



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar (review)

Edward J. Vajda

The Canadian Journal of Linguistics / La revue canadienne de  
linguistique, 48(1/2), March-June/mars-juin 2003, pp. 113-115 (Review)

Published by Cambridge University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/cjl.2004.0016>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/174194>

This opens the door for an informed typological study of the phenomenon that could shed yet more light on what types of language structures especially favour the development and maintenance of reduplicative morphophonological processes.

## REFERENCES

- Alderete, John, Jill Beckman, Laura Benua, Amalia Gnanadesikan, John McCarthy, and Suzanne Urbanczyk. 1999. Reduplication with fixed segmentism. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:327–364.
- Cowper, Elizabeth, and Keren Rice. 1985. Phonology and reduplication. Ms., University of Toronto.
- Hayes, Bruce, and May Abad. 1989. Reduplication and syllabification in Ilokano. *Lingua* 77:331–347.
- Inkelas, Sharon, and Cheryl Zoll. 2000. Reduplication as morphological doubling. Ms., University of California, Berkeley and Massachusetts Institute of Technology. [ROA 412.]
- Kenstowicz, Michael, and Degif Petros Banksira. 1999. Reduplicative identity in Chaha. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30:573–585.
- Kiparsky, Paul. 1986. The phonology of reduplication. Ms., Stanford University.
- Marantz, Alec. 1982. Re reduplication. *Linguistic Inquiry* 13:435–482.
- McCarthy, John, and Alan Prince. 1995. Faithfulness and reduplicative identity. In *University of Massachusetts Occasional Papers in Linguistics 18: Papers in Optimality Theory*, ed. Jill N. Beckman and Laura Walsh Dickey, 249–384. GLSA, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Raimy, Eric. 1999. Representing reduplication. Doctoral dissertation, University of Delaware.
- Urbanczyk, Suzanne. 1999. Patterns of reduplication in Lushootseed. Doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts, Amherst.
- Wilbur, Ronnie. 1973. The phonology of reduplication. Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois. [Distributed by the Indiana University Linguistics Club, Bloomington, Indiana].

**J. Randolph Valentine.** *Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 2001. Pp. xxx + 1100. US\$125.00 (hardcover), \$40.00 (softcover)

Reviewed by Edward J. Vajda, *Western Washington University*

Nishnaabemwin (henceforward N) is the native term for several closely related forms of Anishinaabemowin, a complex of dialects most commonly referred to in linguistic and popular literature by such Europeanized names as Ojibwe, Ojibwa, Ojibway, or Chippewa. N itself is spoken in a broad area of Ontario north of Lake Huron. A map on p. 2 shows the location of 41 communities where some variety of N is still spoken. Anishinaabemowin creates a vast dialect chain stretching from Québec westward to Saskatchewan and south into Minnesota and Wisconsin. Together with its northern neighbour Cree, it is the most widely spoken Algonquian language. A map on p. 15 illustrates that Saulteaux, Algonquin, Nipissing Algonquin, and Odawa (Ottawa), often regarded as separate languages, actually

belong to this dialect complex, as well. An authoritative, up-to-date survey of these interlocking dialects can be found in Valentine (1994), though the present volume recapitulates all of the basic information (pp. 14–19), along with a discussion of the differences separating the Anishinaabemowin complex from other languages in the Algonquian family (pp. 12–14).

The author of this comprehensive reference grammar has been working with native informants of N for over a decade and has donated all future royalties from his book to the Walpole Island First Nation to support language maintenance and preservation projects (p. xxxiv). Although professional linguists will undoubtedly be elated with this work's detail and precision, the book is actually designed with teachers of N as its primary target audience (p. 1). Several features were specifically included to facilitate the book's use by native educators who may lack a firm prior grounding in theoretical linguistics. Each individual section includes basic information, so that as the chapters progress, the book serves as a sort of general linguistics course as well as a detailed reference grammar to a specific language. There are discussions of the notion of dialect, language, and speech community (pp. 5–12), phones and phonemes (pp. 29–32), the vocal tract and articulatory phonetics (pp. 32–33). These transition smoothly into discussions of N-specific language facts. Finally a superb glossary (pp. 1006–1063) provides clear explanatory definitions of all linguistic terminology used throughout the book, from Algonquian-specific categories such as "obviation" and the various names of Anishinaabemowin dialects to more general terms such as "agent", "allophone" "schwa", and "velar". The most obvious native-oriented feature is the careful use of native names such as Nishnaabemwim itself (which speakers use to refer to their own language), Nishnaabeg (how the speakers refer to themselves as a people, Nishnaabe being the singular), and Anishinaabemowin (the native language name for the entire Ojibwe dialect complex to which N belongs).

The one feature that will perhaps disappoint some linguist users is the lack of word-internal morpheme divisions in most of the examples. The author explains this as deriving from a request by N speakers themselves, who felt that such details distract from the natural flow of the presentation (p. xxxiii). However, as a sort of compromise, word-level glosses are provided following the literal English translation of example sentences. Thanks to the largely agglutinative character of N morphology, these glosses rather easily lend themselves for the purpose of word-internal segmentation of the actual N forms, once the user has become familiar with the language's structural patterns.

The fact that the grammatical description covers only a limited portion of the Anishinaabemowin dialect chain allows for maximum linguistic depth. Virtually every aspect of the language is discussed and illustrated with copious examples to an extent and level of detail rarely equaled by other authors of First Nations' reference grammars. The eighteen chapters take the user from basic information on dialects, speech communities, and Algonquian languages in chapter 1 on through increasingly more complex areas of language structure, culminating with chapter 18, which covers syntax and discourse. Because all N words, phrases, and sentences are written using a phonemic alphabet, it is important for users to note the charts explaining the allophonic pronunciation of vowels (p. 34) and consonants (pp. 41–42). From the vantage of language typology or just sheer curiosity, several individual subsections might attract special interest. These include the discussions of topic and focus (pp. 951–956), expressions of feelings and attitudes (pp. 1002–1004), and finally, a brief treatment of baby talk and verbs of compassion (pp. 1004–1005). The proximate/obviative distinction, for which Algonquian as a whole is often cited, is placed

in the chapter on pronouns (pp. 623–643). The complex topic of verb-internal morphology and the function of semantic roles in subject/object cross-referencing receives an entire chapter (chapter 13, pp. 647–703). There are literally hundreds of paradigm tables, all very clearly presented, despite the lack of morpheme-internal divisions in the N word forms themselves.

This thorough, yet highly readable book will serve native teachers and non-native learners and linguists alike and achieves a new standard in the field of Algonquian language descriptions. Highly recommended for any library interested in keeping abreast of the latest publishing achievements in First Nations languages.

### REFERENCE

Valentine, J. Randolph. 1994. Ojibwe dialect relationships. Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas, Austin.

**Blair A. Rudes.** *Tuscarora–English/English–Tuscarora Dictionary*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. 1999. Pp. xlv + 700. US\$80.00 (hardcover).

Reviewed by Edward J. Vajda, *Western Washington University*

Tuscarora is a Northern Iroquoian language originally spoken in portions of interior eastern North Carolina. It shares a close linguistic affinity with the better-known Seneca, Onondaga, Oneida, Cayuga, and Mohawk — the five original members of the Iroquois League, which the Tuscarora joined in 1722 upon relocating northward. By the early nineteenth century most members of the tribe were living on the Tuscarora Indian Nation Reservation near Lewiston, New York, or at the Six Nations Reserve in Canada. The same is still true today, though only one or two completely fluent speakers of the language remain (p. xii). The appearance of a major dictionary such as this is therefore of the utmost importance both for the Tuscarora people in reclaiming their traditional heritage, and also for the science of linguistics in its efforts to document the world's disappearing languages in as much detail as possible.

The compiler, Blair A. Rudes, has worked with native Tuscarora informants for almost thirty years. He also helped bring to publication the largest existing collection of Tuscarora texts (Rudes and Crouse 1987), and is the author of an earlier root, stem and morpheme list assembled on the basis of his first decade of field work (Rudes 1987). The present dictionary includes everything from this first project, as well as extensive new field data Rudes collected in the subsequent fifteen years. It also contains a vast quantity of lexical material recorded over the years by other researchers. Represented are recordings made by contemporary fellow linguists as well as a rich trove of archived materials assembled during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. At the core of this earlier material are entire vocabularies taken down during the late 1870's to 1883 by Erminnie A. Smith or by native speaker J.N.B. Hewitt over the next half century. Smith and Hewitt were the first persistent scholars of the language, though they published little of their own results. Words originally recorded by Smith or Hewitt were re-elicited and rechecked, so that the dictionary is unified in its presentation of dialectal and other speaker peculiarities. A list of published sources appears on pp. xli–xliii. A table on pp. xiii–xiv gives the names of native informants