



PROJECT MUSE®

---

Tuscarora-English/English-Tuscarora Dictionary (review)

Edward J. Vajda

The Canadian Journal of Linguistics / La revue canadienne de  
linguistique, 48(1/2), March-June/mars-juin 2003, pp. 115-117 (Review)

Published by Cambridge University Press

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1353/cjl.2004.0017>



➔ *For additional information about this article*

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/174195>

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. xliv + 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

from whom 16 researchers, including Rudes, elicited Tuscarora data. Accompanying this information is the location and years during which this research was conducted. These range from 1700, when John Lawson recorded the first known Tuscarora vocabulary from unknown informants, to the present day. In this roster, Rudes and Francene Patterson are the only linguists identified as presently engaged in work with native speakers.

The introduction devotes much space to matters of dialectology (pp. xix–xxiii). A chart (p. xxii) describes idiolectal variation among a dozen of the most prominent native informants over the past half century. Also discussed are the main lexical and phonetic differences between the Western dialect, spoken at the Six Nations Reserve in Canada, and the Eastern dialect of New York’s Tuscarora Indian Reservation. Though Rudes states that the historical record reflects variation in pronunciation and vocabulary among speakers since the earliest times (p. xix), the two best documented dialects appear largely to be products of the separation of the tribe into two groups after the exodus northward. Part of the difference developed from the numerous Oneida loan words acquired by Eastern but not Western Tuscarora. This and other issues of language contact are briefly discussed (pp. xvi–xix). There are also a few cursory phonological comparisons with other Northern Iroquoian languages.

The most important preliminary information appears in a section entitled “Guide to using the dictionary” (pp. xxiv–xl). There is essential information about the internal morphological divisions characteristic of each word class, though a more extensive overview of Tuscarora morphology and syntax would have made an extremely useful supplement and could perhaps be eventually published separately. The IPA pronunciation of the symbols used to write the Tuscarora entries is discussed (pp. xxxvi–xxxix), with attention to the differences between Eastern and Western dialectal pronunciation. Western dialect vowels are more complicated, since they alter their place of articulation under the high pitch toneme. It is not clear from the description whether the low pitch toneme likewise changes these vowels. The problem does not exist for the Eastern dialect, where tone does not affect vowel articulation in this way. More information on the typology of the Tuscarora pitch-accent system would have been useful here.

The bulk of the volume is the extensive Tuscarora-English dictionary (pp. 1–539), followed by a much shorter English-Tuscarora section (pp. 541–675). There are also brief English-first indexes of proper names (pp. 677–684) interjections and expressive vocabulary (pp. 685–689), and grammatical morphemes (pp. 691–697), the latter alphabetized according to the English linguistic term assigned to each morpheme. The English-Tuscarora sections are designed to be of the most direct use to non-linguists, while the Tuscarora-English portion contains far greater linguistic detail, as well as information about the morphological status and composition of each item listed. Sources for the data are given only in the Tuscarora-English dictionary entries. A Tuscarora pronunciation key resembling that used in typical English dictionaries appears at the bottom of each page, so that users need not master the symbol guide in order to have immediate access to the pronunciation of Tuscarora words. Rudes is keenly aware of the practical need to satisfy two audiences simultaneously: the non-linguist Tuscarora user, on the one hand, and the linguist, anthropologist or other professional scholar, on the other (p. viii). Dictionaries of First Nations languages in the past have all too often satisfied only one of these audiences. This dictionary succeeds admirably toward both ends.

Rudes makes no claim to have exhaustively presented all of the lexical resources of the Tuscarora language (p. viii). Such a statement would be a modestly accurate portrayal

of any dictionary produced for any language. The scope and volume of Rudes' work is impressive by any standard, all the more so since Tuscarora is critically endangered. If a lexicon even half as rich could be produced for every endangered speech form, the benefits to linguistics and to the world's cultural posterity would be magnificent in the extreme. This monumental work seems destined to become the authoritative source on the Tuscarora lexicon and morpheme inventory, and should definitely be acquired by any scholar or library interested in Iroquoian linguistics or cultural heritage.

## REFERENCES

- Rudes, Blair A. 1987. *Tuscarora roots, stems, and particles: Toward a dictionary of Tuscarora*. (Memoir No. 3.) Winnipeg, Manitoba: Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.
- Rudes, Blair A., and Dorothy Crouse. 1987. *The Tuscarora legacy of J.N.B. Hewitt: Materials for the study of the Tuscarora language and culture*. 2 vols. (Mercury Series Paper No. 108.) Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilization.

**Angela Marcantonio.** *The Uralic Language Family: Facts, Myths, and Statistics*. In the series *Publications of the Philological Society* 35. Oxford: Blackwell. 2002. Pp. xxiv + 335. US\$39.95 (softcover).

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

Though titled *The Uralic Language Family*, this book's main thesis is that no real evidence supports the commonly held view that such a family actually exists. According to M, the various sub-groups of what is traditionally regarded as "Uralic" cannot in fact be demonstrated to form a genetic unit. M discusses what she believes are three fundamental problems with the Uralic Hypothesis. First, Hungarian is not demonstrably related to the two Ob-Ugric language clusters in Western Siberia (Khanty and Mansi), which means there is no "Ugric" node in the Finno-Ugric side of Uralic. Second, the glaring inability of linguists to reconstruct Proto-Uralic convincingly at any level of structure indicates that Samoyedic, Finnic, Saamic, Ob-Ugric, and the Hungarian isolate should be regarded as separate families (it is unclear to me whether M supports the genetic unity of Permian and Volgaic with the rest of Finnic). Third, because each of these groups, in turn, displays well-known, though usually ignored, individual affinities with other Eurasian families — notably Yukagir and certain Turkic, Mongolic, Tungusic languages — some of the Uralic sub-groups may eventually prove to have closer areal or even genetic ties with non-Uralic languages. Amassing evidence from a variety of disciplines and, more importantly, employing the impact of what M sees as the absence of convincing linguistic proof despite more than a century of attempts to describe Uralic in terms of the family tree model, the author calls for a "paradigm shift" (p. 278) to demolish the "myth" of Uralic genetic unity.

My review will argue that in making her arguments, M tends to minimize the best evidence — primarily lexical — that supports Uralic as a valid genetic node, though one whose constituent branches have undergone extensive areal contact mutually as well as with non-Uralic languages. Still, even if one accepts Uralic as a family on the basis of shared basic vocabulary, then M is undoubtedly correct in emphasizing that it is a family quite unlike Indo-European, for which much of the morphosyntax as well as core vocabulary