

Four Poems in Passamaquoddy

Philip S. LeSourd

Indiana University

Abstract. This article presents analyses of four poems in Passamaquoddy, an Eastern Algonquian language of Maine, that were published in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, some in more than one version. The original texts were included in works by Charles Godfrey Leland and John Dyneley Prince, two of the leading figures in their era involved in documenting the traditions of the Native peoples of New England and Maritime Canada.

1. Introduction

This article presents editions of four short poetic works in the Eastern Algonquian language Maliseet-Passamaquoddy that were recorded in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Maliseet is spoken today in five communities located along the Saint John River in New Brunswick, Canada, while Passamaquoddy is spoken in two communities in the St. Croix River valley of Maine, in the U.S. Maliseet and Passamaquoddy were formerly spoken in several additional communities, located in Quebec, New Brunswick, and Maine (Erickson 1978).

Maliseet and Passamaquoddy differ in numerous details of structure, phonology, and lexicon, but the two dialects are readily mutually intelligible. Both are now endangered. Leavitt (1996: 1) reports that about 500 fluent speakers of Maliseet and Passamaquoddy together remained at the end of the last century. Tribal leaders indicate that the number has declined substantially in subsequent years.

Two of the leading figures involved in documenting the traditions of the Algonquian peoples of New England and Maritime Canada in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were Charles Godfrey Leland (1824–1903) and John Dyneley Prince (1868–1945). Leland’s chief contribution in this area was *The Algonquin Legends of New England or Myths and Folk Lore of the Micmac, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot Tribes* (1884). Prince was the author of numerous analytical essays on northeastern Algonquian languages, including Western Abenaki and Penobscot (1901a, 1902, 1910), Mi’kmaq (1906), and Maliseet-Passamaquoddy (1914). In several articles he published Passamaquoddy textual material (Prince 1897, 1898, 1899, 1901b, 1909, 1917). His most substantial work along these lines was *Passamaquoddy Texts* (1921a). Less interesting from the point of view of the linguist or ethnographer is *Kulóskap the Master and other Algonkin Poems* (1902), a joint work by Leland and Prince in which they render many of the tales in Leland (1884) into blank verse.

Although Leland’s *Algonquin Legends* includes much material of value for the study of Algonquian folklore, there are serious problems with the volume as a scholarly work. He presents his tales as having largely been “gathered directly from Indian narrators, the greater part by myself” (1884: iv), but in fact he relied extensively on secondary sources, including both material provided to him by amateur folklorists with whom he corresponded and the manuscript of Silas T. Rand’s *Legends of the Micmacs* (published 1894), which the latter generously lent to him. Moreover, Parkhill (1997) has demonstrated that Leland edited his material with a heavy hand, introducing certain elements into his tales and eliminating others in order to make them conform to preconceived ideas of their proper content and form.

Most notably, Parkhill traces the evolution a tale prominently placed at the beginning of *Algonquin Legends* that presents an account of the origin of the culture hero known in Maliseet

and Passamaquoddy as *Kəloskəp*, Leland's "Kuloskap." The story Leland tells got its start in two brief tales recounted by Maliseet storytellers Peter Solis and Gabe Acquin to Edward Jack, a New Brunswick folklorist and one of Leland's correspondents. Leland transformed their skeletal narratives into a major statement of the purported Native conception of the opposition between good and evil (Parkhill 1997: 17–31). The original stories tell of Kəloskap's rivalry with his twin brother, who tries to kill Kəloskap and is then killed by him. The identity of the brother is not stated. Leland augmented Jack's versions with material taken from the manuscript of Rand's story "Glooscap's Origin," later published as Rand 1894: 339–340. Like Solis and Acquin's Maliseet accounts, this Mi'kmaq story does not specify the identity of Kəloskap's brother. Leland found this information in Sweetser 1883, a guidebook for tourists visiting the Maritime Provinces, which included a brief version of the tale of the brothers and their rivalry (Parkhill 1997: 38–39). The guidebook's account indicates that the brother of "Glooskap" was named "Malsunsis." Recognizing this name as Maliseet-Passamaquoddy *malsəmsis*, a diminutive of *malsəm* 'wolf', Leland declared the brother's name to be "Malsumsis," and decided that he was a wolf.¹ This identification, as it turns out, fit Leland's purposes perfectly, since it meant that "Kuloskap" and "Malsumsis" were parallel to two figures in Norse mythology: Odin and his enemy the evil wolf Fenris (Leland 1884: 18; Parkhill 1997: 61).

One of Leland's stated goals in presenting his *Algonquin Legends* to the public was to draw out parallels with episodes from early Scandinavian sources and thus to demonstrate that there are numerous "points of similarity between the myths or tales of the Algonquins and those of the Norsemen, as set forth in the Eddas, the Sagas, and popular tales of Scandinavia" (1884: v). Leland suggests that we cannot "account for these resemblances save by the so-called 'historical theory' of direct transmission" (1884: v). His Algonquian narrators were recounting

Norse tales, he argues, either because the stories were transmitted to them directly at an early date or because they had been passed on to them via Inuit intermediaries.

Even some of Leland's contemporaries were skeptical of his reasoning and of his brash conclusions. As one reviewer noted:

Mr. Leland thinks that a good deal of Eddaic lore has filtered through the Eskimo to the Algonquins, and certainly many curious coincidences in Eddaic and Indian folk-lore may be accounted for by that hypothesis, though we are not yet convinced of its accuracy. Perhaps, for complete proof, other examples of Indian institutions, dress, weapons, gear of every kind, derived from Norsemen might be adduced. They would certainly strengthen the hypothesis. (*The Athenaeum*, January 31, 1885, 146–147.)

Leland made no attempt to offer such corroborating evidence. His stories were all the evidence he required, and he edited his material heavily to lend support to his conclusions.

Prince's work presents its own set of problems. His principal treatment of Passamaquoddy grammar, "The Morphology of the Passamaquoddy Language of Maine" (1914), is a pioneering work that made an important contribution in its day, but it includes numerous misidentified and misanalyzed words.

Most seriously, Prince reports a dual paradigm for transitive verbs in Passamaquoddy that appears to be almost entirely his own creation, one that distinguishes forms for definite and indefinite object. Just such an inflectional system is found in Western Abenaki, which has maintained this definite-indefinite contrast from Proto-Algonquian (Goddard 1974). Prince had

extensive experience with Western Abenaki: He reports in detail on the definite and indefinite paradigms of the transitive verbs of this language in Prince 1901a.² In Maliseet-Passamaquoddy, however, what were once definite-object forms are now used indifferently with definite or indefinite objects. Traces of the old distinction remain in the inflection of the class of transitive verbs that select grammatically inanimate objects.³ For these, the old indefinite-object forms continue in use in indefinite-object contexts as occasional alternates of the usual forms that may equally well be used with definite objects. But there are no comparable traces of the indefinite-object inflection of transitive verbs of the class that select grammatically animate objects. The supposed indefinite-object forms of these verbs that Prince (1914) claims to have recorded for Passamaquoddy are ghosts. For the most part, they closely parallel the indefinite-object forms of Western Abenaki.⁴ The conclusion seems inescapable that Prince found a contrast between definite and indefinite object paradigms in Passamaquoddy simply because he expected to find one.

A few of Prince's texts were taken down from speakers, notably the short items published as "Some Passamaquoddy Witchcraft Tales" (1899; see LeSourd 2000 for a modern edition), which he recorded on wax cylinders, and the longer tale presented in "A Passamaquoddy Tobacco Famine" (1917), which was dictated for him. For the most part, however, Prince had his Passamaquoddy consultants write out stories for him, for which they provided translations in "Indian-English" (Prince 1897: 481). His principal consultant for much of this work was Lewis (or Louis) Mitchell (1847–1931), a highly respected member of the Passamaquoddy community at Pleasant Point, ME, who served several terms as the tribal representative to the Maine State Legislature.

One major problem with Prince's procedure for collecting texts was that he did not exercise any control over his consultants' sources. In fact, even a cursory examination of the material in *Passamaquoddy Texts* (1921a) reveals that the stories that Mitchell had sent him were back-translations into Passamaquoddy of narratives published by Leland in his *Algonquin Legends* (1884). Mitchell's Passamaquoddy texts typically follow Leland's English versions sentence by sentence, with some omissions and occasional slight differences in content. Mitchell even lets Mi'kmaq words stand in his translations where they appear in Leland. For example, a character is named "Team, the Moose" in Leland's story, "The Merry Tales of Lox, the Mischief Maker" (1884: 140–169).⁵ This is Mi'kmaq *tiya:m* 'moose' (DeBlois 1996: 87); the Passamaquoddy form is *mòs*. Prince has the same story from Mitchell (Prince 1921a: 56–76), and here the Moose is called <Tiyum> (p. 56), clearly following Leland's lead, but with a spelling that reflects Mitchell's own familiarity with the pronunciation of Mi'kmaq. Prince, who was intimately familiar with Leland's work, can hardly have been unaware that the texts he was presenting as Mitchell's original work were in fact translations.

In his early work, Prince commented on Mitchell's "extremely variable orthography," but he nonetheless presented textual material as Mitchell (or others) had written it, "although tempted in many cases to depart from it, as he has written what is evidently the same sound sometimes in as many as three different ways" (1897: 481). By the time of the publication of his *Passamaquoddy Texts* (1921a), however, he evidently felt confident that he knew the language well enough to rewrite Mitchell's spellings more scientifically. The results are frequently less than ideal: When the same text is available both in Mitchell's transcription and in Prince's, Mitchell's is almost always easier to decipher. Moreover, Prince frequently mistakes a word as Mitchell has spelled it for some other word, leading him to garble the text in rewriting it.

An example from one of the poems analyzed here may serve to illustrate the issues involved (although it is not clear that Mitchell was Prince's source for the particular text in question). In the second line of the 1898 version of the poem that Prince calls "Passamaquoddy Love Song" (analyzed in section 3 below), Prince writes ⟨Boski k'tlabin⟩, which he translates as "Oft on a lonely day thou lookest." The first word is clearly *póski* 'often'; the second is *ktəlápin* 'you (sg.) look (there)'. Evidently 'on a lonely day' is an addition by the translator—or by Prince. In Prince (1921a), the same phrase is given as ⟨Peski k't-el-apin⟩ and translated as 'Lonely thou lookest'. Prince has rewritten the vowel of the first word to fit an incorrect analysis of the line: He has mistaken *póski* for a form of the numeral *pèsk^w* 'one', taking this to have a reading 'lonely'—it does not—as suggested by the spurious part of his original translation. He makes the identification of ⟨peski⟩ with *pèsk^w* explicit in Prince (1914: 117), where he comments briefly on the relevant stanza of the love song.

Since Prince's emendations of the writings of his consultants are frequently problematic, I have generally followed the earlier published versions of the poems discussed in this paper, in which he simply reproduces the spellings of his sources. The exception is "Song of the Stars," discussed in section 4. Both Leland (1884: 378–379) and Prince (1921a: 82–85) include versions of this text, and both of these must be considered to arrive at a conclusion concerning their status. The text Prince provides is substantially different from the one that Leland presents, but appears to be derived from it, partly on the basis of the English translation given by Leland. This situation is likely due to difficulties that Prince's consultant (very likely Mitchell) encountered in trying to decipher Leland's inaccurate transcription of the Passamaquoddy of the poem.

I note finally that the present article bears on larger issues than establishing the texts of several nineteenth and early twentieth-century songs in Passamaquoddy. We need to ask more

generally how reliable we can expect information to be that we attempt to glean from early records of Native American languages. A full exploration of this complex issue is beyond the scope of the present work, but I hope to have demonstrated here that much can in fact be learned from older material, provided that we attend not only to the language of the texts but also to the motives and methods of those who recorded them.

2. To the Sugar Bush

The first text to be discussed is a bit of nonsense verse that Leland includes in his *Algonquin Legends* (1884: 379), where it appears as the last item in the volume. It begins by telling us of a misadventure by one *Piyel Tomáhsis*, literally ‘Peter Little Thomas’, and ends by informing us that *Máli ’tósəl* ‘Mary’s daughter’ will go with the speaker to the sugar bush.

Leland does not indicate that “To the Sugar Bush” was a song, but as it happens, two sentences closely resembling the third and fourth lines of Leland’s poem are included in some handwritten notes left among the papers of the amateur anthropologist Edwin Tappan Adney (1868–1950), which are now in the collections of the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem, MA. These lines appear to be in the hand of Lewis Mitchell, who corresponded with Adney as he had with Leland (Mitchell n.d.). Mitchell labels the lines “Song.”

I provide the text of the larger song below as Leland published it. In (a) I give each line as it is printed in *Algonquin Legends*, enclosing this material in angled brackets ⟨...⟩, followed by the translation offered there, in double quotes. Then in (b) I give a retranscription with a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss and a new translation (in single quotes). It appears that either Leland or his source was uncertain of parts of the transcription and of parts of the translation. The uncertain portions were printed in italics in Leland (1884).

Text 1: *To the Sugar Bush* (Leland 1884: 379)

1. a. ⟨‘Ahboohe b’lo maryna Piel to-marcess’⟩
“Tumbling end over end, goes Piel to *mercess*”
b. Apockæli—əlǎm-amǎ-yà Píyel Tomá-hsis.
upside.down—away-fly-(3)-PROX.ABS.SG Peter Thomas-DIM
‘Peter Little Thomas went flying off end over end.’
2. a. ⟨We poual gee yuaa⟩
“With feathers on his eyes.”
b. Wiphonǎw-alǎk-ík^w-ǎ-ya.
feather-hole-face-have-(3)-PROX.ABS.SG
‘He had feathers on his eyes (as he fell).’
3. a. ⟨Mar-yuon *cordect* delo son⟩
“To the maple-sap ridge *we are going*,”
b. Mahk^wan-káti-k nt-əl-ohsa-nè-n.
maple.sugar-collecting.place-LOC 1-there-walk-N-1PL
‘We (dual exc.) are walking to the sugar bush.’
4. a. ⟨Ne morn-en nute magk med-agon⟩
“Our lunch a cod-fish skin;”
b. Nima-nè-n nohkǎmek^w-ǎtékən.
(1)-take.as.lunch-N-1PL codfish-skin
‘We (exc.) are taking along a codfish skin for a lunch (= a snack).’
5. a. ⟨One est Molly duse-al *ca-soo-son nen.*⟩
‘*One est* Molly’s daughter goes with us.

- b. Ən=əc Máli ʔt-ósəl n-mace-wsa-nè-n.
 and.then=FUT Mary (3)-daughter-OBV.SG 1-start-walk-N-1PL
 ‘And Mary’s daughter will go with us (exc.)’

The spelling of the words in the text is erratic. For the most part, however, probable interpretations can readily be identified. As noted above, the second and third lines are confirmed by a note included among Edwin Tappan Adney’s papers. The relevant passage (which is repeated twice in the manuscript) reads as follows:

Text 2: “Song. Passamaquoddy” (Lewis Mitchell n.d.)

1. a. ⟨Maquan katic Ludanech.⟩
 “Let us move to Maple Sugar Ridge”
- b. ⟨nok meqw Dekench knimanen.⟩⁶
 “we take Cod Fish Skin for Lunch.”
2. a. Mahkwan-káti-k l-otá-nec.
 maple.sugar-collecting.place-LOC there-change.residence-1PL.IMPER
 ‘Let’s (dual) move to the sugar bush.’
- b. Nohkǎmek^w-ǎtékən=c k-nima-nè-n.
 codfish-skin=FUT 2-take.as.lunch-N-1PL
 ‘We (inc.) will take along a codfish skin for a lunch.’

Mitchell’s song employs a form of the verb *ǎl-ote-* ‘change residence (to there)’ where Leland’s has the more general term *ǎl-ohse-* ‘walk (there)’.⁷ The sense of the corresponding lines

nonetheless matches closely in the two texts. Thus Mitchell's notes confirm the interpretation of Leland's text offered here. Further confirmation comes from work by the anthropologist and historian Nicholas N. Smith, who recorded three "hunting songs" that were sung in Maliseet by Francis Nicola at the Penobscot reservation at Indian Island, ME, in January, 1953. The words of the second song were nearly the same as the ones that Lewis Mitchell wrote out for Adney, if we may judge from Smith's transcription (Smith n.d.).⁸

A few additional comments are in order. The verbal suffix *-yà* in lines (1) and (2) indicates that the subject is PROXIMATE, SINGULAR, and ABSENTATIVE. Proximate forms refer to the current discourse focus. (Forms with non-focal referents are OBVIATIVE.) Absentative marking indicates that a referent is deceased, formerly possessed, or formerly present but now absent. It is the last type of reading that is relevant here: Peter has fallen head over heels and disappeared from sight, actually or metaphorically. Adding the designation 'Little Thomas' to the name 'Peter' probably serves to indicate that Peter is the son of Thomas.⁹

Since the whole song is nonsense verse, the transition to a proposed expedition to the sugar bush needs no motivation. Nor does the idea of taking a codfish skin along for a snack have to make sense. (It should be noted that in Maine English, a snack is a "lunch.") The last line of the song includes an example of what Schwartz (1988) calls VERB-CODED COORDINATION: The plural verb *n-mace-wsa-nè-n* 'we (exc.) will start to walk, walk away' is construed with a singular subject *Máli 'tós-əl* 'Mary's daughter', yielding the reading 'we and Mary's daughter will go', or more simply 'Mary's daughter will go with us.' The noun *tós-əl* 'her daughter' bears the obviative singular suffix *-əl*.

3. Passamaquoddy Love Song

Prince (1898, 1921a) calls the next poem considered here a “Passamaquoddy Love Song.” It represents the lament of a young Passamaquoddy man (or possibly a woman) whose lover has left and gone away. This poem again is a song. In fact, Prince (1914: 116) provides us with the music to which some of the words were set, a point to which I return below. I follow the 1898 version in presenting the text here for the reasons I have set out above.

I have divided the song into five stanzas on the basis of a salient feature of its structure: The first line of the poem is repeated at the end of each section that I identify as a stanza, with a slight modification in the last. (I should note, however, that this line also occurs in the middle of the relatively short section I am calling stanza 3.) My division of the text into stanzas differs from that adopted by Prince (1898), who takes a longer stretch of material to constitute a refrain. Prince’s 1898 edition includes the material of four of my stanzas, but he notes that there was an additional verse in the original text that he had obtained from his consultant. As it happens, however, “no translation is given” of this stanza in the manuscript he had obtained, so he “omitted it and the final refrain in the present paper” (1898: 374–375). In his 1921a text collection, he prints what appears to be the previously unpublished material, but presents it as a separate poem (with a translation) and places it before the main body of the text. I have restored this stanza to what appears to be its original position at the end of the song.

Text 3: Passamaquoddy Love Song (Prince 1898: 375)

Stanza 1

1. a. ⟨Anigowanotenoo!⟩

“Oh, it is long!” [translation from Prince 1921a: 83]

- b. Á nít k^wen-ótǎ-yən ó.
 ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh
 ‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’
2. a. ⟨Boski k’tlabin elmi nelemwik elmi papkeyik;⟩
 “Oft on a lonely day thou lookest on the beautiful river and down the shining stream.”
- b. Póski kt-əl-ápi-n elǎmi—nǎlmówi-k, elǎmi—papkéyi-k,
 often 2-there-look-N away—be.upriver-3IN away—be.downriver-3IN
 ‘Often you (sg.) look off upriver, downriver.’
3. a. ⟨boski k’tlabin,⟩
 “Oft thou lookest,”
- b. Póski kt-əl-ápi-n.
 often 2-there-look-N
 ‘Often you (sg.) look that way.’
4. a. ⟨Anigowanotenoo!⟩
- b. Á nít k^wenótǎyən ó.
 ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh
 ‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’

Stanza 2

5. a. ⟨Neket m’pesel etli-nemiot-/yikw.⟩
 “When last I saw thee,”
- b. Nekèt mcássəl etǎli—nǎmih-ótǎ-yikw,
 then.PAST last ongoing—see-RECIP-1PL.INC
 ‘When we (dual inc.) last saw each other,’

6. a. ⟨Etuchi w'linakw-ben se-/bayi sibook;⟩
 “how beautiful that fair stream looked,”
- b. etoci—wǎli-nak^w-k^w-ǎpən sǎpáyí sípo-k,
 extreme—good-look-3IN-PRET along.edge river-LOC
 ‘it was very beautiful along the river,’
7. a. ⟨etuchi w'li baquas-/keten.⟩
 “how lovely was the silver moon.”
- b. etoci—wǎli-pak^wáhsǎ-k=ǎte=na
 extreme—good-moon.shine-3IN=EMPH=also
 ‘and the moonlight was very beautiful as well.’
8. a. ⟨K'machtena nolithasiben;⟩
 “Thou knowest how happy we were.”
- b. Kǎmàc=ǎte=na k-ol-itahàsì-pən.
 very=EMPH=also 2-good-think-1PL
 ‘We (dual inc.) were very happy, too.’
9. a. ⟨mechinoltena keppitham'1,⟩
 “Ah, since that night I think of thee always,”
- b. Mecimí=te=na k-tǎp-itahám-əl.
 always=EMPH=also 2-consider-think.of-1/2
 ‘And I think of you (sg.) always.’
10. a. ⟨Anigo-/wanotenooh!⟩
- b. Á nìt k^wen-ótǎ-yən ó.
 ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh

‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’

Stanza 3

11. a. ⟨Boski kʼtlabin elmi nelemwik naga elmi papkeyik⟩

‘Oft on a lonely day thou lookest on the beautiful river and down the shining stream.’

- b. Póski kt-əl-ápi-n elǎmi—nǎlǎmówik naka elǎmi—papkéyik.

often 2-there-look-N away—be.upriver-3IN and away—be.downriver-3IN

‘Often you (sg.) look off upriver and downriver.’

12. a. ⟨Anigowanote-/noo.⟩

- b. Á nit kʷen-ótǎ-yən ó.

ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh

‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’

13. a. ⟨Neketlo he eli-alnisookme-/kwpen sebayi guspenik etuchi we-/lanakw-sititben

wuchowek he eli-/machip klamisken mipisel,⟩

‘When we paddled the canoe together on that beautiful lake how fair the mountains

looked and how we watched the red leaves whirl in the gentle breeze,’

- b. Nekèt=ǎlo=te eli—ali—nis-olǎm-ǎkʷ-pən sǎpáyi

then.PAST=but=EMPH thus—around—together-canoe-1PL.INC-PRET along.edge

kʷǎspém-ǎk, etoci—wǎl-inakʷsi-htí-t-pən wǎcǎw-ǎk=ǎte

lake-LOC extreme—good-look-3PL -3AN-PRET hill-LOC=EMPH

eli—mace—tǎpikʷe-lamsóke-k mipís-ǎl.

thus—start—whirl-wind.blow-3IN leaf-IN.PL

‘But when we (dual inc.) paddled together along the shore of the lake, the mountains

were very beautiful as the leaves began to whirl in the wind.’

14. a. ⟨Anigo-/wanotenoo!⟩
 b. Á nít k^wen-ótǎ-yən ó.
 ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh
 ‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’

Stanza 4

15. a. ⟨Anigowanotenoo,⟩
 b. Á nít k^wen-ótǎ-yən ó.
 ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh
 ‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’
16. a. ⟨nittloch apch eli-alnisooknukw tan etuch apachyaie;⟩
 “we will go once more in a canoe”
 b. Nít=əlo=hc àpc eli—ali—nis-óləm-ək^w
 then=but=FUT again thus—around—together-canoe-1PL.EXC
 tən etoci—apac-ihá-yən.
 such at.point—return-go-2SG
 ‘But we (dual inc.) will go canoeing together again when you (sg.) come back.’
17. a. ⟨tanetch etuch boski p’kesik mipisel yut pemden nit k’tlaskooyin.⟩
 “and watch the beautiful green leaves on the mountain.”
 b. Tàn=əc etoci—pask-ipəké-ssi-k mipí-səl yòt pem-ətán-e-k,
 such=FUT at.point—burst-bud-move-3IN leaf-IN.PL here along-hill-be-3IN
 kt-əl-askó-l-ən.
 2-there-await-1/2-N

‘When the leaves are bursting out of their buds here on the ridge, I will be waiting for
you (sg.).’

18. a. ⟨Boski k’tlabin elmi nelemwik elmi papeyik,⟩

‘Oft on a lonely day thou lookest on the beautiful river and down the shining stream,’

b. Póski kt-əl-ápi-n eləmi—nələmówi-k, eləmi—papkéyi-k,
often 2-there-look-N away—be.upriver-3IN away—be.downriver-3IN

‘Often you (sg.) look off upriver, downriver.’

19. a. ⟨Anigowanote-/noo.⟩

b. Á nit k^wen-ótə-yən ó.
ah that.IN length-change.residence-2SG oh

‘Ah, you (sg.) have gone away for so long, oh.’

Stanza 5 (1921a only)

20. a. ⟨Peski k’t-el-apin elmi-nelemwik⟩

‘Lonely thou lookest upstream’

b. Póski kt-əl-ápi-n eləmi—nələmówik,
often 2-there-look-N away—be.upriver-3IN

‘Often you (sg.) look off upriver,’

21. a. ⟨Elmi-sikwâk-lo takwâk’nwi-lok-lo⟩

‘In spring and in autumn;’

b. eləmi—sík^wək=əlo, tək^wákəwik=əlo.
away—be.spring-3IN=but be.fall-3IN=but

‘but spring passes, fall passes.’

22. a. ⟨Teīp'tuk k'nimihi-sa kwilakweyun⟩

“Perhaps thou mayest see me seeking thee.”

b. Cípǎtok k-nəmíh-i=na k-k^wilǎwoh-ól-ən.

perhaps 2-see-2/1=also 2-look.for-1/2-n

‘Perhaps you (sg.) see me, too, looking for you (sg.).’

23. a. ⟨Kuwēnotin U; Kuwēnotin U.⟩

“It is long, Oh; it is long, Oh.”

b. K^wenótǎyin ó, k^wenótǎyin ó.

length-change.residence-2SG oh length-change.residence-2SG oh

‘You (sg.) have been gone for so long, oh; you (sg.) have been gone for so long, oh.’

Again, a few lines require special comment, beginning with the first line of the poem, which is repeated periodically throughout. Prince (1898: 375) has the text given here as line (1), which is written as a single word and left untranslated: ⟨Anigowanotenoo!⟩. But Prince (1921a: 82) offers word divisions: ⟨A ni kuwēnotin U!⟩. A translation is provided as well: “Oh, it is long!” Given the sense of the poem as a whole, it seems reasonable to assume that the force of this line is, ‘You have been gone for a long time.’

The first word ⟨ni⟩ is plausibly taken to be the demonstrative ‘that (in.)’, contemporary *nít*. I return to the question of the form of this word immediately below. We may then construe ⟨kuwēnotin⟩ as a participle (a relative clause form) that is equated with this, bearing the second-person singular ending *-(y)ən*.

There are two likely candidates for a participle meaning something like ‘you have been gone for (that) long’: *k^wen-ǎtów-ən* ‘how long it takes you to return’ (stem *k^wǎn-ǎto-*), as in (1) below, and *k^wen-ótǎ-yən* ‘how long it has been since you moved (away)’ (with stem *k^wǎn-ote-*).

(1) *Nit k^wen-ǎtów-ən tǎkkìw peci-yá-yin?*

that.IN length-be.away-2SG until arrive-go-2SG

‘It took you (sg.) that long to arrive?’ (Francis and Leavitt 2008: 475)

Both verbs include the initial component *k^wǎn-* ‘length in space or time’, with ablaut of first-syllable *ǎ* to *e*, a characteristic feature of participles. The stem of the first verb includes the final component *-ǎtó-* ‘be away’, not attested in other formations in my material; the second is based on the final *-ote-* ‘change residence’; cf. *pet-óte* ‘he moves to here’. For the sense of *k^wǎn-ote-* as ‘be so long since (someone) has moved’, compare the meaning of the verb in (2), another derivative of *k^wǎn-*.

(2) *Tàn ’k^wən-íya-n?*

how (3)-length-go-N

‘How long has he been gone?’ (Francis and Leavitt 2008: 474)

The verb *k^wen-ǎtów-ən* postulated under the first of our solutions would be phonetically [k^wen(ǎ)dówən]. The second verb *k^wen-ótǎ-yən* would be phonetically [k^wenódiyín].¹⁰ The latter comes closer to Prince’s ⟨kuwēnotin⟩, especially if we suppose that phonemic *k^w* has undergone phonetic lengthening to [kuw].

An additional check on this solution comes from the way that the text of the song aligns with its music. Prince (1914: 116) provides the music for one stanza of the poem, given above as Stanza 5; see Figure 1. Note that the transcription that Prince gives for this passage follow his erroneous interpretation of *póski* ‘often’ in line (25) as a form of *pèsk^w* ‘one’, taken to mean ‘lonely’; see the discussion in section 1.

The figure shows six lines of musical notation in a single system, each with a treble clef and a key signature of one sharp (F#). The lyrics are written below the notes. The lyrics are: Pes - kî k'te-la - pin el - mî - ne - lem-wik; el - mî - sî-kwak- lō ta-kwa-k'n - wi-lok-lō chip- tuk ke-ni-mi - hî - sa kwi - la-kweyun ku - wê - no - din u ku - we - - no - din u

Figure 1. Musical setting of Stanza 5 of “Passamaquoddy Love Song” (Prince 1914: 116).

Here we have evidence that the initial *k^w* of *k^wenótāyən* ‘for how long you have moved away’ was elongated to extend over two notes. Apart from this, the fit between the expected

phonetic form of this verb and the music is close, given that the final two syllables *tǎyən* will be realized as [diyin], with an extra-short first vowel. The verb form that the alternative solution offers, *k^wen-ǎtów-ən* ‘how long have you been gone’, fits the sense of the passage, but its phonetic shape [k^wen(ǎ)dówən] does not provide as good a fit to the music. Where Prince indicates a syllable ⟨no⟩, held first for the duration of a quarter note and then for that of a dotted quarter note, this form offers only a short [ə] or zero; for Prince’s ⟨din⟩, it would give us [dowən]. I conclude that *k^wenótǎyən* ‘for how long you have moved away’ is the better interpretation of the verb that appears in the poem.

This leaves the question of the demonstrative in our equational sentence, for which Prince has ⟨ni⟩. This could in principle be an archaism, since contemporary *nìt* ‘that (in.)’ reflects an earlier form **ni* to which an emphatic enclitic **=ta* has been added: Compare the corresponding Western Abenaki demonstrative *ni* ‘that (in.)’ (Laurent 1884: 59) and the Western Abenaki emphatic enclitic *=ta* (LeSourd 2015: 305), as well as the contemporary Passamaquoddy emphatic demonstrative *níta* ‘that (in.)’. On the other hand, only the form *nìt* is attested for the demonstrative in other nineteenth-century sources, such as Prince (1897), where multiple occurrences of *nìt*, mostly spelled ⟨nitt⟩, appear in a text written by Lewis Mitchell. It seems reasonable to conclude, then, that Prince’s ⟨ni⟩ in his “Passamaquoddy Love Song” is simply an error for *nìt*, perhaps one that reflects his familiarity with the corresponding Western Abenaki form.

Two other forms in Stanza 5 require special attention, both occurring in line (22). First, there is ⟨k’nimihī-sa⟩, which Prince translates as “thou mayest see me.” Prince (1914: 117) suggests that this verb contains a “conditional” suffix ⟨-sa⟩. This is not a Passamaquoddy verb suffix, however; rather it is a form of the dubitative (non-personal-knowledge) suffix of Western

Abenaki. Compare ⟨kizihiza⟩ *kis-ih-i-sa* (past-make-3/1-DUBIT) ‘the one (i.e., God) who made me’ (Desfossés 1832: 21). The Passamaquoddy dubitative form that would be grammatically required in the present context is *k-nəmih-i-ps* ‘you (sg.) must have seen me’, whose sense does not fit the passage. I have accordingly interpreted Prince’s ⟨sa⟩ as a misreading of ⟨na⟩, reflecting the enclitic =*na* ‘also’.

A second form in the same line also appears to have been misread: ⟨kwilakweyun⟩ “(my) seeking thee.” The intended form must be *k-k^wiləwoh-ól-ən* (2-look-for-1/2-N) ‘that I look for you (sg.)’. The inflection is subordinative (suffix -N), which is appropriate for the purposive construction that occurs here.¹¹ It seems likely that Prince has mistaken his consultant’s handwritten ⟨hul⟩ in this case for ⟨kwey⟩. Other apparent errors of transcription in Prince’s text are also likely the result of misreading the handwriting in his manuscript source.

4. The Song of the Stars

The third poem that I consider here, “The Song of the Stars,” appears both in Leland’s *Algonquin Legends* (1884: 378–379) and in Prince’s *Passamaquoddy Texts* (1921a: 82–85), but the two versions are rather different. An analysis of the differences suggests that the text that Prince gives is derived from Leland’s, and that the source of Prince’s version at least in part was Leland’s English translation.

The subject of the poem is the configuration of the stars in the constellation Ursa Major: The three stars in the handle of the Big Dipper are described as hunters pursuing the stars that make up the body of the Great Bear. A chorus of stars sings of this eternal chase and announces that they are preparing the Milky Way, known in Passamaquoddy as *Kehtak^wsuwàwt* ‘the spirit

road’, as a path over which God, *Nkihci—Niweskómǎnəl* ‘our (exc.) Great Spirit (obv.)’, will pass.¹²

I present Leland’s version of the poem first as Text 4 below. As before, his text and translation are given for each line in (a), followed in (b) by a retranscription, a morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, and a new translation.

Text 4: Song of the Stars (Leland 1884: 378–379)

Title: a. <GLINT-WAH-GNOUR PES SAUSMOK.>

“THE SONG OF THE STARS.”

b. ’T-əl-intow-akǎn-ówa pæssésǎmo-k.

3-thus-sing-NOM-3PL star-PROX.PL

‘The song of the stars.’

1. a. <N’loan pes-sans, mok glint ont-aven>

“We are the stars which sing,”

b. Nilòn pæssésǎmo-k nt-əl-int-ohtì-pæn.

we.EXC star-PROX.PL 1-thus-sing-MPL-1PL

‘We (pl. exc.) stars sing.’

2. a. <Glint ont-aven, nosh mor-gun>

“We sing with our light;”

b. Nt-əl-int-ohtì-pæn wahrenǎmákæn.

1-thus-sing-MPL-1PL torch

‘We (pl. exc.) sing with a torch.’

3. a. ⟨N'loan sep-scess syne-duc⟩
 “We are the birds of fire,”
- b. Nilòn sipsís-ək sk^wóte-k.
 We.EXC bird-PROX.PL fire-LOC
 ‘We are birds of fire.’
4. a. ⟨Mach-ak wah le-de-born harlo kirk⟩
 “We fly over the sky.”
- b. N-mace-təwiya-wələti-pən alóhk-ək.
 1-start-fly-MPL-1PL cloud-loc
 ‘We (pl. exc.) fly off above a cloud.’
5. a. ⟨Pes-sauk-wa morgun pa-zazen.⟩
 “Our light is a voice;”
- b. Pəssak^whenəməkən pəssésəm.
 1-lamp star
 ‘The light is a star.’
6. a. ⟨Dout-tu cował, yu’ eke ne-mess comall⟩
 “We make a road for spirits,”
- b. ’T-awti-hkéw-a-l N-kihci—Niweskó-m-əñ-əl,
 1-road-make.for-DIR-N-1PL spirit-POSS-OBV.SG
 ‘It (the star) makes a road for our Great Spirit (obv.),
7. a. ⟨Dow-dar bowsee des ge-che-ne-wes skump,⟩
 “For the spirits to pass over.”

- b. wt-àwt elǎm-óhse-t=əc N-kihci—Niwesko-m-ən.
 3-road away-walk-3AN=FUT 1-great—spirit-POSS-1PL
 ‘the road along which our Great Spirit will walk.’
8. a. ⟨Na-havak dunko to-awk w’che-mon wh’oak⟩
 “Among us are three hunters”
- b. Nohów-ək kətonk-ahtó-w-ək n-wiciyem-kó-nǎw-ək.
 three-PROX.PL hunt-MPL-3-PROX.PL 1-go.with-INV-1PL-PROX.PL
 ‘Three are hunting and accompanying us (exc).’
9. a. ⟨No-saw yu-well *Mooen* nill⟩
 “Who chase a bear;”
- b. Nohsohkǎw-á-wa-l mowínǎ-yəl.
 (3)-follow-DIR-3PL-OBV.SG bear-OBV.SG
 ‘They are pursuing a bear.’
10. a. ⟨Mask da-ah gawank la me la-tak-a-dea-on⟩
 “There never was a time”
- b. Mèsk^w=ǎte tayǎwè katáma ’t-əl-ǎtahk-ahtí-w-ən,
 not.yet=EMPH when not 3-thus-do-MPL-NEG-N
 ‘There has never been a time when they (pl.) did not do this,’
11. a. ⟨Di-wa godamr Kudunk-ah dea-on⟩
 “When they were not hunting.”
- b. tayǎwè katáma ’kətonk-ahtí-w-ən.
 when not hunt-MPL-NEG-N
 ‘a time when they (pl.) were not hunting.’

- 12 a. ⟨Glor-ba dea-on glom-de-nec⟩
 “We look down on the mountains.”
- b. Nt-əl-api-nè-n pem-ǎtón-e-k.
 1-thus-look-N-1PL along-hill-be-3IN
 ‘We look upon the ridge.’
13. a. ⟨Glint-wah-gnour pes sausmok.⟩
 “This is the Song of the Stars.”
- b. ’T-əl-intow-akǎn-ówa pæssésǎmo-k.
 3-thus-sing-NOM-3PL star-PROX.PL
 ‘This is the song of the stars.’

The transcriptions that appear in this text are quite inaccurate, and their interpretation is correspondingly uncertain. Moreover, in several cases, the spellings employed are ones that native speakers are unlikely to have used. For example, phonemic *p* is written ⟨v⟩ in ⟨glint ont-aven⟩ “(we) sing” in line (1) and again in ⟨Glint ont-aven⟩ “we sing” in line (8). These must both be *nt-əl-int-oh-tì-pən* (1-thus-sing-MPL-1PL) ‘we (pl. exc.) sing’. It is of course possible (as a reviewer reminds me) that whoever wrote out the text of the poem perceived a particularly lax pronunciation of intervocalic *p* as [v]. But as Prince noted in connection with his work with Mitchell, Passamaquoddy speakers generally wrote intervocalic *p* as ⟨b⟩, and not as ⟨v⟩. It seems likely, then, that the poem was written down by a non-speaker of the language (who may or may not have been Leland), who then obtained a translation from his or her source.

In addition to errors in the text that arose from mishearing, there are also errors that must reflect the misreading of handwritten notes either by the original transcriber or by Leland. One

example of this type is ⟨syne-duc⟩ “of fire” in line (3). This appears to represent the locative form *sk^wáte-k* ‘in, from fire’, written as ⟨sque-duc⟩ and then misread with ⟨qu⟩ taken to be ⟨yn⟩. The use of this locative form in the locution ‘birds of fire’ is unusual (a noun modifier like *sk^wátewi-* ‘fiery’ would be expected instead), but perhaps the intended sense is ‘birds from, out of fire’.

I follow Adney (n.d.: 8) in interpreting ⟨Dout-tu cowall⟩ “we make a road” as *t-awti-hkéw-a-l* (3-road-make.for-DIR-OBV.SG) ‘he (prox.) makes a road for him (obv.)’. Grammatically, the subject of this verb is proximate and animate, presumably a null pronoun referring to *pæssésəm* ‘star (an.)’ in the preceding line. The object is obviative and singular; I take the referent to be *N-kihci—Niweskó-m-ǎn-əl* (1-great—spirit-POSS-1PL-OBV.SG) ‘our Great Spirit (obv.)’, hence ‘(the star) makes a road for our Great Spirit’, the Milky Way.

The transcription in lines (10) and (11) is particularly obscure. The translations we are given are “There never was a time” and “When they were not hunting.” Taking line (11) first, we can interpret the initial two words ⟨Di-wa godamr⟩ as *tayǎwè katáma* ‘when not’. The following word ⟨Kudunk-ah dea-on⟩ appears to be *kátonk-ahtí-w-ən* (hunt-MPL-NEG-N) ‘they (pl.) were not hunting’, a subordinative form (suffix -N). This gives us, as required, ‘when they (pl.) were not hunting’. But *tayǎwè* is not used to form adverbial ‘when’ clauses; the meaning must be ‘a time when they (pl.) were not hunting’.

Line (10) is translated as “There never was a time,” but this appears to be only a partial translation of the line. The first two words ⟨Mask da-ah⟩ may be read as *mèsk^w=ǎte* ‘not yet + emphatic particle’, giving ‘there never was’. I suggest that we should take the next words, ⟨gawank la me⟩, to be a garbled rendition of *tayǎwè* ‘(a time) when’ plus *katáma* ‘not’, giving a literal reading as ‘there never was a time when not’.

This interpretation is admittedly speculative. But ⟨gawan⟩ is about the right length to represent *tayǎwè*, which is phonetically [taywɛ], and the second syllable of *tayǎwè* is written as ⟨wa⟩ in ⟨Di-wa⟩ in line 11. Spurious indications of nasalization are fairly common in early transcriptions of Passamaquoddy, so the ⟨n⟩ of ⟨gawan⟩ is not an unlikely error: Witness the second ⟨n⟩ ⟨glint ont-aven⟩ *nt-əl-int-ohtì-pən* ‘we (pl. exc.) sing’ in line 1. Only the initial ⟨g⟩, then, really presents a difficulty for interpreting ⟨gawan⟩ as *tayǎwè* ‘when’. This is not a great objection to the proposed analysis. It is also not a stretch to see ⟨k la me⟩, the remainder of ⟨gawank la me⟩ as a misreading of a rendering of *katáma* ‘not’. So ⟨gawank la me⟩ may be resolved as *tayǎwè katáma* ‘a time when not’.

The remainder of the line is ⟨la-tak-a-dea-on⟩. This must represent a negative verb form, one that can be construed with the negative particle *katáma*. The final syllables ⟨a-dea-on⟩ resemble the end of the verb form in (11), where ⟨-ah dea-on⟩ reflects *-ahtì-w-ən*, with the negative suffix *-w-*. So we just need a stem that might have been spelled ⟨la-tak-⟩. An appropriate candidate is *əl-ǎtahke-* ‘do (thus)’, which drops its final *e* before the multiplural suffix *-ahtì-*. We then need only suppose that the third-person prefix *’t-* went unrecorded before *əl-* (a syllabic [l] in this context), and we obtain *’t-əl-ǎtahk-ahtì-w-ən* ‘they (pl.) did not do (thus)’. Line (10) has now received a full interpretation: *Mèsk^w=ǎte tayǎwè katáma ’t-əl-ǎtahk-ahtì-w-ən* ‘There never was a time when they (pl.) did not do this’, i.e., the three “hunters” in the handle of the Big Dipper have always pursued the four stars in the body of the Great Bear. The remaining lines of the text are reasonably straightforward.

The second version of this poem, published in Prince’s *Passamaquoddy Texts* (1921a) differs in several notable respects from the one found in Leland (1884). First, the more obscure forms in Leland’s text (such as the ones we have just been seeking to elucidate) are replaced in

Prince's text by more transparent forms with different meanings. Second, there are inconsistencies in the use of person-marking prefixes in Prince's text that make for contradictions in person reference. Finally, at points where the sense of the Passamaquoddy version that Leland provides either differs from that of the translation he offers, or else is simply unclear, the sense of the Passamaquoddy in Prince's text follows that of Leland's English translation. Taken together, these points suggest that Prince's text is derivative of Leland's. In particular, it appears that Prince's consultant—very likely Mitchell—crafted the text that Prince ultimately published on the basis of the one published in *Algonquin Legends*, but relied in large part on Leland's translation.

The text of Prince's "Song of the Stars" is presented and analyzed below as Text 5, following the same format as before. A discussion of the issues that this version of the poem raises follows.

Text 5: Song of the Stars (Prince 1921a: 82–85)

1. a. ⟨Nilun pesēs̄muk elintakwik⟩

“We are the stars which sing”

- b. Nilòn pæssés̄mo-k el-intá-k^w-ik.

we.EXC star-PROX.PL thus-sing-3AN-PROX.PL

‘We (exc.) are the stars that sing.’

2. a. ⟨Nt'lintotēp'n k'p'sakh'nmâk'nuk.⟩

“We sing with our light.”

- b. Nt-əl-int-ohtì-pən k-pəssak^whenǎma-kǎn-ónno-k.
 1-thus-sing-MPL-1PL 2-shine.light-NOM-1PL-PROX.PL
 ‘We (pl. exc.) sing with our lamp.’
3. a. ⟨Nilun sipsisuk sku‘tik;⟩
 “We are the birds of fire;”
- b. Nilòn sipsis-ək sk^w‘ótek.
 we.EXC bird-PROX.PL fire-LOC
 ‘We (exc.) are birds of fire.’
4. a. ⟨K’p’mitoyap’n pisokikw’s;⟩
 “We fly over the heaven;”
- b. K-pəm-itǎwiyà-pən pisǎw-əkisk^w.
 2-along-fly-1PL through-air
 ‘We (dual inc.) fly through the air.’
5. a. ⟨K’p’sakh’nmâk’n p’sēs’m.⟩
 “Our light is a star.”
- b. K-pəssak^whenǎma-kǎn-èn pəssésəm.
 2-shine-light-NOM-1PL star
 ‘Our (inc.) lamp is a star.’
6. a. ⟨K’t’lintowanen aut niweskuk;⟩
 “We sing on the road of the spirits;”
- b. Kt-əl-ihtow-a-nè-n àwt niwésko-k.
 2-thus-make-DIR-N-1PL road spirit-PROX.PL
 ‘We (inc.) make a road for the spirits,

7. a. ⟨W't-aut K'tci Niweskw.⟩
 “The road of the great spirit.”
- b. wt-àwt Kci—Níweskw.
 3-road great—spirit
 ‘the road of the Great Spirit.’
8. a. ⟨Kwitchimkononowuk nohowuk k'tonkewin'wuk⟩
 “Among us are three hunters”
- b. K-wiciyem-ko-né-nəw-ək nohów-ək kətonke-winów-ək
 2-go.with-INV-N-1PL-PROX.PL three-PROX.PL hunt-person-PROX.PL
 ‘We (inc.) are accompanied by three hunters’
9. a. ⟨Nosokwat muwiniyul.⟩
 ‘Who follow the bear,’
- b. Nohsohkəw-á-c-ik mowínə-yəl.
 follow-DIR-3AN-PROX.PL bear-OBV.SG
 ‘who follow a bear.’
10. a. ⟨Nit meskw tepnaskwiewis⟩
 “There never was a time”
- b. Nit mèskw^w tepənaskowiye-wì-ss
 then not.yet time.comes-(3)-NEG-DUBIT
 ‘It seems there never was a time’
11. a. ⟨Meskw k'tonketitkw.⟩
 “When they were not hunting.”

- b. mèsk^w kətonké-hti-hk^w.
 not.yet hunt-PROX.PL-3AN.NEG
 ‘when they (dual) were not yet hunting.’
12. a. ⟨K’t’lapinen pemteni‘kok.⟩
 “We look upon the mountains.”
- b. Kt-əl-api-nè-n pem-ə̀tən-íhke-k.
 2-thus-look-N-1PL along-hill-be.many-3IN
 ‘We (dual inc.) look upon the mountains.’
13. a. ⟨Yut lintowâk’n pemteni‘kok.⟩
 “This is a song of the mountains.”
- b. Yòt l-intow-ákən pem-ə̀tən-íhke-k.
 this.IN thus-sing-NOM along-hill-be.many-3IN
 ‘This is a song of the mountains.’

A few grammatical points need to be addressed before we turn to the main issues that this text raises. In (2a), Prince’s text has ⟨k’p’sakh’nmâk’nuk⟩, translated as “(with) our light.” This is presumably to be read as *k-pæssak^whenə́ma-kə̀n-ə̀nno-k* (2-shine.light-NOM-1PL-loc) ‘our (inc.) lamp (loc.)’, an inflected form of *pæssak^whenə́mákən* ‘lamp, light’, despite the fact that there is little or no trace of the first-person plural possessor marker *-ə̀nno-* in Prince’s transcription. In (5a), the form ⟨K’p’sakh’nmâk’n⟩ “our light”, i.e. ⟨k-pæssak^whenə́ma-kə̀n-ə̀n⟩ (2-shine.light-NOM-1PL) ‘our (inc.) light’, also appears to lack the expected first-person plural suffix, which takes the form *-ə̀n* in word-final position.¹³

Line (6a) offers the statement “we sing on the road of the spirits,” where Leland’s line (6a) has “we make a road for spirits.” The verb in Prince’s line is ⟨K’t’li^towanen⟩, seemingly a subordinative form of *əl-into-* ‘sing’. But ‘we (inc.) sing’ would actually be *kt-əl-into-nè-n*. Moreover, ‘on their road’ would be the locative form *wt-awtí-wa-k*. There is a simple solution to this puzzle, however. We need only suppose that Prince has misread an ⟨h⟩ in his consultant’s handwritten form as ⟨n⟩, and that the translation he has given is his own attempt to make sense of the result. The form that we obtain this way is ⟨K’t’li^towanen⟩, which is transparently interpretable as *kt-əl-ih^tow-a-nè-n* (2-thus-make-DIR-N-1PL) ‘we (inc.) make it for them’. The sense of the line that we obtain in this way is in accord with what we find in Leland’s text.

The Passamaquoddy form that Prince translates “who follow (him)” in (9a) is ⟨Nosokwat⟩. This is a singular participle, ‘the one who follows him or them’. A plural participle is required, since the reference is to three hunters. Thus, Prince’s form must be an error for *nohsohkǎw-á-c-ik* (follow-DIR-3AN-PROX.PL) ‘they (prox.) who follow him (obv.)’.

The final line of the poem is also puzzling. Prince’s translation here is, “This is a song of the mountains.” This echoes the preceding line, “We look upon the mountains.” Both lines end with *pem-ǎtǎn-ihke-k* (along-hill-be.many-3IN) ‘mountains’ (literally ‘where hills or mountains extend’). The last line of Leland’s text, however, is, “This is the Song of the Stars.” It seems odd that Prince’s version of the poem differs from Leland’s in this respect. Perhaps, then, Prince’s author mistakenly copied over the last word of the penultimate line of his draft in writing out the final line of his text.

Turning now to more general issues, consider first the fact that Prince’s text includes none of the words of Leland’s text that make it difficult to interpret. The synthetic expression *’t-awti-hkéw-a-l* (1-road-make.for-DIR-N-1PL) ‘he makes a road for them’ in (7) is gone, replaced

by the analytical locution *kt-əl-ih̄tow-a-nè-n àwt* (2-thus-make-DIR-N-1PL road) ‘we make a road for them’. The phrase *wt-àwt elām-óhse-t=ac* ‘the road along which (he) will walk’, which is badly mistranscribed in Leland’s text, is displaced simply by *wt-àwt* ‘his road’. The elaborate *mèsk^w=ǎte tayǎwè katáma ’t-əl-ǎtahk-ahtí-w-ən* ‘there never was a time when they (pl.) did not do this’ in (10) has vanished, and in its place we have the straightforward *Nit mèsk^w tepǎnaskowiye-wì-ss*, literally, ‘it seems a time has never come around’. We are left with the impression that Prince’s text is a skeletal version of the poem that Leland published.

There is also a series of grammatical anomalies in Prince’s text that make it seem like it was not prepared with a coherent sense of its contents. These involve the use of pronouns and inflectional prefixes that indicate the grammatical person of nominal possessors and the subjects or objects of verbs. In lines (1) and (3), the birds who are the ostensible speakers in the poem refer to themselves as *nilòn* ‘we (exc.)’, that is, as ‘we, not including the addressee’. (The inclusive pronoun is *kilòn*.) The inflection of the verb *nt-əl-int-oh̄tì-pən* ‘we (pl.) sing’ matches this: The combination of the first person prefix *n(t)-* and the first-person plural suffix *-pən* indicates a first-person non-singular exclusive subject (further specified as non-dual in number by the multiplural suffix *-oh̄ti-*). But thereafter inflection shifts. In (4), (5), (6), (8), (12) we find verb forms and forms of possessed nouns that specify an INCLUSIVE first-person plural argument, e.g., *k-pæssak^whenǎma-kǎn-ən* ‘our (inc.) lamp’ in (5), *k-wiciyem-ko-né-nǎw-ək* ‘they accompany us (inc.)’ in (8), and *kt-əl-api-nè-n* ‘we (dual inc.) look (there)’¹⁴ in (12). In these forms, the combination of the second-person prefix *k(t)-* and the first-person plural suffix *-nǎw- ~ -(ə)n* signals that the indexed argument includes both the second person and the first among its referents. This state of affairs suggests that the author who composed this version poem was treating different sections of the work in independence of one another.

One more feature of Prince’s text of “Song of the Stars” should make us hesitate to take the work at face value. This is the fact that where Leland’s English translations do not accurately convey the meaning of his Passamaquoddy text, Prince’s Passamaquoddy text follows the sense of the translations, rather than the sense of Leland’s Passamaquoddy.

Line (1) of the poem offers a good example of the situation in question. Leland’s translation reads, “We are the stars which sing.” But his Passamaquoddy text is *nilòn pæssésǎmok ntəlintohtìpən*, literally ‘we stars sing, are singing’. Prince, on the other hand, has *nilòn pæssésǎmok elinták^wik* ‘we are the stars that sing’, with a participle that exactly matches the relative clause of Leland’s English. A second clear example is line (6). Here Leland’s translation has ‘we make a road for spirits’, but his Passamaquoddy text says, ‘*tawtihkéwal Nkihci—Niweskómǎnəl* ‘he makes a road for our Great Spirit’. Prince has *ktəlihtowanèn àwt niwéskok* ‘we (inc.) make a road for (the) spirits’. To cite just one more example (several might be given), in line (12) Leland translates “we look down on the mountains,” but his Passamaquoddy text is actually *ntəlapinèn pemǎtǎnek* ‘we (dual exc.) look upon the ridge’. Prince has *ktəlapinèn pemǎtǎnihkek* ‘we (dual inc.) look upon the mountains’. In each case, Prince’s Passamaquoddy offers a good paraphrase of Leland’s English translation, but not of his Passamaquoddy text. And, of course, the distinction between inclusive and exclusive ‘we’ that seems to have confused Prince’s author is absent in the English of Leland’s translations, so that these offer no guidance for someone who is translating English rather than composing directly in Passamaquoddy. The conclusion seems inescapable that this is what Prince’s source did in producing the text of “Song of the Stars” that appears in Prince’s *Passamaquoddy Texts*. I conclude that the text published in Leland’s *Algonquin Legends* offers the superior version of this poem, despite the difficulties of interpretation that it presents.

5. The Song of the Drum

The fourth and last poem to be considered here is the “The Song of the Drum,” which was first published in Prince’s “Notes on Passamaquoddy Literature” (1901b: 385–386), then in a revised transcription in *Passamaquoddy Texts* (1921a: 84–85). As before, I follow the text of the earlier version here.

The song is an expression of authority by a *m̄awǎlàn* or ‘shaman’, a person with special personal power, who explains what he can accomplish with his drum. He describes how various powerful beings stop what they are doing and hearken to the sound of his drum. These include animals on the ridge in line (1); a storm and the thunder that accompanies it, as well as the Whirlwind, in (2). Also included is a being known as *Cipélahk^w*, the Spirit of Night, in (3). The latter entity, capable of flight, would carry off unguarded children. As one Maliseet story teller described him, “his crotch was way the hell up at his throat, and below were just his arms and his legs that spread out like roots from way up beneath his throat and his head” (LeSourd 2007: 99). The shaman could not only summon the winds, we are told in line (3), but even *Wácáwsən* himself, the great Wind Bird who lives in the north and creates the winds with his wings (Prince 1921a: 46–49). Other beings the drummer summons include, per line (4), *lampek^winówək* ‘underwater sprites’, who have magical powers (Prince 1921a: 58–61), and *Atǎwaskənikèhs* the Forest Spirit, the latter “an invisible being who roams [the] forest” (Francis and Leavitt 2008: 92). A final creature who heeds the drum is the sea monster *Apotámkən* (line 5), who is reported by contemporary Passamaquoddies to have “long, red hair” and to have been “a favorite of mothers to frighten children into staying away from the water” (Francis and Leavitt 2008: 80).

I present the text of “Song of the Drum” in the same format as before. For the most part, Prince’s Passamaquoddy forms are readily interpreted. Notes on a few particulars follow the text.

Text 6. The Song of the Drum (Prince 1901b: 385–386)

1. a. ⟨Nil nolbin naga n'tetlitemen pek-/holagon. Nitutle-wiquotahan we-/yisesek... pehutenek naga ona pechioo wuchowsenel w'chiksitma-/gon n'pekholagon.⟩

“I sit down and beat the drum, and, by the sound of the drum, I call the animals from the mountains. Even the great storms hearken to the sound of my drum.”

- b. Nil n-ól-ǎpi-n naka n-tətǎl-ih-téh-m-ən pəkhólákən.

I 1-good-sit-N and 1-ongoing-strike-TH-N drum

‘I sit down and beat the drum.

Nit nt-əli—wik^w-táh-a-n weyæssís-ək [wciw] pem-ǎtán-e-k,

that.IN 1-thus—call-strike-DIR-N animal-PROX.PL from along-hill-be-3IN

‘With it I summon the animals from the ridge,

naka=na peciw wəcawsón-əl n-ciksətámá-ko-n n-pəkhólákən.

and=also even wind-IN.PL 1-heed.X's-INV-N 1-drum

‘and even the winds obey my drum.’

2. a. ⟨Nolbin naga n'tetlitemen pekhola-/gon. Pechioo mechkiskak petagik n'tasitemagok pekhola(gon) naga na k'chi applassemwesitt chenisoo w'chiksitmun n'pekholagon.⟩

“I sit and beat the drum, and the storm and thunder answer the sound of my drum.

The great whirlwind ceases its raging to listen to the sound of my drum.”

- b. N-ól-ǎpi-n naka n-tətǎl-ih-téh-m-ən pəkhólákən.

1-good-sit-N and 1-ongoing-strike-TH-N drum

‘I sit and beat the drum.

Peciw mec-ǎkískah-k petákǎ-yək nt-asitemá-ko-k pekholì,
 even bad-be.weather-3IN thunder-PROX.PL 1-reply.to-INV-PROX.PL beat.drum-(1SG)

‘Even the thunder of the storm replies to me when I drum,

naka=na kci—Apǎlahsǎmowéhs-i-t cǎn-éssó w-ciksát-ǎm-ən

and=also great—whirlwind-be-3AN stop-move-(3) 3-heed-TH-N

‘and the great Whirlwind also ceases so as to heed

n-pǎkholákən.

1-drum

‘my drum.’

3. a. ⟨Nolbin naga n’begholin. Nitte Chebelaque w’pechiyan naga w’chiksitmagon
 n’pekholagon. El-/taguak pechite k’chi Wuchowsen w’chenekla oneskee naga
 w’chick-/sitmun eltaguak n’pekholagon.⟩

“I sit down and beat the drum, and the spirit-of-the-night-air comes and listens to the
 sound of my drum. Even the great *Wuchowsin* will cease moving his wings to hearken to
 the sound of my drum.”

- b. N-ól-ǎpi-n naka n-pǎkhóla-n.

1-good-sit-N and 1-beat.drum-N

‘I sit and beat the drum.

Nit=te Cipélahk^w w-pec-íya-n naka w-ciksátǎmá-ko-n n-pǎkholákən.

then=EMPH spirit.of.night 3-arrive-go-N and 3-heed.X’s-INV-N 1-drum

‘Then the Spirit of the Night comes and obeys my drum.

El-ták^wah-k péci=te kci—Wəcáwsən w-cənehl-à w-ənəski
 thus-make.sound-3IN even=EMPH great—wind 3-stop-DIR-(OBV.PL) 3-wing-(OBV.PL)

‘When it sounds, even the great Wind Bird ceases to move its wings

naka w-ciksət-ə̃m-ən el-ták^wah-k n-pəkhólákən.

and 3-heed-TH-N thus-make.sound-3IN 1-drum

‘and obeys the sound of my drum.’

4. a. ⟨Nolbin naga n'tegtemen n'pekhol-/akon. Pechioo te Lumpeguinwok moskapaswok naga w'chiksitmu-/nia n'pekholagon naga na At-/wusknigess chenaque tehiye naga w'chiksitmun n'pekholagon.⟩

“I sit down and beat the drum, and the spirit-under-the-water comes to the surface and listens to the sound of my drum, and the wood-spirit will cease chop-/ping and hearken to the sound of my drum.”

- b. N-ól-ə̃pi-n naka n-tək-téh-m-ən n-pəkhólákən.

1-good-sit-N and 1-hit-strike-TH-N 1-drum

‘I sit and strike my drum.

Peci^w=əte lampek^w-inów-ək Mosk-apásə-w-ək

even=EMPH underwater-person-PROX.PL emerge-pl.go-3-PROX.PL

‘Even the water sprites (pl.) emerge

naka w-ciksət-ə̃m-ənə̃-ya n-pəkhólákən, naka=na Atəwəskənikəhs

and 3-heed-TH-N-PROX.PL 1-drum and=also forest-spirit

‘and heed my drum, and also the Forest Spirit

cǎn-ak^w-tihíke naka w-ciksót-ǎm-ən n-pəkhólákən.

stop-wood-chop-(3) and 3-heed-TH-N 1-drum

‘stops chopping wood and heeds my drum.’

5. a. ⟨Nolbin naga n'tegtemen n'pekhol-/agon naga k'chi Appodumken o'muskatintena negem w'chiksít-/mun n'pekholagon.⟩

“I sit down and beat the drum, and the great *Appodumken* will come out of the deep and hearken to the sound of my drum.”

- b. N-ól-ǎpi-n naka n-tək-téh-m-ən n-pəkhólákən,

1-good-sit-N and 1-hit-strike-TH-N 1-drum

‘I sit and strike my drum,

naka kci—Apotámkən w-mosk-íya-n,

and great—sea.monster 3-emerge-go-N

‘and the great Sea Monster emerges,

nít=te=na nekəm w-ciksót-ǎm-ən n-pəkhólákən.

then=EMPH=also he 3-heed-TH-N 1-drum

‘and he, too, heeds my drum.’

6. a. ⟨Pesaquetwok, petagiyik, wuchow-/senel, machkiskakil, Atwusskni-/gess, applassemwessitt, Lumpequin-/wok, Chebelaque; mesioo mame petaposwok nachichiksítmunia el-/taguak n'pekholagon.⟩

“The lightning, thunder, storms, gales, forest-spirit, whirlwind, water-spirit and spirit-of-the-night-air are gathered together and are listening to the sound of my drum.”

- b. Pəssak^whehtów-ək, petákǎ-yik, wəcawsén-əl, mec-ǎkiskáh-k-il,
 lightning.flash-PROX.PL thunder-PROX.PL wind-IN.PL bad-be.weather-3IN-IN.PL
 ‘The lightning flashes, the thunder, the winds, the storms,
 Atǎwəskənikəhs, Apǎlahsǎmowéhs-i-t, lampek^w-inów-ək,
 forest.spirit whirlwind-be-3AN underwater-person-PROX.PL
 ‘the Forest Spirit, the Whirlwind, the water sprites,
 Cipélahk^w, msìw=ǎte mawe—pet-apásǎ-w-ək
 spirit.of.night all=EMPH together—arrive-pl.go-3-PROX.PL
 ‘the Spirit of the Night, they all come together
 naci—ciksət-ǎm-énǎ-ya el-ták^wah-k n-pəkhólákən.
 go—heed-TH-N-PROX.PL thus-make.sound-3IN 1-drum
 ‘to attend to the sound of my drum.’

There are only a few points in this text that require comment. The first concerns the stem *pəkhole-* ‘beat a drum’ and its nominalized derivative *pəkhólákən* ‘drum’, which occur in various inflected forms throughout the text. I have usually heard the latter as *pəkohólákən*, but Francis and Leavitt (2008: 434) attest both *kh* and *koh* for this stem, and Prince’s spellings clearly point to the former.

In line (2), Prince’s has ⟨pekhola(gon)⟩ “the sound of my drum,” evidently taking the line to include the noun *pəkhólákən*; ⟨gon⟩ must be his emendation. Prince 1921a: 84–85 instead has ⟨pekhola⟩, which he translates as “when I drum,” taking this verb to be an adjunct to *nt-asitemá-ko-k* ‘they (the thunder, pl.) reply to me’. Since the latter is an animate-object form, it cannot take the inanimate noun ‘drum’ as its complement. Thus Prince’s 1921 analysis is correct, except

that the appropriate form of an e-stem verb in this context ends in *i*: *pekholi* ‘when I beat the drum’. In line (3), Prince’s ⟨n’begholin⟩ “(and I) beat the drum” must be the subordinative form *n-pəkhóla-n*. Stem-final *e* is regularly replaced by *a* before the subordinative marker *-n*.

Returning to line (1), we find ⟨we-/yisesek... pehutenek⟩, which Prince translates as “the animals from the mountains.” The first word is clearly *weyəssísək* ‘animals’, and the third must represent a misreading of ⟨pemteneκ⟩, i.e., *pem-ə́tən-e-k* ‘the ridge’ (literally, ‘where the hill runs along’). This leaves the question of the middle word ‘from’, which Prince evidently could not read in the manuscript he was working with. (He simply left out the text corresponding to ‘from the mountains’ in Prince 1921a: 84–85.) A likely emendation is the particle *wciw* ‘from’ (contemporary *’ciw*); cf. *wciw* ‘from’, spelled ⟨wedciu⟩, at Prince 1921a: 36.

Other forms in this text are readily recovered on the basis of their transcriptions in Prince (1901b), which generally reflect his consultant’s spellings.

6. Conclusion

Although I have lodged substantial criticisms against the scholarship of Charles Godfrey Leland and John Dyneley Prince, the contribution of both of these men to our knowledge of Passamaquoddy oral literature is undeniable. The four texts that I have sought to establish in this article are particularly notable, since they stand out amidst a record that otherwise consists largely of narrative works. Doubtful points in the transcriptions remain, but for the most part the texts appear to be recoverable, despite the vagaries of the spelling of our sources.

The conclusions reached here may also be instructive for the more general issue of the reliability of information we can discern from early records of Native American languages. The case of the two divergent versions of “The Song of the Stars,” Texts 4 and 5 above, is

particularly relevant in this connection. The transcription of the first version is clearly defective, but the underlying text ultimately emerges with reasonable clarity after careful analysis. The second version of the song, on the other hand, dissolves under analysis, which reveals it to be derivative of the published translation of the first and thus to be unreliable as an example of early Passamaquoddy verse. I suggest that these results are encouraging. It is indeed possible to determine what is reliable and what is not in early attestations of Native Americans languages if we attend both to the language of our texts and to the methods the creators of those texts employed in producing them.

References

- Adney, Edwin Tappan. n.d. Chi-bel'-akw, the Charon of the Malecite Indians. Ms., Papers of Edwin Tappan Adney. *Ethnology* 7, box 54. Phillips Library, Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, MA.
- DeBlois, Albert D. 1996. *Micmac dictionary*. Canadian Ethnology Service Mercury Series Paper 131. Hull, PQ: Canadian Museum of Civilization.
- Chamberlain, Montague. 1899. *Maliseet vocabulary*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Coöperative Society.
- [Desfossés, Basilide]. 1832. *Kagakimzouiasis ueji Uo 'banakiak adali kimo 'gik aliuitzo 'ki Za Plasua*. [Small catechism for Abenakis who are studying in a place called St. Francis]. Quebec: Fréchette.
- Erickson, Vincent O. 1978 Maliseet-Passamaquoddy. In *Handbook of North American Indians, Vol. 15, Northeast*, edited by Bruce G. Trigger, 123–136. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Francis, David A., and Robert M. Leavitt. 2008. *Peskotomuhkati Wolastoqewi latuwewakon / A Passamaquoddy-Maliseet dictionary*. Orono, ME: University of Maine Press.
- . 1994. The Indian devil, mischief-maker. In *Coming to light: Contemporary translations of the native literatures of North America*, edited by Brian Swann, 503–518. New York: Random House.
- Goddard, Ives. 1974. Remarks on the Algonquian independent indicative. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 40: 317–327.
- Gordon, Arthur Hamilton. 1864. *Wilderness journeys in New Brunswick in 1862–63*. Saint John, NB: J. & A. McMillan.

- Lapomarda, Vincent A. 1977. *The Jesuit heritage in New England*. Worcester, MA: Holy Cross College.
- Laurent, Joseph. 1884. *New Familiar Abenakis and English Dialogues*. Quebec: Leger Brousseau.
- Leavitt, Robert M. 1996. *Passamaquoddy-Maliseet*. Munich: Lincom-Europa.
- Leland, Charles G. 1884. *The Algonquin legends of New England or myths and folk lore of the Micmac, Passamaquoddy, and Penobscot tribes*. London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.
- Leland, Charles G., and John Dyneley Prince. 1902. *Kulóskap the master and other Algonkin poems*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls.
- LeSourd, Philip S. 2000. The Passamaquoddy “witchcraft tales” of Newell S. Francis. *Anthropological Linguistics* 42: 441–498.
- . 2007. *Tales from Maliseet country: The Maliseet texts of Karl V. Teeter*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 2015. Enclitic particles in Western Abenaki: Form and function. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 81: 301–335.
- [Mitchell, Lewis.] n.d. [Notes on Passamaquoddy lore.] Ms., Papers of Edwin Tappan Adney. Ethnology 7, box 39. Phillips Library, Peabody Essex Museum, Salem, MA.
- [Newell, Wayne A., and Robert M. Leavitt, eds.] 1976. *Mikcic / Turtle*. Indian Township, ME: Wabnaki Bilingual Education Program.
- Parkhill, Thomas C. 1997. *Weaving ourselves into the land: Charles Godfrey Leland, “Indians,” and the study of Native American religions*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Prince, John Dyneley. 1897. The Passamaquoddy wampum records. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 36(156): 479–495.
- . 1898. Some Passamaquoddy Documents. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 11(1): 369–377.
- . 1899. Some Passamaquoddy witchcraft tales. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 38(160): 181-189.
- . 1901a. The modern dialect of the Canadian Abenakis. In *Miscellanea linguistica in onore di Graziadio Ascoli*, 343–362. Torino: Ermanno Loescher.
- . 1901b. Notes on Passamaquoddy literature. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 13(1): 381–386.
- . 1902. The Differentiation between the Penobscot and the Canadian Abenaki dialects. *American Anthropologist* 4(1): 17–32.
- . 1906. A Micmac manuscript. *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Congress of Americanists*, Quebec, PQ, September 10–15, 1906, pp. 87–124.
- . 1909. A Passamaquoddy aviator. *American Anthropologist* 11(4): 628–650.
- . 1910. The Penobscot Language of Maine. *American Anthropologist* 12(2): 183-208.
- . 1914. The morphology of the Passamaquoddy language of Maine. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 53(213): 92–117.
- . 1917. A Passamaquoddy tobacco famine. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 1(1): 58-63.
- . 1921a. *Passamaquoddy texts*. Publications of the American Ethnological Society, vol. 10. New York: G.E. Stechert.
- . 1921b. Passamaquoddy-Malecite dictionary. Ms., Columbia University, New York.

- Proulx, Paul Martin. 1978. Micmac inflection. Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca.
- Rand, Silas Tertius. 1894. *Legends of the Micmacs*. New York: Longmans, Green.
- [Review of] *The Algonquin Legends of New England*. By Charles G. Leland. 1885. *The Athenaeum*, January 31, 1885, pp. 146–147.
- Schwartz, Linda. 1988. Asymmetric feature distribution in pronominal “coordinations.” In *Agreement in natural languages: Approaches, theories, and descriptions*, edited by Michael Barlow & Charles A. Ferguson, 237–249. Stanford, CA: CSLI.
- Smith, Nicholas N. n.d. [Notes on recordings of Maliseet songs.] Ms., Brunswick, ME.
- Speck, Frank G. 1940. *Penobscot man*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Sweetser, Moses Foster. 1883. *The Maritime Provinces: Handbook for travellers; A guide to the chief cities, coasts, and islands of the Maritime Provinces of Canada, and to their scenery and historic attractions; with the Gulf and River of St. Lawrence to Quebec and Montreal; also, Newfoundland and the Labrador coast. With four maps and four plans*. 3rd ed. Boston: James R. Osgood.
- Vetromile, Eugene. 1856. *Indian good book: For the benefit of the Penobscot, Passamaquoddy, St. John's, Micmac, and other tribes of the Abnaki Indians*. New York: Edward Dunigan & Brother.

Notes

Acknowledgements. I am deeply indebted to many members of the Passamaquoddy community who have shared their knowledge of their language with me over the years. Most especially, I am grateful to the late David A. Francis, to the late Anna Harnois, to Estelle Neptune, and to Wayne A. Newell. Thanks are also due to the staff of the Phillips Library of the Peabody Essex Museum in Salem, MA, who helped me to locate and photocopy material in the Papers of Edwin Tappan Adney. I also grateful for the helpful comments of two reviewers for *AL*, which have led to substantial improvements in the work presented here. Remaining inadequacies are all my own.

Notation. Maliseet and Passamaquoddy have five distinctive vowels and twelve distinctive consonants: *i, e, o, a, ə*, and *p, t, c* (= [č]), *k, k^w, s, h, l, m, n, w, y*. Phonemic /h/ before a consonant at the beginning of a word is written as an apostrophe. The acute accent indicates a distinctively high-pitched stressed vowel, the grave accent a distinctively low-pitched stressed vowel. Certain “weak” occurrences of *ə*, which are skipped over in assigning stress on an alternating pattern from right to left, are marked with a breve: *ǎ*. Preverbs and prenouns (prior members in verbal and nominal compounds, respectively) are joined to the base they modify by a dash (—). These compounds may be syntactically discontinuous; in such cases, the first segment of the compound is written with a trailing hyphen and the second with a leading hyphen. Angled brackets ⟨...⟩ enclose material in the spellings of the sources. I have added indications of accentual features to my phonemic renderings of sources that do not note these, including modern sources.

Abbreviations. The following abbreviations are used in glosses: 1 first person; 2 second person; 3 third person; 1/2, etc., first-person subject with second-person object, etc.; ABS, abs.

absentative; AN animate; DIM diminutive; DIR direct; DUBIT dubitative; EMPH emphatic; EXC, exc. exclusive; FUT future; IN inanimate; INC, inc. inclusive; INV inverse; LOC locative; MPL multiplural (indicates that a subject refers to more than two individuals); N suffix *-(o)n(e)-*, with several functions; NEG negative; NOM nominalizer; OBV obviative; PL, pl. plural; POSS possessed; PRET preterite; PROX proximate; RECIP reciprocal; SG, sg. singular; TH thematic suffix of transitive verb with inanimate object. Glosses are given in parentheses for morphemes that have no surface segmental shape.

¹ Parkhill (1997: 43–45) observes that Sweetser’s source for the story in question, Gordon 1864, explicitly notes in a footnote that he has called the brother of “Clote Scarp” (Kəloskap) “Malsunsis” or “the little Wolf” not because this was his name, but because “the name of the second brother... has escaped my recollection” (Gordon 1864: 56; quoted by Parkhill 1997: 45). Gordon 1864 was not known to Leland, however. He simply relied on Sweetser’s uncorroborated account.

² Prince’s works dealing with Western Abenaki are considerably more reliable than his publications concerning Passamaquoddy. This is probably due in considerable measure to the fact that he made extensive use of Laurent 1884, a good descriptive grammar of Western Abenaki written by a native speaker; cf. Prince 1901a: 346, notes 2 and 3.

³ The definite-indefinite distinction is made (in the languages that maintain it) only in the inflection of transitive verbs in the independent indicative paradigm, the principal set of inflected forms used in main clauses. The indefinite-object forms of transitive inanimate verbs (verbs that select for grammatically inanimate objects) resemble intransitives in their inflection; the corresponding definite-object forms include additional object agreement suffixes and also take a suffix reflected in Maliseet-Passamaquoddy as *-(ə)n(e)-*, glossed here as ‘-N’. Occasional

examples like (i) reflect the continued use of the old intransitive-style forms with an indefinite object. Compare the verb in (ii), which represents the usual contemporary usage: Here we have ordinary transitive inflection for singular object, with *-(ə)n(e-)*.

- (i) Ma=te kèk^w mikahké-kt-a-k^w **peci-pt-ò**.
 not=EMPH something fight-use-TH-3AN hither-carry-TH-(NEG)

‘(Such a person) doesn’t bring anything to fight with.’

(Maliseet, LeSourd 2007: 116, no. 3)

- (ii) Ma=te kèk^w **nəmiht-ó-w-ən** weci-=hp -sasətemí-li-t.
 not=EMPH something (3)-see-TH-NEG-N from-=COND -cry-OBV-3AN

‘She couldn’t see anything that it (a child, obv.) could be crying about.’

(Maliseet, LeSourd 2007: 8, no. 6)

⁴ For example, Prince gives ⟨k’nimiá‘pa wíkwus⟩ as “you [pl.] see a mother” (1914: 100). This is presumably to be interpreted as the ungrammatical **k-nəmiht-á-pa w-íkəwəss*. The verb in this example would match the Western Abenaki indefinite-object form ⟨K’namihôba⟩ *kə-namih-q-pa* ‘you (pl.) see (someone)’ (Laurent 1884: 110). (Here *q* writes a mid, back, unrounded, nasal vowel.) Both have inflection resembling that of intransitive forms like Western Abenaki ⟨k’môjiba⟩ *kə-məci-pa* ‘you (pl.) go’ (Laurent 1884: 65) or Passamaquoddy *k-macahá-pa* ‘you (pl.) leave’, inflection distinct from that of Western Abenaki ⟨K’namihôwô⟩ *kə-namih-q-wq* ‘you (pl.) see him’ (Laurent 1884: 114) and contemporary Passamaquoddy *k-nəmiy-á-wa* ‘you (pl.) see someone, him’. (In the course of the last century, Passamaquoddy **h* has been replaced by *y* when it follows *i* and precedes a vowel other than *i*.) Further evidence that Prince’s example is simply erroneous, rather than representing some archaic usage, comes from the fact that the form **w-íkəwəss* “a mother” he supplies here as the object of ‘see’ is just as impossible as his verb

form. The noun *-ikǎwǎss* ‘mother’ is obligatorily possessed. Its forms that bear the third-person prefix *w-* are all definite in reference: e.g., *w-ikǎwǎss-əl* ‘his mother (obv.)’, *w-ikǎwǎs-kəl* ‘his late mother (obv. abs.)’, and the semantically anomalous *w-ikǎwǎss* ‘his mothers (obv.)’.

⁵ Francis and Leavitt 1994 provides a modern edition of “The Merry Tales of Lox,” with spellings adjusted to reflect contemporary pronunciation. Editions of several other Passamaquoddy stories from Prince’s 1921 text collection were published in the 1970s in versions prepared by Wayne A. Newell and Robert M. Leavitt (e.g., Newell and Leavitt 1976). They noted that there was “a strong English influence on the Passamaquoddy language” of these texts, which they sought to correct (p. 2). They attributed this influence to the fact that most of Prince’s Passamaquoddy material had been destroyed in a fire at his house in 1911 (Prince 1921a: 2), after which it had been necessary to recreate the texts. It would appear, however, that the process of recreation largely consisted of Mitchell’s preparing translations of passages from Leland 1884.

⁶ As noted above, this song appears twice in the Mitchell manuscript. The first version gives the last word of the text as ⟨knimanen⟩. The second appears to have ⟨knimaha/nen⟩, split across lines. The latter form is presumably an error; it has not been confirmed by my consultants.

⁷ Mitchell’s form *l-otá-nec* ‘let’s move (there)’, which was confirmed by the late Passamaquoddy elder David A. Francis (1917–2016), is an apparent archaism. The usual suffix of first person plural imperatives in the contemporary language is *-ne*: *sehká-ne* ‘let’s stand’. The ending that Mitchell has used here is attested for Maliseet by Chamberlain 1899: ⟨yut ũk-wa’-nĕts⟩ *yòt əkʷahá-nec* ‘let us land [our boat] here’ (p. 86); ⟨wi-wi-sa-i’-nĕts⟩ *wihwisayí-nec* ‘let us hurry’ (p. 85). (For *hw* in the latter example, compare Prince 1921b, where we find ⟨wiwhisai⟩ “quickly” for *wihwisay* ‘hurry (sg.)!’) A cognate suffix is found in Mi’kmaq (spoken in a large

area bordering Maliseet territory on both the west and the east): *pusi-neč* ‘let’s go aboard’ (Proulx 1978: 136).

⁸ Smith (n.d.) gives the words of the song in question as shown in (i), which I interpret as indicated in (ii):

(i) ⟨Maw-kwan kut-ick tul-oo-un-nan⟩

“THEY WILL MOVE TO THE SUGAR GROVE”

⟨Nook-mak^w dag-un K-nee-mun-nan⟩

“AND THEY WILL TAKE WITH THEM THE SKIN OF THE CODFISH”

(ii) Mahk^wan-káti-k kt-əl-ota-nè-n.

maple.sugar-collecting.place-LOC 2-there-change.residence-N-1PL

‘We (dual inc.) will move to the sugar bush.’

Nohkǎmek^w-ǎtékən k-nima-nè-n.

codfish-skin 2-take.as.lunch-N-1PL

‘We (dual inc.) will take along a codfish skin for a lunch.’

Smith reports that he obtained his translation from Peter L. Paul (1902–1989) of the Maliseet reserve at Woodstock, NB. Note, however, that the verbs here are inflected for ‘we (inc.)’ as subject, not ‘they’.

⁹ The anthropologist Frank G. Speck noted that among the Penobscot, neighbors of the Passamaquoddy to the south and west, “[o]ne customary rule was... for the eldest and next eldest son and daughter, in case there were many children, to inherit the [parent’s given] name, with the termination *-sīs*, ‘little’, until the parents’ demise, after which the termination would be dropped” (1940: 251).

¹⁰ Prince observed that Mitchell “frequently us[ed] *b, d, g* for *p, t, k*; *j* for *ch*” (1914: 94). The non-strident obstruents *p, t, k, k^w* are voiced between vowels; the strident obstruents *s* and *c* are voiceless but lax in this context.

¹¹ Subordinative forms are used in several other constructions as well. Most of these contexts involve clauses that describe a state of affairs that follows temporally or logically on another state of affairs indicated in a preceding clause, either within the same sentence or (in narratives) in a preceding sentence.

¹² The Passamaquoddy were converted to Catholicism by French missionaries in the seventeenth century. The term *Kci—Níwesk^w* ‘Great Spirit’ is the traditional Passamaquoddy word for ‘God’ used in Catholic discourse. For example, the Jesuit Eugene Vetromile, who ministered to the Native population of Maine between 1854 and 1887 (Lapomarda 1977: 21–22), used the term ⟨Ketchi Niwèsku⟩ *Kci—Níwesk^w* to refer to God in his writings in Passamaquoddy (e.g., Vetromile 1856: 299).

¹³ The items that correspond to these possessed forms of ‘lamp, light’ in Leland’s text likewise fail to display the first-person plural possessive suffix. But both in fact appear to be non-possessed nouns, despite Leland’s translations with “our light”: In (2a) ⟨nosh mor-gun⟩ is apparently *wahsenǎmákən* ‘a torch’, while in (5a) ⟨Pes-sauk-wa morgun⟩ is simply *pəssak^whenǎmákən* ‘a lamp, a light’.

¹⁴ In contemporary Passamaquoddy, a set of multiplural suffixes is used to maintain a fairly strict distinction between dual and plural forms of the class of intransitive verbs that select grammatically animate subjects. At the time when Leland and Prince were working with the language, however, it was still common for forms that are now interpreted as duals to be construed with plural subjects. (In contemporary Maliseet, “dual” forms may refer to small

groups of individuals.) Thus, it is not surprising that the form cited here is understood to have a non-dual subject.