Numerical Form-Content and Prosody

Section 4 is divided into four complex groups which are, in turn, divided into one, two, or three subgroups. Numerical patterning occurs in twos and fours (or three and one) at the level of the line. Speaker turns also show a numerical pattern: Steller's Jay and Magpie each have three turns. The dialogue chunks display patterning of threes and ones. Steller's Jay's first turn is divided into a group of three statements, the content of which has been described here as: (1) protestation; (2) repeat and expand (protestation); and (3) elaborate ("she will bark like a dog"). Magpie's repetition of Steller's Jay's statement adds a fourth unit. Steller's Jay's first statement aligns with four subgroups. Her statement aligns with two subgroups and four lines. Her final statement aligns with four subgroups and four lines.
Magpie's first response aligns with one subgroup and two lines. Her second comment aligns with one subgroup and five lines (in one sentence). Her last aligns with one subgroup with three lines.

In conclusion, the analysis presented thus far has demonstrated evidence for form-content parallelism in Nobility at Utsaladdy. Although a full treatment of the alignment patterns and variants of form-content parallelism and prosody is well beyond the scope of this thesis, the results of the analysis are sufficient enough to show that numerical form-content parallelism is a significant feature in this Lushootseed narrative. It was also found that the Lushootseed culture number four is not the only pattern—three and five are other numerical patterns organizing the text. Not examined is the independent role of form-content parallelism, which should show misalignments with the prosodic components investigated in this study. This awaits future analysis, which should extend beyond this portion of the text to include the entire tale of Nobility at Utsaladdy.
Figure 3. Interaction of Form-Content Parallelism and Prosodic Units

**Key:**
- CG Complex Group
- SO Subgroup
- Num. Numerical repetitions
4. CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The notion that language is a system of systems was promulgated by Jakobson (1960, 1981). This sentiment is echoed in Woodbury's (1985, 1987) rhetorical theory, which attempts to isolate and describe the interaction of rhetorical components used to organize traditional narratives. Woodbury's rhetorical model is currently a preferred approach, differing from those of other ethnographers and linguists who argue for a single driving force in the organization of text, whether it be syntactic, form-content, or prosodic.

The objective in this thesis is to avoid preconceptions regarding structure and approach the Lushootseed narrative as a multifaceted entity. I do not impose a predetermined structure on the narrative that might constrain the emergence of covert structures. As such, this analysis of SSP's narrative diverges from others by attempting to get past the unit-based approach to narrative analysis, concentrating instead on the interdependencies among prosodic and syntactic elements and their role in the organization of the narrative.

Woodbury's approach made it possible to uncover distinct rhetorical components in Suzie Sampson Peter's narrative. Each rhetorical component studied—intonation, pause, and syntactic constituency—contributed to the structure of the narrative either independently or interactively, enhancing meaning and giving texture to the story. What remains to be done is to see how different speakers make use of these components creatively, thus capturing the range of styles of Lushootseed traditional narrative.

Although Beck (1998) made the first attempt to describe prosodic levels in Lushootseed, his data, like mine, was gathered from only one speaker. Also, he
approached his analyses with the assumption that the prosodic hierarchy is valid for Lushootseed. Given this, there may be patterns that exist that were overlooked in his analysis simply because they were not amenable to the theory. Moreover, there are other features in the prosodic component, such as rhythm, tempo, and loudness, that have yet to be examined for the ways in which they may interact and align. Finally, it would be interesting to know how this model can be used to analyze other discourse genres like oratory and conversation. Unfortunately this cannot be done in Lushootseed because it is a moribund language. There are other Salish languages, however, which are still spoken today, i.e., Halkomelem, Okanagan, and Secwepemctsin (Shuswap), and they may allow broader discourse analyses. The model may also be tested on other indigenous languages of the Northwest such as Nuu-chah-nulth (Nootka), Tsimshian, Chilcotin, and Carrier.

In addition, there are several important issues involved in the characterization of prosody in natural discourse that have not been settled. Carleton says, "These issues involve both functional [and] formal characteristics of prosody . . . Issues of quantitative modeling in several languages require more controlled data than what is currently available" (1996:88). Future developments in these areas will also be relevant for Lushootseed. Subsequent analyses of Lushootseed narratives will have to be refined, incorporating methods of laboratory phonology and phonologically-based theories of intonation. I agree with Woodbury (n.d) who points out the need for more careful analysis of tone placement, tone scaling, and intonational phenomena such as boundary tone and F0 reset, in order to see what determines their patterning. This research may lead to a convincing proof of the existence of a prosodic hierarchy, one that would allow for interdependencies among prosodic elements to be established.


__________. 1998. Extending the prosodic hierarchy: evidence from Lushootseed narrative. 34th International Conference on Salish and Neighbouring Languages, 35-59. Port Angeles, WA.


APPENDIX 1

Nobility at Utsaladdy: An Intralinear Prosodic Segmentation

A<0.>  A<0.>  B<.05>
Storytelling time, [in this story it is said] as usual that nobility lived there.

A<0.>  B<0.>  B<1.8>
There they lived there at Utsaladdy.

A<.798>
3. ?astatil ti?a? s'ka?/
Nobility lived there.

B<.855>
4. ?astatil ti?a? p'ac'eb./
Bobcat lived there.

B<1.86>
5. ?astatil tsia? kay' kay'/
Steller's Jay lived there.

B<0.>  B<0.>  B<.982>  B<2.08>
Bobcat was the grandson of Magpie, her grandson.

A<0.>  B<0.>
7. ?a gwal tus?ubadid / ti?a? p'ac'eb./
Now, Bobcat was a hunter.

B<0.>  B<1.09>
He would hunt, he would hunt.

A<0.>  B<0.>
9. gwal ?ac'adgadg / tsia? kay' kay'/
And would talk this Steller's Jay

B<1.06>
10. ?ac'adgadg/
She would talk.

Letters mark intonation contours, pause duration noted within angled brackets, and slashes indicate prosodic boundaries.
11. 'gʷadgʷad./
   She would talk.

12. gʷal ʔuqalduh ʔa / tsiʔa? ʔadəd./
   And Magpie cautioned her to stop it.

13. "ʔuuhuʔaxʷ / kəʔ' kəʔ' / ʔuuhuʔaxʷ./
   "Stop that Steller's Jay, stop it!

14. ti ḥagʷi gʷal əsχicâʔəb ʔə / kʷi təbšədə[d] / gʷakʷədyibətəxʷ."/
   You're the one headsnaicbed by the warriors if they come here to kidnap you."}

15. tiłəb / ḥuqut kʷsi / kəʔ'kəʔ' /
   Instantly replied this Steller's Jay

16. "ʔu. / ʔu. / xʷiʔ gʷədskʷədəbyiʔəb ʔə / kʷi təbšədə[d ], / xʷiʔ"./
   "No. No. I wouldn't be kidnapped by the warriors, no!

17. "xʷiʔ, xʷul’ čəd gʷaqʷiqʷəbqʷəbəcyəcəd, xʷuľ’./
   "No, I would just sound like a dog, I would."

18. xʷuľ’ təbaʔqʷəqʷəbqʷəbəcyəcəd gʷəʔəəʔə [h]ə / kʷi təbšədə[d ]/
   She would just sound like a dog if the warriors came.

19. "I would just sound like this,"

bark bark bark bark bark

20. ?acas / gʷəʔəstaʔ? / tsiʔaʔ / diʔaʔ / gʷədəxʷədəʔəbəs / gʷəʔəxəbəsəbəs
   She would indeed be like that, if she were headsnaicbed

?ə / kʷi təbšədə[d ]/
   by the warriors.
would just whistle.

I would just whistle.

I would make them think that they were hearing a whistler."

She would truly do this!

Then they were kidnapped.

The warriors came to kidnap them there at Utsaladdy.

Robin was taken.

They took this yay'qa?.

They had them sitting, sitting as slaves.

Now Steller's Jay ran away, she climbed up high.

That's why she's the way she is now.

2 Today, no one knows what kind of bird this is.
33. huy / gwubaxw/   Now she barked.

34. saq'w/   Flew.

35. hagwədagwəp/   Among the trees down low.

36. gwəl balagwuub/   Again she barked. —bark bark —

37. ṭukw/ / dxwəl tiʔə? / dadə'ua'swətixʷtəd / gwəl baʔa [ h ] kwı əsugwuuβs/
   She went to yet another tree and there she barked some more.

38. huy / xiwiw'adəxw/   Then she whistled.

39. huy / xiwiw'adəxw/   Then she whistled.

40. huy xiwiw'adəxw tsiʔə? kay'kay'/
   Then this Steller's Jay whistled.

41. xiʔwaacaxw tiʔə? / tubšəda [ d ]/   She whistled at the warriors.

42. huy / tuyabaxw tiʔə? tubšəda [ d ]/
   The warriors were terrorized.

43. huy q'ilagwilaxw/
   They got in their canoes.

44. huy ?uluʔaxw/
   They travelled away.
45. xʷiʔaxʷ gʷəsqʷildubs tiʔ tiʔaʔ? ñʔads.
   Their people didn't get put on board.

46. huy cuucxʷ / tsiʔaʔ? ñʔadəd./
   Then she said to Magpie,

47. "xuhaydxʷ čəxʷ ?u / ñʔadəd."
   "Did you find out Magpie?

48. "xʷiʔ / gʷədsḵibəčtab / xʷiʔ gʷədsḵibəčtab."
   "I didn't get headsnatched!

49. xʷul'ul’čəd ᵇuqʷəbqʷəbəcut, xʷul’...
   I just pretended to be a dog, just.

50. gʷal ᵇuʔəc / təbəda[al]."
   And scared the warriors.

51. ᵇu tsi sʔəsabaβdxʷ.
   Oh, the poor thing.

52. ᵆudahahubut./
   She sure helped us out.

53. "xʷiʔaxʷ kʷi tədsugʷətubicid kəʔkəy".
   "I won't scold you anymore, Steller's Jay.

54. xʷiʔaxʷ.
   "No more."

55. cutəb / kʷsi kəʔkəy'./
   She said to Steller's Jay.

56. "xʷiʔaxʷ kʷi tədsugʷəɡʷətubicid."
   "I won't scold you anymore.

---

3 Aff. represents an affective feature added to the contour.
(singing)

57. "खैल चैद गर्नाटिङ्ग चाहु गर्नाटिङ्ग, गर्नाटिङ्ग वॉल दोबारा, गर्नाटिङ्ग जुनाक किवि चुट्टादा.[ d ]."
"I would just pretend to be a dog and the warriors would be frightened.
— bark—bark—bark—bark—"

A<0.>

Now it is her spirit power song that she sings.

A<664>

59. qalalitutsaxʷ /
Her power song.

A<0.> A<0.> B<1.27>

60. qalalitutsaxʷ ?a tsiʔa? kaya’kay’ tiʔit / daxʷ xʷal’dxʷs / di túbšada. /
The spirit power song of Steller’s Jay was what she used to overpower the warriors.

(singing)

61. "खैल चैद गर्नाटिङ्ग चाहु गर्नाटिङ्ग, गर्नाटिङ्ग वॉल दोबारा, गर्नाटिङ्ग जुनाक किवि चुट्टादा.[ d ]"
"I would just pretend to be a dog and the warriors would be frightened.

62. bark.bark.bark.

63. qetle. qetle. qetle.
APPENDIX 2

Nobility at Utsaladdy: A Prosodic Transcription

(Section Complex Group: Subgroup: Line)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Line</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1: 1 | hābu::? | Story-telling time
|       | [hābu? k’wəl] sīxʷ gʷəl | [and in this story it is said] as usual that nobility lived there. |
| 1: 2 | ?əstaθlil tiʔə? sə'ə? | B <0.5> | There they lived at Utsaladdy.                                      |
| 2: 4 | t’iθac | B <0.5> | Grandson of Magpie (was) Bobcat.                                     |
| 2: 11 | tsiʔə? adəd | B <0.5> | He would hunt.                                                       |
| 2: 12 | t'ila? p’ač'əb | B <0.92> | Now then, was a hunter Bobcat.                                       |
| 3: 6:14 | aː gʷəl tuʔubədi | Now then, was a hunter Bobcat.                                       |
| 3: 15 | tila? p’ač’əb | B <0.8> | He would hunt.                                                       |
| 4: 8:18 | gʷəl a’ugʷadgʷə? | And would talk Steller’s Jay.                                        |
| 4: 19 | tsiʔə? kəy'kəy' | B <0.5> | She would talk.                                                      |
| 4: 21 | a’ugʷadgʷə? | B <0.8> | She would talk.                                                      |

1 The text is transcribed morphophonemically. Rhetorical lengthening is marked by (::).
And cautioned her to stop it this Magpie.

Stop it

Stop it!!

You're the one who would be headnatched by the warriors, if they get hold of you.

Instantly replied this so called Steller's Jay,

No.

No!

I wouldn't be kidnapped by the warriors, nope!

Nooo I just would sound like a dog just.

She would just sound like a dog if came the warriors.

I would just sound like this!

BARK — BARK — BARK — BARK — BARK.
Indeed she would be like that, if she were called if she were headsnatched by the warriors.

I would just whistle. I would just whistle. I would just whistle.

I would make them (think they were) hearing a whistler.²

Truly (she) would do this.

Then they were kidnapped!

Came now (to kidnap) them AGT. the warriors, there (at) Utsaladdy.

They took- this uh--, Robin! They took this yay'qa?.

²There is some indeterminacy in the clarity of the intonational break between the personal pronoun čad and gʷə̱ðə̱bə̱xʷ I have grouped them together to correspond to the C W pattern of the Lushootseed phonological phrase described by Beck (1996, 1998).
There now, they had them sitting, sitting now as slaves.

Now ran away this Steller's Jay.

(She) climbed up high!

That's why she is the way she is now.

Now she barked.

Flew among the trees down low and again she barked.

(She) went to DEM.

Yet another tree and there she barked some more.

Then she whistled!

Then she whistled. Then Steller's Jay whistled.

She whistled at the warriors.
Then IRR.--
the warriors were terrorized.

Then they got into their canoes.
Then they travelled away.

Their people did not get put on board.

Then she said to Magpie,

Did you find out Magpie?

I didn't get headsnatched. I didn't get headsnatched.

I just pretended to be a dog, just and scared the warriors.

Oh, the poor thing. She sure helped us out.

I won't scold you anymore Steller's Jay no more.
She said to this so-called Steller's Jay.
:51:111 xwi?ex w kwi
  tudseug w ag w atubicid !B <beat>
  I won't scold you anymore!
(singing)

20:52:112 xwi' caad
  gwaq w iq w abq w abaycut
  :113 gwal tuhac kwi
  tudsead[d] A <0.>
  I would just pretend to be a dog
  and the warriors would be frightened.

20:52:115 qala:lituxax w ti?e? cadi
  :116 huwil: d qalalituxax w A<0.>
  Now it is the very spirit power song
  she sings. Her spirit power song.

20:52:117 qalalituxax w ?a
  :118 da[xw] w al'dx w s A<0.>
  The spirit power of this Steller's Jay
  was what she used to overpower the warriors.

20:52:118 qalalituxax w ?a
  :119 di tubsead[d] B<1.27>
  I just would pretend to be a dog
  and frighten the warriors.

:54:120 xwi' caad
  :121 gwaq w iq w abq w abaycut
  :122 gwal tuhac kwi tubsead[d]


:56:124 WOOF. WOOF. WOOF.