UC Merced
The Journal of California Anthropology

Title
Moshinsky: *A Grammar of Southeastern Pomo*

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/2pk7z898

Journal
The Journal of California Anthropology, 4(1)

Author
Oswalt, Robert L

Publication Date
1977-07-01

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

second edition with the *full* notes!

In the meantime, Californianists should be grateful to the editors of this volume for making the material available, and especially for making this Fernando Librado's book. Librado must have been one of the most amazing figures in southern Californian history. I share many of Robert Heizer's reservations, expressed in this journal, about Harrington as ethnographer, but I have no reservations about acknowledging Librado as a man whose memory and memories deserve to be kept alive. The editors of this work are to be commended for their scholarly and sensitive achievement of this goal.

A Grammar of Southeastern Pomo. *Julius Moshinsky. University of California Publications in Linguistics* 72. 1974. xiii + 144 pp. $5.50 (paper).

A Grammar of Eastern Pomo. *Sally McLendon. University of California Publications in Linguistics* 74. 1975. xiv + 196 pp. $6.50 (paper).

Reviewed by ROBERT L. OSWALT
California Indian Language Center
Kensington

The Pomo, or Pomoan, family of seven related languages is located in northern California, primarily on Clear Lake, the Russian River, and adjacent sections of the coast. The individual languages of the family are usually referred to by terms giving their geographic locations relative to one another, hence Southeastern Pomo and Eastern Pomo. Only the Kashaya (Southwestern Pomo) possess a name for themselves as a whole, although there are native names for separate village communities within the other linguistic groups. The geographic terms are unambiguous but have led to the continuance of the notion that there is one "Pomo language" with slightly varying dialects. In actuality, the seven languages are quite distinct, with a divergence in their small area comparable to that of the far-flung Athapaskan family, which extends from Alaska to the southwestern United States.

Phonetically accurate recording of these languages began with the work of Abraham Halpern in 1939-40; it is largely unpublished. Nothing further of significance was done until 1957, when linguistic field work among the Pomo was reinstituted with the support of the Survey of California (and Other) Indian Languages, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley. This activity is resulting in an accelerating number of articles and has, so far, produced doctoral dissertation grammars on three of the languages: Kashaya (Oswalt 1961), Eastern Pomo (McLendon 1966), and Southeastern Pomo (Moshinsky 1970). The latter two have now been published with minor revisions.

The Southeastern and Eastern Pomo languages were spoken by small adjacent groups on the shores of Clear Lake, yet they are among the most divergent of the neighboring pairs of Pomo languages. This divergence, greater than that between English and German, can be grasped by an inspection of the two grammars—if one can factor out the differences in presentation, for the grammars are written in dissimilar styles and theoretical frameworks. *A Grammar of Southeastern Pomo* (henceforth GSeP) employs a great deal of formal apparatus which will remove much of the sections on Phonology, and Chapter 5 on Syntactic Rules, from the comprehension of those who have not studied transformational grammar. *A Grammar of Eastern Pomo* (GEP) is written less abstractly, more discursively, and with more information on the meanings of the grammatical elements, and is thus more readable. That the GSeP is more formulaic does not make it more accurate and comprehensive, for it is actually a sketchier work than the GEP. However, I do not intend here to analyze the

adequacy of the grammatical rules, nor point out instances in which they could be rearranged, combined, and simplified; such remarks would be more appropriate for a purely linguistic journal. I will indicate some of the areas of these two grammars that contain information of wider interest, especially to anthropologists concerned with ethnoscience.

Both grammars contain important new information on the kinship systems. That in the GSeP (pp. 102-104) was not intended to have a complete semantic specification of the kin terms and must be used in conjunction with Gifford's work (1922:104-106). Thus, the GSeP glosses *ʔimbaċ* simply as 'father's father', while Gifford, in his representation as *imbat*, specifies it more fully as 'father's father, father's parent's brother'. In all instances, the GSeP gives the phonetically more accurate form and, in addition, a morphological analysis: *ʔi-* 'first person singular [and plural?] possessor', plus *-m-* a prefix occurring with non-vocative kin terms, plus *baċ* the root. Gifford is inconsistent in distinguishing the vocative case form (term of address) from the subject case form, a situation that can be corrected by reference to the GSeP. On the other hand, one can be fairly certain that there is an error of transposition of definitions in the GSeP when it has *wí mšùd* '[my] mother's younger sister' and *ʔímxyaq* '[my] mother's older sister', while Gifford has *imsut* (the rules in the GSeP would allow an alternate form *ʔímšud*) 'mother's older sister, father's brother's wife older than mother' and *imkiyax* 'mother's younger sister, mother's brother's daughter, father's brother's wife younger than mother'.

The GEP (pp. 108-121) covers the kinship system much more thoroughly and stands alone as the most complete and accurate reference for Eastern Pomo kin terms. Interested investigators may, however, want to compare this material with that in Gifford (1922:106) and Kroeber (1917:370-72). Eastern Pomo exhibits, as do other Pomo languages, the trait of having, for many kin terms, quite different roots according to whether the possessor is the speaker or someone else. For example, *níḱ* 'speaker's [my or our] mother', versus *-ṭʰé* 'second or third person's mother'; the distinction between 'your mother' and 'his or her mother' would be made by a prefix to *-ṭʰé*. Such alternations exist in Southeastern Pomo but are reported in the GSeP to a lesser extent.

In the western Pomo languages, the alternations include the merger of some distinctions for other than the speaker's relatives. Thus, Kashaya has *ḱun?* 'my younger brother' and *šomen?* 'my younger sister' but loses the gender difference in *-ṭiki* 'someone else's younger sibling'. Most of these complications were missed by Gifford and Kroeber because they mainly elicited forms with first person possessors only.

Both grammars have clear presentations of the pronominal systems in tabular form; the GEP has the greater amount of additional information on the meaning and use of the formative elements. As with the kinship system, there are enough cognates among the pronouns to recognize that the two languages are related, but the differences are startlingly great, especially in the forms for the third person and in the associated demonstratives.

Among the other areas of general interest, the GEP has a discussion of the numerals (pp. 128-30), a subject not touched in the GSeP. On the other hand, the GSeP has its only detailed semantic analysis in a domain not covered in the GEP, that which Moshinsky calls the "motion-configurational system" (pp. 79-92). This partially corresponds to what are known in the Athapaskan languages as the "classificatory verbs." The selection of verb roots for notions like "be (in a location or position), go, carry, etc." depends, among other factors, on the shape and number of objects involved. Thus, there is a different verb for "hold a long object (for example, a stick)" and "hold a nonlong object (a rock)." All Pomo languages have somewhat similar systems, but South-

eastern Pomo is unique in the extent to which it contains a distinction between dual and plural. Moshinsky's binary semantic analysis is worth close study; its terminology and orientation derive in part from Talmy (1972).

The Pomo verb roots are not as differentiated by shape as are the classificatory verbs in most Athapaskan languages. However, there can be reconstructed for Proto-Pomo a much more complex set of about 20 verbal prefixes known as "instrumental prefixes," many of which indicate the shape of the instrument used in performing the action denoted by the verb; for example, whether the instrument is long or not and, if long, whether it operates lengthwise or sidewise. Intricately interwoven with the classification by instrument shape are prefixes referring to specific body parts (eye, tongue, foot, etc.) and to natural forces (wind, heat, gravity). Sound change in Southeastern Pomo has caused the coalescence of many of the prefixes that are kept distinct in Eastern Pomo and thus a partial breakdown of the system (more details are in Oswalt 1976).

Both of the grammars under review contain useful material on these prefixes but the semantic interaction of prefix and verb root is so complex and radically different from anything in English that the analysis of the system must rest on a very large data base of hundreds of sample sentences for each prefix. It could take a large monograph to present adequately the semantic and syntactic behavior of the instrumental prefixes in one Pomo language.

The two grammars treat to varying extents many other areas: phonology, case, number, derivation, subordination, aspect, mode, evidentials, directionals, postpositions, word order, phrase structure, etc. But, of course, there is much more that needs to be done soon to preserve these moribund languages and to reveal them to others. We can all hope that Moshinsky, or someone else, will be able to carry on the recording and analysis of Southeastern Pomo. McLendon is continuing her work on Eastern Pomo. With these two grammars, they have both made valuable contributions to the field of linguistics and to the preservation of an important part of the Indian heritage.

REFERENCES

Gifford, Edward W.
1922 California Kinship Terminologies. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 18 (1).

Kroeber, Alfred L.
1917 California Kinship Systems. University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology 12(9).

Oswalt, Robert L.
1976 Comparative Verb Morphology of Pomo. *In* Hokan Studies, Papers from the First Conference on Hokan Languages, Margaret Langdon and Shirley Silver, eds. pp. 13-28. The Hague: Mouton, Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 181.

Talmy, Leonard
1972 Semantic Structures in English and Atsugewi. Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of California, Berkeley.

Autobiographies of Three Pomo Women. *Elizabeth Colson.* Berkeley: University of California Archaeological Research Facility (non-serial publication). 1974. 235 pp. $4.50 (paper).

Reviewed by AMELIA SUSMAN SCHULTZ
University Hospital
University of Washington, Seattle

These autobiographies have had an interesting history: Between 1939 and 1941, Colson collected the data under the auspices of the Social Science Field Laboratory under Bernard and Ethel Aginsky. The results came out as a Microcard Publication in Primary Records in Culture and Personality, University of Wisconsin, 1956, which was discovered by