

Colville-Okanagan dictionary. Compiled by ANTHONY MATTINA. (University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics, 5.) Missoula: Linguistics Laboratory, Department of Anthropology, University of Montana, 1987. Pp. viii, 354. \$18.00.

Colville-Okanagan is a dialect continuum in the Southern Interior division of the Salishan family. While Boas and others had worked on the language at various times, most of our

knowledge of the language derives from M's own work, carried out fairly steadily over the last twenty years. M has worked with a large number of speakers of the language and has collected a considerable body of texts, many of which were utilized in the compilation of this dictionary.

The 350 pages of small type that comprise this work, which M characterizes as 'a first, preliminary edition', are a rich source of lexical and grammatical information. It is hard to overestimate the value for Salishan studies of M's meticulous contribution. Proper dictionaries of these languages scarcely exist, and lexical information typically must be gleaned from word lists appended to grammars, or, worse, from grammatical descriptions or textual material. Even where the word lists are extensive and provide examples of words in context—the word list to Kuipers' excellent *The Squamish Language* (Mouton, 1967) comes to mind—there is no English-to-Salish list to complement the Salish-to-English one, making comparative work difficult. There is, in fact, only one published Salish dictionary in the same league as M's—Hess's fine *Dictionary of Puget Salish* (University of Washington Press, 1976). A comparison between the two works is revealing and indicates some possible changes that M might incorporate into the promised future editions of this already impressive work.

M's entries are more extensively illustrated; in fact, the number of illustrative sentences can be overwhelming. But for the specialist, this represents a goldmine of material. Hess's entries are easier to deal with, and may be more useful for nonspecialists, e.g. nonfluent speakers of the language who may wish to consult the dictionary as a reference.

Hess provides a more straightforward morphological analysis, listing all compounds, reduplicative forms, etc., together as a class. This information can be got from M's work, too, but not as simply. Hess has a number of lexical entries organized as lexical fields, defining and contrasting a range of related items. This aspect of Hess's dictionary is, as far as I know, unique among reference works for 'exotic' languages and is extremely valuable. Hess also provides lots of cross-referencing to semantically related items. It would be nice to see something like this in later editions of M's dictionary.

M's dictionary has a proper English-to-Salish component, which is most welcome. Hess's dictionary contains an English-to-Salish compo-

nent that amounts to a set of cross indices to the Salish-to-English part. This, of course, saves space and repetition, but it is not nearly as convenient as a full-fledged set of entries.

Both dictionaries have primary entries organized by root and both are scrupulous in citing the speakers from whom they obtained their material.

In sum, Hess's dictionary is more innovative than M's, but M's is richer in illustration. If future editions of M's dictionary incorporate some of the better features of Hess's, M will have produced one of the best dictionaries of any Native American language. Even in its current form, M's work stands out as one of the most important contributions to Salish studies in the 1980s. [MICHAEL NOONAN, *University of Wisconsin Milwaukee*.]