REVIEWS

THOMPSON RIVER SALISH DICTIONARY. Compiled by Laurence C. Thompson and M. Terry Thompson. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 12. Missoula: University of Montana. Pp. xxvii + 1412. $45.00.

This large *Dictionary* is a major accomplishment, one of a series of ongoing achievements in Salishan linguistics, a number of which have appeared in the superb University of Montana series, of which this is number 12. I commend the editors of the series, Anthony Mattina and Timothy Montler, for their energy and exemplary standards, which guarantee the high quality of all of the volumes in the series.

I also commend the compilers of the present *Dictionary*, Laurence and Terry Thompson, for whom the Thompson language is obviously a favorite, the object of their expert and loving attention for over thirty years. Thanks in great measure to the dedication of this extraordinary couple, most of the Salishan languages have received an unusual amount of study during this period, with an incredible concentration of talent and linguistic expertise, first while the Thompsons were at Seattle, subsequently after their move to Hawaii. The graduate students trained during this time are among the most capable, productive, and energetic of any now working in American linguistics. Even without the impressive scholarship of the Thompsons themselves, the creation of this pool of insightful workers would guarantee them a large place in the history of American linguistics during the final decades of the twentieth century.

The Thompson language (*nleʔkepmxcin*), with some minor dialect variation, belongs to the subdivision of Salish known as Interior Salish, which is spoken in the plateau area of southern British Columbia, eastern Washington, western Montana, and the Idaho Panhandle. (The other four branches of Salish include coastal languages spoken in British Columbia, Washington, and northwest Oregon.) Depending on how the count is made, Interior Salish consists of either five (Kinkade 1990) or seven (e.g., Elmendorf 1965) languages. The following tabulation makes both reckonings clear:

1. Lillooet
2. Thompson Group
   a. Thompson
   b. Shuswap
3. Okanagan Group
   a. Okanagan-Colville-Sanpoil-Lake
   b. Spokane-Kalispel-Pend d'Oreille
4. Columbian
5. Coeur d'Alene

The seven-language tabulation separates both of the Thompson and Okanagan Groups into two language-level groups each.

Good (and in most cases modern) descriptions, including dictionaries, exist for almost all of these languages: only Lillooet and Coeur d'Alene do not yet have an adequate dictionary.[1] Comparative studies of Interior Salish are hence on an excellent footing, and we can expect that the near future will see even richer offerings on these complex Plateau languages.

The body of the *Dictionary*, the Thompson–English dictionary and the English–Thompson index, is found on the Arabic-numbered pages, part I, Thompson–English (pp. 1–482), and part II, English–Thompson (pp. 565–1412). There are also three appendixes and a bibliography, which all follow part I (pp. 483–561).

The Roman-numbered pages consist of a preface, in which collaborators and sponsoring organizations are acknowledged. Following this is a 14-page introduction, in which are described the history of the *Thompson Dictionary*, the orthography used, including the principles of spelling followed in the work, and an explanation of the organization of the *Dictionary* entries. This treatment is of course crucial for the correct use of the *Dictionary* and is worth a brief consideration here, since the theoretical principles involved are important both for Salish lexicography and for lexicology in general.

The transcription chosen for items entered into a dictionary may give information of many kinds, with a range of phonetic and morphological implications. For this reason, few dictionaries utilize a simple phonetic transcription, using instead a variety of transcriptions to serve different lexicographic needs.

The Thompson orthography, while utilizing the same symbol set, is in reality several related orthographies, each tailored to the representation of specific phenomena. The symbols themselves are the ordinary letters of the Roman alphabet, together with some diacritics and symbols borrowed from the International Phonetic Alphabet. Alphabet order follows the Latin alphabet, with non-Latin letters following the most closely related Latin letter. /ʔ/ (glottal stop) is arbitrarily placed at the beginning of the alphabet, the pharyngeals at the end. (The full alphabet is printed across the bottom of every set of facing pages in the Thompson–English dictionary—a very helpful feature.)

For most languages, the principal obstacles to a unitary orthography are morphophonemic alternations and dialect or individual variation in pronunciation of particular items. The former is usually handled by the use of underlying forms, the latter by listing of variants. This procedure is followed in the *Thompson Dictionary*. All roots are given in an underlying form, while even forms which purport to be phonetic are actually also underlying in the sense that written vowels may be dropped in actual pronunciation—a pervasive Salish phenomenon. (The rule is simple: only stressed vowels MUST be pronounced; predictability therefore depends on indication

---

[1] Available dictionaries are Thompson: Thompson and Thompson (1996); Shuswap: Kuipers (1975; 1983); Okanagan (Colville): Mattina (1987); Spokane: Carlson and Flett (1989); Columbian: Kinkade (1980). For a fuller bibliography of descriptive studies, see Mattina (1989), to which should be added Thompson and Thompson (1992), Thompson, Thompson, and Egesdal (1996), Egesdal (1992), and Hess (1995).

of the position of stress, which is done in the *Dictionary*.) Truly unpredictable variation, as in doublet forms or in the facultative deletion of particular sounds, is handled by variant spellings for doublets and parentheses around sounds subject to erratic deletion.

The structure of individual entries is also complex, but a set of principles has been followed which makes each part of the entry clear and unambiguous.

The entry is initiated with a HEADWORD in boldface type. In most cases this is a stem, but it may also be a full word or a particle. (Full words or particles are entered whole because they are theoretically not subject to further analysis.) STEMS are identified by a preceding slash (slanted bar) and a following hyphen, the latter to show that further derivation or inflection is possible. Stems with variant forms have all forms listed between wavy lines. When a stem or portion of a stem is subject to reduplication, this is indicated by a raised dot ("bullet") following the portion of the stem subject to reduplication.

Headwords which are FULL WORDS are also preceded by a slash, but without a following hyphen. Position of stress, which is inherent in stems and words, is marked. Where homonyms are involved, these are listed serially, with superscript numbers. Particles are normally a subtype of full words, but they are entered as headwords without a preceding slash or a following hyphen; position of stress is indicated, as elsewhere.

Following the headword is given the presumed root from which the headword element is derived. The root is preceded by the root sign, and the whole is included in square brackets. Cross-references to related items which share the same root are sometimes given in the entries, but more usually the user has to discover these alone. For this purpose, an index of roots, with all of the derivations included in the *Dictionary*, is given in Appendix A (pp. 483–530). While cross-references are always of interest, particularly to scholars, the inclusion of such in individual entries could have been cumbersome, and the separate listing is a good compromise.

Following the root listing, and wherever appropriate throughout entries, is given grammatical information of various kinds; this can include references to the Thompson's previously published Thompson grammar, *The Thompson Language* (1992). These are printed in small capital letters. Following this comes an English definition or gloss in ordinary print; where these pertain to a particular semantic domain, as basketry, mythology, or acculturation, this is indicated BEFORE the translation/gloss. Other special information about entries, e.g., "analysis uncertain," "unusual middle form," "recorded only in plural," etc., is indicated in italics within parentheses FOLLOWING the definition/gloss.

Additional information, beyond this minimum, with examples, appears in subentries. Found here are such things as paradigmatic forms, idiomatic expressions, word compounds, and examples containing lexical suffixes. Subentries are divided into separate paragraphs set off by a heavy preceding diamond wherever appropriate, e.g., in the case of polysemy. In all examples, known morpheme boundaries are marked by several different symbols, which differ according to the type of morpheme involved.

In order to make the preceding intelligible to the reader of this review, here is a sample entry from the Thompson–English section of the *Dictionary*:

/x̣ʷix̣̌'- [√x̣ʷix̣̌' *cluster/fringe* ?] CF √x̣ʷúx̣̌' ▶INS
  /x̣ʷix̣̌'-tn- : NOM s/x̣ʷíx̣̌'-tn fringe (on shawl, coat,
  pants, gloves)
      ♦ /x̣ʷix̣̌' = c(n)- : ST ʔes/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = cn fringed, have a
      fringe : TR /x̣ʷíx̣̌' = c-e-s make a fringe for s.t. : /x̣ʷíx̣̌'-
      = c-e-t-e he ʔ/kepú make a fringe for your coat!
  ▶/x̣ʷix̣̌'-=ec'- : NOM s/x̣ʷix̣̌'-=éc' mountain goat
  Oreamnos americanus (Blainville) CF /qʷyéyɬ :
  s/x̣ʷix̣̌'-=ec'-=éɬc'iʔ mountain goat meat : s/x̣ʷix̣̌'-
  -=ec'=qín ACL blond, white hair, hair the color of
  mountain goat ▶/x̣ʷix̣̌'-=cp- : ST ʔes-n/x̣ʷix̣̌'-=ép [of
  salal, blue elderberries] have a cluster [of fruit]
  hanging down : INSTR n/x̣ʷix̣̌'-=ép-tn stem holding
  dependent cluster : /kəɬ-t-ét-e he n/x̣ʷix̣̌'=ép-tn-s take
  the stem off! [elderberries, grapes, dates, figs,
  anything in cluster] ▶n/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = qn common reed grass
  (for identification and uses, see n/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = xn)
  ▶n/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = xn *id. Phragmites australis (P. communis),*
  reed canary grass *Phalaris arundinacea,* and other
  tall marsh grasses commonly used in basket
  imbrication, sometimes called 'Chilliwack grass' (*also
  known as* n/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = qn) AND ALT /x̣̌'əx̣ʷqéʔ : NOM
  s/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = xn : s/x̣ʷíx̣̌' = xn tək s/yíq-m [alt name] *id.*

As can be seen, thorough familiarity with the introduction is required, and such familiarity guarantees ease in using the *Dictionary.*

One other organizational feature deserves comment. Where languages employ a large number of inflectional and derivational affixes, the dictionary maker must decide if these are to be given parity with lexical morphemes or treated separately. (There are usually good structural and semantic reasons for separating the two.) In a dictionary which favors surface forms, separating affixes out may make items, particularly those beginning with prefixes, difficult to find. English lexicographers long ago decided not to meddle with affixes, and this works fine for English and related languages, where words are relatively invariant in shape, having high psychological reality, and where a lexicographer has a reasonable chance of listing all of the words in the language.

The matter is otherwise in a polysynthetic language, however, where word shape is almost infinitely variable. In cases such as this, it makes much more sense to treat affixes separately and to concentrate attention in the main portion of the dictionary on lexical morphemes. This is the procedure which is followed in the *Thompson Dictionary.* Salish languages employ prefixes, suffixes, and infixes, which may be unitary or reduplicated, with both grammatical and lexical meanings—a lexicographer's nightmare! The principal strategy which the Thompsons use is appendixes in which the various types are described and illustrated. Appendix B (pp. 531–43) treats lexical suffixes—a characteristic Salish structural feature shared by only a few other languages such as Eskimo and Algonquian. Appendix C (pp. 545–55) treats

grammatical affixes. It goes without saying that a successful use of the *Dictionary* must be very familiar with these appendixes also.

Part II, the English–Thompson index, appears to have been computer generated from the Thompson–English dictionary. It is considerably longer than the Thompson–English dictionary, however, presumably because many Thompson forms appear in more than one place. The entries in the index include most, but not all, of the information given in part I.

Because of possible differences between entries in the two sections, Thompson equivalents to English expressions should also be checked in the Thompson–English dictionary. For example, the fact that *cicely* (*Osmorhiza occidentalis* [Nuttall] Torrey) had medicinal uses is indicated only in the Thompson–English section. Spot comparison between the two sections showed only minor differences of the above kind.

Still, perusal of the English–Thompson index is intrinsically interesting, for the semantic rubrics draw together material which is otherwise scattered throughout the Thompson–English section. An example of this is the entry *bread*, which offers nearly a page of names of different kinds of bread in the Thompson language. This multiplicity of names would not be evident to a user of the Thompson–English dictionary alone, since most are built on different roots.

As a nonspecialist in Salish languages, I found the dictionary of most interest for theoretical considerations, although I enjoyed looking through it also simply because reading a good dictionary can be fascinating. One thing that impressed me is the thorough and accurate coverage given to the plant world of the Thompson people—not surprising, since the Thompsons collaborated on an ethnobotany for these people (Turner et al. 1990).

The *Thompson Dictionary* seems well suited to the several communities for which it is destined: native speakers of Thompson, Salishanists, and linguists and lexicographers in general. Salishanists might prefer even more analysis than is given, but what is there is clearly labeled and presented. Native speakers can skip over the technical information, such as roots and grammatical labels and comments, and look only at the examples, which are readable even though they contain some technical symbols within the transcription. Native speakers and general linguists will make greatest use of the English–Thompson index, which permits semantic accessing, but once the desired forms are located there, the Thompson–English entry, with full information, is easy to locate from information given in the English–Thompson index. Lexicographers are most likely to be interested in the format, which derives ultimately from Robert Hsu's Lexware, a program which is admirably suited to dictionary construction and which will probably be more and more widely used as time goes on.

A reviewer is supposed to find, and point out, shortcomings in a reviewed work. This was one of the most difficult aspects of this assignment. I noted one apparent omission, probably of one or more lines, between the last line on page x and the first line at the top of page xi. Probably the most important blemish in the book is the omission of a definition for the solid arrowhead which appears frequently in entries in the Thompson–English dictionary; its function is to set different grammatical forms off from each other.

The only major additional feature I would have liked to have is a grammar of the language, or at least an outline, somewhat along the lines of Thompson, Thompson,

and Egesdal (1996). There are references to the grammar of 1992, but this and the 1996 sketch will often not be available to users of the dictionary, possibly leaving some residual questions. In my opinion it should be *de rigueur* to include a grammatical sketch in any dictionary. I admit that inclusion of a grammar in this dictionary would make a hefty tome even heftier, which could in itself become a negative feature.

Given the amount of pleasure I derived from examining this *Dictionary*, I can only imagine the delight of Salishanists in doing the same. I envy them. If only we could be experts in everything, what a joy life would then be—if we could stand the intensity!

ALLAN R. TAYLOR, *University of Colorado*

REFERENCES

CARLSON, BARRY F., AND PAULINE FLETT. 1989. Spokane Dictionary. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 6. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

EGESDAL, STEVEN M. 1992. Stylized Characters: Speech in Thompson Salish Narrative. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 9. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

ELMENDORF, WILLIAM. 1965. Linguistic and geographic relations in the Northern Plateau Area. Southwestern Journal of Anthropology 21:63–78.

HESS, THOM. 1995. Lushootseed Reader with Introductory Grammar. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 11. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

KINKADE, M. DALE. 1980. Dictionary of the Moses-Columbia Language. Nesplemen, Wash.: Colville Confederated Tribes.

_____. 1990. History of research in linguistics. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 7, Northwest Coast, pp. 98–106. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.

KUIPERS, AERT H. 1975. A Classified English–Shuswap Word List. Lisse: Peter de Ridder.

_____. 1983. Shuswap–English Dictionary. Leuven: Peeters.

MATTINA, ANTHONY. 1987. Colville-Okanagan Dictionary. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 5. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

_____. 1989. Interior Salish post-Vogt: a report and bibliography. IJAL 55:85–94.

THOMPSON, LAURENCE C., AND M. TERRY THOMPSON. 1992. The Thompson Language. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 9. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

_____. 1996. Thompson River Salish Dictionary. University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, no. 12. Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, University of Montana.

THOMPSON, LAURENCE C.; M. TERRY THOMPSON; AND STEVEN M. EGESDAL. 1996. Sketch of Thompson, a Salishan language. Handbook of North American Indians, vol. 17, Languages, pp. 609–43. Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution.