

REFERENCES

- Carlson, Barry F. 1972. A Grammar of Spokane: A Salish Language of Eastern Washington. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 4.4 (1972).
- 1974. The n shift in Spokane Salish. Paper presented to the IXth International Conference on Salishan Languages.
- 1976. The n shift in Spokane Salish. IJAL 42:133-139.
- Curtis, Edward S. 1911. The North American Indian, vol. 7. (Ed. by Frederick Webb Hodge.) Norwood, Mass.: The Plimpton Press. (Joinson Reprint, 1970.)
- Gibson, James A. 1973. Shuswap Grammatical Structure. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5.5 (1973).
- Kinkade, M. Dale. Forthcoming. Interior Salishan: Historical linguistics and dialect geography. Handbook of American Indians, Volume XI: Plateau. Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institution.
- Kuipers, Aert H. 1974. The Shuswap Language: Grammar, Texts, Dictionary. The Hague: Mouton.
- 1982. Shuswap-English Dictionary (Preliminary Edition). Leiden.
- Labov, William. 1981. Resolving the neogrammarian controversy. Language 57:267-308.
- Mattina, Anthony. 1973. Colville Grammatical Structure. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation in Linguistics, University of Hawaii. Distributed as University of Hawaii Working Papers in Linguistics 5.4 (1973).
- Reichard, Gladys A. 1938. Coeur d'Alene. Handbook of American Indian Languages, ed. by Franz Boas, 3:517-707. Gluckstadt-Hamburg-New York: J. J. Augustin.
- Thompson, Laurence C. and M. Terry Thompson. Forthcoming. The Thompson Language. Victoria, B. C.
- Vogt, Hans. 1940. The Kalispel Language. Oslo: Det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi.

OKANAGAN COMMUNICATION AND LANGUAGE¹

Anthony Mattina and Clara Jack

University of Montana and Okanagan Indian Curriculum Project

We take language for granted. All physically able people, regardless of their educational backgrounds speak a language, without special conscious effort. For purposes of everyday communication words flow out of our mouths with seeming ease. How do communication and language happen?

In this brief essay we discuss, first in general, and then with specific reference to Okanagan, two aspects of language:

- (1) the communicative norms that regulate linguistic use in society;
- (2) the grammatical norms that underlie the linguistic utterances.

Let us begin with an analogy. Think of communication as transportation, and of language as a motor vehicle. Transportation is regulated by norms such as Drive on the right side of the road, Give the right of way to pedestrians, and so on, and involves the moving of people and cargo for all kinds of reasons: work, competition, vacation, racial integration, and so on. Language similarly is used for varied reasons: trade, study, poetry, warnings, and so on. Just as vehicles have engines with complex mechanisms and functions, most of which we needn't understand in order to drive, languages, similarly, have complex grammatical requirements which we needn't be aware of in order to speak. The analogy goes further: some people are great drivers, and others are great poets and orators; some people are great mechanics, and others are great linguists. Finally, we are all entitled to our preferences in engines and body styles, as we are in languages and linguistic expressions.

Let us return to communication. Communicative norms are learned after extended exposure to their usage. We know, for example, if needing a direction to a landmark and encountering an elderly woman, not to say to her: "Tell me, old woman, where is the Coliseum." Addressing the person as "old woman", while

¹To appear in *Okanagan Indian Sourcebook* for lay readership. We wish to acknowledge the helpful comments that Jeff Smith and Jeannette Armstrong have made on earlier drafts of this essay.

literally appropriate, is not socially acceptable. Similarly one would not address a man of the frock as "Mac". And very seldom would one answer "No. This is the ugliest baby I have ever seen," to a mother's prompt "Isn't my baby beautiful?" We come to learn rules of communications within our group, and thereby function and survive in our social environment. When we find ourselves in an unfamiliar cultural milieu, we are uneasy about communication, and often discover the hard way that applying our own communicative norms may not always work. For example, in Sicily it is considered extremely rude to accept food at the first offer. One is expected to be coy, as it were, until asked three or four times. The reasons for such "games" may be quite obscure to a British Columbian, but the "game" is as natural to the Sicilian as it is ridiculous to the Canadian. Notice then, that communication, while we must assume that in most cases aims to convey some truth, often takes a tortuous road thereto. Even though the communicative symbols (the words) have a uniform literal meaning, they can only be interpreted correctly in context. This is true at different levels: within a narrow professional group (rugby players, computer experts, psychologists), or more broadly, in larger regional and national settings. Think of our transportation analogy: a stop sign in Canada means different things depending on who is driving, what time of night it is, how many RCMP cars are sitting by, etc. A stop sign in Tokyo or Rome is the same symbol, but is interpreted by the locals as transmitting quite different messages.

Both with language and with other communicative systems we tend to believe that our own are the best, and other folks' inferior. It is a natural tendency to prefer the familiar and distrust the unfamiliar. The ancient Romans called speakers of languages other than Latin or Greek "barbari"; the word in its modern English form "barbarians", has survived with the shifted meaning of uncouth, uncivilized peoples, and with other well known pejorative connotations. The attitude implied in this semantic shift is one of ethnocentrism, the perfectly natural (and unenlightened) tendency to view and judge the rest of the world by one's own cultural perspective. It is precisely

the attitude that has maintained for a considerably long time that the languages of the American Indians (and also of the aborigines of Australia, New Guinea, Africa, etc.) are impoverished tongues, with a vocabulary of a few hundred words, and a sound system consisting of a few grunts. Sometimes, when we manage to learn something, even a very little, of another language, we express judgments on the relative worth of languages, and depending on our own position in society (as preachers, teachers, politicians, etc.), we are instrumental in diffusing these views. Consider, for example, the widespread notion that French is a language more melodious than English. Or that German is a "guttural" language. While we are entitled to hold such views, as we are entitled to prefer Fords to Toyotas, they are based on little more than whim, they are a sort of linguistic chauvinism. Consider another case. To listen to teachers of Latin and Greek, the only way to attain a thorough education is to know either of these two languages, and preferably both. At the beginning of every school year at the University of Montana, posters all over campus arrogantly proclaim Latin the *sine qua non* of an educated person, thereby branding as uneducated all those who do not know the language. Taking another example closer to home, consider how some of us, thinking it elegant to speak "properly", substitute *I* to *me* even when the language does not require it. Practically everybody now says "They invited Jane and I" where *me* is perfectly grammatical, as anyone willing to compare the acceptable "They invited me" with the ungrammatical "They invited I" can readily see. We grow to believe such mistaken notions, and to cherish them, holding them to be self-evident truths.

The astute reader will have been able to read between the lines that we are building up the background necessary for an open-minded look at the communicative norms of the Okanagans. We want to pave the way for the assessment we are about to give of the sociolinguistic situation of the Okanagans, emphasizing that communication and language, while deeply interrelated, are also two different topics of study. We should also warn our readers that discussions of linguistic matters very often spill into the

political and into the socio-economic, but for the moment we wish to concentrate on the two topics selected.

Roughly two hundred years ago the newly arrived Europeans became permanent guests in these parts of North America. Considering themselves superior to the Indians in every way, they took their lands because they thought they could put them to better use than the Indians; they imposed on them the various brands of the Christian religion, thinking them superior to the Indians' belief systems; and they imposed on the Indians practically all of their cultural norms, including, of course, language. The "civilizing" invaders felt that the best chance for the survival of the Indians was their complete adaptation to the European way. This missionary syndrome extended to the language, and Indian pupils were severely punished for speaking their own languages, and made to speak English. If there hadn't been in the last thirty years a growing awareness that the Indians do have some rights, as individuals as well as nations, the process of total assimilation of the Indians into the North American melting pot could be expected to have been completed in another century or so. Fortunately this process has been slowed down (and we hope will be reversed) by a mounting awareness of minorities and their rights. The word chauvinism, which came into our everyday vocabulary with the women's movement, applies to the majority's feelings of superiority towards all minorities, Indians included.

Like all other cultural groups the world over, the various Indian groups have their own communicative norms. To give a total account of the Okanagan communicative norms is a very complex undertaking, no different in kind from describing the communicative norms of any other group narrowly or broadly defined, and would amount to a psycho-social profile of the Okanagans. Ethnographies are such descriptions of peoples, written by anthropologists, who are professional observers of peoples. It is interesting to notice that the better we know a culture the fewer categorical statements we are willing to make about the culture. Rather, we wish to qualify and explain in detail our

statements. Just imagine how a treatise on the communicative norms of British Columbians would read. Where would you start? What sub-groups of the culture would you include, what circumstances would you describe? Think of the enormous difficulties you would run into if you tried to measure the British Columbians for extroversion, or friendliness, openness, work-ethics, and so on. The most general statements are also the most superficial. For example, it is not difficult to say that traffic in BC flows more smoothly than in Japan, where people strike us as maniacs of the highway. Lines at the ticket windows in BC are more orderly than those in Saudi Arabia. Food is eaten with less noise than in Malaysia. But what do these details tell us about the collective psyche of a people?

The difficulties in trying to do justice to a topic as vast as the one we are now trying to address, are enormous, and the chances are very good that our extrapolations are often gross misunderstandings. The ultimate message we want to convey is that an enlightened attitude is one that recognizes cultural diversity, accepting it without prejudice. More immediately we have to characterize in some way the communicative framework within which the Okanagans operate.

The people who spoke Okanagan once occupied the north-south expanse of the Okanagan valley from what is now Enderby through Kelowna, Penticton, Oliver, Osoyoos, Oroville, Omak, and Okanagan, and westward the Similkameen and Methow valleys; they occupied the north-south expanses of the Sanpoil and Kettle rivers, and the area west of the Columbia river as far as the bend around Wilbur. In the spring the various bands moved around from their wintering places to the camas flats, to the summer camps and salmon runs, and to the fall hunting grounds, year after year. They all spoke Okanagan with small dialectal differences. These were not much more marked than the differences between Canadian and midwestern US English. The Okanagans' neighbors, clockwise from the west, were the Thompson, the Lillooet, the Shuswap, the Kootenay, the Pend Oreille-Kalispel-Flathead-Spokane, the Coeur d'Alene, and the Wenatchee-

Moses-Columbia. All these peoples, except the Kootenays are Salishan peoples who spoke mutually unintelligible but related languages. Of the estimated 3,000 Okanagans living in the present BC area, and an equal number south of the 49th parallel, fewer than 2,000 remained in 1963.² At the time of this writing very few individuals under the age of 40 can speak Okanagan, and do so only rarely. The Okanagans now reside year around in seven Reserves, surrounded by the communities, roads, fences, and power lines of the Whites.

Nearly all of the material culture and social customs of the Okanagans are either no longer active or have undergone profound acculturation (hunting, food gathering, marriage customs, dwellings, dress, etc.), and Okanagans make use of all the Western technological amenities. The traditions that are preserved best are those that depend on language, the ancient legends and stories of the Okanagans, transmitted orally generation after generation. These are Okanagan history and philosophy, doctrine and poetry. Through them instruction is imparted on how to view the world and how to live in it. In brief, they mirror Okanagan culture.

The Okanagans form a close-knit group with its own fully developed and operative communicative norms, but very often, when Indians and non-Indians come face to face, especially in groups of more than two or three, it is soon obvious that communication is not as smooth as with a homogeneous group. The Okanagans and the Whites follow different communicative strategies, each rooted in its own cultural background. Communication is all the more difficult for the Okanagans whose lives have undergone profound transformations.

The problem of miscommunication is not restricted to Okanagan Indians, but applies to other Indians; US Blacks have also had to cope with similar problems. Scholars such as the Scollons, studying several types of miscommunication that occurs between Athapascan Indians and Anglos, have

²For further details and break-down by tribe and band, cf. Duff, Wilson 1964. *The Indian History of British Columbia. Volume 1, The Impact of the White Man.* Anthropology in British Columbia, Memoir No. 5, British Columbia Provincial Museum, Victoria.

explained them as functions of different underlying cultural identities.³

Starting with the observation that "it is the way ideas are put together into an argument, the way some ideas are selected out for special emphasis, or the way emotional information about the ideas is presented that causes miscommunication," they study four areas of discourse (or communication), concluding in each case, that different expectations have contributed to the miscommunication, fostering the creation of stereotyped characterizations. They found that where the Athapascans perceived the Anglos as speaking in braggadocio, the Anglos perceived the Athapascans as speaking too timidly; where the Anglos perceived the Athapascans as speaking too little, the Athapascans perceived the Anglos as speaking and interrupting too much, and controlling the topic of conversation. The Scollons also noted mismatches in certain prosodic features (intonations) in the speech of the Anglos and the Athapascans, as well as mismatches in the organization of subject matter (Anglos organize ideas in threes, Athapascans in fours). All of these factors contribute to the establishment of stereotypes, all based on misunderstandings. The Athapascans are likely to think of Whites as pushy as arrogant, while they will strike the Anglos as listless, apathetic and withdrawn.

It must be realized that there are several possible sets and subsets of setting and circumstances where communication will take place: an all-Okanagan group, a mixed Indian group, an Okanagan-Anglo group, etc.; the place of encounter is also likely to be important, whether the private home of an Okanagan or a White, a meeting forum, and so on. And similarly the ages of the participants will influence the tenor and direction of the communication. To study inter-ethnic miscommunication then means to reconstruct, or extrapolate, each ethnic group's communicative norms and strategies. Conflicts (miscommunication) arise when these are at odds with each other.

³Ron Scollon and Suzanne B. K. Scollon have written a considerable amount on this and related topics. In this essay we quote from the October 1980 draft of their article "Athapascan-English Interethnic Communication." Centre for Cross-Cultural Studies, University of Alaska, Fairbanks.

We have not conducted any systematic study of the patterns that recur when miscommunication takes place--therefore we have to limit our remarks to describe some of the strategies of Okanagan communication as partials of a more complex network.

Within the Okanagan framework the first time two persons meet, they do so with caution, studying each other. Judgment is delayed until there is solid evidence that a person is trustworthy. This strategy also requires that if one party prematurely commits himself (by asking the wrong question, or by proposing some interaction, etc.), the other is obligated to reject the proffer outright. These norms are understood by the Okanagans, but not necessarily by the Anglos. Consider the case of a linguist searching for speakers of Okanagan. If he asks a stranger "Do you speak Okanagan?", he might be answered "No," and later discover that that person does speak the language. If, after considerable interaction, the person admits his fluency, the reversal causes the Indian no embarrassment; if the other party understands the strategy, he will not be offended, since the denial is neither to be construed as a lie nor an insult, but proper Okanagan behavior. The requestor had failed to pave the way for cooperation, and the Okanagan had short-circuited the communication. Or consider the case of an Indian crossing the US-Canada border. All the officer's questions will seem to the Indian inappropriate invasions of privacy, while the Indian's laconic answers will be interpreted as obstructionistic and possibly concealing illegal activity. This sort of communicative behavior suggests that it is guided by a principle of patient timing. Without trying to make too much of that, we offer the observation that Okanagans have a keen sense of when it is the "right" time or one's "turn" to do something. Just as one observes carefully the right time to propose some interaction, one awaits patiently the right time to speak or otherwise intervene. The notion of a moderator who assigns turns is not consonant with Okanagan communicative behavior. When one holds the floor the audience refrains from interrupting (walking away, however, is not frowned upon). This strategy of turn-taking has

an interesting variant when it involves ridicule, which at times can be vicious. A ridiculed (usually younger) person who is being "picked on" is expected not to offer resistance or retort. His turn will come sooner or later to be on the giving end, more than likely to a younger person.

The principle of patient timing may also be operating in another situation, when a speaker seems to hover around a topic, in a sort of holding pattern waiting not so much for the right moment to finish making his point, as for the interlocutor to grasp the point on his own, before it is finished making. Anglos in such situations are often impatient, feeling that the Okanagan is being deliberately vague. The Okanagan, interrupted and quizzed, will question the sincerity of the Anglo's interest in the topic.

The Okanagans' reticence to initiate communication with Anglos, or to respond quickly to Anglos' communicative overtures, has roots in the basic mistrust that Indians harbor toward Whites. Anyone who is even superficially familiar with the treatment that the Indians have had to suffer at the hand of the invading Whites can readily appreciate this.⁴ Under certain circumstances the Indians give vent to their feelings of frustration. Very often at the completion of some ceremonial functions (from which Whites are usually excluded), the Indians, especially the young adults, engage in a ritual that aims to reaffirm Indian identity and condemn White supremacy. They begin to sing songs that, celebrating some historical event, such as Custer's defeat, cast the Whites in a negative light, through the powerful vehicle of derision. These song, called "forty-niners", are sung in English, but in Indian cadence to the rhythm of the drums. The songs are sung in English because, unlike the tongues of their ancestors, English is common to all of them. Similarly in informal setting, such as a visit with a majority of Indians and one or two

⁴At the same time people who lack the historical perspective fail to appreciate the magnitude of the cultural upheaval that the Indians have been subjected to. People who wish that the disoriented Indian would "get in step" with white societal norms have never stopped to think how they might react to a take-over from an alien culture that, outnumbering them 2,000 to 1, brings in undreamed-of changes.

white guests, the Indians will often steer the discussion toward the topic of their oppression at the hand of the Whites. The careful study of these and other patterns might lead to a better understanding of Anglo-Indian miscommunication.

Successful communication requires familiarity with the communicative norms required by the circumstances. As the Scollons have observed, "although languages use grammar as the system of expressing ideas, in interethnic communication it is the discourse system which produces the greatest difficulty... The grammatical system gives the message while the discourse system tells how to interpret the message. The greatest cause of interethnic problems lies in the area of understanding not what someone says but why he is saying it." At the risk of overusing analogies, let us think for a moment that communication is like chess: you have to know the pieces and how to move them; you have to have a strategy that tells you when to attack, defend, develop pieces, converge on an area of the board, etc.; and you have to have tactics that dictate what the best immediate manoeuvre is. As linguists we are more interested in the pieces and how they move. This is very simple in chess, but extremely complex in language. The sounds of the language combine to form morphemes, which in turn combine into words and sentences. Linguistics studies these components of language and tries to account for their functions and interrelations. Returning once again to the analogy with a vehicle, to study grammar is to take apart the engine of the language, understanding the structure and function of every nut, bolt and part, and their interrelationships. We cannot go into the subject of Okanagan grammar in any detail, but we hope that through the following discussion you will glean something of how linguistic analysis proceeds, and become stimulated to do further study on Okanagan linguistics.

Languages are spoken in groups of sentences by speakers who take turns. For analysts who do not speak the language to understand what is being said, they have to know how the stream of speech is divided into words, and what

these words mean in their contexts. The road that leads to that understanding is long and difficult. It is the road that children travel when they learn the language of their people, and it is the road that linguists have to travel when, intrigued by a language unknown to them, they set out to study it. While children learn subconsciously by listening, linguists consciously compare structures to determine how they function. Analysis without writing is hardly imaginable, not only in European tradition, but everywhere linguistic analysis has been done. Even though we learn languages by identifying words in sentences, linguists make their tasks manageable by first identifying the sounds of a language. We might think that this is a relatively simple task that consists of identifying an objective reality by means of careful observation—but it is not simple. It may be obvious and correct to say that the English word dog consists of three sounds, but it is not obvious how many sounds make up a word like bay. Two is as good an answer as three. It may also seem obvious that cat is a one-syllable word, but what about oil? One syllable or two?

To explain how analysts approach a language is to warn readers that to give an account of the Okanagan language is a very arduous task complicated by the fact that once we commit a language to writing we have to contend with the reactions people will have to a writing system. Whereas the principle of alphabetic writing is simple (one symbol for one sound), once a written tradition is established we tend to view the written symbol as primary. This causes all kinds of problems, from the attitude that dictionaries tell us how to pronounce words⁵ to the attitude that letters have an inherent sound associated with them. It is not so. Languages are spoken, and language analysts reduce them to writing for the purpose of preserving records of these for its speakers the set of sounds it will make use of. These phonological systems vary significantly from language to language,⁶ and while English, for

⁵ Instead of reporting how we pronounce.

⁶ Lest our readers think that there is one English and one Okanagan, let us clarify that both languages have

example, has one f-like sound, Okanagan has none, and Russian two. Similarly, Okanagan has a p-like sound (of words like pína? cedar bark basket) that neither English nor Russian has. And so it goes. Languages differ in their structure phonologically, morphologically, syntactically, and lexically.

The ethnocentric filter through which we inescapably process all forms of behavior we observe, distorts also our perception of "foreign" languages. When we hear a Frenchman pronounce a word, we match each French sound with the closest equivalent in our own English dialect; when we borrow the word, we adapt it to the English scheme of sounds, i. e. the phonemic system of English. Thus, for example, when saying the word 'garage', most of us dispense with trying to imitate a French [ʁ], and substitute for it our own [r]; similarly we reduce the pronunciation of the first [a] to a central vowel sound [ə], geráž.

What words we have borrowed from Okanagan into English, have been similarly processed. For example we pronounce Kelowna as [kelóne], diverging from the Okanagan [ki?láwna] (meaning 'she-grizzly') in all of its vowels. Similarly Penticton is the Okanagan word [píntktɔp], meaning 'all year around', but adapted to the English pronunciation—the stress has shifted, and the vowels have been changed, along with the syllabication of the word. [kərmíws], a word which means 'cut across', has been anglicized as Keremeos and pronounced as we do now. The glottalization of the k (the popping sound that accompanies its release) is eliminated altogether, along with other phonetic features of the word.

several dialects. English has many dialects, some, for example, have, among other distinguishing characteristics, identical pronunciations for the words whale and wall (unlike some other dialects where whale is pronounced with initial aspiration), and identical pronunciations for the words dawn and don (unlike other English dialects where dawn is pronounced with a rounded "open o", and don is pronounced with an unrounded low [a]). Similarly Penticton Okanagan has two pharyngeal sounds, one plain, as in the words sənkáʔmən 'church' cyáʔ 'they gathered', ʔáʔtmən 'yellow bell', and one glottalized, as in ʔan 'magpie', while the closely related Inchelium Colville Okanagan has four pharyngeal sounds, the two that also occur in Penticton Okanagan, and two other rounded sounds. In fact, for example, the pharyngeal of sənkáʔmən 'church' is rounded. Conversely, in Penticton Okanagan there is a sound [ɣ] that does not occur in Colville. Thus cyip, the Penticton pronunciation of the word 'tree', is matched by the Colville cyip.

As we have already suggested, linguists attempt to study languages in terms not of another "model" language (such as Greek, Latin, or English), but in terms of general features. Subsequently they classify languages by genetic affiliation (how languages are related), and by types (what sorts of sounds, morphological and syntactic mechanisms they make use of). Okanagan belongs to the Salishan family of languages, a family represented by more than 20 languages and many more dialects, ranging from as far north and west as Bella Coola, and as far south and west as Tillamook, Oregon, to as far north and east as Pend Oreille and as far south and east as Coeur d'Alene. Okanagan has a phonological system typical of other Salishan languages, with a large inventory of sounds, richer in consonants than English (or French, or German), but with fewer vowels. To discuss it in detail would mean to devote twenty or thirty technical pages to it—we'll have to limit ourselves to giving the charts of sound inventories of English and Okanagan. Those who want to study the matter further can consult a phonetics textbook along with a grammar of Okanagan.⁷

Notice first that we cannot restrict ourselves to the letters we use in spelling English, because, as we are all aware, English spelling is not a good symbolization of the sounds of the language. For example, spellings like "read" and "bow" conceal the fact that they each represent more than one pronunciation. Similarly, the spellings of many, many other English words are ambiguous and/or inconsistent—they do not tell us how to pronounce the word they are supposed to represent. But the phonetic symbols that we will use in the charts are intended each to stand for a single phoneme, unambiguously—and this is, after all, the purpose of writing language.

⁷At present no pedagogic grammars of Okanagan exist in print. We hope that soon such a grammar will appear. However, several technical studies are available: Donald Watkins in 1970 prepared a grammar of Head of the Lakes Okanagan as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Alberta; Anthony Mattina in 1973 prepared a grammar of Colville (southern Okanagan) as a doctoral dissertation at the University of Hawaii; and Randy Bouchard has prepared long Okanagan word lists as part of the activities of his British Columbia Indian Languages Project. Articles on grammatical topics have been printed in scholarly journals.

THE CONSONANT PHONEMES OF ENGLISH

p	t	č	k	
b	d	ǰ	g	
f	θ	s	ʃ	h
v	ð	z	ʒ	
m	n	l	r	y
				ŋ w

Chart I

THE CONSONANT PHONEMES OF OKANAGAN

p̣	ṭ	č̣	ḳ	ḳʷ	q̣	q̣ʷ	ʔ
p	t	c	k	kʷ	q	qʷ	
		s	ʃ	x	xʷ	ʃ	ʃʷ
ṃ	ṇ	ṛ	ḷ	ɹ̣	ẉ	ɹ̣	
m	n	r	y	l	v	w	ɹ

Chart II

THE VOWEL PHONEMES OF ENGLISH AND OKANAGAN

EnglishOkanagan

i		u		i		u
I		U				
e	ə	o			ə	
ɛ						
æ	a				a	

Chart III⁸⁸For a brief elaboration, explanation, and exemplification of these charts, consult the appendix to this essay.

In addition to these brief comments on the phonology of Okanagan, we should now try to give our readers an idea of the remaining parts of Okanagan grammar. The make-up of words, and its study, is called morphology. Given the English word [kæts] 'cats' as speakers of the language we recognize it to consist of two morphemes:⁹ [kæt] 'cat' and [-s] 'plural'. Morphemes often have more than one phonetic shape, as when, for example, the English plural morpheme is added to a word like [bæg] 'bug'. The plural of [bæg] is not [*bægs],¹⁰ but it is rather [bægz]. An analogous example in Okanagan involves the loss of [n], showing that in Okanagan the choice of either the morpheme (in-) or (i-), both meaning 'my', depends on the sound with which the word to be modified begins. If the word begins with any sound except [s] or [ʃ], then (in-) will be used, otherwise (i-) will be used.

qicq	'older brother'	inqicq	'my older brother'
kilx	'hand'	inkilx	'my hand'
pícaʔ	'digging stick'	inpícaʔ	'my digging stick'

Contrast these forms with:

spuʔús	'heart'	ispuʔús	'my heart' (not *inspuʔús)
stáɬəm	'boat'	istáɬəm	'my boat' (not *instáɬəm)
ɪqáqcaʔ	'older brother'	iiqáqcaʔ	'my older brother'
			(not *iniqáqcaʔ)

In morphology we distinguish between inflectional and derivational categories. To inflect a word is to modify it by changing its most basic references: person (e. g. 'I go' but 'he goes'), number (e. g. singular vs. plural), tense (e. g. present vs. future), aspect (e. g. continuing vs. completed action), and so on. We have given some examples of inflection. To

⁹A morpheme is the smallest linguistic unit with meaning. This and related notions are discussed further in the appendix.¹⁰An asterisk as used here indicates an incorrect form.

derive a word is to change it so as to make a noun from an adjective (good → goodness), a verb from another verb (do → undo), and so on. Derivational morphological rules are harder to learn than inflectional rules because, far from being applicable throughout the language, they are selective. Consider, for example, how in English there is a morpheme (in-) (with variants im- or i-, depending on the following sound) easily identifiable as changing adjectives to their opposite:

possible	impossible
congruous	incongruous
reverent	irreverent
imitable	inimitable
direct	indirect
excusable	inexcusable
elegant	inelegant

However, (in-) (meaning 'not ...'), may not be prefixed to any adjective. Thus (1) you cannot say "inencumbered, "ineducated, "ingood, etc.; and (2) sometimes the meaning of the derived word is not what you would expect, as in the case of different - indifferent. The morphological derivation of a language is captured in its dictionary which specifically aims to report, not only the words of the language, but the derivational range of the lexical morphemes of the language. To be thoroughly familiar with the derivational morphology of a language amounts to being fluent in that language. Okanagan derivational morphology is extremely rich. Here we can only offer you a glimpse of this richness. Consider the affix -ikst, basically meaning 'hand', and by extension 'branch'. It occurs in forms such as txw'ikst 'many branches', sca'ikst 'fingers' (literally 'fringe of the hand'), txw'cpikst 'broken arm or branch'. In the construction ktər'qikst 'winter dance', it loses its meaning. The word tər'qám means 'to dance', and it is based on a root with the meaning of 'kick' (cf. tər'qəntín 'I kick it'), yet in the form ktər'qikst whatever connection, if any, there might have been with 'hand', is obscured.

Finally we must say a word about sentence structure. Beginning with the observation that in English a sentence is almost sure to be comprised of a subject (usually a noun phrase), followed by a verb, in turn followed by an object (a noun phrase if a direct object, otherwise a prepositional phrase), we will generalize that in Okanagan a sentence is almost sure to begin with a verb phrase, followed by an object. The subject is usually incorporated in the verb, and is pronominal. Needless to say, both in English and Okanagan we find several other sentence types (for example, if an English sentence begins with a verb it's sure to be an imperative sentence); nevertheless we believe these generalizations to hold.

Languages follow the political fortunes of their speakers. Conquered peoples usually lose their language and adopt that of their victors. But this needn't be so. We sincerely hope that the Okanagans will have the opportunity to retain their language, their most precious of all their cultural artifacts. We can think of no better way for a people to retain its cultural identity than through its language, proudly.

The symbols in the first two rows in charts I and II represent the stops.¹ Both languages have two series. English has a voiceless and a voiced series ([p]g] 'pig' vs. [b]g] 'big' [t]em] 'tame' vs. [d]em] 'dame'; [č]ip] 'cheap' vs. [j]ip] 'jeep'; [k]et] 'cut' vs. [g]et] 'gut'); and Okanagan has a plain (voiceless) series and a glottalized series, but not a voiced series. Glottalized stops are sort of "popping" sounds made with a sudden release of glottal pressure. The differences between the pairs are as follows:²

[p̥]	: [p]	pínaʔ	basket	vs.	pícaʔ	digging stick
[t̥]	: [t]	tínaʔ	ear	vs.	tinx	sineu
[č̥]	: [c]	čait	cold	vs.	cakʷ	should
[k̥]	: [k]	kípəm	pinch	vs.	kilx	hand
[k̥ʷ]	: [kʷ]	kʷúləm	work	vs.	kʷúien	borrow
[q̥]	: [q]	qilt	sick	vs.	qilt	top
[q̥ʷ]	: [qʷ]	qʷʔay	black	vs.	qʷay	blue

The two other stops of the Okanagan language are [ʔ] (glottal stop)³ of words like ʔaʔúsaʔ 'egg', and the lateral affricate⁴ [k̥] of words like k̥əx̥k̥ap 'parent'.

The third and fourth rows in the chart of English consonants, and the third row in the chart of Okanagan consonants, represent the fricatives.⁵ English has contrasting voiced and voiceless fricatives; Okanagan has only

¹Stops are sounds made by an occlusion in the vocal tract, followed by sudden release.

²Voiced sounds are produced with vibrating vocal cords. Place your fingertips on your Adam's apple and pronounce s (make a long hissing sound). Then pronounce z. You will feel the vibrations when pronouncing z, but not s.

³We give examples of these sounds in words-initial position, where they are easiest to hear.

⁴The glottal stop in English occurs in the rapid pronunciation of 'hunting' or 'putting' where it replaces (t)l.

⁵This is a sort of tl sound, with the tongue positioned to pronounce t, with lateral release of air, plus glottalization.

⁶Fricatives are sounds produced by friction at various points in the mouth.

voiceless fricatives. While Okanagan has twice as many stops as English, it has fewer fricatives than English. English has labial and interdental fricatives that Okanagan lacks altogether ([fayn] 'fine' vs. [vayn] 'vine'; [θay] 'thigh' vs. [ðay] 'thy') as well as the voiced alveolar and both the palatal fricatives [z, ʃ, ʒ] ([zɔn] 'zone', [ʒur] 'sure', [ʒʒər] 'azure') that Okanagan also lacks. Both English and Okanagan have /s/ and /h/ in words like English [sɛŋ] 'sung' and [hɛŋ] 'hung', and Okanagan [syups] 'tail' and [hiwt] 'rat'. But Okanagan also has five fricatives that English does not have, [ɬ x xʷ]. These sounds occur in words like iúʔmen 'spoon', xʔit 'first', xʷʔit 'many', xast 'good', xʷilsta 'he throws it away'.⁷

The fifth row in the English chart and the fourth and fifth rows in the Okanagan chart represent the resonants. Okanagan has two series, one of which is glottalized; English has no glottalized resonants at all, has three nasals [m n ŋ]⁸ while Okanagan has no [ŋ]; both languages have [l y r] with [r] being pronounced differently in the two languages, with Okanagan [r] being a tapped sound.⁹ English has no pharyngeals,¹⁰ but Okanagan has two, one plain as in ʔaláp 'he lost', and one glottalized as in cyaʔ 'they gathered'. Finally, Okanagan has [ɣ] in words like ɣmin 'crow bar', and ɣap 'he got speared'.

The vowels of the two languages are exemplified as follows:

⁷ɬ is like an l, but voiceless, with air flowing along the sides. x is like French x, but voiceless; xʷ is the same sound, but pronounced with lips rounded. x and xʷ are their homologs, more forward in the mouth.

⁸ŋ is the final sound of words like 'sing' and 'long'. Notice that there is no [g] sound in 'singer', but there is a [g] in 'longer'.

⁹Similar to Italian r.

¹⁰Pharyngeals are pronounced with in the pharynx, which is above the larynx. ɣ is the voiced counterpart of x, discussed earlier.

¹¹The dot under a resonant signifies a syllable peak. Cf. English 'button' [bət̚n] where the n constitutes a whole syllable.

The English vowels:

[i]	[lik]	'leak'
[I]	[lIk]	'lick'
[e]	[lek]	'lake'
[ɛ]	[lɛg]	'leg'
[æ]	[læk]	'lack'
[ə]	[lək]	'luck'
[u]	[luk]	'Luke'
[U]	[lUk]	'look'
[a]	[lak]	'lock'

The Okanagan vowels:

[i]	[kilx]	'hand'
[u]	[kʷúʔən]	'borrow'
[a]	[kʷalt]	'warm'

[ə] occurs only unstressed in Okanagan, usually to break up clusters of consonants, for example qʷiləm 'song', kípɣɣlx 'they were squirming around', kʷə-kʷyuma? 'small'. In addition, each of these vowel sounds changes according to the surrounding consonants. In Okanagan, when a [q] or [ɣ] precedes [i], the vowel is pronounced lower than otherwise. Thus, for example, the vowel in [qilt] 'top' is lower than the vowel of [kilx] 'hand', approaching the quality of [e]. Similarly [u] approaches the height of [o] in analogous environments, as in [qʷúct] 'fat'. Other kinds of rules in both languages govern the occurrence of combinations of sounds, and how neighboring sounds affect one another. For example, there is no native English word that begins with the sound [ŋ]. Similarly there is no native Okanagan word that begins with [r]. [ʒ] is a rare sound in English, and [h] is a rare sound in Okanagan. When English [t] precedes [y] as in the utterance "not you", the [t] becomes [č], and so on. Other phonetic modification are predicated by and are the consequence of morphosyntax, and the operations that trigger these modifications, called morphophonemics, are amongst the most interesting mechanisms of languages. When the application of a morphological rule has phonological consequences, we speak of morphophonemics. We have seen in our discussion of English plurals that the morpheme (s-) has variants: the plural of [roz] 'rose' is neither [*roz] nor [*rozz], but it is [rózɛz]. Yet speakers of English know that the

(-s) of [kɛts], the (-z) of [bɛgz] and the (-ɛz) of [rózɛz] are all members of the same English morpheme that signifies 'plural'. To give another example which will have analogs in Okanagan, consider the fact that often the vowels of English words change according to where the stress falls in the word, which, in turn, is a function of morphological rules:

fótegráf	'photograph'
fetágrefl	'photography'
fetágrefer	'photographer'

The first, second, and third vowels of these words change along with the shifts in stress. In Okanagan the rule of the language is that if stress shifts away from a vowel, then this vowel is either lost or reduced to [ə]. For example, the word for Indian is sqílɣ. In combination with the word skʷíst 'name' it becomes sqelɣskʷíst, meaning 'Indian name' (the [i] of sqílɣ has been reduced to [ə]). In our text we have given the example of the loss of [n] in Okanagan where the choice of either the morpheme (in-) or (i-), both meaning 'my', depends on the sound with which the word to be modified begins. Similarly, the Okanagan morpheme that means 'his, her, its' is either (-s) or (-c). The first is used normally, and the second is used when a word ends in [s] or [ɛ]:

ɛqáqca?	'older brother'	ɛqáqca?s	'his older brother'
kilx	'hand'	kilxs	'his hand'

Contrast these forms with:

spuʷús	'heart'	spuʷúsc	'his heart'
spaʷáɛ	'sore'	spaʷáɛc	'his sore'

We have stated in our text that inflection is the grammatical core of the language. Inflectional morphemes are usually few, but have a high functional load, that is, they are productive in the language. The Inflectional morphemes of English are few ((-s, -z, -ɛz) for the plural of nouns; (-s, -z, -ɛz) for the singular of verbs: [waks] 'walks', [ridz] 'reads', [wáʃɛz] 'washes'; (-t, -d,

290

-ad) for the past of verbs: [təpt] 'tapped', [faynd] 'fined', [pədəd] 'padded'), and a few others. Okanagan has a considerably larger number of such grammatical markers, and these are suffixes (morphemes attached at the end of words), prefixes (morphemes attached at the beginning of words), infixes (morphemes attached inside words), or particles (morphemes that accompany words as separate entities, but usually do not have a stress of their own). We will discuss a few Okanagan inflectional categories to give some idea of how the language treats these.

Person. The persons marked in Okanagan are the same as those marked in English:

'I'	first person singular
'you'	second person singular
'he, she, it'	third person singular
'we'	first person plural
'you'	second person plural
'they'	third person plural

In English second person singular is undistinguishable from second person plural, and in Okanagan it is the third person which is often unmarked for singular or plural. Whereas English distinguishes between subject and object forms in a few words ('I' vs. 'me', 'she' vs. 'her', etc.), Okanagan does so pervasively, and besides distinguishes between various kinds of pronominal forms that fall into two major classes, intransitive and transitive. In Okanagan, therefore, the choice of person morphemes is correlated with the choice of voice morphemes. Let us begin with a simple example.

x^wuy means 'go'. This is an intransitive form. To inflect it for person requires a set of particles, as follows:

ken	as in	ken x ^w uy	'I go'
k ^w	as in	k ^w x ^w uy	'you sg. go'
Ø	as in	x ^w uy	'he, she, it goes'

291

k ^w u	as in	k ^w u x ^w uy	'we go'
p	as in	p x ^w uy	'you pl. go'
Ø	as in	x ^w uy-(l)x	'they go'

x^wuy may be transitivized, that is, it can be made to take objects beside subjects, and in such cases it means 'to take'. To transitivize x^wuy we add -st:

x ^w uy	'go'	x ^w uy-st-	'take ...'
-------------------	------	-----------------------	------------

The hyphen after the t, and the dots after 'take' signify that this form is still incomplete. To make it a full word we must add personal object and subject pronouns. The full set of the pronouns is as follows:

-(i)n	'I subject with implied third person object'		
-(i)x ^w	'you sg. subject	"	"
-(i)s	'he, she, it subject	"	"
-(i)m	'we subject	"	"
-(i)p	'you pl. subject	"	"
-(i)s-elx	'they subject	"	"

The entire paradigm is as follows:

c-x ^w uy-st-en	'I took it (there)'
c-x ^w uy-st-x ^w	'you sg. took it (there)'
c-x ^w uy-st-s	'he, she, it took it (there)'
c-x ^w uy-st-em	'we took it (there)'
c-x ^w uy-st-p	'you pl. took it (there)'
c-x ^w uy-st-s-elx	'they took it (there)'

What about the other subject-object combinations? There are many, of course, for example 'I took you', 'you took us', etc. We cannot give examples for all possible combinations, but will give a chart that contains all possible combinations, and a few examples:

-st paradigm

292

Subj ^{1,2}	1sp	2sp	3s	3p Obj
1s		-st-(ú)m-ən	-st-(í)n	-st-(í)n-əlx
2s	k ^w u -st-(í)x ^w	-st-(í)x ^w	-st-(í)x ^w -əlx	
3s	k ^w u -st-(í)s	-st-(ú)m-s	-st-(í)s	-st-(í)s-əlx
1p		-st-(ú)m-t	-st-(í)m	-st-(í)m-əlx
2p	k ^w u -st-(í)p		-st-(í)p	-st-(í)s-əlx
3p	k ^w u -st-(í)s-əlx	-st-(ú)m-s-əlx	-st-(í)s-əlx	-st-(í)s-əlx
Indef			-st-(í)m	-st-(í)m-əlx

Note that the chart includes all suffixes, except k^wu, a preposed^{1,2} particle. Also remember that the parenthesized elements occur when stressed, but are deleted when stress is taken away from them. Examples are:

k^wu c-x^wúy-st-x^w 'you took me (there)
 c-x^wúy-st-m-ən 'I took you (there)
 c-x^wúy-st-x^w 'you took him/her/it (there)'

So far we have seen that an intransitive word (like x^wuy) can be transitivized with -st. But there are at least three other ways to make a word transitive, and the proper choice depends on the complex rules of the language. Without going into all the details, let us point out that another way to transitivize a form is to add -nt to it. Thus, for example, čx^wam is 'promise', an intransitive form (where -m has a definite function, but one which we needn't discuss here). To transitivize this form, and to add personal object and subject referents, we must first add -nt to the root without its full vowel as follows:

^{1,2}The abbreviations are: Subj = Subject; s = singular; p = plural; Obj = Object; sp = singular and plural.

^{1,2}The particle is placed before the inflected form, as in the example given.

čx ^w -ənt-ín	'I promise it'
čx ^w -ənt-íx ^w	'you promise it'
čx ^w -ənt-ís	'he, she, it promises it'
čx ^w -ənt-ím	'we promise it'
čx ^w -ənt-íp	'you pl. promise it'
čx ^w -ənt-ís-əlx	'they promise it'

293

Notice that the personal subject pronoun endings are the same as those used with -st (we have already pointed out how shifts of stress condition the presence or absence of vowels). What happens when we want to add further (object) pronoun reference? The set of object pronouns used with -nt is different from the set used with -st, as follows:

-nt paradigm

Subj	1sp	2s	3s	2p	3p Obj
1s		-nt-s-(í)n	-(nt-í)n	-í(úl)m-ən	-(nt-í)n-əlx
2s	k ^w u -nt-(í)x ^w		-nt-(í)x ^w		-nt-(í)x ^w -əlx
3s	k ^w u -(nt-í)s	-nt-s-(ís)	-(nt-í)s	-í(úl)əm-s	-(nt-í)s-əlx
1p		-nt-s-(í)t	-nt-(í)m	-í(úl)əm-t	-nt-(í)m-əlx
2p	k ^w u -nt-(í)p		-nt-(í)p		-nt-(íp)-əlx
3p	k ^w u -(nt-í)s-əlx	-nt-s-(í)s-əlx	-(nt-í)s-əlx	-í(úl)əm-s-əlx	-(nt-í)s-əlx
Indef			-nt-(í)m		-nt-(í)m-əlx

Let us exemplify a few of these pronouns in actually occurring forms:

k^wu čx^w-ənt-ís 'he promised me'
 čx^w-ənt-s-ín 'I promise you'
 čx^w-ənt-s-íp 'you (pl) promise him/her'

There are two other major transitivity affixes in Okanagan, *-it* and *-x(i)t*. These are added to word-stems just like *-nt* and *-st*, and with regard to their suffixal requirements, *-it* patterns with *-nt* (requires the same affixes as *-nt*), while *-x(i)t* patterns with *-st*. Both affixes add yet another person referent to the form (and this is why they have been called ditransitive), *-x(i)t* adding the notion 'on behalf of', and *-it* adding the notion 'so-and-so's'. Without giving charts (which can be inferred), and without going into details, we exemplify the forms so as to give an idea of their force:

k'u čx'-əit-ís i? kəwáp-s 'he promised me his horse'

k'u may-xít-s i? cáwt-s 'he told me his story (for my benefit)'

k'u may-it-ís i? cáwt-s 'he told me his story'

MARKING SURFACES IN COEUR D'ALENE
AND UNIVERSALS IN ANATOMICAL NOMENCLATURE

Gary B. Palmer

University of Nevada, Las Vegas

and

Lawrence Nicodemus

Coeur d'Alene Tribe of Idaho