Title
The Thompson Language. By Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson.

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0qk8g28t

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 17(3)

ISSN
0161-6463

Author
van Eijk, Jan P.

Publication Date
1993-06-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information

This sort of opinion evokes heated debate in Indian Country and often results in confrontation between people of varying degrees of Indian ancestry. The authors' intentions are admirable, however, in that they attempt to dispel a governmentally imposed criterion for determining ethnic/racial identity. Nevertheless, the topic should be addressed in a more objective way. For example, American Indian students could discuss sovereignty issues (tribal communities, and not the United States government, have the inherent right to determine their own membership) and how they are addressed by different tribes recognized and unrecognized by governmental entities.

Clearly, the strengths of *Teaching American Indian Students* outweigh the weaknesses. Indian and non-Indian educators are likely to find the volume an insightful reference that points to further important resources. The volume's primary use may be as a text for undergraduate teacher-training courses or first-year graduate training education programs.

D. Michael Pavel
University of California, Los Angeles

The Thompson Language. By Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. Missoula, Montana: University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics No. 8, 1992. 253 pages. $20.00 paper.

The book under review contains a description of the Thompson language spoken in southwestern British Columbia, Canada, along the lower part of the Thompson River and in adjacent areas. The immediate linguistic affiliations of Thompson are with Lillooet and Shuswap, spoken to the northwest and northeast, respectively, of Thompson. Together, these three languages make up the Northern Interior subgroup of the Interior branch of Salish, a family of twenty-three members that spreads well into Washington, Idaho, and Montana. Like the other Salish languages, Thompson is severely threatened, the number of fluent speakers declining steadily. On the other hand, efforts are being made to teach the language to the younger generation (either within family settings or through the school system). The appearance of this grammar is thus timely and welcome, especially since the book is well organized, thoroughly researched, and rich in grammatical detail.

This is also the first full grammar of Thompson. There are earlier, partial descriptions of the language, mainly in the shape of vocabularies or grammatical sketches (Gibbs 1877, Good 1880, Boas 1898, Hill-Tout 1899, Teit 1900; see the book under review for full bibliographical references). However, in addition to their incompleteness, these materials suffer from inaccurate transcriptions and outdated conceptual frameworks. Thompson and Thompson's grammar thus not only fills a gap in our knowledge of the Thompson language, it also complements the growing body of literature on Salish in general (including Vogt 1940 on Kalispel; Mattina 1973 on Colville-Okanagan; Kuipers 1974 on Shuswap; and many other studies listed in the bibliography of Thompson and Thompson's grammar).

Aside from brief periods of fieldwork starting in 1962, Thompson and Thompson gathered most of the material for this book from 1968 to 1983, from a variety of consultants, the most important of whom was Annie York (ZixtkWu), who passed away in 1991. In 1983, Laurence Thompson suffered a stroke, which has since prevented him from making further substantial contributions to the book. The final edition was prepared by Terry Thompson, with assistance from M. Dale Kinkade and Steven M. Egesdal.

Like all Salish languages, Thompson has a complex phonological and morphological structure. Since many notions such as pronominal subject and object are expressed morphologically, syntax is relatively simple, although phonological complexities leave occasional doubt as to which particle is involved in a certain sentence; this then complicates the analysis of syntactic structures. The phoneme inventory is large, encompassing plain and glottalized (ejective) plosives (p, p', t, L', c, c, c', k, k', kW, k'W, q, q', qW, q'W, 7, and the borrowed phoneme t'), fricatives (L, s, s, x, xW, x, xW, h), plain and laryngealized resonants (m, m', n, n', l, l', z, z', y, y', g, g', w, w', G, G', GW, G'W), and vowels (i, i, e, a, E, E, u, o). (Due to equipment constraints, capital W in the preceding symbols replaces the raised w used by the Thompsons; underlined symbols replace symbols with a subscript dot; L' is the barred and glottalized lambda; L is the voiceless lateral fricative [barred l]; g replaces the gamma for the voiced velar resonant; G replaces the reversed glottal stop for the voiced uvular resonant; E replaces the inverted e for schwa, and 7 replaces the traditional glottal stop symbol.) There is one suprasegmental phoneme, viz., a dynamic stress (written as an acute over the stressed vowel by

the Thompsons, but as a prime ['] after the vowel by me). The morphology is rich and complex and employs various patterns of reduplicative and nonreduplicative prefixation, suffixation, and infixation, plus ablaut. Semantically, these operations express such notions as transitivity and intransitivity; control (on which see also below); pronominal subject, object, and possessor; field and lexical content; augmentative and diminutive; and various aspectual notions. Morphophonemic processes such as metathe- sis, elision, and contraction often obscure the morphological makeup of a word, and the authors wisely provide both the underlying and surface forms of many examples. A few such cases are given here, illustrating both the morphological complex- ity of Thompson and the effects of morphophonemic develop- ments:

//LEk'W-min-t-sey-ep// (p. 63)   /LEk'W-mi'n-ci-p/

//REMEMBER-relational-transitive-
me-you (pl.)//   /"you folks remember me"/

//puc-n-t-sut// (p. 77)   /pu'c-e-st/

//COVER WITH DOWN-directive-
trans.-refl.//   /"he covers himself withdown"/

//kEL=ekst-n-t-ep// (p. 113)   /kL=e'ks-e-t-p/

//REMOVE=HAND-
directive-trans.-you (pl.)//   /"you folks remove his handsfrom it"/

(The equal sign [=] in the last example introduces a so-called lexical suffix.) The syntax of Thompson is, on the whole, some- what less complex than its morphology. The predicate is the only obligatory element in a clause, and this predicate is usually clause-initial (although adverbial or other elements may occa- sionally precede it.) Complements and adjuncts thus regularly follow the predicate, and the kernel of predicates, complements, and adjuncts may be a noun or verb (the latter category also encompassing adjectives). Thus, in Thompson (and in Salish in general) there is no viable distinction between noun and verb on the syntactic level, and phrases like "the man sings" and "the one who sings is a man" are paralleled in Thompson by sentences of the type "sing-is the man-is" and "man-is the sing-is," respec-

tively. (As these examples show, complements—and adjuncts—are embedded predicates themselves, based on either a noun or a verb.) One example of a typical Thompson sentence must suffice:

> /poGWte's ekwu n L e s7uLxW L tu'Lkist-s/ (p. 150)
> /"he pounded (poGWte's) on the inside (s7uLxW) with his stone hammer (tu'Lkist)"/

Thompson and Thompson's discussion of the above and other features of Thompson grammatical structure is neatly organized into five sections, with subsections numbered decimally: tens for phonology, twenties for morphology, thirties for syntax, forties for the appendix (numerical system, kinship system, orthography conversion tables), and fifties for the illustrative text. The morphological discussion quite sensibly follows a functional semantic format, centering around issues such as pronominal possession, subject and object, augmentative, diminutive, aspect, and control, rather than following a rigidly formal format (prefixation, suffixation, reduplication). Particular attention is paid to the issue of control, which expresses "whether some agent is in control of the situation reported" (p. 51). Whereas most predicative words are marked as having plus or minus control, some affixes can change the control status of the stem to which they are added. Thus we can have two derivations of the same stem, one expressing lack of control, the other expressing control, for example:

> /sEk-s-t-e'xW/ "you hit him (accidentally) with a stick" v. /sEk-e-t-e'xW/ "you hit him (intentionally) with a stick" (the former derived with the control-less transitive combination /-s-t/, the other with the control transitive combination of the underlying shape //-n-t//) (p. 71).

In spite of the authors' modest remark that "[t]here are no signs that we are beginning to achieve anything like full coverage" (p. xv), it is obvious that this grammar is an excellent piece of work. The organization and discussions are very clear, and the authors give a thorough, data-based analysis of the grammatical structure of an extremely difficult language. Particularly rewarding are the richly detailed treatments of the phonology (including the vexing phonetic data—always a problem in Salish) and the personal affixation (inflection). Comparison with descriptions of other Salish grammars (including my grammar of closely related Lillooet) shows no real gaps in the coverage of the Thompson

facts. Since good grammars always inspire discussion, critical comments, and counterarguments (bad grammars only cause confusion, irritation, and rejection), I do have a few suggestions for alternate treatment of a number of topics from the phonology, morphology, and syntax.

First, a minor objection which concerns the authors' treatment of the lateral resonants. These are listed as /l l'/ in the chart on page 3, but on page 6 it is remarked that "they are usually dark, produced with tongue-root drawn back." I am somewhat bothered by the term *usually*. Does this mean that these phonemes have nonretracted allophones or free variants, or is there a phonemic distinction between retracted and nonretracted lateral resonants that in the description has somehow slipped through the cracks? Of the six examples with /l l'/ on page 6, three cases (/lhec'/, /la'qWes/, /sk'il'/) are paralleled in Lillooet by forms with nonretracted /l l'/, while the three remaining ones (/c'7al/, /7esk'il̲/, /nkWl'ank/) are paralleled by Lilloeet forms with retracted /l̲ l̲'/. Where the Thompson laterals are retracted, I would prefer to write them /l̲ l̲'/, to bring them visually in line with the other retracted consonants, viz., /c̲ s̲. This orthographic adjustment is made feasible by the fact that the authors already pose //l̲l̲'// in the underlying forms of those Thompson words that have matching /l̲ l̲'/ in Lillooet, e.g., //k'il̲-Eme// "to cut (buckskin or cloth)" on page 40. (We still would have the problem that the postvelar fricatives are written /x̲ x̲W/, although they are—at least in my view—not retracted variants of prevelar /x xW/ but phonemes of a different place of articulation than /x xW/. This could be amended by writing the postvelars as /x xW/ with superscript hachek as is done in a number of Salish sources.)

Distribution of the stress in Thompson is complex and is discussed by the authors in terms of weak and strong roots, and weak, strong, and ambivalent suffixes (section 14.1, pp. 27–30). In a few respects, this discussion invites suggestions for simplification. First of all, on page 27 the authors state that strong roots without stressable suffixes "take main stress on the syllable with underlying primary stress." This statement seems not only circular (in that the underlying primary stress can apparently be deducted from the main stress), but unnecessary because of the observation, a few lines down, that "[f]or word stress assignment a general rule comes in to play: main stress falls on the last of a sequence of primary stressed syllables." Thus, the word //xWesi't/ / —> /xWesi't/ "she walks" which is listed as having underlying

primary stress on the last syllable and then has this syllable stressed according to the first rule, could also be captured by the second rule and be listed as //xWe'si't// —> /xWesi't/.

Another problem concerns the so-called strong suffixes which will take stress from either a weak or a strong root. (An example is /-me'mn/ DESIDERATIVE, page 28, which takes stress from the strong root /te'kL/ "rain" in /tekL-me'mn/ "it is trying to rain." Nonstrong suffixes take stress from a weak root but not from a strong one, and these nonstrong suffixes fall into weak suffixes, which create weak stems that lose stress in the presence of any further stressable suffix, and ambivalent suffixes which generally retain the stress after a weak root, when further ambivalent [or weak] suffixes are added. In addition to the stressable [strong and nonstrong] suffixes, we also have nonstressable suffixes.) In section 14.13, a process called regeneration is discussed whereby main stress is assigned to the first stressable suffix after the primary stem, converting a weak or ambivalent suffix in that position to a strong suffix. In light of this, I would class /-me'mn/ and similar suffixes as ambivalent suffixes automatically creating regenerated forms, thus eliminating the need for a separate strong category. (This solution also meshes with the fact that strong suffixes attract the stress after another stressable suffix [section 14.123], implying a type of regeneration.)

Although the discussion of the morphology is generally of exceptional clarity, the treatment of the so-called lexical suffixes (suffixes with a lexical semantic content, referring to body parts, three-dimensional objects, etc.) is rather underdeveloped. These suffixes are briefly discussed in section 25.14 (p. 112), and a lengthy list is given on pages 190–91, but, in addition to this list, we find, for example, /-eLp/ "plant" and /-eLxw/ "house" (both on p. 134) and /-eLq/ "berry patch" (?) on page 42. A complete listing of these suffixes (such as Kuipers gives in his 1974 monograph on Shuswap) would be a welcome addition in future editions of this book.

My strongest objection to the morphological section concerns the discussion of augmentative and characteristic reduplication. Like other Salish languages, Thompson employs an operation that reduplicates the first CVC (consonant-vowel-consonant) of the root (CVC and CVCC being the overwhelmingly favored root shapes in Salish). Thus we have formations of the type CVC-CVC(..) with the CVC sequences being identical to each other. Stress in such formations falls either on the first CVC sequence, in which case the authors treat this CVC as (part of) the root and the

second CVC as an insert and assign to the whole complex a "characteristic" meaning (section 22.15), or the stress falls on the second CVC sequence, in which case the authors treat the first CVC sequence as a prefix and analyze the meaning of the whole complex as "augmentative" (plural, repetition-persistence, in-crease—section 22.12). The unstressed CVC sequences in both formations usually have their vowel reduced to /E/. Thus we have, for example, augmentative /LEx̲-*La'x̲i/ "they are cold" (/ La'x̲i/ "she is cold," p. 82) versus characteristic /*L'a'q'-L'Eq'-t/ "full of thorns, thorny" (/L'aq'-t/ "he is struck by thorns"; /-t/ IMMEDIATE; the asterisk [*] precedes the root in my retranscription of the reduplicative forms as analyzed by the Thompsons.

The strict distinction made by the authors between the aug-mentative and characteristic patterns seems an unnecessary complication of the facts. First of all, semantically the "charac-teristic" function seems to be a subset of the repetition-persis-tence aspect of the augmentative function (cf. /*L'a'q'-L'Eq'-t/ above with augmentative /n-ki-*key-m/ [via //n-kEy-*ke'y-m/ /] "he keeps following"). Secondly, a number of forms that have a characteristic "feel" have an augmentative shape, e.g., / tExW-*to'x̲W-t/ "right, correct, proper" (p. 142), /qWEn-*qWa'n-t/ "poor" (p. 215), /cEk-*ce'k/ "cool" (p. 84). Conversely, in a few augmentatives, stress falls on the first syllable. These forms thus resemble characteristic forms, e.g., /s-*k'Wo'z-k'Wez/ "aunts" (/s-k'Woz/ "aunt"). In the third place, some "character-istic" Thompson cases are paralleled by augmentative cases in other Salish languages, e.g., /s-t-*qWE'z-qWEz-t/ "blue" (p. 165) which is paralleled by Lillooet /qWez-*qWa'z/ "blue." It is highly unlikely that Lillooet and Thompson have different affixation patterns (prefixation v. infixation/suffixation) in such formally and semantically closely related items. It is much simpler to posit only an augmentative CVC reduplication (prefixation) and to accept that in a number of cases the stress falls rather inexplicably on the prefix instead of on the root. This solution would also cover cases like /s-t-*zE'l-zEl-t/ "it is in oval shape" v. /zEl-*zE'l-t "it has gone into oval shape" (p. 118) which both could be interpreted as augmentative, but with a stress shift to the prefix in the former case (which then would be interpreted as /s-t-zE'l-*zEl-t/), and this stress-shift possibly resulting from a metrical realignment that could have been caused by the /s-t-/ prefix combination. Similarly, we could treat cases like /s- t-paG-*pa'G-paG-t/ "sev-

eral are grey, faded" (p. 89) and /si7-*se'y-si7/ "he plays (intensely ?)" (p. 156) as having double augmentative reduplication, with stress shift to the prefix in the first derivation (/se'y'-si7/ via //se'y'-sEy'// "to play," /s-t-pa'G-paG-t/ "grey, faded") and no stress shift in the second derivation.

One problematic issue from the syntax concerns the so-called established-past particle /L/ (underlying shape //LE//), which, according to the authors, "introduces entities or situations no longer in evidence or absent at the time referred to by the predicate" (p. 149). Many examples provided by the authors (mostly in the illustrative text) actually suggest that /L/ does not refer to entities or situations absent at the time referred to by the predicate but absent at the time of the situation of speech. Thus in the sequence /poGwte's ekWu n L e s7uLxw L tu'Lkist-s/ (p. 150, also quoted earlier in this review), both the inside and the stone hammer are certainly present at the time of the knocking. Similarly, in the illustrative text, which relates a story set in the mythical past and from which the above sentence is taken, the /se'ytkn=mx/ "people" are introduced with /L/ in lines 69, 80, 310, 317, and 319, although in all these cases they are present in the time referred to by the predicate ("then he heard people," "then the people told him," etc.), only in one case (line 5) the people are introduced with the "direct" particle /e/ which does not suggest separation in time, but, in this particular line, mention is made of people in general, such as still exist nowadays. (In lines 18, 52, 58 and 177, /se'ytkn=mx/ is introduced with the articles /k/ or /tEk/ which fall outside the present discussion.) I also doubt whether /L/ introduces adjuncts, as the authors maintain, rather than mere complements. (Adjuncts are described as stating the relationships with the predicate in terms of certain modal, aspectual, or relational nuances—p. 149.) However, in the illustrative text, many entities introduced with /L/ refer to agent or patient entities, and, in this respect, they do not seem to differ from entities introduced with /e/ or /tE/ which refer to complements (section 32).

The above points of criticism detract nothing from the merits of this excellent book. Like other studies of similar depth and breadth of coverage, this work has a manifold value: (1) as an exciting intellectual adventure in itself, describing meticulously many details of a difficult and little-known language; (2) as a contribution to linguistic theory beyond Salish linguistics. Although the authors describe Thompson structure largely within the frame-

work of classical structuralism, with occasional insights from generative linguistics, theoreticians of a more exclusive or modern bent can easily mine Thompson and Thompson's rich lode of materials for their own interests; (3) as a reference manual for those teaching Thompson (or other Salish languages) in Thompson or other Salish communities; (4) as a teaching tool for those teaching linguistics at either the undergraduate or the graduate level; and (5) most importantly, as a lasting testimony to the linguistic genius of the Thompson people who have kept their beautiful language alive through hard and trying times. Annie ZixtkWu York could not have wished for any better monument to her memory.

Finally, a few words about typos. Fortunately, the book is largely free of these pesky errors, but a few have escaped the authors' scrutiny. In what follows, page numbers are given before the slash, line numbers after it (a minus sign indicating "from bottom"): xx/-4: ZixWtkWu —> ZixtkWu; 25/3: hu'meL —> hu'm'eL (latter form on 19/9); 38/-7: Engelmannii —> engelmannii; 56/13: Thompson 1986 —> Thompson 1985; 58/chart: move //-sey// over to the left, under "object" and move all other Sing. 1st markers one column to the left; 63/chart: line up IDF-2p and IDF-1p forms with the other forms; 67/-6: (trans)plant —> (trans)plants. I also have two suggested additions. First, although the book is based on the dialect of Spuzzum (which is minimally different from the other dialects), Spuzzum is not listed in the map on the cover of the book. (The interested reader can ink it in north of Hope, east side of the Fraser River, just above the point where the dotted line crosses the river.) Finally, one sadly has to add "dec." after "Annie York, Spuzzum" on page xxii.

Jan P. van Eijk
Saskatchewan Indian Federated College

What This Awl Means: Feminist Archaeology at a Wahpeton Dakota Village. By Janet D. Spector. St. Paul, Minnesota: Minnesota Historical Society Press, 1993. 161 pages. $32.50 cloth; $15.95 paper.

In an era when, by definition, the archaeological site report is stupefyingly dense and virtually unreadable, this small book comes as an elegant gift. It retrieves the site report from its airless