Report and Reference Manual on Documentation and Classification of Aboriginal Languages in Canada

3rd Edition

By:

Mary Jane Norris

Norris Research Inc.

March 7th, 2016

Acknowledgements

Recommended Report Citation**:**

Norris, M.J. 2016: "Report and Reference Manual on Documentation and Classification of Aboriginal Languages in Canada". Unpublished report originally prepared for Aboriginal Affairs Directorate, Department of Canadian Heritage, January, 2011; 3rd edition March 2016.

Preface to the Second Edition

For the second edition, the main body of the report is unchanged. Additional material has been added to several of the appendices. Most of these additions have arisen from the need to correlate the language classification used by Neville (1970) with the classification presented in this report (Appendix H). Appendix H is unchanged from the first edition. There are several new rows added to Appendix A. There are minor revisions to Appendices D (Extinct languages) and F (Dialects). There is one change to Appendix J – Delaware is identified as representing both Munsee and Unami.

Preface to the Third Edition

The revisions are confined to Appendix J. A new introduction to the appendix describes some of the rationale behind the hierarchical classification scheme, and points out where it diverges from the scheme found in the Ethnologue.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Preface

The Department of Canadian Heritage requires definitive research to identify and enumerate all currently spoken Aboriginal languages in Canada (including dialects). The objectives of this study are to account for as many Aboriginal languages names and their variants in Canada as possible, and to develop a comparative analysis and reconciliation of all known languages, in relation to the 3rd edition of UNESCO's *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger*. The Atlas classification currently identifies 88 Aboriginal languages in Canada (including two languages extinct or "sleeping" within living memory). This UNESCO linguistic classification serves as a baseline reference for the identification and enumeration of Aboriginal languages and their variants, and in linking to their primary reference sources.

Findings from this report can also contribute to other bodies of publications and data collections on Aboriginal languages in Canada. Results suggest that some minor revisions to the existing UNESCO classification are required in order to be more consistent with the most currently available information on Aboriginal language names and classifications. As well, information and outputs from this report can also aid in updating and expanding Statistics Canada data collection and information on Aboriginal languages in Canada's Census.

Executive Summary

A major aim of this study has been to enumerate all known names and variations of Aboriginal languages in Canada, with the intention of reconciling the different names and classifications of Aboriginal languages in reference to UNESCO's 3rd edition of the *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger.* In terms of the names of Aboriginal languages and dialects, findings demonstrate a significant diversity of names, synonyms, and spellings.

This study has thus far yielded an inventory of about 350 different names of Aboriginal languages and dialects. About 100 of these 350 entries could not be directly linked to the 88 languages of UNESCO's 3rd Edition Atlas, with the majority, about 64%, being names of dialects (not considered as separate languages), 16% extinct languages; 9% pidgin or trade languages; and 11% Canada / USA cross border languages (once spoken in Canada, but now or were spoken primarily in the USA). Of the remaining 250 names, which include the 88 Atlas languages themselves, it is estimated that about 155 can be linked as synonyms or spelling variations to the 88 unique languages. In other words, out of this current inventory of 350 names, each of the Atlas's 88 unique languages corresponds directly, on average, to almost two other synonyms or variations of the language name.

Study results, outputs and reference materials from this research are provided in the report's ten Appendices, with the major inventory of 350 entries, contained in Appendix A: Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages in Canada. The other appendices of notes and tables on various aspects of the analysis include: proposed revisions to the Atlas classification; Unicode and Aboriginal orthographies; Extinct languages; Cross-cultural/trade/pidgin/sign languages; Dialects; Canada/USA cross-border languages; Transliteration challenges; a revised classification of Aboriginal languages; and, the Hierarchical classification of North American Aboriginal languages. A bibliography and references on language sources and maps are also provided.

In order to be consistent with the most recent research on Aboriginal language names and classifications, revisions proposed to the UNESCO Atlas classification of Aboriginal languages include: the addition of four First Nation languages spoken in British Columbia and the deletion of a pidgin language in Manitoba. However, in terms of numbers, that impact has been relatively minor, and would change the total number of languages in the Atlas (including two extinct within living memory) from 88 to 91; and in the case of still spoken languages from 86 to 89. It is expected that these proposed revisions will be followed up in the near future with the Atlas Editor, Christopher Moseley.

Findings point to significant output in the study of Aboriginal languages in Canada, in concert with an ever-increasing emphasis of the use of Aboriginal-based terminology and orthographies. More and more Aboriginal groups and communities are reverting to their traditional language names, and sometimes separate orthographies. These developments suggest that the process of transliteration could fill an important role in rendering Aboriginal language names more accessible to the general public through their anglicization or romanization. Further linguistic research on the transliteration of new and developing Aboriginal orthographies is also being explored with Christopher Moseley.

It is reasonable to expect continuing developments and challenges in the naming and classification of Aboriginal languages, given the growing emphasis on Aboriginal-based terminology and writing systems. These trends can have implications not only for documentation and classification of languages, but also for awareness, accessibility and use of Aboriginal names of First Nation, Inuit and Métis languages among Canadians in general.

Finally, as a consequence of the continually evolving and ongoing developments in the naming and classification of Aboriginal languages, the results of this study, while comprehensive in nature, nevertheless remain provisional and subject to revision. Thus, this report should generally be regarded as a work in progress.

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and Objective

Canada has a rich diversity of Aboriginal languages comprising First Nation, Inuit and Métis languages that reflect a variety of distinctive histories, cultures and identities. The identification and linguistic classification of these different languages are important considerations in assessing both the number and the situations of different Aboriginal languages. This is especially the case for the smaller, more endangered languages which can often be under-represented depending on the linguistic classification employed. However, it is no small challenge to enumerate all the different living Aboriginal languages in Canada today, given the variations associated with naming, alphabets, spelling and linguistic classifications.

The Department of Canadian Heritage requires definitive research to identify and enumerate all currently spoken Aboriginal languages in Canada (including dialects). In its objective to account for as many Aboriginal languages names and their variants in Canada as possible, and to develop a comparative analysis of all known languages, this study utilizes the listing and classification of the 88 Aboriginal languages in Canada (including two languages extinct or "sleeping" within living memory) currently identified in UNESCO's 3rd edition of the *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger.* This UNESCO linguistic classification serves as a baseline reference for the identification and enumeration of Aboriginal languages and their variants, and in linking to their primary reference sources. Furthermore, new information developed in this study has also led to some proposed revisions to the existing UNESCO classification to more accurately reflect the different languages.

1.2 Data Sources

In addition to the third edition of the UNESCO *Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger,* this report relies on a wide variety of sources including provincial and territorial websites and publications; regional and national Aboriginal language organizations; data from Aboriginal communities; Aboriginal language reports (*including the Aboriginal Languages Initiative database);* 2001 and 2006 Census data; and other linguistic references, including both Canadian (e.g. B.C.'s First Peoples Culture, Heritage and Language Council) and international (e.g. The Ethnologue) classifications. Other materials include mappings and various historical sources on Aboriginal languages. (See References and Bibliography on Language Sources)

1.3 Report content and outputs

This report discusses the issues and challenges associated with the enumeration and linguistic classification of Aboriginal languages in Canada. It identifies, categorizes and addresses variations of language names and classifications based on considerations associated with: synonyms of UNESCO languages in relation to Aboriginal names, spellings and alternate names; and languages not directly matched to UNESCO languages in relation to dialects versus languages; trade and pidgin languages; languages no longer spoken in Canada but in the United States; multiple languages and extinct languages.

Given the growing emphasis on traditional names of Aboriginal languages and increasing use by Aboriginal peoples of their own writing systems, significant discussion is allocated to the distinctions between indigenous and non-indigenous names and orthographies of Aboriginal languages (including autonyms and xenonyms); their anglicization into English pronunciation; and romanization with respect to the English alphabet and diacritics, such as accents (to affect the sound value of the letter). The issues discussed here can also be considered applicable in terms of pronouncing and writing Aboriginal names and

orthographies in French. Various aspects of Aboriginal orthographies and alphabets are explored, including developments with the International Phonetic Alphabet, and the application of Unicode characters. Challenges in the transliteration and anglicization / romanization of Aboriginal alphabets are also discussed and illustrated with various Aboriginal language names.

The report also highlights recent significant outputs and developments in the study and knowledge about Aboriginal languages in Canada, citing examples of recent publications.

Findings are provided in a series of detailed appendices, including the inventory of Aboriginal languages, of some 350 entries, along with related discussion and tables in the text. Recommendations arising from the research are also formulated with respect to proposed revisions to the classification of Aboriginal languages in UNESCO's 3rd Edition of the Atlas, and for further research in the area of transliteration of Aboriginal language names and orthographies.

The study concludes with some thoughts on the implications of the findings with respect to the number, diversity and regional distributions of Aboriginal language names. Considerations are also raised with respect to indigenous names and orthographies of Aboriginal languages, and their transliteration in order for the language name to be pronounced and written in English.

1.3.1 Inventory and Reference Manual of Aboriginal Languages in Canada in relation to UNESCO 3rd Edition

This report provides a lexicon or reference manual / compendium which corresponds directly to the 88 languages (including 2 extinct "sleeping" within living memory) identified in the UNESCO interactive online version of the Atlas (Moseley, 2009; UNESCO, 2009). It was developed by first creating an inventory of all Aboriginal languages indigenous to Canada at some point in time, from pre-contact to present, and then creating different categories of these traditional languages in relation to the UNESCO classification. These include a major group of entries that can be associated with the UNESCO classification including

currently living languages and those recently extinct or "sleeping" within living memory. The second major group of entries are those that are not found within the UNESCO Atlas classification, and includes dialects, long extinct languages, pidgin or trade languages, and languages once spoken in Canada, but now or were spoken primarily in the USA.

Aboriginal languages are identified, classified and analyzed in a series of reference tables and related appendix sections (e.g. ISO 639-3 codes). Results are also summarized in tables, reflecting regional aspects and findings specific to First Nation, Inuit and Métis languages. The report includes an inventory of source materials used in the identification and enumeration of languages, as well as a bibliography of publications and websites.

1.3.2 Proposed Revision of Classification in UNESCO 3rd Edition

It is important to note that as a consequence of the study's findings revisions are proposed to the original UNESCO classification referenced as a starting point for this report. Changes to the original distribution are proposed to accommodate those living language dialects and multiple languages that were not directly included within the original classification. Such changes, as indicated in the report's findings, pertain to the Aboriginal languages of British Columbia. As such, these changes reflect the most recent information available on Aboriginal languages in Canada since the development of the 3rd edition's classification practically two years ago in late 2008 / early 2009.

1.3.3 Contribution to knowledge: UNESCO and Statistics Canada

This report can also contribute to other bodies of publications and data collections on Aboriginal languages in Canada. Findings from this research and especially the proposed refinements to the current 3rd edition classification will contribute to the next update of UNESCO's *"Atlas of world languages in danger".* Information and outputs from this report can also aid in updating and expanding Statistics Canada data collection and information on Aboriginal languages in Canada's Census.

2 Existing Classifications of Aboriginal languages

There is no one definitive classification of Aboriginal languages in Canada, and consequently no consensus on their actual number. Some of the existing classifications suggest numbers in the range of about 50 to 80 plus. However, the lack of a single standard classification is not unique to Aboriginal languages.

2.1 No one standard language classification

To a large extent, linguistic classification systems of languages throughout the world can vary from the viewpoint of having a definitive standard, since the approach often depends on the purpose and criteria used in the identification of languages. According to the *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*, the definition of language itself can be problematic:

> Due to the nature of language and the various perspectives brought to its study, it is not surprising that a number of issues prove controversial. …The definition of language one chooses depends on the purpose one has in identifying a language. Some base their definition on purely linguistic grounds. Others recognize that social, cultural, or political factors must also be taken into account….. Not all scholars share the same set of criteria for what constitutes a "language" and what constitutes a "dialect." (Gordon and Grimes 2005, 8)

It is indeed also the case for Aboriginal languages in Canada that no single standard language classification exists, and as such the actual number of Aboriginal languages in Canada can be disputed.

2.2 Statistics Canada and the Ethnologue

The estimated number of Aboriginal languages spoken in Canada depends on the system of linguistic classification. For example, the linguistic classification underlying Statistics Canada Census data is based on Kinkade (1991), which identifies some 50 different Aboriginal languages spoken by First Nations, Inuit and Métis, categorized into 11 language families or isolates. By comparison, the most recent fifteenth edition of the Ethnologue yields a higher number, estimating

that within Canada there are 78 living (spoken as a first language) languages "indigenous" to the country (Gordon and Grimes 2005).

This situation of varying numbers and classifications of Aboriginal languages presents challenges in the concordance of language names and classifications. Thus, in undertaking the enumeration and classification of Aboriginal languages, it is necessary to choose an existing and relatively current and detailed linguistic classification to serve as a framework. The recently (2009) developed UNESCO framework of linguistic classification described below provides a fairly detailed accounting of Aboriginal languages across Canada, identifying 88 different languages (two of which became "extinct" within living memory).

2.3 UNESCO Language Classification

The classification framework utilized in the third edition of the UNESCO Atlas of the World's Languages in Danger (Moseley, 2010; UNESCO, 2010), lists 86 living Aboriginal languages. This estimate is based on three major sources: Statistics Canada census data; the previous second edition of the Atlas, which identifies 104 languages (UNESCO 2001), and the Ethnologue, which, as noted above, identifies 78 languages (Gordon and Grimes 2005). With respect to the third edition, the decrease from the second edition is attributable mainly to the dropping of the Trade or Pidgin languages and the long-extinct (greater than 100 years) languages. It is most compatible with, although not identical to, that of the Ethnologue, yielding 86 distinct languages, plus two that are known to have become extinct within living memory. The gap relative to the Ethnologue is attributable mainly to the splitting of Inuktitut into several distinct dialects, similar to those previously identified in the second edition (Norris 2010, 2009).

The UNESCO framework provides a more detailed classification of Aboriginal languages than those derived from Kinkade and the Ethnologue, not only for smaller and endangered languages but also for larger, more viable languages.

> For example, in the case of larger viable languages, the Census classification treats Cree and its variants as one language, whereas the UNESCO classification recognizes six different versions of Cree as

separate languages rather than dialects; similarly the UNESCO framework provides more detailed Inuit language categories, with 11 different languages, compared to one of Inuktitut prior to 2006 Census (two listed in 2006). Regionally, the UNESCO classification yields higher numbers of languages, especially in British Columbia and Ontario, owing mainly to the impact of a greater number of languages that have only a few speakers. (Norris, 2009, page 24).

Similarly, in comparison, the UNESCO classification also reflects a more consistent approach across regions in detailing the number of different languages. Consistency of linguistic classifications has important implications for comparability, and hence more reliable comparisons of regional diversity and endangerment across geographic areas (whether regions or countries) (Norris, 2009). As the Atlas notes regarding international comparisons of language endangerment "…countries with high linguistic diversity tend to have high numbers of endangered languages, while countries where very few languages are currently spoken tend to have few that are endangered …ratios of languages in danger cannot be calculated until consistent methodologies are applied in assessing the total number of languages in each country or area" (Moseley, 2009, UNESCO 2009).

3 Some Issues in the Classification and Naming of Languages

The classification of languages in general entails various aspects, such as methods and types of approaches. For example, genetic classification groups languages into families according to their descent (e.g. Indo-European family) while linguistic typology involves the classification of languages according to their structural characteristics on the basis of syntax, phonology and morphology (O'Grady and Archibald, 2009, pages 287-317).

While it is beyond the scope of this paper to address the methods and types of language classification, three related topics are relevant to this discussion. The first involves an issue common to most language classifications, which is distinguishing between a dialect and a language. The second aspect relates to

the actual naming of languages - whether the name of the language is an "autonym", that is, native to the language to which it refers, or a "xenonym", that is, derived from a language not native to the language itself (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Xenonym). The third focus concerns orthography, referring to the written form of a language, and related aspects of transliteration, anglicization and spelling.

3.1 Dialect and language

A major issue in the classification of languages is the distinction between a dialect and a language, one that is not always a straightforward matter. Generally if speakers of different tongues can understand each other then they are considered to be speaking dialects of the same language. However, the distinction can often involve other considerations such as social and political factors as well as linguistic considerations, as Steinbergs explains in O'Grady and Archibald (2009) "Contemporary Linguistic Analysis". Even the linguistic aspect is not necessarily clear:

> It is often difficult to determine whether two linguistic communities speak different languages or merely different dialects of the same language. One test that linguists use to decide this involves the criterion of mutual intelligibility (Steinbergs (2009), from O'Grady and Archibald, pages 287-288). Mutually intelligible varieties of the same language can be understood by speakers of each variety. According to this criterion, the English of Toronto, the English of Milwaukee and the English of London qualify as dialects of the same language. On the other hand, if two speakers cannot understand, one another, then linguists normally conclude that they are speaking different languages. The Italian of Florence and the French of Paris are examples of varieties of speech that are not mutually intelligible.

> … complications also arise when we try to divide a continuum of mutually intelligible dialects whose two endpoints are not intelligible. Dutch and German, for example, are mutually intelligible around the border area between Germany and the Netherlands; however, the Dutch of Amsterdam and the German of Munich are not. Similarly, Palestinian Arabic and Syrian Arabic, are mutually intelligible, but Moroccan Arabic, and Saudi Arabian Arabic are not.

In addition, these linguistic considerations can be confounded by non-linguistic, factors:

> Political, cultural, social, historical and religious factors frequently interfere when determining linguistic boundaries. (In fact it is sometimes said that a language is just a dialect with an army and a navy!) For example, Serbs and Croats, with their different histories, cultures and religions, often claim that they speak different languages. However, even though they use different alphabets, Serbian and Croatian are actually mutually intelligible dialects of the same language, which linguists call Serbo-Croatian. In contrast, we often think of Chinese as if it were a single language, even though it is actually a number of individual, mutually unintelligible languages (Mandarin, Cantonese, Taiwanese, Wu, and so on), each with a multitude of dialects of its own (Steinbergs (2009), from O'Grady and Archibald, pages 287-288).

Thus, as this discussion demonstrates, clearly non-linguistic factors, such as socio-cultural and political differences can have a significant impact on the distinction between dialect and language, at times outweighing linguistic tests. This reflects the fact that languages are not only a way of communication but are also part of the culture of the community or group, just as other shared practices are a way of displaying group identity. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Languages

3.2 Autonym and Xenonym

A major component in the classification of languages through out the world lies with the actual naming of the language. The name of a language that derives from the speakers themselves, as its traditional name in its own language is considered to be an autonym or endonym. (It may also be the case that no traditional name exists for the language.) Alternatively, the name of a language can be from external sources – not the speakers – and in other foreign languages; as such these language names are known as xenonyms or exonyms. These distinctions in naming also apply to names of places and peoples. An explanation in Wikipedia, http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endonym, illustrates these distinctions with some examples throughout the world as follows:

An exonym (from the Greek: ἔξω, éxō, "out" and ὄνομα, ónoma, "name") is a name for a place or a personal name that differs from that used in the official or well-established language within that place or for that person by the local inhabitants, or a name for a people or language that is not native to the people or language to which it refers. The name used by the people or locals themselves is called endonym, autonym (from the Greek ἔνδον, éndon, "within" or αὐτό, autó, "self" and ὄνομα, ónoma, "name"), or self-appellation. For example, India, Germany, Greece, Japan, and Korea are the English exonyms corresponding to the endonyms Bharat, Deutschland, Ellas, Nippon/Nihon, and Hanguk/Joseon.

3.2.1 Controversies and Complications

(This section from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endonym)

There is a growing trend to replace xenonyms for language names with autonyms. However, as various sources in Wikipedia indicate, there are controversies and complications associated with the use and avoidance of exonyms. In situations where exonyms have pejorative connotations, groups prefer traditional names. For example, Romani people prefer that term over exonyms like Gypsy (from Egypt) or the French term bohème (from Bohemia). Similarly, the use of exonyms associated with historical sensitivities may be discouraged, such as German names for Polish and Czech places or Russian place names being used for locations once under its Russian control. Similarly, geographers are more likely to avoid the use of exonyms for place names and to use local appellation. For example, Spanish speakers are more likely to refer to the Turkish capital as Ankara rather than use the Spanish exonym Angora (from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endonym) .

However, in some situations there can be complications with attempts to reduce the use of exonyms, especially if the name in question has become embedded in the language or history of the groups.

According to the United Nations Statistics Division, "Time has, however, shown that initial ambitious attempts to rapidly decrease the number of exonyms were over-optimistic and not possible to realise in the intended way. The reason would appear to be that many exonyms have become

22

common words in a language and can be seen as part of the language's cultural heritage."

The use of endonyms themselves can also have implications for outsiders in terms of accessibility, pronunciation, spelling and word category as the following passage from Wikipedia illustrates:

> The endonym may include sounds which are highly unfamiliar to speakers of other languages, making appropriate usage difficult if not impossible for an outsider. Over the years, phonetic changes may happen to the endonym either in the original language or the borrowing language, thus changing an endonym into an exonym, as in the case of *Paris*, where the *s* was formerly pronounced in French. … In many cases no standardized spelling is available either because the language itself is unwritten (even unanalyzed) or because there are competing non-standard spellings. Use of a misspelled endonym is perhaps more problematic than the respectful use of an existing exonym. Finally, an endonym may be simply a plural noun and does not extend itself to adjectival usage in another language, like English, which has a propensity to use the adjectives for describing culture and language. The attempt to use the endonym thus has a bizarre-sounding result. …The name for a language and a people are often different terms, of course, which is a complication for an outsider.
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Endonym

Additionally, the use of endonyms may not always apply well to situations involving large multi-ethnic groups *(such as in Canada)* and the likelihood that different sub-groups often have incompatible preferences. The implications are that that the principle of self-appellation may be limited in such a situation, as the following passage from Wikipedia suggests:

> Moreover, every natural language has traditionally ignored this principle, exerting its privilege to invent its own ethnic terms for other peoples. Speakers of the English language are no exception, and use terms such as Germans, Dutch, and Albanians, disregarding the self-appellations and preferences of those subjects (Deutsche, Nederlanders, and Shqiptarët). Not surprisingly, English names for the pre-Columbian Americans were largely assigned by tradition. They are not always accepted by the peoples themselves.
>
> (From
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Native_American_name_controversy#Endonyms_and_exonyms

3.3 Orthography, Transliteration, Anglicization and Spelling

Another important element of language classification systems, and one especially relevant to Aboriginal languages, is the orthography of a language, which is basically a standard writing system or script for a specific language. A writing system is a symbolic system used to represent elements or statements expressible in language. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Writing_system. More than one writing system can be used for a language. For example the languages of Kurdish, Uyghur or Serbian can have more than one orthography. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Orthography. Some examples of Aboriginal languages having more than one orthography include the various Inuit, Cree and Ojibway languages.

Orthographies can differ across languages, in representing speech sounds and their rules associated with spellings. Some orthographies are not always regular in their spellings and speech sounds, that is, "the set of habits to represent speech sounds in writing". The English orthography, the alphabetic spelling system used by the English language, is a case in point:

> "…. nearly every sound is spelled in more than one way, and most spellings and all letters can be pronounced in more than one way and often in many different ways. This is partly due to the complex history of the English language, but mainly due to the fact that no systematic spelling reform has been implemented in English, contrary to the situation in most other languages…English spelling is mainly based on how the language was pronounced in the 15th century. Especially the pronunciation of long vowels and diphthongs has completely changed since then. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/English_orthography

In order to know and pronounce the names of languages in other orthographies the process of transliteration is necessary, and a process increasingly relevant in the naming and classification of Aboriginal languages:

> Transliteration is a mapping from one system of writing into another, word by word, or ideally letter by letter. Transliteration attempts to use a one-to-one correspondence and be exact, so that an informed reader should be able to reconstruct the original spelling of unknown transliterated words.
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transliteration

The process of transliteration can entail, although not always necessarily, that of transcription, "…which specifically maps the sounds of one language to the best matching script of another language". Yet it would seem that many transliterations tend to map the letters from one language script to letters pronounced similarly in the other language.

> "…If the relations between letters and sounds are similar in both languages, a transliteration may be (almost) the same as a transcription. In practice, there are also some mixed transliteration/transcription systems that transliterate a part of the original script and transcribe the rest…. In a broader sense, the word transliteration may be used to include both transliteration in the narrow sense and transcription."
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transliteration
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transcription_(linguistics)

More precisely, within the context of this study, transliterations from Aboriginal orthographies to English entail the processes of anglicization (a rendering in English), a transcription method; and, romanization (representation of written word in Roman alphabet), which encompasses several transliteration and transcription methods http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transliteration. According to Wikipedia references:

> Anglicization or anglicisation is the process of converting verbal or written elements of any other language into a form that is more comprehensible to an English speaker. Or, more generally, to alter something such that it becomes English in form or character…. The term most often refers to the process of altering the pronunciation or spelling of a foreign word when it is borrowed into English. Personal names may also be anglicised. This was rather common for names of antiquity or of foreign heads of state, and it was and is also common among immigrants to English-speaking countries (e.g., Battenberg became Mountbatten) (from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Anglicizing)

And,

> …. romanization (romanisation) or latinization (latinisation) … is the representation of a written word or spoken speech with the Roman (Latin) alphabet, or a system for doing so, where the original word or language uses a different writing system (or none). Methods of romanization include transliteration, for representing written text, and transcription, for representing the spoken word. The latter can be subdivided into phonemic transcription, which records the phonemes or units of semantic meaning in speech, and more strict phonetic transcription, which records speech sounds with precision. Each romanization has its own set of rules for pronunciation of the romanized words. (From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Romanization)

With respect to the Latin alphabet mention should also be made here of diacritics, or glyphs, which are added to a letter to change the sound value of the letter to which they are added. An example in English is Noël. In orthography, diacritics can also be used in combination with a letter, representing a new distinct letter or letter-diacritic combination. "…In some cases, letters are used as "in-line diacritics" in place of ancillary glyphs, because they modify the sound of the letter preceding them, as in the case of the "h" in English "sh" and "th"."
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diacritic

4 Developments and Challenges in the enumeration, and classification of Aboriginal languages in Canada

There are a host of considerations associated with the identification and classification of Aboriginal languages in Canada, most of which are universal in nature while others are unique to Canada's indigenous languages. The distinction between dialects and languages, and single and multiple languages is a major linguistic issue for Aboriginal languages as well as for other language classifications throughout the world. Also, as with other languages, non-linguistic factors (e.g. cultural, social, political, territorial, and historical) can play a role in the classifications, orthography, names and spellings of Aboriginal dialects and languages.

More Aboriginal-specific considerations are those associated with issues in the naming of Aboriginal languages, especially the growing emphasis on the use of language names native to the language itself – that is, "autonyms". More and more Aboriginal groups and communities are reverting to their traditional language names, and sometimes separate orthographies, which can entail the related aspects of transliteration, anglicization and spelling. At times, preferences on the part of the community of Aboriginal speakers with respect to language classification can differ from those based solely on linguistic considerations.

These various considerations represent ongoing challenges in enumerating and reconciling the different names and classifications of Aboriginal languages. As well, historical factors are also important to consider in accounting for languages that may not be reflected in current linguistic classifications. For example, practically all of the "mixed" or "cross-cultural" languages in the history of Aboriginal languages in Canada occur as pidgin or trade languages. A pidgin or trade language "…is a simplified language that develops as a means of communication between two or more groups that do not have a language in common" http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Pidgin. Such languages often developed in

the course of trade between native and non-native, and among native groups themselves. A more detailed discussion on native American pidgin and trade languages from Campbell's "American Indian Languages" (1998, pages 18-25) suggests that "…Basque-Algonquian Pidgin is perhaps the oldest pidgin attested in North America, thought to have been spoken ca. 1540-1640 (Bakker 1987, 198a,1989b)."

While pidgin or trade languages are included in this inventory, they are generally not covered in either the 3rd edition UNESCO or Ethnologue classifications, with the exception of Michif, the traditional language spoken by the Métis. Michif is classified as a mixed language "… in which most nouns (approximately 90%) and most adjectives … are French in origin, whereas almost all the verbs… are from Plains Cree (Campbell, 1998, page 19).

Two other historical categories of languages included in the inventory but not listed in the UNESCO classification include: those once spoken in Canada, but now only in the United States; and those long extinct.

4.1 Dialects and languages; Multiple versus single languages:

4.1.1 UNESCO Classification of Aboriginal languages

Aboriginal languages differ across the various classifications, in their distinctions between dialect and languages, and therefore in their numbers. The UNESCO 3rd edition classifications of Cree and Ojibway languages stay very close to those of the previous 2nd edition and the Ethnologue, indicating six Cree languages and five Ojibway languages. In the case of Inuit languages, the 3rd edition classification of ten different languages corresponds more closely to the 2nd edition than the considerably abridged Ethnologue which indicates only four different Inuit languages. In sharp contrast, the Statistics Canada classification based on Kinkade indicates one Cree language, one Ojibway language and, as of the 2006 Census, two Inuit languages.

With respect to distinguishing between dialects and languages, both linguistic and non-linguistic factors contribute to the complexity, and as such make it practically impossible to apply a consistent methodology across Canada.

4.1.2 Linguistic factor of Intelligibility

From a solely linguistic perspective, the distinction between dialect and language is not straightforward for some Aboriginal languages like Cree, Ojibway and Inuit. For these languages, the test of mutual intelligibility is confounded by the complexity noted earlier of a continuum of dialects whose two endpoints are not intelligible. This is not surprising, given the widespread geographic distribution of these three large language groups across Canada. For example in the case of Cree, the UNESCO classification indicates six different languages, from east to west and in the north. It is the case that speakers of Eastern Cree in James Bay will have more difficulty understanding speakers of Plains Cree in Alberta and British Columbia, compared to speakers of the geographically adjacent and mutually intelligible languages of Moose Cree (spoken in Ontario) and Swampy Cree (spoken in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan). Thus on one hand, geographically adjacent Cree languages that are mutually intelligible are in that sense dialects; on the other hand those that are much further apart in Eastern and Western Canada are much less intelligible and hence, are more like languages in relation to each other.

In the case of Inuktitut, the UNESCO Atlas recognizes ten distinct languages spread across the four major Inuit regions of Canada (Nunavut, Nunavik in northern Quebec, the Inuvialuit region of the Northwest Territories, and Nunatsiavut in northern Labrador). Again, intelligibility among the different dialects lessens and their writing systems differ as distances among the different language communities increase:

> While these dialects or languages can be interrelated or overlapping, especially as neighbouring dialects, they become increasingly distinct over large distances, such that a speaker of one dialect will have difficulty communicating with a speaker of another. The different dialects can have different writing systems or orthographies. For example, in western

> Nunavut, the Natsilingmiutut language is written with syllabics, whereas Inuinnaqtun is written with a roman orthography rather than syllabics. Further east, in Labrador a Roman orthography is used for Nunatsiavummiutut. (Norris, 2010, page 114).

However, for other Aboriginal languages the linguistic distinction between dialect and language is relatively clear. For example, the Blackfoot language has several dialects that are mutually intelligible among speakers in nearby reserves, including Blackfoot, Cheyenne, Piscataway, Lumbee, Wiyot, and Yurok.

4.1.3 Non-linguistic factors

Non-linguistic factors that can intervene in the distinction between dialect and language entail a range of possible considerations, such as cultural, social, political, territorial and historical effects that often underlie the preferences of Aboriginal groups and communities. Such factors can yield outcomes in classification different from those based on a purely linguistic approach. For example, a solely linguistic approach might suggest that a community language is a dialect, whereas other non-linguistic historical or political dimensions could yield the designation as a language rather than a dialect.

There are various illustrations among Aboriginal languages of the varying effects linguistic and non-linguistic factors play in the distinctions between dialect and languages. Different types of situations can result, such as the case of two mutually intelligible dialects of the same language being treated as separate languages, or vice versa linguistically different languages being treated as dialects of one language.

4.1.3.1 Example of Carrier, Babine and Witsuwit'en

The variety of different approaches in distinguishing between dialect and language can be demonstrated by four different classifications of Carrier dialect and languages in British Columbia. In both the 2nd and 3rd editions of the UNESCO Atlas the First Nation tongues of Babine and Witsuwit'en were not considered as distinct languages, as they were considered to be dialects of the

Carrier language. However, the Ethnologue indicates three distinct Carrier languages: Babine (including); Carrier and Southern Carrier. A third classification approach appears in the paper "The Names of the First Nations Languages of British Columbia" by linguist William J. Poser http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf , which indicates that Babine-Witsuwit'en is a language, consisting of the two dialects of Babine and Witsuwit'en. With respect to Carrier itself, Poser notes that "…The term Carrier has been used both as a name for Carrier in the narrow sense and for Carrier together with Babine-Witsuwit'en, which is sometimes called Northern Carrier". Poser also notes that with respect to Carrier that "….Dakelh is the name that Carrier people use for themselves and also for their language". On the other hand, a fourth approach is found in the First Peoples Heritage, Language and Culture Council (FPHLCC) report on the status of BC First Nations Languages (2010). This Aboriginal language organization lists three separate languages of Dakelh, Wetsuwit'en and Nedut'en which is the indigenous term for Babine the Eastern dialect of Carrier (page 23). It would seem then, that from Aboriginal-specific territorial and community perspectives that the most appropriate classification is three distinct languages, rather than one or two with dialects.

4.1.3.2 Nisga'a & Giksan: Linguistically dialects; Non-linguistic factors suggest languages

An example of linguistic tests suggesting distinctions as dialects, while intervening political factors point to classification as languages, is the B.C. case of Nisga'a and Gitksan. Linguists consider them to be closely related, such that "…they have often been treated as dialects of the same language, denoted Nass-Gitksan" (Poser, http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf). In the 3rd Edition of the UNESCO Atlas, they are shown as distinct languages, consistent with the approach in the (FPHLCC) report, listing Gitsenimx (Gitksan) and Nisqa'a (page 23). As Poser explains:

> "If the people do not think of each other as forming a single social or political unit, it may be necessary to make a finer distinction. Thus, until fairly recently Nisga'a and Gitxsan were treated as a single language

called Nass-Gistksan in the linguistic and anthropological literature. The
two speech varieties are still quite similar and mutually comprehensible,
but they are generally treated as separate languages and given distinct
names, because of the political differences between the two groups."

On the other hand, as Poser points out, sometimes the opposite situation can
occur in which people who feel a sense of cultural unity may consider themselves
to speak a single language, when in fact linguistically the varieties spoken are
different enough to be considered languages. Poser cites the example of the
Southern Wakashan languages of Nuuchahnuth (Nootka), Ditidaht (Nitidaht) and
Makah (the latter spoken in the U.S. in Washington State) which speakers
consider to form a single language known as the "Westcoast language".
However, not all linguistic classifications consider Dititdaht and Nuuchahnuth to
be separate languages. The Ethnologue and the 3rd Edition treat Ditidaht
(Nitidaht) as a dialect of Nootka, while both Poser and the FPHLCC (page 23)
classifications lists Ditidaht and Nuuchahnuth as separate languages.

4.1.3.3 Languages Names as Aggregations of Dialects or Languages

There are also situations where there is no traditional name for a language as a
whole that is spoken in different communities (as Poser suggests, a "lack of a
cover term") when people may characterize themselves in terms of political or
residential units but not in cultural or linguistic units. In these cases, linguists
have resorted to an aggregation of dialects in referring to a single language with
dialects of spoken in different communities. Examples of this type include
"…Comox/Sliamon spoken both at Comox and Sliamon, and Heiltsuk / Owekyala
for the language spoken at both Bella Bella and Oweekneo."(Poser).

The Inuit language of Inuvialuktun, one of the official languages spoken in the
Northwest Territories, is an example of an aggregation of dialects or languages –
in this case of three linguistically distinct Inuit languages owing to the intervention
of political factors. Inuvialuktun is spoken by the Inuit who live in the Inuvialuit
Settlement Region in NWT (a land claim area) and who call themselves
Inuvialuit. Thus, the language term Inuvialuktun derives more from Inuvialut - the

territorial / residential unit of speakers, rather than their three linguistically distinct different languages. As various sources note, including http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inuvialuit:

> "…the official understanding of Inuvialuktun is somewhat at variance to the way linguists understand it. Rather than a single dialect, Inuvialuktun is a politically motivated grouping of three quite distinct and separate dialects."

Inuvialuktun covers three distinct languages spoken in the Inuvialuit Settlement Region (Kangiryuarmiutun, Siglitun, Uummarmiutun), where Kangiryuarmiutun is essentially identical to the Inuinnaqtun spoken in western Nunavut, and Uummarmiutun is essentially the same as Alaskan Inupiatun. However, the government of the Northwest Territories considers Inuvialuktun distinct from the Inuktitut spoken in Nunavut (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inuvialuktun).

Neither the 2nd or 3rd editions of the Atlas, nor the Ethnologue classify Inuvialuktun as a language. However, with respect to the corresponding Inuit languages, all three Inuinnaqtun (Kangiryuarmiutun), Siglitun and Inupiatun (Uummarmiutun) are listed in the 3rd edition; while Inupiaq, a synonym for Inupiatun, and Inuit (Mackenzie Delta), a synonym for Siglitun are listed in the 2nd edition.

4.2 Language Names and Synonyms: Autonyms & Xenonyms;

4.2.1 Naming: Traditional (Autonyms) versus Outsider (Xenonyms)

Increasingly, in order to better reflect their traditional cultures and languages Aboriginal language users and communities are emphasizing the use of names that are native to their own language, that is, "autonyms" instead of "xenonyms". To some extent, this emphasis on the use of Aboriginal names for languages reflects the ongoing controversy in general about appropriate and acceptable terminology of indigenous peoples, cultures and geographies. According to Wikipedia sources:

The Native American name controversy is a dispute over the acceptable terminology of the indigenous peoples of the Americas and to the broad subsets thereof, such as those living in a specific country or sharing certain cultural attributes.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Native_American_name_controversy#Endonyms_and_exonyms

For example, this name issue extends to place names. Many place names in Canada are of Aboriginal origin originating from the words of the First Nations, Métis, or Inuit languages. One of the most well known names is the word 'Canada' itself, which comes from the word meaning "village" or "settlement" , "….as used in the Saint-Lawrence Iroquoian language spoken by the inhabitants of Stadacona and the neighbouring region near present-day Quebec City in the 16th century". Many place names today, often used only in English or French, have alternate names in the local native languages, for example: "*Alkali Lake,* British Columbia is *Esket* in the Shuswap language, *Lytton*, British Columbia is *Camchin i*n the Thompson language (often used in English as Kumsheen). (From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_place_names_in_Canada_of_Aboriginal_origin)

4.2.2 Xenonyms: Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal

The distinction between self-designated Aboriginal names of languages (autonyms) and names imposed by outsiders (xenonyms) is critical for an accurate inventory and enumeration of different Aboriginal language names. External names of Aboriginal languages in Canada are often associated with non-Aboriginal names, from mainly English and French, such as those of Babine, Nicola, Nootka, Northern Straits Salish and Thompson in British Columbia.

However, it is also important to recognize that not all xenonyms or language names from outside are necessarily non-Aboriginal in origin. It is also the case that some "xenonyms" are those imposed by other Aboriginal groups. For example, according to Poser, there are five names of First Nation languages in British Columbia that did not originate from the speakers themselves but from

neighbouring First Nations – these include: Bella Coola, Klallum, Pentlatch, Sechelt and Tagish. For example, the language name Bella Coola (spoken by the Nuxalk Nation), derives from a name the Heiltsuk used to refer to the Nuxalk.

As well, some xenonyms were the outcomes of languages without a traditional name to begin with. According to Poser this was the situation with Bella Coola since "…no traditional name for all Nuxalk people or the language is known".

4.2.3 Anglicizations of Aboriginal Autonymys and Xenonyms

Another dimension of Aboriginal language names is their anglicization. Many names of Aboriginal languages today tend to reflect the anglicized versions of the indigenous name. This is an important aspect, since it can indeed be the case that the traditional Aboriginal names have been retained, but in an anglicized or francized version. In other words, the name of the language is not a xenonym but an autonym that has been anglicized. This appears to be the case for the majority of BC First Nation languages, about 60% according to Poser. For example, Chilcotin is an anglicized version of the indigenous language name <Tsilhqot'in>.

A similar distinction between language origins and anglicization also applies to xenonyms. An Aboriginal-based xenonym, such as Bella Coola, is in fact an anglicized version of its name in Heiltsuk (see Appendices for details).

4.2.4 Translations of Aboriginal Autonymys and Xenonyms

Another aspect of English or French usage of Aboriginal language names are translations of the indigenous name into English or French. These are distinct from the process of anglicization, which has more to do with rendering the Aboriginal name into a form that can be written and pronounced in English. For example, Poser considers the "Beaver" language to be an English translation of the First Nation language name, whereas Chilcotin is an anglicized version of the indigenous language name <Tsilhqot'in>.

4.3 Categories of Names by Self-Designation and Anglicization

Thus if all the relevant data were available, it would be possible to analyse Aboriginal languages in terms of their self-designation (autonyms vs. xenonyms), anglicization and translation across six major categories:

1) autonym (self-designation in its own indigenous language);

2) anglicized version of autonym;

3) xenonym from other Aboriginal group;

4) anglicized version of xenoym;

5) translations (English or French) of Aboriginal autonyms and xenonyms; and,

6) xenonym from non-Aboriginal group (English or French).

While this study attempts to compile language names according to autonyms and xenonyms, and anglicizations, it would not be feasible given existing sources to produce a complete classification for all Aboriginal languages. Furthermore, the distinction between Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal xenonyms would require a detailed investigation which is beyond the scope of this study.

However, to the extent possible within the given data availability and time and resource constraints, languages have been listed according to whether or not the language name is an autonym or xenonym, along with their indigenous and anglicized versions (see Appendix A: Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages in Canada).

As well, a brief summary of the situation in British Columbia is provided here based on the work by Poser, which provides a good illustration of the complexity and issues in First Nation language names (see http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf .

36

4.3.1 Aboriginal language names in British Columbia: Autonyms, Xenonyms and Anglicization

In his paper "The Names of the First Nations Languages of British Columbia", Poser's analysis of the 37 different languages (including those extinct within living memory) reveals, contrary to popular opinion, that it is **not** the case that First Nations languages and peoples have been given arbitrary English names. Rather it is more accurate to say the majority (some 60%) of the province's First Nation languages are anglicized versions of autonyms, that is, traditional self-designated names. And, he demonstrates that 32 names (86 percent) either are, or are based on, First Nations terms, such that only five names can be said to be of purely colonial origin. The 37 language names are categorized as follows:

1) Autonym (self-designation in indigenous language) = One language (Gitskan);

2) Anglicized version of autonym- anglicizations of the indigenous name for the language of the people or subgroup of people = 21 languages (Chilcotin, Coast Tsimshian, ComoxSliamon, Cree, Haida, Haisla, Halkomelem, HeiltsukOowekyala, Kootenay, Kwakiutl, Lillooet, Nisga'a, Nitinat, Okanagan, Sekani, Shuswap, South Tsimshian, Squamish, Tahltan, Tlingit, and Witsuwit'en);

3) Xenonym from other neighbouring First Nations = 5 languages (Bella Coola, Klallam, Pentlatch, Sechelt and Tagish);

4) Anglicized version of xenoym – e.g. Bella Coola

5) English translations of terms used by other First Nations = 3 languages (Beaver, Carrier, and Slave).

6) Xenonym from non-Aboriginal group – names of purely colonial origin= 5 languages (Babine, Nicola, Nootka, Northern Straits Salish, and Thompson).

7) Other = 1 language, Kaska, is an anglicization of the indigenous name of a place in Kaska territory and another, Saulteaux, appears to be the French translation of the indigenous name of one band.

4.4 Orthography, Transliteration, Anglicization and Spellings

4.4.1 Aboriginal Orthography of Syllabics: System unique to Canada

Syllabics are used as writing systems for a number of Canadian Aboriginal languages within the Algonquian, Inuit, and (formerly) Athabaskan language families. Although they have been used on occasion in the United States, syllabics are practically exclusive to Canada. They are currently used mainly for Cree, Inuit and Ojibwe languages. Further west, syllabics were used in earlier times but very rarely for the Algonquin languages of Blackfoot or for Athapaskan languages such as the Carrier language of Dakelh. "Among Dakelh users, a well developed Roman alphabet has effectively replaced syllabics, which are now understood almost exclusively only by elderly members of the community." From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canadian_Aboriginal_syllabics

Syllabics originated with missionaries in Native communities, and given the long history associated with their development and use among Aboriginal languages, many communities associate the syllabics writing system with their languages and cultures, whereas Roman orthographies represent linguistic assimilation. At one point, the use of syllabics as writing systems received relatively little support, and tended to be discouraged on the part of governments. Now, syllabic writing systems have official status in Inuit languages in Nunavik and Nunavut:

> In Nunavut, laws, legislative debates and many other government documents must be published in Inuktitut in both syllabics and Roman alphabet form. The rapid growth in the scope and quantity of material published in syllabics has, by all appearances, ended any immediate prospect of marginalisation for this writing scheme.
>
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canadian_Aboriginal_syllabics

4.4.2 Aboriginal Orthography of First Nation Languages in British Columbia

Many of the B.C. First Nations are switching to using their own names for their languages, using their own orthographies. For example, Nɬeʔkepmxcín is the preferred name for Thompson, the current name in the UNESCO Atlas. All of the B.C. languages are listed in their own orthographies on the cover page of the "Report on the Status of B.C. First Nations Languages, 2010": http://www.fphlcc.ca/downloads/2010-report-on-the-status-of-bc-first-nations-languages.pdf

For several of these language orthographies it is not obvious (for a non-linguist) how to produce English alphabet transliterations. Furthermore, there can be more than one Aboriginal orthography in use for the same language. A good example of this is the language of Comox/Sliammon (as designated in the UNESCO Atlas). On the LanguageGeek website http://www.languagegeek.com/ Comox/Sliammon is written as ʔayʔaǰuθəm/Saɬuɬtxʷ, and in the FPHLCC report it is written as Éy7á7juuthem.

In order for these indigenous names to be accessible in English, these different orthographies raise various considerations, such as: their representation in the English alphabet, including the Atlas; the inclusion of special characters such as '7', in the name; questions of pronunciations by an English speaker, for example, in relation to the two '7's. While the resolution of such questions is beyond the scope of this report, they nevertheless are areas that warrant further attention regarding accepted, or even proposed, transliteration. In the meantime, this current report adopts transliterations that have already appeared frequently in the literature, for example Pentlatch = Pəntl'áč, Tlingit = Łingít.

4.4.2.1 Aboriginal Orthographies and International Phonetic Alphabet

Some of the Aboriginal orthographies reference in part the "International Phonetic Alphabet" (IPA). It appears that some of the symbols used in the Aboriginal orthographies correspond to some of the IPA symbols that are not as easily accessible with standard font. For example, it seems that the "7" corresponds to the glottal stop /ʔ/ in the IPA.

An example, in the case of the B.C. language of Squamish, is the autonym in the specialized Aboriginal orthography is: Sḵwx̱wú7mesh sníchim. The autonym of Squamish expressed in the IPA orthography is sqʷχʷúʔməʃ. Perhaps Squamish represents an acceptable transliteration. Also, in relation to the use of the '7', character the following note from Wikipedia illustrates some of the challenges surrounding the various orthographies:

> "Reading at random, I came across an article about the Sḵwx̱wú7mesh … Not having seen a 7 used as a letter before, I was curious and looked up Sḵwx̱wú7mesh language, and I'm still not certain: what does it sound like? Is it perhaps like an ʿayin in Hebrew and related languages? The IPA version of the name of this group of people is sqʷχʷúʔməʃ I don't understand IPA, so I'm only guessing on the ʿayin. Nyttend (talk) 22:42, 2 November 2008 (UTC)…Looking at the IPA, the 7 seems to represent /ʔ/, a glottal stop. Algebraist 22:50, 2 November 2008 (UTC)"

From http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Reference_desk/Archives/Language/2008_November_2 (accessed January 29, 2011)

At the time of writing, the links between the different Aboriginal orthographies and IPA - based orthography are not clearly understood by the author. For example, the autonym of Comox is Éy7á7juuthem, but it is also written as ʔayʔaǰuθəm/Saɬuɬtxʷ. It is not clear how these two separate orthographies are linked, such as the association based on the '7's, and the extent to which either of these orthographies correspond to an IPA version.

4.4.2.2 Aboriginal Orthographies and Unicode

Advances in computer technology have enabled the use and support of syllabics and other Aboriginal orthographies. In particular, display of the special characters used in Aboriginal language around the world has been an issue for many years, but is beginning to fade away as Unicode becomes more universal.

However, the various special characters can still prove problematic with the current generation of PCs. While these special symbols are all present in the most recent Unicode character set, they can frequently end up being displayed as boxes because of software limitations. For example, Diitiidʔaaʔtx̱ is the preferred name for Ditidaht, but the 'ʔ' and 'x̱' characters will end up appearing as boxes on many people's computers.

The installation of special fonts (such as those available from The LanguageGeek website http://www.languagegeek.com/) can facilitate working with Canadian Aboriginal languages, although it may not be reasonable to expect the average end-user to install special fonts in order to view basic language information.

In general, the application of Unicode standard plays a major role in supporting language learning and use, such as is the case for syllabic-based languages in Canada:

> …. In many places there are now standardization bodies for syllabic spelling, and the Unicode standard supports a fairly complete set of Canadian syllabic characters for digital exchange. Syllabics are now taught in schools in Inuktitut-speaking areas, and are often taught in traditionally syllabics-using Cree and Ojibwe communities as well.
> http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Canadian_Aboriginal_syllabics

4.4.3 Sources of Variations in Language Names

Alternative spellings and synonyms of the same language name are common among Aboriginal languages, and often arise where variations of language names are simply the same word, which can sometimes reflect community or official differences in spelling, which again may not be in agreement with a solely linguistic-based version.

A range of factors can contribute to the significant variations in Aboriginal language names. Some of these contributions can be traced to: the transliteration of Aboriginal orthographies, alternative spellings and writing practices; historical, territorial and political considerations; and spelling errors.

4.4.3.1 Developing Aboriginal Orthographies, Transliteration and Alternative spellings

While a number of Aboriginal languages like Inuit, Cree and Ojibway already have their own orthographies (such as syllabics), not all Aboriginal languages in Canada have their own writing systems. However, as part of the ongoing trends in the preservation and revitalization of Aboriginal languages, speakers of these languages are also in the process of developing and adopting their own alphabets. This evolution in orthography, including official and unofficial (more local "folk") writing systems, historical changes in pronunciations, and the effects of transliteration from Aboriginal alphabets (often still being designed) to English alphabets and anglicization in general, can certainly give rise to different names, synonyms and spellings of the same language name. This is the situation for many languages already (Ojibwe, Ojibwa, Ojibway; Micmac and the many substitutions of k, q and w for one or both of the 'c's). In the example of the BC language of Carrier, Poser notes that at one time the Carrier name for the Carrier language was <Takél> based on an early writing system by Father Adrien-Gabriel Morice, whereas the current term of Dakelh is from the more widely used Carrier Linguistic Committee writing system. Poser also notes that other variations can arise from the First Nation practice of separating the syllables of First Nation words, such as Nuu-chah-nulth.

4.4.3.2 Historical, Territorial or Political considerations

In addition to spelling variations, synonyms of altogether different names for the same language can tend to reflect regional or community variations arising from various historical, territorial or political considerations. For example, the use of earlier terms may fall out of favour, such as in the case of Chipewyan, a synonym for the Dene Suline language. The speakers themselves seem to prefer the name Dene Suline, rather than Chipewyan: quoting from the web page http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Chipewyan : "Many Chipewyan believe that the name is derogatory."

4.4.3.3 Spelling Errors

According to Poser, sometimes language names can vary due to spelling errors. He cites the spelling of the dialect of Witsuwit'en, which has been spelled instead in official use as wet'suwet'en. Nevertheless, from a linguistic perspective he indicates "…this is simply a mistake. …. Insofar as the writing system for Witsuwit'en is intended to be phonological, as indeed it is, Poser indicates it is an error to write <t's> for the sound /ts/." In the FPHLCC 2010 listing of BC languages the spelling is wetsuwet'en.

4.4.4 Same Language Names but Different Levels of Classification

Sometimes the same language name can have different connotations, such as referring to the name of the language family, and also separately to the individual language name. An example of this is Dene, which at one level of language classification can refer to all the Dene languages of the Athapaskan family, comprising Dene Suline, Dogrib, South Slavey and North Slavey; alternatively, Dene is also used to refer specifically to the Dene Suline language.

4.4.5 Similar Language Names but Different Languages

There are instances in which some languages have similar sounding names but are completely different languages. For example, the language name of

Chipewyan can be confused with the Chippewa language name. However, these are two distinct languages: Chipewyan being a synonym for Dene Suline, while Chippewa is a synonym for Ojibwe. Another example of similar sounding names but different languages is that of Gwich'in (an Athapaskan language) and Gitksan (a Tsimshian language).

4.5 Ongoing Examples of Developments and Challenges in Language Names and Orthographies

4.5.1 Recent Developments in Study and Knowledge about Aboriginal Languages

Clearly, the documentation and classification of Aboriginal languages continues to evolve. The past two decades has seen a dramatic output in the study and knowledge about Aboriginal languages in Canada, accompanied by an ever-increasing emphasis of the use of Aboriginal-based terminology and orthographies. Recent developments on the publication front have produced comprehensive materials and resources.

For example, in the case of B.C.'s First Nation languages, the University of Washington Press has just announced that this year (2011) the Squamish Nation Dictionary Project will see the first published compilation of the Squamish – English dictionary, titled "Skwxwú7mesh sníchim – Xwelíten Sníchim Skexwxts / Squamish-English Dictionary". This dictionary, published with the Squamish Nation Education Department is the result of over a century of documentation and research, involving Squamish speakers working with anthropologists and linguists.

> "The dictionary is also informed by Squamish elders who taught language classes in the 1960s. More recently, the Squamish Language Elders Advisory Group has been involved with and supported the work of the Skwxwú7mesh sníchim dictionary and language recovery initiatives. (University of Washington Press, New Titles, Spring / Summer, page 22, 2011) http://www.washington.edu/uwpress/

Another First Nation example, one from Eastern Canada, is the extensive 2001 volume titled "Nishnaabemwin Reference Grammar" by J. Randolph Valentine, published by the University of Toronto Press. This comprehensive book has been hailed as a major contribution to Ojibwe grammar (John O'Meara), and as a major contribution to the field of linguistics (Keren Rice).

With respect to the Métis, the first detailed analysis of Michif, by Peter Bakker, was published in 1997, titled "A Language of our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis".

And, in the case of Inuit languages, 2010 saw the release of Louis-Jacques Dorais's "The Language of the Inuit: Syntax, Semantics, and Society in the Arctic". This book represents nearly forty years of research, and addresses linguistic and geographical aspects of Inuit languages and dialects.

4.5.2 Challenges of Transliteration and Anglicization / Romanization of Aboriginal Language Names:

Ongoing developments and emphasis in the application of Aboriginal orthographies would suggest that transliteration could play an important role, by providing accessibility to language names through their anglicization or romanization. Without accepted or proposed transliterations of developing and relatively new Aboriginal orthographies, there is also a risk that users could start transliterating these names independently of one another, contributing to a proliferation of spelling variations for the same language name. For these reasons it is felt that further research on the transliteration of new Aboriginal orthographies could perhaps lead to the development of a proposed set of transliterations and eventually achieve some degree of consensus based on input from "stakeholders" which could also be represented on the UNESCO Atlas website.

To illustrate some of the ongoing challenges, Appendix H: "Transliteration Challenges NRI 2011 Classification" outlines some of what is currently known

and not known by the author regarding the transliteration of autonyms from their Aboriginal language names to their anglicized versions.

As noted earlier, this report adopted transliterations that have already appeared frequently in the literature, for example Pentlatch = Pəntl'áč, Tlingit = Łingít. Another example may be Squamish, for which the autonym is expressed in the Aboriginal orthography as: Sḵwx̱wú7mesh sníchim, and in the IPA orthography as sqʷχʷúʔməʃ. It is thought that perhaps Squamish could serve as an acceptable transliteration.

At the same time though, there are various languages for which accepted, or even proposed, transliterations could not be found, as was earlier illustrated by the example of Comox/Sliammon with autonyms written in two different orthographies of ʔayʔaǰuθəm/Saɫuɫtxʷ, and Éy7á7juuthem. In the case of Thompson (a xenonym), the autonym expressed in the Aboriginal orthography is Nłeʔkepmxcín, but it is not clear what it would be in the IPA version. However, it seems the standard transliteration using the Roman alphabet is Nlaka'pamuxtsn.

4.5.2.1 Aboriginal Language Autonyms and Orthographies in the Atlas

Fortunately, there is flexibility with respect to the representation of autonyms and their orthographies in the UNESCO Atlas, in that anything that can be written in Unicode is acceptable for language name entries (personal communication, Chris Moseley, January 26th, 2011). Also, with respect to the representation of special characters such as diacritics, UNESCO has applied uniform sign conventions for English names of the languages. For example, the convention is to use ' (= vertical apostrophe) for glottal stop and ' (= curved apostrophe) for glottalization ejectivity (Hugues Sicard, UNESCO, email November 26, 2009). This is illustrated in the spelling of Kwak'wala, the "k' " is an ejective/glottalized (and also labialized) velar stop, so following UNESCO's conventions, the transcription should be to use the curved apostrophe (Ewa Czaykowska, University of Victoria, BC, email November 26, 2009).

5 Results and Outputs

The results of this study are provided in a series of reference tables and appendices at the end of the report discussion. It is important to note that these results should generally be treated as provisional and subject to revision, given the evolving and ongoing development in the naming and classification of Aboriginal languages. This section provides a listing of the nine appendices, references and bibliography, followed by a discussion of some of the preliminary overall findings to date.

5.1 List of Appendices, Bibliography and Language References

A listing of all of the different names of Aboriginal languages and dialects in Canada identified in the course of research to date (as of January 31, 2011), based on available information thus far, is detailed in the Appendix A table titled: "Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages in Canada". This document, which represents the report's major output, provides a preliminary listing of about 340 different entries cross referenced against the 88 Aboriginal languages classified in the 3rd Edition of the UNESCO Atlas.

In addition to the key reference of Appendix Table A, the study's findings are also contained in a series of related appendices covering the various aspects of Aboriginal language classification discussed in this report thus far. Source data are provided in the bibliography and references.

Given the nature of this analysis, it is important to stress that none of these documents should be considered as finalized, but rather as provisional and subject to revision. A list of the set of appendices, along with bibliography and references (World Wide Web; Maps; Language References) follow.

List of Report Outputs: Appendices, Bibliography and References

5.1.1 Appendix A: Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages in Canada

5.1.2 Appendix B: Classification Notes re UNESCO Atlas 3rd Edition

> **5.1.2.1   BC languages**

> **5.1.2.2   Pidgin languages**

> **5.1.2.3   Dialects of major languages**

> **5.1.2.4   Autonyms vs. Xenonyms**

5.1.3 Appendix C: UNICODE and Aboriginal orthographies

5.1.4 Appendix D: Extinct languages (Excluding Cross-Cultural)

5.1.5 Appendix E: Cross-cultural/trade/pidgin/sign languages

5.1.6 Appendix F: Dialects

5.1.7 Appendix G: Canada/USA cross-border languages

5.1.8 Appendix H: Transliteration Challenges NRI 2011 Classification

5.1.9 Appendix I: NRI 2011 Classification

5.1.10   Appendix J: Hierarchical Classification of North American Aboriginal Languages

5.1.11   Bibliography and References (World Wide Web; Maps; Language References)

5.2 Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages in Canada

Based on available information thus far, Appendix Table A provides a listing of all of the different names of Aboriginal languages and dialects in Canada identified in the course of research to date. This table lists some 350 different language-related entries cross-referenced against the 88 (including two extinct within living memory) Aboriginal languages classified in the 3rd Edition of the UNESCO Atlas. Some of these entries may not refer directly to a language or dialect but rather to a group of people or languages. As indicated earlier, not all of the languages and dialects identified in this study can be linked to UNESCO's 88 languages, since there are some categories of languages, as well as dialects, not included in the 3rd Edition.

The four categories of language/dialect names not covered in the 3rd Edition of the Atlas are: Extinct languages (long extinct/not within recent memory); Cross/cultural Pidgin/Trade or Sign Languages; Dialects (not considered as separate languages); and Canada/USA cross-border languages (once spoken in Canada, but now or were spoken primarily in the USA). There is an additional category comprising several entries that cannot be strictly classified as either dialects or separate languages, since some names refer to peoples (e.g. Yellowknife) or to First Nations or groups (e.g. Yinka Dene) or groups of languages (e.g. Western Canadian Inuktitut). Finally, the remaining category consists of those language names that can be linked to the 88 Atlas languages, comprising largely of synonyms or spelling variations.

Table 1 provides a summary of the preliminary counts of the Dictionary's some 350 language names, distinguishing between those that do and do not correspond to the 88 languages of the UNESCO 3rd edition classification. The numbers of unique of languages and dialects and their corresponding numbers of synonyms are also estimated. Given the nature of continually evolving developments in language naming, orthographies and classification, these estimates should be treated as provisional, such that they continue to remain subject to revision.

5.2.1 Estimated Number of Languages/Dialect Names Not Linked to 3rd Edition Atlas

Out of a total of some 350 entries, an estimated 100 fall into those language categories that are not included in the 3rd Edition of the Atlas. These 100 names represent about 75 unique entries, with 25 corresponding synonyms. They consist of four categories, with the largest being dialects, numbering about 65, of which 50 dialects also represent two-thirds of the 75 unique entries and similarly 15 of the 25 synonyms. The other 25 of the 75 unique listings not included in the 3rd Edition include three other categories of distinct languages, comprising: 10 extinct languages (plus 5 synonyms); 8 Cross/cultural or Pidgin/Trade languages (+1 synonym); and 7 USA languages (+4 synonyms).

There is also a fifth category which contains names that do correspond to the Atlas classification. These are the names which refer to different peoples, First Nations, or groups of languages instead of actual dialects or languages. This category is small in number, currently containing several entries at most, and representing relatively few of the remaining 250 of the 350 entries.

5.2.2 Estimated Number of Language Names linked to 3rd Edition Atlas

Given the nature of this research, it is not possible to know with certainty whether all of the possible language names, synonyms and spelling variations that can be linked to the 88 languages have been completely analyzed, nor their numbers accurately ascertained. However, an estimated number (rounded to the nearest 5) of the different language names and variations that correspond to the 88 different Atlas languages could be derived from the remaining 250 entries of the 350-entry inventory. These 250 entries comprise the following categories: the 88 unique Atlas languages themselves; several (~ 7) entries that are neither languages nor dialects; and, the remaining 155 entries which would therefore represent the synonyms and spelling variations corresponding to the 88 unique Atlas languages The "residual" approach that is used to derive this estimate is demonstrated in more detail in Table 1 as outlined in the following steps. First,

we estimate the total number of entries of languages and dialects in the inventory itself that can be considered unique. This number is calculated to be about 165 on the basis of the 88 UNESCO Atlas language entries plus the estimated 75 unique non-UNESCO entries (about 50 dialects; 10 extinct languages; 8 cross/cultural or pidgin languages; and 7 Canada/USA languages). Second, the total number of corresponding synonyms and spelling variations could be derived as the difference between the total 350 entries and the 165 unique entries, yielding an estimated count of 185 entries. Third, several of these 185 entries, which we could round to 5, consist of names that do not refer to separate languages directly, but rather to peoples or groups of languages. Fourth, of these 180 entries of actual language names, 25 are synonyms for the 75 non-Atlas entries. This would then suggest that the number of synonyms/spelling variations associated with the 88 Atlas languages might be about 155 (180 minus the 25 synonyms for non-UNESCO entries).

Table 1: Estimates of Preliminary Numbers of Entries in Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages, by Categories in relation to UNESCO Atlas 3rd Edition

Estimated Numbers of Entries by Categories			
N.B. All Numbers are approximate and can be subject to revision			
Categories of Entries	Number of Unique Entries	Number of Synonyms	Total Number of Entries
Languages / Dialects Not in 3rd Edition			
Extinct (excluding Pentlach & Tsetsaut)	10	6	16
Pidgin / Trade (excluding Bungee & Michif)	8	1	9
Dialects	50	15	65
Canada/USA	7	4	11
"Other": Names of Peoples, Groups of Languages (Not Specific Languages) Dialects	n/a	n/a	*Several**
Total Entries Not Linked to 88 Atlas Languages	~75	~25	~100+ *Several**
Languages in Atlas 3rd Edition	88	~155	~240
Estimated Totals without "Other" Names Category	~165	~180	~345
Estimated Total of all Categories including "Other"	~165	~185	~350

6 UNESCO Classification: Coverage, Limitations and Revisions

6.1 Coverage and Limitations:

The inventory of all Aboriginal languages that are identified and enumerated in Canada over time contains Aboriginal languages that cannot be accounted for by the UNESCO language classification for a variety of reasons, as this paper demonstrates. As discussed, some UNESCO groupings of languages may be broader; such that a language may be treated as a dialect rather than a language (e.g. Western Algonquin is not included as a separate language, but rather as a dialect, being a subset of Northern Algonquin). Similarly, some multiple languages have been classified as a single language (e.g. Carrier encompasses at least two languages, including Babine and Southern Carrier).

Based on new information gained from this research, particularly for the BC languages and dialects, a number of proposed revisions to the current 88 languages of the UNESCO 3rd Edition classification would seem to be in order.

6.2 Revised Classification of UNESCO 3rd Edition Atlas

The impact of proposed revisions to the Atlas on the number of languages is relatively minor, yielding a total count of 91 languages instead of 88, with the addition of four BC First Nation languages originally treated as dialects for the purposes of the Atlas, and the deletion of Manitoba's pidgin language of Bungee.

6.2.1 Addition of BC Languages

The changes to the 3rd Edition classification for the BC languages are outlined in *Appendix B: Classification Notes on UNESCO Atlas 3rd Edition Revisions* showing: Carrier split into three separate languages: Babine; Wisuwit'en ;and Dakelh (xenonym: Carrier); Ditidaht identified as a distinct language from Nootka; and Tsimshian, split into Coast and Southern.

6.2.2 Deletion of Pidgin Language of Bungee

For the 3rd Edition as a whole, a decision was made to drop pidgin or trade languages and sign languages. This represented a significant impact on Canada, since many of these languages were well represented in the 2nd Edition, and almost all were dropped from the 3rd Edition in December 2008 with the exception of Michif and Bungee. Michif, spoken by the Métis, is a very special case, as documented by Bakker (1997).

However, further research since would suggest that Bungee is a relatively straightforward dialect of English, and a relatively minor pidgin language, equivalent to those that were dropped when going from the 2nd to 3rd Edition of the Atlas. Linguistic distinctions between Michif and other pidgin languages indicate that Michif is much more complex than the other cross-cultural languages, including Bungee, in its elements from the two source languages of French and Cree, with nouns from French and verbs from Cree (Bakker, 1997). In fact Bakker does not even consider Michif to be a pidgin or trade language "In particular, Michif is not a trade language, a pidgin, a creole, an interlanguage, a case of code mixing, nor a case of second-language acquisition." (Bakker, page 25)

Consequently, in light of the sharp distinctions between Michif and the "other" pidgin and trade languages, the inclusion of Bungee in the Atlas could not be justified to the same degree. Consequently, findings from the current research would support the deletion of Bungee from the Atlas classification.

The revised classification based on the addition of the four BC languages and the deletion of Bungee is provided in Appendix H: NRI 2011 Classification.

7 Implications of Findings on Names and Numbers of Aboriginal Languages in Canada

7.1 Diversity of Aboriginal Language Names and Synonyms

In terms of the names of Aboriginal languages and dialects in Canada, findings from this report have demonstrated a significant diversity of names, synonyms, and spellings. This study has thus far yielded an inventory of about 350 different names of Aboriginal languages and dialects. About 100 of these 350 entries could not be directly linked to the 88 languages of UNESCO's 3rd Edition Atlas, with the majority, about 64%, being names of dialects (not considered as separate languages), 16% extinct languages; 9% pidgin languages; and 11% Canada / USA cross border languages (once spoken in Canada, but now or were spoken primarily in the USA). Of the remaining 250 names, which include the 88 Atlas languages themselves, it is estimated that about 155 can be linked as synonyms or spelling variations to the 88 unique languages. In other words, out of this current inventory of 350 names, each of the Atlas's 88 unique languages corresponds directly, on average, to almost two other synonyms or variations of the language name.

7.2 Regional Distributions of Aboriginal Languages Spoken across Canada

Findings also suggest some revisions to the classification of Aboriginal languages in the UNESCO Atlas 3rd Edition in order to be consistent with the most recent research on Aboriginal language names and classifications. These revisions would include the addition of four First Nation languages spoken in British Columbia and the deletion of a pidgin language in Manitoba. However, in terms of numbers, that impact is relatively minor, and would change the total number of languages in the Atlas (including two extinct within living memory) from 88 to 91; and in the case of still spoken languages from 86 to 89.

As well, these changes pertain only to the provinces of classification, since none of these four languages are spoken outside their province of classification. As a consequence, these changes in numbers of languages have had a relatively minor impact on regional distributions of First Nation languages across Canada. Naturally, the province of BC's share is the most affected among the regions, while the difference in its share is distributed across several other provinces and territories which are, as a result, less affected. Table 2 provides the number and percentage distribution of the regional shares of the Atlas languages for First Nation languages, and also for total Aboriginal languages, by, their "Classified" and "Spoken" (occurrences) across Provincial / Territorial Locations. According to the original Atlas classification, for example that BC's regional share of the 74 First Nation languages distributed by where they are spoken, or occur across Canada, is 28.8% based. The proposed addition of four of the province's languages, and the deletion of the Manitoba pidgin language would cause BC's share to rise by 3 percentage points to 31.8%. In contrast, Ontario's share would decrease relatively less by 0.5 of a percentage point, from 17.3% to 16.8%.

7.3 Indigenous and Anglicized Names of Aboriginal Languages

As this study and others (Poser) illustrate, the variety in the names of Aboriginal languages and dialects can come from a number of different sources associated with the classifications of languages, differences across communities in names of the same languages, different orthographies/writing systems and spellings, and spelling errors for the same language.

A major and probably growing source of the variety of language names can be associated with the increasing awareness and emphasis on the use of Aboriginal language names and orthographies. Associated with this trend is the process of transliteration, of moving from the indigenous name and orthography of an Aboriginal language and to the anglicization and romanization of the name, in order for the name to be pronounced and written in English. The issues and challenges can also be similar in the case of French, in terms of an Aboriginal language name and orthography being pronounced and written in French.

Table 2: Number and Percentage Distribution of First Nation and Total Aboriginal Languages from UNESCO 3rd edition of Atlas, by, "Classified" and "Spoken" Provincial / Territorial Location, original Atlas classification and proposed revisions

Number and Percentage Distribution of First Nation and Total Aboriginal Languages by Provincial / Territorial Location, Original and Revised 3rd edition Atlas												
Provincial / Territorial	**Original: 74 First Nation Languages; 104 Occurrences**			**Revised: 77 First Nation Languages; 107 Occurrences**			**Original: 86 Aboriginal Languages; 119 Occurrences**			**Revised: 89 Aboriginal Languages; 122 Occurrences**		
Location of Language Classified / Spoken	Classif	Spoken	Total FN occurr.	Classif	Spoken	Total FN occurr.	Classif	Spoken	Total Aboriginal occurr.	Classif	Spoken	Total Aboriginal occurr.
	No.	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**	**No.**
Prince Edward Island	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1
Newfoundland & Labrador	0	3	3	0	3	3	2	3	5	2	3	5
Nova Scotia	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	1
New Brunswick:	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2
Quebec	10	2	12	10	2	12	11	2	13	11	2	13
Ontario	12	6	18	12	6	18	12	6	18	12	6	18
Manitoba:	6	2	8	5	2	7	6	3	9	5	3	8
Saskatchewan:	4	4	8	4	4	8	5	4	9	5	4	9
Alberta	4	3	7	4	3	7	4	3	7	4	3	7
British Columbia	25	5	30	29	5	34	25	5	30	29	5	34
Yukon	7	1	8	7	1	8	7	1	8	7	1	8
Northwest Territories	4	2	6	4	2	6	6	3	9	6	3	9
Nunavut	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	1	7	6	1	7
Canada: Total Languages	**74**	**30**	**104**	**77**	**30**	**107**	**86**	**33**	**119**	**89**	**33**	**122**

Sources: UNESCO. 2009. Interactive atlas of the world's languages in danger: http://www.unesco.org/culture/languages-atlas/index.php; Editor Chris Moseley. Paris: UNESCO; Norris, M.J. 2009: "Linguistic Classifications of Aboriginal Languages in Canada: Implications for Assessing Language Diversity, Endangerment and Revitalization"; Canadian Diversity Journal, Vol.7:3, Fall.

Number and Percentage Distribution of First Nation and Total Aboriginal Languages by Provincial / Territorial Location, Original and Revised 3rd edition Atlas											
Provincial / Territorial	**Original: 74 First Nation Languages; 104 Occurrences**			**Revised: 77 First Nation Languages; 107 Occurrences**			**Original: 86 Aboriginal Languages; 119 Occurrences**			**Revised: 89 Aboriginal Languages; 122 Occurrences**		
Location of Language Classified / Spoken	Classif	Spoken	Total FN occurr.	Classif	Spoken	Total FN occurr.	Classif	Spoken	Total Aboriginal occurr.	Classif	Spoken	Total Aboriginal occurr.
	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
P.E.I.	0.0	3.3	1.0	0.0	3.3	0.9	0.0	3.0	0.8	0.0	3.0	0.8
Newfoundland & Labrador	0.0	10.0	2.9	0.0	10.0	2.8	2.3	9.1	4.2	2.2	9.1	4.1
Nova Scotia	1.4	0.0	1.0	1.3	0.0	0.9	1.2	0.0	0.8	1.1	0.0	0.8
New Brunswick:	1.4	3.3	1.9	1.3	3.3	1.9	1.2	3.0	1.7	1.1	3.0	1.6
Quebec	13.5	6.7	11.5	13.0	6.7	11.2	12.8	6.1	10.9	12.4	6.1	10.7
Ontario	16.2	20.0	17.3	15.6	20.0	16.8	14.0	18.2	15.1	13.5	18.2	14.8
Manitoba:	8.1	6.7	7.7	6.5	6.7	6.5	7.0	9.1	7.6	5.6	9.1	6.6
Saskatchewan:	5.4	13.3	7.7	5.2	13.3	7.5	5.8	12.1	7.6	5.6	12.1	7.4
Alberta	5.4	10.0	6.7	5.2	10.0	6.5	4.7	9.1	5.9	4.5	9.1	5.7
British Columbia	33.8	16.7	28.8	37.7	16.7	31.8	29.1	15.2	25.2	32.6	15.2	27.9
Yukon	9.5	3.3	7.7	9.1	3.3	7.5	8.1	3.0	6.7	7.9	3.0	6.6
Northwest Territories	5.4	6.7	5.8	5.2	6.7	5.6	7.0	9.1	7.6	6.7	9.1	7.4
Nunavut	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7.0	3.0	5.9	6.7	3.0	5.7
Canada: Total Languages	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**	**100.0**

7.4 Learning and Using the Indigenous Names of Languages

The growing emphasis on Aboriginal-based terminology and writing systems in the names of Aboriginal languages has implications for not just the naming and classification of languages, but also for their use in general. In his study of the names of First Nation languages in BC, Poser makes the observation that reference to and usage of First Nation names in English should indeed reflect those of the First Nations names and suggests that "…there is… an ethical argument for the use of English names based on those of the First Nations, namely that this recognizes the fact that First Nations and settlers are not foreign nations but share the same land… Using First Nations names shows respect for our hosts and neighbours". http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf

Furthermore, Poser goes on to say that ideally BC speakers of non-Aboriginal languages should learn to pronounce the names of the First Nation languages as they would be spoken in the actual language itself. He suggests that while this would prove difficult for an adult learner, this could be feasible for children.

> Indeed, an argument can be made that British Columbians ought not merely to make use of anglicizations of the native names but to learn to pronounce the native names in their true form. For adults this may be difficult, but for primary school children it is not. The task is facilitated by the fact that in spite of their diversity, the First Nations languages of British Columbia have similar sound systems. Learning what the languages of our province sound like could easily be integrated into the social studies curriculum. Indeed, it would be a small step in including something about language in the school curriculum.
> http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf

For Aboriginal languages overall, this perhaps is a goal worth striving for on behalf of younger generations of Canadians in general.

8 Conclusion

The findings of this report demonstrate that the documentation and classification of Aboriginal languages in Canada are continually evolving, with new developments and challenges associated with a range of considerations, such as dialects and languages; language names and synonyms; autonyms and xenonyms; Aboriginal orthographies, IPA alphabets and Unicode; transliteration, anglicization / romanization and spellings. In fact, given the dramatic and ongoing output in resources and materials pertaining to the study and knowledge of Aboriginal languages, it is recognized that the enumeration and classification of Aboriginal languages will necessarily remain a work in progress.

In terms of the names of Aboriginal languages and dialects, findings have demonstrated a significant diversity of names, synonyms, and spellings. This study has thus far yielded an inventory of about 350 different names of Aboriginal languages and dialects, of which about 100 cannot be directly linked to the 88 languages of the 3rd Edition Atlas. Of the remaining 250 names, which include the 88 Atlas languages themselves, it is estimated that about 155 can be directly linked to the 88 unique languages as synonyms or spelling variations. In other words, out of this current inventory of 350 names, each of the Atlas's 88 unique languages corresponds directly, on average, to almost two other synonyms or variations of the language name.

Results also suggest some revisions to the classification of Aboriginal languages in the UNESCO Atlas 3rd Edition, in order to be consistent with the most recent research on Aboriginal language names and classifications. These proposed revisions would include the addition of four First Nation languages spoken in British Columbia and the deletion of a pidgin language in Manitoba. However, in terms of numbers, that impact has been relatively minor, and would change the total number of languages in the Atlas (including two extinct within living memory) from 88 to 91; and in the case of still spoken languages from 86 to 89.

Report and Reference Manual on Documentation and Classification of Aboriginal Languages in Canada
3rd Edition, March 7th 2016, Norris Research Inc.

8.1 Next Steps

This study has scoped and identified the variations and issues in language names and orthography, using the Atlas classification as a reference. It has resulted in a number of findings that suggest next steps associated with revisions to the 3rd Edition Atlas classification. As well, research also highlights the need for further work on transliteration of recent and emerging Aboriginal orthographies.

8.1.1 Proposed Changes to UNESCO Atlas

A major aim of this study has been to enumerate all known names and variations of Aboriginal languages in Canada, with the intention of reconciling the different names and classifications of Aboriginal languages in reference to UNESCO's 3rd Edition of the Atlas. More recent naming and classifications of Aboriginal languages, particularly the First Nation languages in BC, have pointed to discrepancies with the current Atlas classification, identifying a need for revisions to the UNESCO classification. However, at the time of writing these proposed changes to the Atlas website are in a preliminary stage, in that they have not as yet been formalized with UNESCO. The necessary geographic community coordinates for some of the additional languages still need to be developed for mapping purposes in the Atlas. It is expected that these developments will be followed up in the near future with the Editor of the Atlas, Christopher Moseley.

8.1.2 Transliteration of Aboriginal Orthographies

Clearly, the documentation and classification of Aboriginal languages continues to evolve. Indeed, the past two decades has seen significant output in the study of Aboriginal languages in Canada, in concert with an ever-increasing emphasis of the use of Aboriginal-based terminology and orthographies. More and more Aboriginal groups and communities are reverting to their traditional language names, and sometimes separate orthographies, which can entail the related aspects of transliteration, anglicization and spelling.

These ongoing developments and the increased emphasis in the use of Aboriginal orthographies suggest that the process of transliteration could fill an important role in rendering Aboriginal language names more accessible to the general public through their anglicization or romanization. In terms of next steps, the avenue of further linguistic research on the transliteration of new and developing Aboriginal orthographies is also being explored with Christopher Moseley. Such an undertaking could perhaps lead to the development of a proposed set of transliterations, which might eventually achieve some degree of consensus based on input from "stakeholders" and could thereby also be represented on the UNESCO Atlas website.

8.2 Outlook for Aboriginal Language Naming and Classification

It is reasonable to expect continuing developments and challenges in the naming and classification of Aboriginal languages, given the growing emphasis on Aboriginal-based terminology and writing systems. These trends can have implications not only for documentation and classification of languages, but also for awareness, accessibility and use of Aboriginal names of traditional languages among Canadians in general. Ideally, as Poser suggests, speakers of non-Aboriginal languages should learn to pronounce the names of Aboriginal languages as they would be spoken in the actual language itself. On the other hand, it is as he notes a goal more feasible for children than adults to achieve.

Nevertheless, Poser's observation that reference to and usage of First Nation names in English should indeed reflect the First Nations names of languages also supports the idea that transliteration can at least serve to increase that awareness, accessibility and use of Aboriginal names (Inuit, Métis, as well as First Nation) through their anglicization or romanization among speakers of non-Aboriginal languages. As Poser concludes "…there is… an ethical argument for the use of English names based on those of the First Nations, namely that this recognizes the fact that First Nations and settlers are not foreign nations but share the same land… Using First Nations names shows respect for our hosts and neighbours". http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf

References / Bibliography

Bakker, Peter, 1997. A Language of our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis. Oxford Studies in Anthropological Linguistics, Oxford University Press, New York.

Campbell, Lyle. 1998. American Indian Languages: The Historical Linguistics of Native America. Oxford University Press.

Dorais, Louis-Jacques, 2010. The Language of the Inuit: Syntax, Semantics, and Society in the Arctic. McGill-Queen's University Press.

FPHLCC, 2010. Report on the Status of B.C. First Nations Languages 2010
http://www.fphlcc.ca/language/language-report

Gordon, Raymond G., and Barbara F. Grimes, 2005. Ethnologue: Languages of the world. 15th ed. Dallas, TX: SIL International.

Kinkade, M. D. 1991. "The decline of Native languages in Canada" in Endangered languages, edited by Robert H. Robins and Eugenius M. Uhlenbeck. Published with the Authority of the Permanent International Committee of Linguists (CIPL), Berg.

Moseley, Christopher. 2010. UNESCO Atlas of the world's languages in danger, ed. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Moseley, Christopher. 2009. UNESCO's Interactive Atlas of the world's languages in danger, http://www.unesco.org/culture/languages-atlas/index.php

Moseley, Christopher. 2007. Encyclopedia of the world's endangered languages. London and New York: Routledge.

Norris, M.J. 2010: "Canada and Greenland" Chapter in UNESCO Atlas of the world's languages in danger, ed. Chris Moseley. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Norris, M.J. 2009: "Linguistic Classifications of Aboriginal Languages in Canada: Implications for Assessing Language Diversity, Endangerment and Revitalization" (pp.21-34) in Canadian Diversity quarterly Journal of the Association for Canadian Studies, Volume 7:3, Fall 2009.

Norris, M.J., 2007. Aboriginal languages in Canada: Emerging trends and perspectives on second language acquisition. Canadian Social Trends 83 (Summer): 19-27. http://www.statcan.ca/english/freepub/11-008-XIE/2007001/pdf/11-008-XIE20070019628.pdf

Norris, M.J. 2005 "The Diversity and State of Aboriginal Languages in Canada" Pp 38-56 in: Canadian and French Perspectives on Diversity, Conference Proceedings, October 6, 2003, Canadian Heritage. Ottawa, Canada.

Norris, M.J. 1998. "Canada's Aboriginal languages". Canadian Social Trends 51 (Winter), Statistics Canada, Cat. No. 11-008.

Norris, M.J. and M. Snider. 2008. "Endangered Aboriginal languages in Canada: Trends, Patterns and Prospects in Language Learning" in Tjeerd de Graaf, Nicholas Ostler and Reinier Salverda (Eds.), Endangered Languages and Language Learning. Proceedings of the XII Conference of the Foundation for Endangered Languages, Fryske Academy and Mercator European Research Centre, Leeuwarden, The Netherlands: 24-27 September, 2008.

O'Grady, W. and Archibald, John. 2009 Contemporary Linguistic Analysis: An Introduction. 6th Edition, Pearson Longman, Toronto

Poser, William J. "The Names of the First Nations Languages of British Columbia", http://www.billposer.org/Papers/bclgnames.pdf

Squamish Nation Dictionary Project. 2011 "Skwxwú7mesh sníchim – Xwelíten Sníchim Skexwxts / Squamish-English Dictionary". University of Washington Press, Seattle, WA, published with the Squamish Nation Education Department.

Statistics Canada. 2008. Aboriginal peoples in Canada in 2006: Inuit, Métis and First Nations, 2006 Census. Catalogue no. 97-558-XIE. Ottawa: Minister of Industry. Also available online at http://www12.statcan.ca/english/census06/analysis/aboriginal/pdf/97-558-XIE2006001.pdf.

Steinbergs, Aleksandra 2009 "The classification of languages" in Contemporary Linguistic Analysis: An Introduction. 6th Edition, (pages 287 – 317)ed. O'Grady, W. and Archibald, John, , Pearson Longman, Toronto

UNESCO. 2010. Atlas of the world's languages in danger. 3rd edition, Ed. Christopher Moseley, Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

UNESCO. 2009. UNESCO's interactive atlas of the world's languages in danger: http://www.unesco.org/culture/languages-atlas/index.php

UNESCO Ad Hoc Expert Group on Endangered Languages. 2003. Language vitality and endangerment. Paper submitted to the International Expert Meeting on UNESCO Programme Safeguarding of Endangered Languages, Paris, March. Also available online at http://www.unesco.org/culture/ich/doc/src/00120-EN.pdf

University of Washington Press, 2011. "New Titles, Spring/Summer", Seattle, Washington, www.washington.edu/uwpress

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

Appendices and Language References

Appendix A: Dictionary of Aboriginal Languages in Canada

Appendix B: Classification Notes on UNESCO Atlas 3rd Edition Revisions

Appendix C: UNICODE and Aboriginal orthographies

Appendix D: Extinct languages (Excluding Cross-Cultural)

Appendix E: Cross-cultural/trade/pidgin/sign languages

Appendix F: Dialects

Appendix G: Canada/USA cross-border languages

Appendix H: NRI 2011 Classification

Appendix I: Transliteration Challenges NRI 2011 Appendix H:

Appendix J: Hierarchical Classification of North American Aboriginal Languages

Bibliography and References:

 World Wide Web

 Maps

 References