THE THOMPSON LANGUAGE. By Laurence C. Thompson and M. Terry Thompson. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 8. Missoula: University of Montana, 1992. Pp. xxvii + 253. (Paper.)

The Thompsons' grammar of Thompson River Salish or Nłeʔkepmxcín (south central British Columbia) is the finest and most complete description of a Salishan language to date. It is remarkable for the great amount of data it presents, and even more remarkable for how easily a user can interpret that data. Their descriptive prose throughout is refreshingly clear and succinct—taut as a bowstring, crisp as a rifle shot.

The Thompson Language might be characterized fairly as a "field guide" to Nłeʔkepmxcín. It began as a tool for fieldwork and was refined continually over more than a dozen summers in the field. That evolution explains in part its meticulous

organization: the Thompsons wanted to be able to find information in it quickly. Related topics were cross-referenced, ever more faithfully and completely over the years, until the present grammar has within it an exceptional concordance of information.

Adding to that internal concordance are several other welcome means with which to access the data: a precise table of contents, including a list of figures and tables (pp. x–xv); lists of abbreviations, symbols, and conventions used to format and organize the data (pp. xxi–xxvii); and a detailed subject index (pp. 235–53). Those "maps" and "compasses" orient the user throughout the grammar's five parts: phonology, morphology, syntax, appendixes, and illustrative text.

Part 1, the phonology (pp. 3–46), presents a rich phoneme inventory and complicated phonological system. (Salishan phonological systems are ordinarily extraordinary, and *Nłeʔkepmxcín* does not disappoint on that score.) The elaborate consonant inventory (forty-three total) shows a primary split between obstruents (voiceless) and resonants (voiced). The obstruents are plain, glottalized ejective, and spirants; the resonants are plain and laryngealized. The phonetic characteristics of those phonemes are carefully described.

Two items deserve comment. First, the phonemic status of /l l'/ vis-à-vis /ḷ ḷ'/ is untidy. (ḷ represents IPA ɫ.) The Thompsons relate that the contrast between retracted /ḷ ḷ/ and clear /l l'/ is neutralized (p. 43). Earlier, only /l l'/ are given as lateral resonant phonemes (p. 3), described as "relatively uncommon" and "usually dark, pronounced with tongue-root drawn back" (p. 6). Plain [l] and retracted [ɫ] do exist in numerous *Nłeʔkepmxcín* words, however, and that phonetic contrast eludes allophonic conditioning. Historically, Proto-Salish *l, *l' > *Nłeʔkepmxcín* y, y'; modern /l l'/ are borrowings, and modern /ḷ ḷ'/ reflect Proto-Salish *r, *r' (Kinkade and Thompson 1974), or possibly *l, *l' instead (Kuipers 1981:324). Some /l l'/ may reflect earlier *l, *l' (from PS *r, *r'), with retraction lost secondarily (i.e., *r > ḷ > l); some /ḷ ḷ'/ also may be borrowed. The overall picture is complicated; however, it may well be that /l l'/ AND /ḷ ḷ'/ are phonemic.

Second, the laryngeals /h ʔ/ are classified as obstruents, with /ʔ/ a plain stop (and /h/ a voiceless spirant). There are languages where that classification is proper (e.g., Hawaiian, where earlier *k > ʔ). Within the *Nłeʔkepmxcín* phonological system, /ʔ/ might better be classified a resonant. Laryngealized resonants (semivowels) syllabify as their homorganic vowel plus [ʔ]: /y'/ > [iʔ], /w'/ > [uʔ], /ʕ'/ > [ɑʔ], ʕʷ' > [ɔʔ]. It is unclear how a voiced resonant /R'/ would syllabify as a vowel plus voiceless obstruent [ʔ]. Furthermore, if laryngealization can be considered the superimposition of a laryngeal setting or feature (i.e., /ʔ/), then it is interesting that ONLY resonants become secondarily laryngealized in certain specialized formations (dimunitives, affectives); obstruents do not. There appears, then, to be some connection between resonants, laryngealization, and laryngeal /ʔ/.

If /ʔ/ is a resonant, then placement of rare /h/ within that system is problematic. /ʔ/ and /h/ pattern together in significant ways, including laryngeal movement (pp. 30–31). Resonants are all voiced; /ʔ/ and /h/ are not. Applying the feature voice for laryngeals is itself a problem, however, so that feature is not dispositive. It may be that the laryngeals /h ʔ/ are resonants (or in a class of their own), and within the system /h/ is to /ʔ/ as /ʕ/ is to /ʕ'/ (cf. Kuipers 1974:21 and van Eijk 1985:4).

A description of a considerably less elaborate *Nłeʔkepmxcín* vowel system follows the consonants. The grammar proposes eight phonemic vowels, a primary set /i u e ə/ and a secondary set of retracted counterparts /i̥ o a ə̥/. It is tempting to reduce the vowel inventory to just the primary set /i u e ə/—and some have been so tempted (e.g., Bessell 1992:184). The Thompsons explain why such simplification was resisted, documenting variation and contrasts between plain and retracted counterparts. For example, *ʔescáq* '[something heavy or bulky] it is set, positioned' vs. *ʔescéq* '[animal] is tamed, domesticated, trained' (p. 18).

Of special importance is the coverage of stress assignment—a radical feature of *Nłeʔkepmxcín* word formation. *Nłeʔkepmxcín* has strong (stress-retentive) and weak (stress-shifting) roots, and strong, weak, and ambivalent (variable stress) suffixes. Stress within a word is assigned hierarchically: strong suffixes over strong roots, strong roots over weak roots, and variable morphemes over weak ones. After stress is assigned to the vowel of the prime morpheme, other vowels usually are deleted or reduced to schwa (in its chameleonic forms), with resultant consonantal changes (loss or syllabification). For example, *kłékstmnxʷ* 'you let go of it' is derived from //√kəł=ékst-min-t-exʷ//: √separate=hand-relational-transitive-2s.subj. (p. 53). Part 1 finishes with intricate coverage of the interplay of stress and phonological conditioning in word formation.

Part 2, "Morphology" (pp. 47–137), begins with an outline of the grammatical organization of the *Nłeʔkepmxcín* word, derived from a root and affixes. It then covers the salient grammatical categories, e.g., transitivity, inflection, mood, aspect, and control. Several items stand out in the morphological description.

First, the category of control is of paramount importance. Thompson words, transitive and intransitive, show a pervasive bifurcation reflecting the degree of control an actor has over the action expressed in the word. That general notion of control is a basic logico-semantic distinction in the language. Control is not a simple binary division but comprises a multivalent hierarchy of dominance. Morphemes (roots and affixes) may be marked for features of control [±ctl] and dominance [±dom]. The interplay of those features in the combination of roots, lexical suffixes, and affixes allows for numerous interesting permutations of control marking in *Nłeʔkepmxcín* words. (Thompson 1985 provides the most complete discussion on control in *Nłeʔkepmxcín*.)

Second, *Nłeʔkepmxcín* shows a rich array of reduplicative affixes (prefixes, infixes, and suffixes), which can be root- or stress-oriented. The principal types are augmentative CVC·, characteristic ·C(V)C (likely a species of the augmentative), out-of-control ·VC, diminutive (infix) [·VC], and affective Ce·.

Third, lexical suffixes represent a specialized affix type unique to Salish (and its Northwest Coast neighbors, Wakashan and Chemakuan). Lexical suffixes have specific lexical meaning, and they differ from correlate independent words with the same lexical meaning; e.g., /kéyx/ 'hand', =ekst 'hand.' Lexical suffixes are an important derivational device, and they show a wide range of analogical extension. *Nłeʔkepmxcín* easily has over 100 lexical suffixes; numerous examples surface throughout the grammar (e.g., pp. 49, 112–14, 126–27, 190–91). Coverage is somewhat limited relative to that in other grammars on Interior Salishan languages. A special section on lexical suffixes in the Thompsons' *Nłeʔkepmxcín* dictionary (Thompson and Thompson 1996) will remedy that modest shortcoming.

Finally, the transitive system perhaps contains two small wrinkles. The causative is analyzed as //-s-t//, a composite of causative //-s// plus basic transitive //-t//. There is some descriptive advantage to that analysis, i.e., to show a contrast with the simple directive transitive //-n-t//. Nonetheless, the causative is perhaps best analyzed as //-st//, which probably represents synchronic productivity more accurately and reflects Proto-Salish *-stəw more clearly.

Conversely, the pretransitive relational suffix is perhaps underanalyzed as //-min//. The relational might better be analyzed as //-mi-n//, relational //-mi// plus directive //-n//. That analysis would remove an artificial (and perhaps sui generis) morphophonemic rule of $n > \emptyset /\_\_ x$, presently needed when relational //-min// occurs before indirective //-xi//. The revision would allow, for example, /ceʔxʷ-mí-x-t-xʷ/ 'you congratulate him' (p. 74) to derive from //√ceʔxʷ-mí-xi-t-exʷ// (√happy-relational-indirective-transitive-2s.subj.), not //ceʔxʷ-mín-xi-t-exʷ//.

The analysis of the relational as //-mi// might allow a postroot -m affix to be analyzed as an allomorph of the relational (after vowel loss), instead of an allomorph of the middle //-əme//; e.g., /xək=m-úymʼxʷ-m/ 'make a sign to identify an area' (p. 105) derived from //√xək-mi=úymʼxʷ-əme// (√mark-relational=land-middle), not //√xək-əme=úymʼxʷ-əme// (showing TWO instances of the middle). (The force of the relational would be to make the root transitivizable.) Certain forms presently analyzed as causative middles also might be analyzed as relational causatives, e.g., /yəx-m-s-t-éne/ 'I know it' (p. 105) derived from //√yəx-mi-s-t-éne// (√clear-headed-relational-causative-transitive-1s.subj.), not //√yəx-əme-s-t-éne// (√clear-headed-middle-causative-transitive-1s.subj.).

Part 3, "Syntax" (pp. 138–86), outlines the basic syntactic organization of Nłeʔkepmxcín. Sentences usually show an initial predicate—the only obligatory element of minimum clauses—followed by optional lexical arguments: complements, adjuncts, or both (although more than one lexical argument per clause is uncommon). Particles clarify the details of the relationship between those elements. The Thompsons distinguish two different predicate modifiers: complements and adjuncts, each type introduced by different particles (e.g., e, tə for complements; ł, k for adjuncts). Both specify or amplify the reference implied in third-person predicates. The Thompsons maintain that complements and adjuncts serve quite different purposes in Nłeʔkepmxcín. That distinction is perhaps problematic. For instance, the particles introducing complements and those introducing adjuncts cooccur, which seemingly confuses the distinction between the two types of predicate modifiers. That apparent "leak" in the grammar deserves further inquiry.

Part 4, "Appendix" (pp. 187–98), contains sections on the Nłeʔkepmxcín numeral and kinship systems and orthography. The numeral system includes classificatory derivatives that vary depending on the item counted (e.g., type, shape). The kinship system is very complicated, organized differently for relatives by blood versus marriage. The orthography table allows one to work between two spelling systems used in Nłeʔkepmxcín, a so-called practical alphabet (which it is not) and the Americanist modification of the IPA used by the Thompsons (and most Salishanists).

Part 5, "Illustrative Text" (pp. 199–227), presents a traditional narrative from the Thompsons' key language consultant and raconteur, Annie York (Zíxtkʷu). The text is entitled "The Man Who Went to the Moon," Annie York's modified version of a well-known Nłeʔképmx going-to-the-sky-world legend, Nx̌ʼíkʼsmtm. The illustrative

text is presented in a four-line format: *Nłeʔkepmxcín*, morpheme-by-morpheme gloss, cross-reference to section in grammar, and English translation. Line 1 of the text provides:

(1)	/wʔéx	ekʷu	néʔ	/x̌ʔiʔ-s/qáyxʷ
	/reside	RPRT	EST.CTX	/fundamental-NOM/male[person]
		31.1	28.1	25.12

'(It is said) there was a person there'.

The Thompsons intended the text to "illustrate[] many aspects of the grammatical description found in the preceding sections" of the grammar (p. 199). It accomplishes that task masterfully. As importantly, it relates a delightful story that captures a piece of Annie York's irrepressible charm and wit.

Finally, the grammar also contains a very useful and extensive bibliography (pp. 229–33) covering all work done on *Nłeʔkepmxcín* and also referring to key works on related Salishan languages.

The Thompson Language undoubtedly will be a classic work in linguistic scholarship on Interior Salishan, taking its place on the bookshelf alongside Reichard (1938), Vogt (1940), Carlson (1972), Mattina (1973), Kuipers (1974), and van Eijk (1985). One seeking a sound treatment of an Interior Salishan language could consult any of those fine works. *The Thompson Language*, however, deserves to be read first.

STEVEN M. EGESDAL, *University of Hawaii*

REFERENCES

BESSELL, NICOLA J. 1992. Towards a phonetic and phonological typology of post-velar articulation. Ph.D. dissertation, University of British Columbia.

CARLSON, BARRY F. 1972. A grammar of Spokan: a Salish language of eastern Washington. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii. [Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 4, no. 4 (1972).]

KINKADE, M. DALE, AND LAURENCE C. THOMPSON. 1974. Proto-Salish *r. IJAL 40:22–28.

KUIPERS, AERT H. 1974. The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary. Janua Linguarum, Series Practica, no. 225. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.

————. 1981. On reconstructing the Proto-Salish sound system. IJAL 47:323–35.

MATTINA, ANTHONY. 1973. Colville grammatical structure. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii. [Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5, no. 4 (1973).]

REICHARD, GLADYS A. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. Handbook of American Indian Languages, ed. Franz Boas, vol. 3, pp. 517–707. New York: Augustin.

THOMPSON, LAURENCE C. 1985. Control in Salish grammar. Relational Typology, Trends in Linguistics: Studies and Monographs, no. 28, ed. Frans Plank, pp. 391–428. Berlin: Mouton.

THOMPSON, LAURENCE C., AND TERRY THOMPSON. 1996. Thompson River Salish Dictionary. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 10. Missoula.

THOMPSON, LAURENCE C.; M. TERRY THOMPSON; AND STEVEN M. EGESDAL. In press. Thompson. Handbook of North American Indians, ed. William Sturtevant, vol. 17, Languages, ed. Ives Goddard. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

VAN EIJK, JAN P. 1985. The Lillooet language: phonology, morphology, syntax. Ph.D. dissertation, Universiteit van Amsterdam.

VOGT, HANS. 1940. The Kalispel Language. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.