Updating the Sauk lexicon:
Strategies and implications for language revitalization[1]
Olivia N. Sammons
University of Alberta

Our kids are modern kids. They see and experience a lot, and they don't have Blackfeet words for their experiences. They dance to MTV. We Blackfeet don't have words for that. But then I think of when the Blackfeet saw the first horses. They didn't have words for that, either. One Blackfeet man said, "ponoka" ("they are elk"). The other guy said, "Naaaa, those are too big. Those are imita, a dog." Another guy looked and decided that they were too large to be dogs but that they weren't quite elks. So he combined the words to get elk-dog, or ponoka imita. We use that word today (Kipp 2007:42).

Both language and culture are constantly changing. To remain viable, languages must adapt to reflect the cultural changes happening around them. According to Hinton and Ahlers, "Language (like culture) is changeable, and if it is not abandoned in favor of another language, it may still change to express new culture and new values. In the changed world in which native language activists find themselves, one can barely find anything to speak about that does not touch on modern culture" (1999:56). For healthy languages, such as English and Spanish, this process usually occurs naturally, especially through the speech of younger generations. However, when there ceases to be a population of young speakers, new words stop being created. Eventually the language becomes less relevant to society. This shift is especially true in the case of highly endangered languages, where growth no longer occurs naturally. These situations often require a more deliberate approach. The creation of new words is a useful tool for the expansion of language use into new domains, including the expression of modern culture in indigenous languages. New words can enable speakers of endangered languages to express themselves within the context of a modern society rather than code-switching into a dominant language, showing that their language is vital and growing, as opposed to weakening and diminishing. Creating new words is also a vital component of language planning and can aid in the development of curriculum for immersion education. In this study, I examine the methods through which vocabulary expansion is taking place in Sauk, a member of the central branch of the Algonquian language family.

1.0 Language Background and Status
The Sauk language is spoken in central Oklahoma by members of the Sac and Fox Nation. At the time of contact, the Sauk were located in the Saginaw Bay and River area of present-day eastern Michigan, prior to removal to Indian Territory in 1867 (Whittaker 1996:362). Mesquakie, Kickapoo, and Sauk are all mutually intelligible with one another,

and thus are considered to be dialects of the same language (Mithun 1999:333). Speakers and community members consider the three to be separate but related languages.

Today, of the 3,490 enrolled tribal members, only four conversationally fluent speakers remain, all over the age of seventy. Speaker population has declined drastically over the last ten years, and the last fully fluent speaker died in 2004 (Sauk Language Department 2008:1). Today's Sauk speakers were raised in bilingual Sauk-English households. They are conversationally fluent, meaning that they are conversant on most topics, but at times have difficulty accessing words due to the fact that English has been their dominant language for the past thirty years or more. Additionally, a few adults are learning Sauk as a second language. Sauk is therefore at the highest level of language endangerment, Stage 8 out of 8 according to Fishman's Graded Intergenerational Disruption Scale. This stage of language endangerment is characterized as a handful of elderly speakers who are geographically and socially isolated. They do not use the language on a daily basis and are beyond child-bearing age (1991:88-90).

1.1 Sauk Language Revitalization

Significant efforts are underway within the community to revitalize the language. The Sauk Language Department, located in Stroud, Oklahoma, was established in 2005 as a permanent infrastructure dedicated to the revitalization of the Sauk language. In 2007, a Sauk language survey was conducted within the community, in which 85.6% of respondents indicated full support of an immersion program. Current revitalization efforts include evening community classes, summer preschool immersion camps, teacher training, and Master-Apprentice language learning to train future Sauk language teachers. They do not follow the traditional Master-Apprentice (MA) model in which one speaker, or "Master", is paired with one learner, or "Apprentice". Instead, they have implemented a modified version better suited to their needs and the reality of their situation. There is one MA team composed of three Sauk language speakers and three second language learners. MA team members alternate between meeting in group and individual sessions at the language department office. Sauk language teacher trainees participate in MA sessions for approximately twelve contact hours per week. With plans for a future immersion school, language acquisition and instruction are the priorities for the department because this is the vehicle through which the language can be transmitted to new speakers. Additionally, within the past four years, the Sauk Language Department has produced several in-house pedagogical materials, including games and lesson plans for community classes, two pilot immersion schools, and summer language camps, and is actively making audio recordings to supplement them.

1.2 Why Create New Words?

When Sauk was widely spoken as a household language, words referring to new elements in Sauk culture and environment developed naturally. For example, the language contains words for 19th century farming terms, such as 'hoe' and 'plow'. Words for diseases such as cancer and diabetes, and many 20th century car-related words, such as 'drive', 'seat belt', and 'motorcycle' have also been incorporated into the language. However, by roughly the mid-20th century, Sauk had largely ceased to be a language of

daily communication and the vocabulary ceased to include words for new technologies and modern concepts.

1.3 Sauk Methods Employed

With future plans for an immersion school, the types of words being created in Sauk directly relates to the focus of their current revitalization efforts. In the immersion school, Sauk will be the only language used in the classroom, and English will not be spoken. When the language department was first created, staff members came up with a list of teaching-specific vocabulary items to be coined. This list included words for games and toys found in a preschool, and disciplinary commands, among others:

(1) *balloon, bulldozer, chalkboard, crayons, Play-Doh, puppet, slide, jump rope, library, roller skates, water fountain*

However, as the Master-Apprentice program has progressed, speakers and language department staff realized that they needed new words for many everyday objects. Today, the need for new words to be coined often arises naturally during Master-Apprentice sessions and other language work. Frequently during one of these sessions the need will arise for a term or expression for which no Sauk equivalent exists. The speaker will either coin a word on the spot or find a way to talk around it. If a word is repeated enough, the apprentices catch on to it and eventually begin to use it themselves as well. Examples of household words that have been created include the following:

(2) *sink, bathtub, curtain, couch, kitchen, paper towels, fly swatter, clothes hanger, umbrella, toothbrush*

Occasionally, speakers have difficulty coining certain new words immediately and need time for reflection. These words are noted and brought up during semi-regular Sauk Language Advisory meetings. The purpose of these meetings is to meet with speakers to help Sauk Language Department staff with a variety of tasks, and so is not specifically focused on coining new words. This team is composed of two to three native bilingual Sauk speakers. The remaining one to two members of this team are employed by the Sauk Language Department. These include a director who is a second language speaker and curriculum developer, and a technical assistant who understands a large amount of Sauk but does not speak it. It should be noted that the Sauk Language Department has preferred to maintain an informal approach to creating new words rather than creating an official committee, as the Hawaiians and Alutiiq have done (Kimura and Counceller 2008). The speakers and staff may have felt they did not need permission, or that there was no one to whom they could turn to grant the official authority to coin and implement new words into the language.

When there are new words to be coined, the team meets together to brainstorm and come up with possible options. Those are noted, and then returned to at a later date. Sauk Language Department staff will usually verify a term with speakers two to three times before it becomes approved. Once a new word has been approved, it is audio recorded and can be used for various instructional purposes. This process remains very fluid.

New Sauk words are developed by and for three main groups of people. These include current L2 learners, elders, and future Sauk speakers. The main purpose of filling in lexical gaps in Sauk is to strengthen the language and enable future Sauk language immersion teachers to conduct classroom teaching entirely in Sauk. Thus, new words are made primarily for the current Sauk language teacher trainees and future Sauk language speakers. The teacher trainees take part in Master-Apprentice sessions, write lesson plans, develop teaching curricula materials, and teach Head Start and community language classes. The elders may or may not incorporate these new words into their vocabularies because they did not grow up using them and may not have as much of a need for them as second language speakers.

At the moment, the language department is not actively distributing the new words. Community language classes typically cover more basic vocabulary, such as animals, colors, food, and so on, and thus the need to distribute new words is not pressing. However, these words are likely to become more and more integrated into daily use through immersion teaching in the future.

2.0 Linguistic Strategies

2.1 Lexical Borrowing

One of the earliest means of incorporating new words into the Sauk language was lexical borrowing. In the case of Sauk, the types of items borrowed that are known and discussed here are all items introduced as a result of European contact, consisting mainly of animals, foods, days of the week, and technological innovations. Borrowings can be found for different stages in history, including early European contact (pre-removal), post-removal to Oklahoma, and 20th century items. Almost all of the borrowed words come from English, and are adapted to Sauk phonological patterns. A few items may have been borrowed from French and other Native languages, but this is not common, and it is difficult to be certain of their origin. The scope of this study is not an early comparative work with other Algonquian languages, and thus these are not fully investigated. However, no overt borrowing with neighboring or related Native languages, such as Mesquakie and Kickapoo, appears today.

The following are examples of older borrowings that became incorporated into the lexicon relatively soon after European contact.

(3) *kâshôha*   'cat'
(4) *kôhkôsha*   'hog, pig, pork'

(data from Whittaker 2005)

The terms *kâshôha* and *kôhkôsha* closely resemble their French counterparts, *chat* and *cochon*, respectively. Goddard proposes, at least for Delaware and Munsee, that these terms were picked up from overhearing Dutch people giving hog-calls. "Munsee *kó:ško:š* "pig"… This word must reflect reduplication of the syllable [ku:š] used in some Flemish dialects in designations and calling terms for pigs; most likely it was taken directly from the hog-call… (1974:155)." These borrowings could also be due to French influence or sound symbolism. Although it is difficult to be certain of their origin, the fact that these

terms are represented very similarly in several Algonquian languages does reveal that these are older borrowings, most likely from the period of early European contact.

The word for 'coffee' is another example of a word that would have been introduced after European contact. Although it is not exactly clear whether coffee was introduced pre-or post-removal, it is evident that the borrowing for 'coffee' has been in the language for a long time. It takes the inanimate third person singular suffix *–wi* to derive a word for the color brown:

(5) *kâhpîhâtêwi*
kâhpî-hâtê-wi
coffee-color-0s/IND[2]
'brown'

(data from Whittaker 2005)

After removal to Indian Territory, many words for new items became integrated into the Sauk language. For example, the borrowed term for 'molasses' is clearly a result of post-removal contact with Southern crops and culture.

(6) *hêmpêkêha*   'hamburger'
pinachi pathêhi   'peanut butter'
pishkitani   'biscuit'

(data from field notes 2008-09)

(7) *châkanetîhi*   'cocoa, chocolate'
chînîhi   'chili'
chîthi   'cheese'
êshkwîmi, âshkwîmi   'ice cream'
kâhpîhi   'coffee'
kechapi   'ketchup'
mashteti   'mustard'
menêshishi   'molasses, sorghum, syrup, maple syrup'
miniki   'milk, commercial milk' (as opposed to *nônâkanâpowi*, breast milk)
ôchimîni, otîmîni   'oatmeal'
panênêhi   'banana'
patêhi   'butter'
tânapi   'turnip'

(data from Whittaker 2005)

---

[2] Abbreviations used are as follows: 0p=third person inanimate plural, 0s=third person inanimate singular, 1=first person, 12=first person plural inclusive, 1p=first person plural exclusive, 2=second person, 3=third person proximate, 3'=third person obviative, 3pl=third person proximate plural, ANIM=animate, CONJ=conjunct, DIM=diminutive, INAN=inanimate, IND=independent indicative order, INDEF=third person indefinite, LOC=locative, NA=noun, animate,NI=noun, inanimate, NOM=nominalizer, PL=plural, POSS=possessive, SG=singular, UN=unknown morpheme, VAI=verb, animate intransitive

Besides food, borrowings for other items can be found as well.

(8) *âtomôpîna*   'car'
     kanâkwa   'clock'
     kâteni   'cotton'
     shkon-   'school, schoolhouse'

The Sauk language also borrowed terms for days of the week from English.

(9) *Manitîheki*   'Monday, on Monday'
     Toshtîheki   'Tuesday, on Tuesday'
     Wêneshtîheki   'Wednesday, on Wednesday'
     Thêshtîheki   'Thursday, on Thursday'
     Pwâtîheki   'Friday, on Friday'
     Thêtitîheki   'Saturday, on Saturday'
     Thanitîheki   'Sunday, on Sunday'

(data from Whittaker 2005)

The existence of terms for nationalities such as Czech and German is indicative of the immigrant groups that the Sauk would have had contact with post-removal.

(10) *Chêmanîha*   'German'
      Mêhikôha   'Hispanic, Mexican'
      Pohîmina   'Czech' (Bohemian)

(data from Whittaker 2005)

Many of the early settlers on the plains were German and Czech. The word *Pohîmina* for 'Czech' comes from the label 'Bohemian'. A large Czech settlement, known today as Prague, Oklahoma, neighbors Sauk territory.

     After removal, many words were integrated into the Sauk language until roughly after WWII, when a noticeable break in vocabulary development occurred. Widescale involvement in the war, a disruption of the traditional economy, and exogamy were significant factors for many tribes in the shift from the Native language to English as an everyday language. Until recently, few borrowings or other coined terms for words were integrated into the language after this time period.

     As illustrated by the above examples, borrowing has been a fairly productive process in Sauk in the past. The words listed above have been fully incorporated into the vocabulary and most are included in the concise dictionary. While in general borrowings are now avoided as a strategy to create new words, there is no drive to eliminate borrowed words that have already become incorporated into the lexicon. The question remains as to why some words are borrowed while others are invented.

2.2 Calques

Calques, or loan translations, are another technique used to create new words in a language. Calques are a direct result of language contact, and thus familiarity with both a contact language and the target (or Native) language is necessary to form them (Silver and Miller 1997:247). While perhaps a step above borrowing, this strategy still shows heavy influence from a more dominant language. Those involved in the process of creating new words in Sauk have expressed an explicit aversion to calques, and thus the language contains only a select few examples:

(11) *kêmiyâni-pîthehkâhi*
    rain-coat
    'raincoat'

(12) *nimêthaho*   *thapâpi*
    jump   rope
    'jump rope'

(13) *pathethota*   *nemôha*
    hot   dog
    'hot dog'

(14) *têtepithâhi-papîni*
    wheel-chair
    'wheelchair'

(15) *thâkichêhikani*   *methenahikani*
    toilet   paper
    'toilet paper'

(16) *wichêno*   *pahkwêshikani*
    playdough/flour/bread
    'Play-Doh'

It should be noted that Sauk speakers often find these constructions humorous and use them jokingly, particularly the form for 'hot dog'. Notice also that in example (15), the term for 'toilet paper' is an example of both semantic extension and a calque, since the word for 'toilet' *thâkichêhikani* literally means 'outside-object'.

Calques may initially seem like an ideal way to create new words, and this was one of the first strategies to be experimented with by the language department staff. However, the language workers have gradually come to the realization that this strategy results in forms that are merely borrowed concepts from English and are not truly representative of Sauk language structure or traditional thought processes. Although entirely composed of Sauk morphemes, these constructions are still very much dominated by an English mentality. Those involved in Sauk lexical development have discovered that there are better, more "Sauk" ways of expressing new concepts and ideas. Thus, notions of language purity may play a part in how new words are formed, especially when it comes to a language's receptiveness to calques.

2.3 Semantic Extension and Narrowing

Semantic extension is a common means through which modern concepts are expressed in Sauk. Semantic extension, as it is used here, refers to the process of assigning new, modern meanings to terms that already exist in the language, but which are no longer in use. Thus, speakers can use the language's own resources by assigning new meanings to words that already exist. The following table provides examples of semantic extension in Sauk.

Table 1: Sauk Semantic Extensions

Word	Original Meaning	Extended Meaning
ahpahikani	'patch'	'Band-Aid'
akôchikani	'pothook'	'clothes hanger'
akwîweni	'robe', 'wrap', 'cover'	'bedspread', 'sheet'
mashishkiyeni	'hay', 'grass'	'weeds'
methenahikani	'relating to wood'	'paper', 'book', 'ticket', 'menu', etc.
môtâhi	'glass'	'drinking glass', 'bottle', 'jar'
nepitheki	'where water comes from'	'water fountain'
shkotêwi	'fire'	'train', 'electricity', 'oven', 'stove'
thâkichi	'outside'	'bathroom' (compare English 'outhouse')
wâthênikani	'(natural) light'	'flashlight', 'lamp', 'light', 'lightbulb'

It is important to note that some of the extended meanings can co-exist with their original meanings, notably *shkotêwi*, which can mean both 'fire' and 'train', as well as *thâkichi*, which can mean either 'outside' or 'bathroom', depending on the context. The original meaning has not been lost, but has simply adopted an extended meaning. The same is true of *akôchikani*, whose original meaning is still in active use today.

Semantic narrowing refers to the process of taking a previously broad term and limiting its meaning. Only one example of semantic narrowing was found in the Sauk data. In the past, the term *(a)thawâwi* was pronounced interchangeably with or without the initial vowel, and was used to refer to both the color 'yellow' and the color 'orange'. Recently, however, the language department staff have entertained the idea of narrowing its meaning by assigning color designations to each of the two possible pronunciations. Thus, *thawâwi* would only mean 'yellow', and *athawâwi* would only mean 'orange'. The desire to create this distinction stems largely from the fact that many of the games played during Sauk language camps and classes require color differentiation. The decision to implement this change has not yet been resolved and is still open to debate.

2.4 Compounding

Lexical compounding is likely to be one of the most common processes in the development of Sauk neologisms. Sauk compounds are right-headed. The two most common types of noun compounding are prenoun[3] + noun compounds and noun + noun compounds.

Prenoun + Noun Compounds

The following are notable examples of new prenoun + noun compounds in Sauk.

---

[3] In standard Algonquian terminology, the term 'prenoun' refers to optional bound morphemes that may be compounded to a noun stem to express location, number, color, and other adjectival notions such as old, new, and young (Valentine 2001:152).

(17) *chaki ahkothikani* 'chalkboard, blackboard'
chaki   +   ahkothi-kan-i
small   +   climb-NOM-INAN
'stool, step stool'

(18) *kenwâkipapîni*
kenwâki   +   papîni
long   +   chair
'couch, bench'

(19) *kenwaki nekwêkani wishkeno*
long + neck + bird
'flamingo'

(20) *mahkatêpethikâhkwa*
makatê   +   pethikâhkwa
black   +   board

(21) *meshitêtêpithoni*
meshi   +   têtêpithoni
big   +   wheel
'ferris wheel'

(22) *meshotêneki*
meshi   +   otêneki
big   +   town
'Oklahoma City; Tulsa'

(23) *wishikiyâki   mâkohkwayi*
wishikiyâki   +   mâkohkwayi
hard   +   hat
'helmet, hard hat'

Noun + Noun Compounds
Noun + noun compounds are especially common in Sauk. The nouns may be derived or underived. The following is a sampling of new terms that have been constructed using this process.

(24) *ahshkotêwi   pîtahikani*   'bicycle'
ahshkotêwi   pîtahi-kan-i
fire   come.in-NOM-INAN
'outlet, electrical outlet'

(25) *meshwêhi   wîtheniweni*
meshwêhi   wîtheniweni
rabbit   food
'salad, lettuce'

(26) *methenahikanani âchimôni*
methenahikanani âchimô-n-i
papers   tell.story-NOM-INAN
'newspaper'

(27) *nêmoweni   pehkwâhki*
nêmoweni   pehkwâhki
breath   ball
'bubble, balloon'

(28) *nîshwi   têtepithâhani*
nîshwi   têtepithâhani
two   wheels

(29) *otêweni   mîhkechêwîta*
otêweni   mîhkechêwîta
town   worker
'city worker'

(30) *pîwâpehkwi âchimôni*
pîwâpehkwi âchimô-n-i
metal   tell.story-NOM-INAN
'telephone'

(31) *pîwâpehkwi wînêtepi*
pîwâpehkwi wînêtepi
metal   brain
'computer'

(32) *shkotêwi   nîhkânîta*
shkotêwi   nîhkânîta
fire   leader
'fire chief'

(33) *tâwakani*   *wâpamôni*   wheels   shoes
     tâwakani   wâpamô-n-i   'roller skates'
     ear   look.NOM-INAN
     'otoscope'   (35) *wîpitani*   *pînahikani*
                                       wîpitani   pînahi-kan-i
(34) *têtepithonani*   *mahkathêhani*   teeth   clean-NOM-INAN
     têtepithonani   mahkathêhani   'toothbrush, toothpaste'

Verb + Noun Compounds
     No new constructed forms from verb + noun compounds were found in the body of Sauk neologisms. More investigation is needed to determine whether this is simply a gap in data or speakers are not readily producing these types of compounds.

2.5 New Derivations
     Many indigenous languages also turn to their own internal resources to build words for introduced concepts and objects (Grenoble & Whaley 2006: 182). That is, they utilize their own traditional derivational processes to fill in lexical gaps rather than the use of calques or borrowing from other languages. Furthermore, affixes, a built-in resource of Native languages, can be used to create nouns from verbs, and verbs from nouns.
     Suffixation is one of the more commonly used strategies for producing new derivations in Sauk. Through this process, noun finals[4], usually nominalizers, are suffixed to stems. The most frequently employed noun finals are *-kan-/*, */-wen-/*, */-kân-/*, and */-(h)ikânek-/*.

/-kan-/ Nominalizer
     One of the most common nominalizers in Sauk is */-kan-/*. This suffix is attached to animate intransitive (VAI) verb stems (initials)[5] to create inanimate nouns. Jones cites *-gAn-* as a nominal suffix that expresses instrumentality in Fox (1911:812). The inanimate marker */-i/* follows this noun final.

(36) *ahpethi-kan-i*
     heat-NOM-INAN
     lit., anything that heats up
     'oven, microwave, toaster'

(37) *âhtêni-kan-i*
     turn.off-NOM-INAN
     lit., something that turns off
     'fire extinguisher'

---

[4] Noun finals occupy the last slot in the stem structure of words. They typically designate the word's part of speech and carry a lexical meaning. They may be either concrete or abstract (Valentine 2001:1025).

[5] Initials, or roots, occupy the first slot in the noun template. They are the only elements that are required to form a noun. Initials can be either roots or stems, simple or complex (Voorhis 1983:77; Valentine 1033).

(38) *anwêni-kan-i*
noise-NOM-INAN
'CD player, radio, iPod,
instrument (musical)'

(39) *chîkakohi-kan-i*
brush, sweep-NOM-INAN
'broom'

(40) *êhnekwâkîhi-kan-i*
measure-NOM-INAN
lit., something you measure with
'ruler, measuring tape'

(41) *kâthihi-kan-i*
wipe-NOM-INAN
lit., anything that wipes off
'eraser, dish towel'

(42) *kepâkohi-kan-i*
enclose-NOM-INAN
'fence, gate, jailhouse, enclosure'

(43) *mâtakohi-kan-i*
cover-NOM-INAN
'umbrella, cover, tent cover,
tablecloth'

(44) *nôtenwi-kan-i*
it.blows.-NOM-INAN
'fan'

(45) *ôchê-pahkachi-kan-i*
fly-strike-NOM-INAN
'fly swatter'

(46) *ô-têhi-pethetahi-kan-i*
3POSS-heart-listen-NOM-INAN
'stethoscope'

(47) *pâshkethi-kan-i*
shoot-NOM-INAN
'gun, rifle'

(48) *pehshkâshi-kan-i*
turn.on-NOM-INAN
lit., anything you use to turn on
'light switch, lighter'

(49) *shoshkwahi-kan-i*
be.slippery-NOM-INAN
'slide, sled'

(50) *thîkachi-kan-i*
be.frozen-NOM-INAN
'freezer'

(51) *wishkwê-tonêmohi-kan-i*
loud-mouth-NOM-INAN
lit., an object that makes your
mouth loud
'microphone'

/-kân-/, /-(hi)kân-ek-/ Noun Finals

Another highly productive strategy is the suffixation of the noun final */-kân-/* to
initials to form inanimate nouns. This noun final differs from the nominalizer */-kan-/* in
the previous section because it has vowel length. According to Jones, the noun final
/-kân-/ is a collective term for place and is most often used for enclosures (1911:813).
Voorhis glosses this same final as 'house' or 'building' (1988: 153):

(52) *shôniyâhi-kân-i*
money-building-INAN
'bank, financial institution'

This noun final may also take the locative suffix *-ek-* immediately preceding the
inanimate marker *-i*:

(53)   *-ikân-ek-i*
       NI.building-LOC-INAN

(54)   *shôniyâhi-kân-ek-i*
       money-building-LOC-INAN
       'bank'

These two constructions, */-kân-/* and */(hi)-kân-ek-/*, are used interchangeably by Sauk speakers to convey the meaning of a room, building, place or structure:

(55)   *âhkomatamo-hikâneki*   sick-building   'hospital'
       athen-ikâneki   stone-building   'brick house, stone house'
       âtomôpîn-ikâneki   car-building   'garage'
       ayôwen-ikâneki   tool-building   'tool shed'
       chîtap-ikâneki   sit-room   'living room, sitting
                                                           room'

       kothekwan-ikâneki   heavy-room   'weight room, gym'
       mamatamo-hikâneki   pray-building   'church'
       mashishkinenîha-hikâneki   doctor-building   'clinic'
       wîthen-ikâneki   food-building   'restaurant, dining room,
                                                           cafeteria'

       Mehikowîthen-ikâneki   Mexican.food-place   'Mexican restaurant'
       meno-hikâneki   drink-place   'saloon, bar'
       methenahikan-ikâneki   book-place   'library'
       nepê-hikâneki   sleep-room   'bedroom'
       pîhkô-hikâneki   bingo-place   'bingo house'
       tawê-hikâneki   trade-place   'store'
       thâkichihê-hikâneki   outside-place   'bathroom'
       tôskashâ-hikâneki   horse-building   'barn'
       wâchaho-hikâneki   cook-room   'kitchen'

/-wen-/ Nominalizer

The nominalizer */-wen-/* is also added to verb stems to derive new inanimate nouns. These nouns may be either abstract or concrete. This nominalizer appears to occur less often than */-kan-/*.

(56)   *amokwî-wen-i*   (58)   *ahpemeki-wen-i*
       UN-NOM-INAN   up-NOM-INAN
       lit., it's eating you   'step'
       'cancer'

                                        (59)   *tashîhkâno-wen-i*
(57)   *achikwathô-wen-i*   play-NOM-INAN
       sew-NOM-INAN   'toy'
       'sewing machine'

2.6 Participles as Locative Expressions

Finally, another strategy being used is the creation of participles from verbs. Speakers often prefer this strategy to coining new nouns. Participles are verbs, carry a noun-like meaning, and function as nouns within sentences (Valentine 2001:1045). Thus, they are somewhat of a cross between nouns and verbs. Participles may be fully inflected for all of the verbal categories except the iterative.

The construction of participles is quite common in Algonquian languages. According to Valentine, many Nishnaabemwin participles for new or introduced concepts, notably technological items and human roles, have become lexicalized:

(60) *baatewaagmiseg*   'beer'   NI
(61) *endzhi-mzinaatesjigeng* 'movie theater'   NI

(Valentine 2001:210).

The participles that are formed describe the event or action associated with the object. Participles are constructed by attaching two preverbs[6] to a verb inflected in the conjunct order[7] to describe the action that takes place:

(62) *e-tashi-hanenwî-wâchi*
    CONJ-place.where-bathe-3PL
    'where they bathe, the place where they bathe'

In the above example, *e-* is a preverb signaling the conjunct order, and *tashi-* is a relative preverb indicating where an event or action takes place. This closely resembles the Kickapoo preverb *tasi-* with the same meaning:

(63) *tasi-*   'there, at that place' (relative)
(64) *tasikeekeθaapamea*   'he peeps at him at that place'

(Voorhis 1974:48).

Thus, rather than coining a noun for bathtub, speakers prefer to describe the action surrounding this object. The following are further examples of participles formed using this construction. Note that because the participles are essentially verbal, they can inflect for any subject, although they are most often inflected for nonspecific subjects (3PL and 3 INDEF).

---

[6] The term 'preverb' refers to optional elements that are prefixed to verb stems. They are used to express a range of meanings, such as tense, aspect, manner, and direction (Valentine 2001:154).

[7] The conjunct order is an inflectional system that signals that a verb is dependent.

(65) *e-tashi-chîtapi-wâchi*   'kitchen'
     CONJ-place.where-sit-3PL
     lit., where they sit
     'living room'   (68) *e-tashi-pâkâtowê-wâchi*
                                             CONJ-place.where-play.ball-3PL
                                             lit.: where they play ball
(66) *e-tashi-pêkohikê-wâchi*   'basketball court, baseball
     CONJ-place.where-dry-3PL   field, baseball diamond, etc.'
     lit., where they dry
     'clothes dryer, clothesline'   (69) *e-tashi-tashîhkâno-wâchi*
                                             CONJ-place.where-play-3PL
                                             lit.: where they play
(67) *e-tashi-wâchaho-wâchi*   'playground'
     CONJ-place.where-cook-3PL
     lit., where they cook

These participles can also be combined with associated words, resulting in a phrase to express a single concept:

3rd person plural

(70) *e-tashi-wâkwapito-wâchi*   *o-kâtani*
     CONJ-place.where-rest-3PL   3POSS-feet
     lit., where they rest their feet
     'footstool'

(71) *e-tashi-wâchaho-wâchi pahkwêshikani*
     CONJ-place.where-cook-3PL   bread
     lit., where they cook bread
      'stove, oven'

(72) *e-tashi-kashkihtô-wâchi*   *shkotêwi*
     CONJ-place.where-make-3PL   fire
     lit., where they make fire
     'fireplace, campfire'

3rd person indefinite

(73) *e-tashi-kôken-ameki*   *shehkîtâkani*
     CONJ-place.where-wash-INDEF   clothes
     lit., where they (indefinite) wash clothes
     'washing machine, washer'

(74) *e-tashi-kôken-ameki*   *nâkanani*
     CONJ-place.where-wash-INDEF   dishes
     lit., where they (indefinite) wash dishes
     'kitchen sink, dishwasher'

(75) *e-tashi-pêko-hemeki*   *shehkîtâkani*
     CONJ-place.where-dry-INDEF   clothes
     lit., where they dry clothes
     'dryer, clothes dryer'

<u>*etashi-* vs. *–(h)ikâneki*</u>
In some cases, both *etashi-* and *–(h)ikâneki* constructions can easily be formed:

(76) 'living room'
     a. *etashichîtapiwâchi*   'where they sit'
     b. *chîtapikâneki*   'sitting room'

(77) 'kitchen'
     a. *etashiwâchahowâchi*   'where they cook'
     b. *wachâhohikâneki*   'cooking room'

These forms can be used interchangeably and appear to solely depend on individual speaker preference.

3.0 Issues and Challenges

The process of creating new words in a revitalization project can present many challenges, both linguistic and social. Some linguistic challenges include the role of nouns versus verbs and semantic vagueness. Some of the more socially-oriented challenges include new words not catching on and choices about borrowing. In this section, I discuss each of these challenges that have arisen and how they have been addressed in Sauk.

3.1 Status of Nouns versus Verbs

While the focus of this study is on the creation of new nouns, it is important to be aware of the large role that verbs play in Algonquian languages. A major factor in creating new words is that the individuals who are involved in this process are also native speakers of English, and thus prone to approach the process from an English frame of mind. Sauk, like other Algonquian languages, is polysynthetic and most of the meaning conveyed is carried by the verb. With its rich verbal agreement for nouns, verbs, and indirect objects, a single verb in an Algonquian language has the potential to be translated into English as an entire sentence. Independent clauses have fairly free word order, and independent noun phrases can be dropped entirely within strings discourse. In English, however, the noun-to-verb ratio is much higher than that of polysynthetic languages (Mithun 2007:9). This propensity towards nouns is especially evident in terms of language teaching methodology, where the majority of vocabulary learned first consists of nouns for colors, numbers, and animals. This major structural difference between Sauk and English can therefore be problematic for native English speakers trying to coin new Sauk words.

Members of the Sauk language team have become increasingly aware of the importance of verbs as they have become more involved in the project. This awareness

can be seen by the transformation of strategies for vocabulary items such as 'bathtub', 'sink', and 'clothes dryer'. Initially, several coinages were proposed involving the compounding of the noun *mahkahkwi*, meaning 'bucket' or 'box', to noun initials. These compounds later proved to be semantically unacceptable, as indicated by the asterisk (*):

(78) *anenwi-mahkahkwi*
  bathing-bucket
  *'bathtub'

(80) *pêhkway-mahkahkwi*
  dry-bucket
  *clothes dryer

(79) *kôkeni-mahkahkwi*
  wash-bucket
  *'washtub, washbowl, sink'

(81) *têhkiyâki-mahkahkwi*
  cold-bucket
  *'air conditioner'

Although created by the speakers themselves, they did not associate these forms with the intended meaning when presented with them at a later date. These constructions were linguistically successful because they were grammatically correct. Semantically, however, they fell flat and were too foreign conceptually to convey the intended meaning. However, a few examples of compounding with *mahkahkwi* were both linguistically and semantically successful:

(82) *methenahikani-mahkahkwi*
  paper-bucket
  'mailbox'

(84) *nêkawi-mahkahkwi*
  sand-bucket
  'sandbox'

(83) *methikwa-mahkahkwi*
  ice-bucket
  'refrigerator'

(85) *wînyaki-mahkahkwi*
  dirty-bucket
  'trash can'

The reasons why some of these compounds were successful while others were not remain unclear. One possible explanation is that these compounds tend to be taken literally and thus the figurative meaning is blocked. Generally speaking, the meaning that compounds give is often idiomatic. In English, a *hot dog* is not actually a dog that is hot, a *couch potato* is not a type of potato, nor is a *chatterbox* a box that chatters. Thus, the meanings associated with compounds are not always predictable based on the meanings of their component parts. This lack of success may also have been due to the fact that these very nounlike constructions were not organic enough to the language and its conceptual thought processes.

As seen previously, after determining that these compounds were unsuccessful, the Sauk language team has adopted a different strategy, that of forming participles from verbs. An examination of the possibilities that speakers generate while brainstorming can be extremely informative. Such observation can reveal their thought processes and what they find most salient about the object before finally deciding upon the best choice for a new word. Consider the following options for 'air conditioner':

(86) a. *têhkiyâki*   *mahkahkwi*
    cold   bucket
    'cold bucket'

  b. *iniwêchi*   *têhkiyâki*
    that's why   it's cold
    'that's why it's cold'

  c. *potachi-kani*
    blow-NOM
    'the thing that blows'

  d. *potachi-kani*   *têhkiyâki*
    blow-NOM   cold
    'the thing that blows cold'

  e. *etashi-wêchimikaki*   *têhkiyâki*
    place.where-UN   cold
    'where the cold air comes from'

  The first choice that the Sauk language team came up with as a word for 'air conditioner' was *têhkiyâki mahkahkwi*, which literally means 'cold bucket'. However, when a language worker asked one of the speakers to turn on the "cold bucket" and they did not understand, it was determined that they needed to coin another term. The next option they produced was *iniwêchi têhkiyâki*, meaning 'that's why it's cold'. This broad description was problematic because it could apply to many concepts besides an air conditioner, such as snow, wind, and so forth. They found the third option, *potachikani*, meaning 'the thing that blows', unacceptable for the same reason. Again, this could be interpreted as several items besides an air conditioner, such as a fan or even a heater. Next they came up with *potachikani têhkiyâki*, meaning 'the thing that blows cold'. This expression was slightly more specific, but still not quite what the speakers were aiming for. After considering several options, they finally decided upon *etashiwêchimikaki têhkiyâki*, meaning 'where the cold air comes from'. The speakers were much more comfortable with this construction, largely because of its verb-like quality and lack of overlap confusion.

  What is at stake in relying solely on nouns to coin new terms is retaining the true nature of the language. With strategies accessible such as the formation of participles, one might even question the necessity of coining new nouns at all. The need to continue developing new nouns in Sauk will depend largely on the purposes for which the language is used and whether or not it is possible to convey the same ideas using verbs. In the Sauk Master-Apprentice sessions, when an object comes up for which no Sauk word exists, speakers have generally learned to talk around the noun, rather than code-switching into English. Because staying in the language is more important than having a word for every object that arises in conversation, it may not be necessary to coin a large number of nouns for modern objects.

3.2 Semantic Vagueness

  Due to extension, there is considerable semantic vagueness for many of the Sauk neologisms, as in the following examples:

(87) *wathêni-kan-i*
  light-NOM-INAN
  '(natural) light, flashlight, lamp, light bulb'

(88) *methenahi-kan-i*
  wood-NOM-INAN
  'paper, book, menu, ticket'

(89) *ahpethi-kan-i*   'fire, train, electricity, stove, oven'
heat-NOM-INAN
'stove, oven, microwave, toaster'   (91) *anwêni-kan-i*
noise-NOM-INAN
(90) *shkotêw-i*   'CD player, any kind of musical
fire-INAN   instrument (clarinet, guitar, etc.)'

In example (87), the basic meaning of the root, 'light' is extended to refer to any type of light-bearing object, from a flashlight, to a lamp, and even a light bulb. In example (88), *methenahikani* can be used for any type of object made out of paper, whether this is actual paper itself, a book, a menu, or even a traffic ticket. Thus, these forms can encompass a wide range of meanings. This vagueness may or may not impede communication, so long as the appropriate meanings can be apprehended through context or clarification. In a recent Sauk Master-Apprentice session, for example, a speaker directed an apprentice to pick up a book and place it on the table. She used the word *methenahikani* and the apprentice immediately picked up a piece of paper. Afterwards, the speaker expressed feeling misunderstood, and voiced the need for a separate word to distinguish 'book' from 'paper' in Sauk. Although in this situation the learner was oblivious to the possibility that the speaker could have been asking for a book rather than a piece of paper, a fluent speaker would likely have asked for clarification, thus negating the need for two separate words. Contextual cues, whether visual or conversational, therefore become extremely important in negotiating meaning in cases of semantic vagueness.

The occurrence of semantic vagueness is a common phenomenon in any language. In English, for instance, the term *wood* can be used to refer to either a small segment of a tree or to a whole group of trees. Likewise, a *crane* may be a type of bird or a specialized type of machinery used to lift heavy objects. It is even possible to *crane* one's neck. However, this multiplicity of meanings typically does not lead to confusion in everyday communication. Speakers can usually discern the intended meaning through context or conversational clarification strategies. Thus, the existence of semantic vagueness in Sauk is not necessarily problematic in and of itself. The potential for problems to arise lies in situations where speakers and learners may impose English expectations onto Sauk. By trying to apply an English set of conceptual and lexical categories onto the language, whether intentionally or unintentionally, part of what is unique and distinctly "Sauk" may be lost or even viewed as inadequate when evaluated by the standards of English. Such reactions are contrary to the goals of language revitalization and should therefore be avoided.

3.3 Choices about Borrowing
Ideology of Borrowing

In endangered language communities and the field of language revitalization, a great deal of debate surrounds linguistic borrowing. Although borrowing new terms is a natural outcome of contact, revitalization efforts in Native American communities have been increasingly resistant to borrowing from English. Borrowing tends to be consciously avoided in cases of indigenous language revitalization in an effort to create a clear separation between the dominant language and the indigenous language. The relationship

between language and identity can be seen through this resistance to borrowing. Borrowing is increasingly avoided as the need to establish an identity that is separate from the dominant culture becomes more acute.

Borrowing from a Dominant Language

Borrowing from European languages has been a common phenomenon across the languages of North America since the time of contact (Mithun 1999:311). According to Silver and Miller, "Almost all the languages of the Americas have loanwords from colonial languages, notably from Danish, French, Russian, English, Spanish, and Portuguese" (1997:330). Algonquian languages in the Northeast have borrowed words from Dutch, languages in Canada and Louisiana from French, languages in California and the Southwest from Spanish, and languages in Alaska from Russian (Mithun 1999:312-13). An observation of the specific words and types of words that have been borrowed can shed light on the dynamics of European contact over time. In describing the abundance of Dutch loanwords in Delaware, another Algonquian language, Goddard states, "…the large contingent of loanwords from Dutch gives important testimony on the nature of the contacts between the Indians and the colonists of New Netherland" (1974:153). These loanwords reveal a great deal of historical insight into the types of animals, European cultural items, and trade goods that were introduced and circulated after contact (Goddard 1974:159).

Borrowing from Related Native Languages

In many language revitalization programs today, if borrowing does occur, it is more likely to be from a surrounding indigenous language, rather than the dominant language. Borrowings have always occurred between Native languages in North America. Borrowing from other related indigenous languages may be a more welcome alternative for many communities than borrowing from a dominant language. Currently, Hawaiian commonly borrows from other Polynesian languages (Hinton 2001:168). According to Grenoble and Whaley, "The possibility of borrowing words from related languages and adapting them to the phonemic and morphemic systems of the local language may be an attractive solution for many communities. This has the advantage of avoiding any sense of accommodation to a language of wider communication" (2006: 181-2).

The need to borrow from other indigenous languages has not been explicitly addressed in Sauk. However, if the need were to present itself, the most likely languages to borrow from would be Mesquakie and Kickapoo. Cree and Ojibwe may provide additional alternatives due to the fact that they are still widely spoken and thus more likely to have terms for a wide array of modern objects.

4.0 Implications for Language Revitalization

4.1 Traditional versus Modern Language Use and Linguistic Purism

According to some members of endangered language communities, traditional ideas should be expressed in the traditional language while mainstream ideas should be expressed in the mainstream language (Hinton 2001:16). This attitude compartmentalizes

not only language, but traditional and modern ways of life. If this separation occurs and persists, then there is never a need to develop new vocabulary items because introduced items and concepts should only be expressed in the mainstream language. Cultural factors, as well as personal biases, can influence choices about what words or types of words should be coined. According to Wilson et al., community members

> …may still believe that Indigenous languages are not practical for the modern world…, or that their children might face a disadvantage if they are taught to speak the Indigenous language fluently. They may like the idea of children learning numbers, colors, and animal words, but they may be more uncomfortable with children speaking about computers, microwave ovens, and convenience stores in the indigenous language, especially if they have to create new words to do so. [Wilson and Yellow Bird 2005:116]

Other influences are language attitudes relating to linguistic purism and resistance to language change. The notion of linguistic purism refers to the idea that one form of a language, usually older, somehow represents a "purer" version than its other forms. This idea of language purity is problematic in any language because languages are constantly changing, making it difficult to determine what is "pure". What was considered pure fifty years ago is very different from what would be considered pure today. According to Trudgill, "All languages change all the time. It is not very well understood why this is the case, but it is a universal characteristic of human languages. The only languages which do not change are those, like Latin, which nobody speaks" (1998:1). However, some individuals feel uncomfortable about the unnaturalness of forming new words so deliberately, and would prefer their language to become extinct than to exist in an altered form. This attitude is contrary to the goals of language revitalization, which actually seek to reverse language shift by carrying language use into new domains. For many communities, a more natural approach to language change is simply not an option. The languages are no longer being used for daily communication and speaker populations are diminishing rapidly. If there is to be any input by the remaining speakers as to how these concepts will be expressed in the Native languages, it must happen now.

4.2 The Role of L2 Learners

Kimura and Counceller assert that neologisms are often more necessary for second language learners than native Hawaiian speakers because they are more proactive about using the language in all domains, while the native speakers, though they have knowledge of the language, may no longer be active users of the language (Kimura and Counceller 2008:124-5). Thus, because of their proactive approach and need to use the language in the classroom, L2 learners are often much more likely to be aware of the need for modern vocabulary and to integrate these new terms into their own vocabularies than are native Hawaiian speakers. Furthermore, although they are not native speakers, Kimura points out that L2 learners can be particularly helpful in the process of creating new words for several reasons. One challenge from a logistical standpoint in producing these forms is that older speakers may be unfamiliar with the modern technological vocabulary, even in English (Hinton 2001:168). For instance, relatively few 70-year-olds are familiar with the concept of a blog, iPod, or texting. L2 learners can help in this way

because they tend to be much more familiar and comfortable with modern technological inventions. Additionally, they often have much more overt knowledge of the structure of the language than do native speakers. This knowledge can be beneficial and L2 learners can work with speakers to develop new terms in the language: "Serious second language learners, who have acquired their language well, generally have a great advantage of knowing how the language works through second language acquisition" (Kimura and Counceller 2008:125). They are familiar with traditional word formation strategies and can draw upon this knowledge to know how component parts fit together. Moreover, in cases where the remaining speakers may not have used the language in a long amount of time, they can help to trigger the memories of elder speakers by providing them with possible options for coinages. Though these may not be the actual coinages that are chosen, they can give elders a jumping off point and help to get them thinking in the language.

4.3 An Ongoing Process

Beyond the noun-verb difference, as seen with the *mahkahkwi* examples described above, speakers have at times decided that they wanted to change a word that they had previously been coined, either because they did not recognize it later or because they wanted to describe something in a different way by focusing on a different aspect of the object.

(92) *wîchêno*   *nîhkânîta*
      play   leader
      *'coach'

The formation in example (92) was unsuccessful because a coach is not actually someone who plays in a game. This construction may however be more appropriate as a word for a team captain. Cases such as this demonstrate the speakers' desire to coin new words that will be readily identifiable based on their component parts. Such identifiability will in turn will aid those who are trying to learn Sauk as a second language by making the meanings more accessible.

Updating a language's lexicon is an evolving process and is never completely finished. Some words that have been recently coined may at some point in the future be deemed unrecognizable.

5.0 Conclusion

Sauk language speakers and learners seem to enjoy developing new words. This task involves the speakers in language revitalization and challenges them to use the language in ways which they may not have previously. In much the same way, speakers of modern English also enjoy experimenting with possibilities for new words. Although creating new words is much more of a prompted effort in Sauk than in English, speakers still appear to derive amusement and satisfaction from participating in this process.

As we have seen, several strategies are being used to create new words in Sauk today, many of which mirror those that have been used in the past. These include borrowing, semantic extension and narrowing, calques, compounding, suffixation of noun finals, and participles. Of these, the latter three tend to be the most productive. The

fact that these three strategies are the most productive today is not surprising since they have been the primary means through which new words have entered the language in the past. Thus, though some may argue that coining new words is an unnatural process and that it changes the language, this study reveals that speakers are in fact continuing to follow the natural processes that have always been used to derive new words. This is significant as L2 speakers and "rusty" or isolated Native speakers are often challenged in their home communities as to the so-called "purity" of their language use. Furthermore, L2 learners play a critical role in the development and use of new words. They can be of assistance by being conscious of the manner in which terms are elicited from speakers. Sauk speakers will often provide direct translations (calques) when English terms are initially elicited. Working with native speakers, L2 learners can be a driving force in the creation of new words. They know how to analyze the possibilities that speakers generate and can guide them towards more natural, Sauk-like options.

Some of the main challenges that have arisen for the Sauk in creating and using new words include the role of nouns versus verbs, semantic vagueness, and choices about borrowing. In each of these cases, it is important to consider the influence of English on how people approach the Sauk language. In general, the speakers prefer more verb-like formations, such as participles, over nouns. This propensity towards verb formations falls in line with the basic polysynthetic structure of the language. Participles are extremely productive and the patterns can be easily taught so that L2 learners can continue to make new words when they are confronted with the need to express concepts or objects for which no Sauk word exists.

This study offers a point of comparison for other language revitalization programs that are developing new words. It also presents some of the strategies that have been used and some of the main challenges that have been addressed. Overall, it appears that language-internal processes such as semantic extensions, nominalization, compounding, and participles, are more favorable for integrating new words into Sauk than language-external means such as borrowings and calques. Present and future Sauk language learners now have many more possibilities to express themselves in the context of modern society than they did even ten years ago. Only time will reveal the extent to which these new words are successfully integrated into the language by future Sauk speakers.

References

Fishman, Joshua A.
    1991   Reversing Language Shift: Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of
            Assistance to Threatened Languages. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Goddard, Ives
    1974   Dutch Loanwords in Delaware. A Delaware Indian Symposium. H. Kraft,
            ed. Pp. 153-60. Harrisburg: The Pennsylvania Historical and Museum
            Commission.

Grenoble, Lenore A. and Lindsay J. Whaley
    2006   Saving Languages: An Introduction to Language Revitalization.
            Cambridge UP.

Hinton, Leanne
    2001   The Green Book of Language Revitalization in Practice. San Diego,
            California: Academic Press.

Hinton, Leanne, and Jocelyn Ahlers
    1999   The Issue of "Authenticity" in California Language Restoration.
            Anthropology & Education Quarterly 30(1):56-67.

Jones, William
    1911   Algonquian (Fox): An Illustrative Sketch. Truman Michelson, ed.
            Bureau of American Ethnology, Bulletin 40(1):735-873.

Kimura, Larry, and April G.L. Counceller
    2008   Indigenous New Words Creation: Perspectives from Alaska and Hawai'i.
            Paper presented at the Stabilizing Indigenous Languages Symposium,
            Flagstaff, May 2-3, 2008.

Kipp, Darrell
    2007   Swimming in Words. Cultural Survival Quarterly 31(2):36-43.

Mithun, Marianne
    1999   The Languages of Native North America. Cambridge UP.

    2007   Linguistics in the Face of Language Endangerment. *In* Language
            Endangerment and Endangered Languages: Linguistic and
            Anthropological Studies with Special Emphasis on the Languages and
            Cultures of the Andean-Amazonian Border Area, W. Leo Wetzels, ed. Pp.
            15-35. Leiden: Publications of the Research School of Asian, African, and
            Amerindian Studies (CNWS), Leiden University.

Sauk Language Department
  2006-9 Manuscript notes, unpublished elicitations, field notes, and teaching
        materials. Stroud, Oklahoma: Sauk Language Department.

  2008   Manuscript, Grant Proposal, Administration for Native Americans 1-27.
        Stroud, Oklahoma: Sauk Language Department.

Silver, Shirley and Wick R. Miller
  1997   American Indian Languages: Cultural and Social Contexts. Tucson: The
        University of Arizona Press.

Trudgill, Peter
  1998   The Meanings of Words Should Not be Allowed to Vary or Change. *In*
        Language Myths. Laurie Bauer and Peter Trudgill, eds. Pp. 1-8. London:
        Penguin Books.

Valentine, J. Randolph
  2001   Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar. University of Toronto Press.

Voorhis, Paul H.
  1974   Introduction to the Kickapoo Language. Indiana University, Research
        Center for the Language Sciences, Language Science Monographs 13.
        Bloomington.

  1983   Notes on the Kickapoo Medial Suffixes. International Journal of American
        Linguistics 49(1):77-86.

  1988   Kickapoo Vocabulary. Memoir 6, Algonquian and Iroquoian Linguistics.

Whittaker, Gordon
  1996   The Sauk Language: a First Look. Papers of the 27th Algonquian
        Conference. 27:362-401.

  2005   A Concise Dictionary of the Sauk Language. Stroud, Oklahoma: Sac &
        Fox Nation of Oklahoma and the Missouri.

Wilson, Waziyatawin Angela and Michael Yellow Bird
  2005   Defying Colonization through Language Survival. *In* For Indigenous Eyes
        Only. Pp. 109-126. Sante Fe, New Mexico: School of American Research.