

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Ojibwe Discourse Markers. By Brendan Fairbanks.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1p78s130>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 40(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Hammerly, Christopher M.

Publication Date

2016-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

Languages as Evidence” and Dian Million’s “Epistemology,” are likely to spark lively classroom conversations on the challenges faced by Native studies departments in the Euro-American academy, education as an act of sovereignty, and language as representing worldview.

The mission of *Native Studies Keywords* to concentrate on multiplicity of meanings ensures that it will add value to any conversation in Native studies. Those who engage with this text will witness the theoretical debates that are happening within the field. Readers will come away with awareness that concepts like “land,” “blood,” and “tradition” have very political ramifications and diverse applications that may date back in time very far indeed. Furthermore, they will see that the field is highly interdisciplinary. Reliance on vocabulary and understanding from conventional, established disciplines might lead to disagreement both in theory and praxis as these disciplines meet in the crosshairs of Native studies. A scholar with a background in law and another with a background in land management might each use *sovereignty* without recognition of how they imbue the term with different significance. That *Native Studies Keywords* seeks to bring this rhetorical inconsistency into the light might result in greater, more meaningful discussions between collaborators with different scholarly qualifications.

The project this text attempts is far too large for one book. As this book can in no way cover the many keywords spotlighted in a field of study, it demands that more like it be published. Unfortunately, the editors do not mention how they came to decide on the chosen terms or which they felt ought to be included in subsequent work that takes up this project. However, any reader of *Native Studies Keywords* is bound to want a larger volume with more essays for each term and more terms included. Hopefully we can expect more, as well as more comprehensive, keywords texts in the near future.

Jennifer Stern

University of Arizona

Ojibwe Discourse Markers. By Brendan Fairbanks. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016. 222 pages. \$70.00 cloth and electronic; \$25.00 paper.

We are at a critical point for the revitalization and documentation of indigenous languages around the world. It is estimated that by the year 2100, as much as 90 percent of the world’s languages will be extinct. By giving a detailed, data-centric analysis of discourse markers in Ojibwe (Algonquian), Brendan Fairbanks makes a vital contribution to a little-studied topic, sure to prove indispensable to both the linguist and the advanced language-learner interested in fueling the renaissance of indigenous languages.

The majority of previous work on Ojibwe, which has centered on the complex system of verbal morphology, has not generally incorporated the greater context in which the language is situated. In *Ojibwe Discourse Markers*, Fairbanks attempts to strike a balance between conveying the syntactic, cultural, and discourse contexts of a given linguistic utterance, and its implications for formal theories of language. The

book can be divided into two parts: a general review of the treatment of discourse markers in linguistic theory, and a description and analysis of how the various discourse markers in Ojibwe fit into this theory.

Discourse markers are informally defined as linguistic particles that either add cohesion to a narrative (termed “Discourse Connectives”) or contribute interpersonal nuance (termed “Mystery Particles”). Using cross-linguistic evidence, Fairbanks shows that essentially every previously proposed formal attribute of discourse markers, many of which were asserted based on the behavior of these markers in English alone, falls flat against scrutiny. He makes six crucial observations: (1) nearly all linguistic categories (i.e. nouns, verbs, connectives) are recruited for discourse work; (2) not all markers have referential meaning; (3) there is no single position in the sentence that discourse markers occupy; (4) discourse-related functions are not restricted to particles, but may be performed by tense-aspect systems; (5) not all discourse markers are syntactically detachable; and (6) there is no single pattern of stress or prosodic structure that defines a discourse marker.

Thus, one of the major challenges in providing a rigorous formal account of discourse markers is their elusive definition as a natural class. The six facts above lead Fairbanks to advance a very general definition of what constitutes a discourse marker—an endeavor that may be misguided. The critique advanced by these observations is indeed important, and shows that existing accounts of discourse markers must be reconsidered, as they are far too restrictive. However, the alternative presented is not fully convincing, and swings too far in the other direction. In particular, unless a more restrictive notion of discourse role is adopted, it is too broad to designate as a “discourse marker” any expression with a role in the discourse. Given the adopted definition, and the author’s subsequent discussion centered on Ojibwe, it is not clear what does *not* qualify as a discourse marker: in some sense nearly every utterance and structure has a discourse function. The theoretical contributions of the book would therefore greatly benefit from a more explicit discussion of exclusionary criteria, which could help rule out certain particles and structures as discourse markers, without obviating their general contribution to the structure of a discourse.

The second half of the book is essentially organized into three sections covering the role of connectives, mystery particles, and conjunct morphology in structuring Ojibwe discourses. The analysis suffers slightly from the broad definition of discourse marker discussed above: on one hand, a more general definition is necessary to encompass the wide range of particles present in Ojibwe, while on the other, the explanatory force of discourse markers as a linguistic primitive seems to be lost. Fairbanks’s treatment of the conjunct verbal order—the name adopted within the Algonquianist tradition for the morphology associated with dependent or embedded clauses—relates most directly to this critique. The classification of the conjunct order as a discourse marker is perhaps what is most responsible for the loss of explanatory force. By moving away from particles to any linguistic constituent, the syntactic attributes (most notably restrictions on position and cliticization) that distinguish discourse connectives and mystery particles from other linguistic elements becomes degraded.

However, what does shine through are thorough descriptions of a huge number of discourse-related particles. Even if it is not always clear what theoretical significance to attribute to a given observation, the observations are made from rich, clearly presented sets of data. For a given particle, in many cases Fairbanks corroborates claims with data from multiple speakers and scenarios. This lends great credence to the descriptions advanced, and allows the reader to feel secure in the conclusions that are reached. In this way, the major contribution of the book is a more complete picture of Ojibwe as it is spoken, rather than a set of dismembered morphemes, as is often seen in the linguistic and Algonquianist traditions.

On the whole, *Ojibwe Discourse Markers* is a crucial contribution to the study of language and the revitalization of Ojibwe. Numerous times, Fairbanks implies that the book is for both the learner and the linguist. Indeed, this goal may be responsible for the main critique of the book: it may not spend enough time on the technical conclusions derived from Ojibwe to fully convince a formally oriented linguist, but at the same time, many of the descriptions may be too opaque to be accessible to the learner without specialized knowledge. Despite this, the value of the research should not be underestimated. For the linguist, it can be seen as a point of departure; for the learner, a challenging, but rewarding, endeavor to master the intricacies of Ojibwe.

Christopher M. Hammerly
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Redskins: Insult and Brand. By C. Richard King. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2016. 226 pages. \$24.95 cloth and electronic.

C. Richard King, the nation's preeminent scholarly expert on the American Indian mascot controversy, has produced in *Redskins: Insult and Brand* the absolute high-water mark study of the contours surrounding the logics of contemporary mascotting. Continuing his work from the past two decades, King takes the next productive step toward demystifying the controversy by mapping the colonial terrain of mascotting practices in the service of suggesting new rhetorically inventive ways that public activists and interventionist scholars might decolonize the mascot milieu in their work on the ground and on the page, respectively. In this way, *Redskins: Insult and Brand* presents both a review of mascot contexts and an updated critical analysis of the Washington R-dskins case, as well as a primer for continuing the mascot conversation in our communities.

King's volume contains a number of highlights, but the *sine qua non* that punctuates the study lies in the way he frames the R-dskins controversy in terms of cultural depth. That is, while many of us in our past work have tracked the eristic, back-and-forth rhetoric of pro-mascotters and anti-mascotters, King scaffolds his analysis of the R-dskins moniker and the deleterious word *redskin* itself with the suggestion that we ought to do more. The issue, he argues, "is about dignity and respect, combatting anti-Indian racism while furthering self-determination and decolonization" (4). Therefore,