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INTRODUCTION

In the earliest presentation of evidence for the Hokan stock, 'tongue' was one of only five sets of resemb-
lant forms set forth by Dixon and Kroeber (1913:51). On
the basis of the words in six languages—Karok, Chimariko,
Shasta, [Eastern] Pomo, Yana, and [Mohave] Yuman—they
suggested an original form of apala or ipili. Haas (1963:53)
proposed a reconstruction *ipari and reduplicated forms
*ipawari (to account for Yana bawal- and Okwanuch Shasta
ipwá) alternating with *iparila (to account for Chumash
-ëlew, -ælew and Washo -ælq 'lick'). The set for 'tongue'figured in early works by Sapir (for example 1917:5) and
later works by Silver (1975) and Gursky (1974:209).

The data employed herein were assembled independently
of the above and are often from more recent sources: diction-
aries in the series University of California Publications in
Linguistics, direct communication with fieldworkers, and my
own work among the Western Pomo.1

As is potentially true for many body part terms in
Hokan, the meaning 'tongue' may lie in three different classes:
noun roots, verb roots, and verb prefixes. In any one lang-

uage or family, the morphemes in the separate classes may be
etymologically distinct or they may be related, or the three-
way differentiation may be absent or unattested. As a verb
root for 'act with the tongue' the translation into English
is most often 'lick'. As a prefix it means '(do) with the
'tongue'. Herein I will be principally concerned with nouns,
but information from other classes will be brought in when
it is available to me and pertinent.

I propose that in Proto-Hokan the root was *PgL and
that the noun was formed from it by a prefix *-i-, which
pertains to animate beings, especially to the body and its
parts. Many Hokan languages have inalienable possessive
prefixes on body part terms. For a third person, or indef-
inite possessor, Proto-Hokan may have had *H-. Thus, a
reconstruction of one form of a complete word for 'tongue'
could be something like *HpPgL.

In the Proto-Hokan reconstruction, a capital letter is
used to indicate that it is not possible to specify closely
the phonemic or phonetic status of that segment, but the
choice of symbols does indicate its general nature. *H was
probably a laryngeal, but there is conflicting evidence on
whether it was *\( i \) or *\( h \); even within one language family it is easy to slip from one laryngeal to another (as will be illustrated for Pomoan). The initial *\( H \)- of *HiPAL may even not have been a distinct phonemic segment in the proto-language but have originated in different branches on vowel-initial stems from a kind of "rough breathing".

*\( P \) was probably a labial stop; in those languages in which there is only one series of stops (for example, Yuman), the reflex is usually \( p \); in those languages with voiced stops (Pomoan), it is often \( b \). Other variations are \( ph, p', w, \) and \( h \).

*\( L \) was an apical continuant, most probably the voiced lateral \( l \), but it also shows up as \( 1, 1^\prime, p, n, \) and \( r \).

*\( A \) is attested as a low central vowel in most of the Hokan branches (especially the key language families Yuman and Pomoan), but it may appear fronted (Shasta, Chimariko) or not appear at all (Serí, Atsugewi, Achumawi, Karok). The loss of a vowel is a common enough development in languages around the world but, if some slight evidence should be found that it is the Hokan languages with a vowel that have developed it eponymically, I would not be averse to eliminating *\( A \) from the reconstruction.

*\( i \) is in lower case because I have greater confidence that it represents a real Hokan prefix of that particular phonetic shape.

A systematic treatment of the sound developments and of length and accent are not now possible. At the time depth of Hokan, far greater than that of Indo-European, potential cognate sets are too rare to permit the multiple attestation needed for firm rules. The variations will be discussed below in the sections for the individual language families and isolates. Those sections will also contain etyma other than that for 'tongue' in support of the reconstructions and the proposal that *\( -i- \) is a Proto-Hokan prefix. 'Tail' is included because of its semantic relationship with, and frequent phonetic similarity to, 'tongue'. The association of the two does not, of course, occur in all branches of Hokan, yet it holds often enough to back a reconstruction for 'tail' of *\( H-i-P \), and thus there is an added bit of evidence for the genetic relationship of divergent languages within an entity Hokan. (However, I do not feel that there is enough evidence to justify the inclusion in that entity of all languages that have been called Hokan; for example, not the Chumashan languages.)
## POMOAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>'tail'</th>
<th>'tongue'</th>
<th>'mouth'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>hi bⁿᵃ-kʰle</td>
<td>hi bⁿᵃ</td>
<td>ⁿahⁿᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kashaya</td>
<td>hi bⁿᵃ</td>
<td>haᵇⁿᵃ</td>
<td>ⁿahⁿᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>bⁿᵃ</td>
<td>hawbⁿᵃ</td>
<td>hⁿᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>(ki mⁿᵃ)</td>
<td>ha bⁿᵃ</td>
<td>hⁿᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeastern</td>
<td>šiⁿᵇⁿᵃ</td>
<td>huⁿᵇⁿᵃ</td>
<td>hⁿᵃ mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>yiⁿᵇⁿᵃ</td>
<td>bⁿ⁻al</td>
<td>xⁿ⁻díⁿᵈᵃ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeastern</td>
<td>bⁿᵃ</td>
<td>bⁿ⁻al</td>
<td>xⁿ⁻ⁿᵃ sto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto-Pomo</td>
<td>ⁿhi bⁿᵃ</td>
<td>ⁿhi bⁿ⁻al</td>
<td>ⁿⁿⁿⁿᵃ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the Pomo family, the words for 'tongue' and 'tail' are much intertwined. In order to disentangle them, I start with the assumption (influenced by the situation in other Hokan languages) that Proto-Pomo had a final lateral in the form for 'tongue', a state evinced only in Eastern and Southeastern Pomo. The other five languages do not have this -l and sometimes have final vowel length. Now, there are a fair number of other sets in which the correspondence holds that Eastern and Southeastern have word-final -l and the other languages -, but there are also several instances (including the common suffixes -l 'object case marker' and -l 'adverb formative') in which all the languages have final -l (except for the late Southern Pomo development *-l → -n). If PP *-l is used for the latter correspondences then something else must be done about the former. McLendon (1973:28) symbolizes the former correspondences with *⁻l in order to point up the resemblance in a couple of sets ('tongue' and 'arm') of Proto-Pomo and Yuma. Herein I shall not treat the absence of -l in five reflexes for 'tongue' as due entirely to a phonologically conditioned sound change of a different kind of lateral but rather as a special case of confusion brought on by the overall similarity in sound and meaning of the words for 'tongue' and 'tail'. This confusion could well have been triggered by an approach in the pronunciation of the terminal syllables *⁻al and *⁻ⁿᵃ, but a complete merger of all such instances need not have taken place before *hiba 'tail' absorbed *hibal 'tongue' in a form with an overall meaning that can be glossed 'appendage'. After the merger, different languages adopted different devices for distinguishing the two particularizations of meaning.

Southern Pomo has a regular sound development PP *CV.CV → CV.C.V, and a long b is realized as bⁿⁿ. Southern hibⁿᵃ is thus the expected reflex of *hiba 'tail', but it does not mean 'tail', only 'tongue'. Through the semantic intermediary 'appendage', it has ended up with a transferred meaning. 'Tail' is designated by the compound hibⁿᵃ-kʰle 'tongue-tree', with which the image is of the 'tail' being
an appendage growing from the body like a plant (\(-kʰłe\)
is the syncopated combining form of \(kʰa\'-lᵉ\) 'plant, tree').

In Central Pomo, word-initial syllables beginning
with a laryngeal have been lost. Thus bá' is the regular
reflex of *hiba* and it has the original meaning 'tail'.
'Tongue' is formed from it by composition:
(hā 'mouth' + -w 'in') + bā' + * hāwbā' → hāwba.
The vowel length and pitch accent of the final syllable of
*hāwbā* are lost, as often happens adjacent to accented
heavy syllables in well-integrated compounds, yielding the
actually occurring word hāwba. Now lexicalized to 'tongue',
hāwba is more literally 'tail in the mouth'.

The Kashaya form is of parallel origin. Both -w and
-
- are locative suffixes meaning 'in, at'. By regular rule
w becomes vowel length before all consonants except a laryn-
geal plus another consonant. The result is that, in the
environment within the compound, the two suffixes would
fall together as -
-
-
(aha 'mouth' + -w/- -) + hiba' 'tail' → #*aha*hiba
→ *ha*ba' → ha*ba.

The loss of the initial syllables ?a- and hi- (aphesis)
and shortening of a long vowel are both common processes
in compounding. The ordinary Kashaya word for 'tongue'
is thus, in origin, also 'tail in the mouth'; but, because
of the sound changes and lexicalization that the compound
has undergone, that origin is not recognized by present-
day speakers of the language.

The Northern Pomo word for 'tongue' has a similar
but slightly simpler derivation, because the suffix for
'in' does not appear in it: hā 'mouth' + bā' → habā'
(there is some reduction in the pitch accent of compounds,
but the rules are not well-understood). The segment bā'
does not occur independently in Northern Pomo in the mean-
ings under consideration (bā' 'man' is from PP *hi*baya).
'Tail' is denoted by an unrelated form, parenthesized in
the table. In origin, the meaning of the Northern word
for 'tongue' was probably something like 'mouth appendage',
but it is not synchronically analyzable as such.

Because there is less material on Northeastern Pomo,
the processes involved are less well documented; they also
happen to be more complex. The two survivors with any
memory of words in Northeastern know 'tail' as ṣi*ba* but
do not know a word for 'tongue'. Halpern's notes (1940)
contain ṣi*ba* 'tail' and have a word hu*ba* cited once
as 'lips' and twice as 'tongue'. I assume that the second
syllables of the above two words are reflexes of *hiba* in
the generalized meaning 'appendage'. The terms are then
particularized by compounding:

#*si*ba 'body' + *hiba' → *si*baba' → si*ba'.
The syllable *hi* may or may not have been deleted first in an intermediate stage but, under this proposal, the construction would be reduced to its final form by haplogy, and what was originally a compound 'body appendage' has become synchronically unanalyzable.

The best suggestion I have for the source of the first syllable of huʔba* is that it is derived from *huʔuy 'eye, face':

*huʔuy + *hiba* → huʔba*

The earlier meaning would thus be 'face appendage'. The actual Northeastern word for 'eye' is ?uy and that form would be expected in any recently and transparently constructed compound. However, hu(ʔ) occurs in a couple of other terms for body parts lying on or near the face: huma* 'forehead' and huʔka 'neck' (neither with clear cognates in other Pomo languages).

Southern Pomo is a much more fully recorded language and in it there are competing types of segmental reduction in compounds. A common process is apesis (loss of an initial syllable) but deletion of intervocalic laryngeals often takes precedence, along with coalescence of vowels thus brought into contact. With the Southern Pomo word huʔuy 'face', the first segments to go are the final -y and the length of the laryngeal:

huʔuy 'face' + kʰaʔbe 'rock' → huʔukʰbe 'eye'

(The above also illustrates the loss of the penultimate vowel of compounds.) Next to go is the intervocalic laryngeal: huʔu- → (huʃu-) → hu-. The syllable hu- occurs in several terms for facial parts in which the remainder of the word is unidentifiable: huʔmati 'cheek', huʔluʔbe 'eyelash', huʔluʔziy 'eyebrow', etc. I have suggested (1976) this reduction may have led to the formation of the unique Southern Pomo verbal prefix hu- ~ *u- 'by talking' and by extension 'sound involved'. The alternation in form makes it conceivable that the variation arose from taking either the first or the second syllable of huʔuy, but it is more certainly related to the general constraints on the distribution of laryngeals (described below in the section on Pomo Body Prefix). If it should be assumed that the Northeastern syllable hu(ʔ) is derived from PP *huʔuy by a mechanism similar to that in Southern Pomo or, alternatively, that it comes from Northeastern ?uy, with dissimilation of the laryngeal from ? to h in the manner common to Proto-Pomo initials (keeping in mind that this would presuppose a reinterpretation in certain compounds of ?uy as an initial syllable when it is actually from the Proto-Pomo second syllable), then the derivation of Northeastern huʔba* would be more understandable.
In Eastern Pomo, a well-attested general development is the loss of initial laryngeal syllables. Hence, bál 'tongue' is a regular reflex and yi- 'tail' is not. I have no convincing explanation for the aberration, nor does McLeod (1973:92). The only closely parallel case known to me is PP *hima 'sinew', Eastern yi- 'tail'. It is unlikely that yi- is from compounding with some root, else it would be accented. One could imagine a phonological mechanism whereby *hi- became yi- but, with the present state of our knowledge, the rule would have to be ad hoc and quite particularized in environment to include 'tail' and 'sinew' but exclude 'tongue', 'hole' (Eastern mo < PP *himo) and many other examples.

In Southeastern Pomo, initial laryngeal syllables and all inherited length are lost. Hence, bal 'tongue' and ba 'tail' are quite regular reflexes.

I do not know of a Pomo verb root meaning 'do with the tongue' but there is a verb prefix *si-. That prefix, however, has a very wide range of meaning, many actions involving the tongue and many involving water and other liquids; in Kashaya, by what I assume to be metaphorical extension, it is even appropriate for actions by light movements of air. Thus, with the Kashaya verb root -hye- 'stop', the form sihyey applies to 'stop licking, sucking, drinking, dissolving, raining, floating, soaring, wafting, etc.' The overlap between the two major instruments 'tongue' and 'water' comes in an action like 'drinking'; however, within the Pomo languages, no one could be picked as original. It is only by comparison with other Hokan languages that the suggestion can be made that 'drink' is earlier (cf. Proto-Yuman *si- 'drink'). That which is typically drunk, 'water', also comes to the fore in some Northern Hokan languages. This etymology was discussed in more detail in Oswalt (1975).

In the columns of Pomo cognates above, the noun 'mouth' was included as evidence for the source of the initial syllable in some of the descendant words for 'tongue'. Some of the reflexes of *waha are compounded with other elements: Northeastern mo 'hole', Eastern či- 'skin', and Southeastern sto (unidentified).²

*ba- 'do with the mouth' (among other meanings) is included because of its similarity to forms in some other Hokan languages (Yana, Karok).

**POMO BODY PREFIX**

There is reconstructable for Proto-Pomo a verb prefix *Hi- attested only in Southern and Kashaya Pomo; it would be lost by the regular sound developments in Central, Northern, Eastern, and Southeastern Pomo. The core meaning is 'with the body as a whole rather than by purposeful act
with one of its individual parts'. For example, in Kashaya, with the verb root -'ta- 'seem, feel', one could say
sáwó₁ hi'taw₂. 'It (the dress) felt₂ tight₁ (to the whole body).'
In contrast, with the prefix si-, one might say
caha₁ si'taw₂. 'It (the drink) tasted₂ bitter₁.'

In Southern Pomo, the 'body' prefix is of the form Hi-, where H-is h- when the next consonant group contains a glottalized or voiced stop or ʔ; it is ʔ- when the next consonant group contains a sibilant, aspirated stop, or h. Before resonants and a few other consonants there is some morphologically determined contrast. In Kashaya, the prefix is regularized to an invariant hi-. I take the alternation in Southern Pomo to reflect the situation in Proto-Pomo because, in both languages, other parts of speech beginning HV- evince an analogous constraint on the distribution of h- and ʔ-.

There is no productive noun prefix of similar form and meaning in the Pomo family, but there is some evidence for a frozen one, evidence so meagre and clouded by vowel assimilation that it must be presented as a statistical tendency. For this purpose, excluding verbs, I assembled 100 Proto-Pomo words beginning *HV-. The list includes the majority of such words but is not exhaustive. The following chart gives the number of examples in each of several phonological subdivisions. V represents any vowel and ;width is a first-syllable vowel which is the same as that in the second syllable, a lower case letter is used to represent only those vowels which are different from the vowel of the second syllable. H-is ʔ- and h- distributed according to the rules given for the verb prefix.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phonological Subdivision</th>
<th>Number of Examples</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HV-</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>*hoʔไท 'brains'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hi-</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>*ʔihsa 'penis'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>*ʔahʃi 'name'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hu-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>*ʔuʔna 'belly'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HV- Total</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That there are no examples of \#He- or \#Ho- provides part of the evidence that Proto-Pomo had only a three-way contrast of vowels in word-initial syllables. Proto-Pomo plainly had five contrasting vowels in the second syllable; whether this number might be reduced to three for Pre-Pomo is too large a topic to discuss fully here.

Of the 17 cases beginning \#Ha-, 6 are nouns, 3 pronouns, 7 adjectives, and 1 adverb. There is a discernible element \#Ha- beginning most deictics, including pronouns (some of the examples are subsumed under the \#HV- class). That the number of adjectives is so high is suggestive of an adjective formative of a similar shape.

Of the 38 cases with \#Hi-, none are deictic, 1 is an adverb, 1 an adjective, and an overwhelming 36 nouns. This is a large enough number to break down further into semantic categories. Of the 36, 22 deal with animate beings and 14 do not. These 22 cases can be broken down still further: 12 are body parts ('bone', 'feather', etc.), 3 are body products ('egg', 'spittle'), and 7 are whole bodies or creatures ('man', 'woman', 'flea', 'condor', etc.). Since only a minor portion of the total noun vocabulary deals with animate beings, the 22 to 14 bias is significant.

Of the 42 cases with \#HV-, 2 are deictic, 7 are adverbs, 2 are adjectives, and 31 are nouns. Of the 31 nouns, 18 deal with animate beings and 13 do not. The bias in favor of nouns over other grammatical classes and of those dealing with animate beings over other nouns is not quite so pronounced as with \#Hi- but is still evident. The lessening of the bias may be due to the merger of former prefix classes. Elsewhere I have argued for a HOKAN noun-formative \#a- (Civault 1975; many of the Proto-Pomo nouns in \#HV- could be assimilated from Proto-Hokan \#a-, others from \#H-i-. Vowel assimilation occurs sporadically in the present-day languages, particularly when two vowels are separated by a laryngeal. An example is Kashaya mi- 'your' + -\#a 'father' = me\#a 'your father'. In only a few instances can the syllable after the \#HV- be related to a morpheme occurring elsewhere; one of the plainest is \#hico- 'egg', which seems to contain the verb root \#-do- '(intransitive) appear, come into existence; (transitive) reveal, create'.

Pomoan provides no evidence for the segmentation of \#Hi- into \#H- + \#-i-; it is other Hokan languages (for example, Chimariko) that suggest that \#H- is from a HOKAN prefix for a third person or indefinite possessor, now generalized in Pomoan with the concomitant loss of the use of possessive prefixes on body part terms (they remain on kin terms, but the third person prefix is quite different). The main thrust of the preceding discussion, that \#Hi- is an old prefix, now barely perceptible in Pomoan, does not rest on the further speculation that \#H- has a morphological origin, for \#H- could have arisen phonologically within Pomoan as a kind of onset to bring vowel-initial words into the general pattern that all words begin \#CV-.
TERMINATION

In order to get this article in on time for inclusion in the present volume, I have had to terminate it before the planned lengthy discussion of the evidence in the Hokan branches other than Pomoan and of the possible effect of onomatopoeia and symbolism on the forms. The earlier title "The Hokan Word for 'Tongue'" has been amended to indicate the paper's more restricted scope, but it has not been possible to delete the occasional internal remarks referring forward to the now nonexistent sections. They are thus left dangling and for that I apologize.

Pending the future completion of the discussion, I present here the bone-bare, key data from those other branches:

Proto-Yuman (I am grateful to the many Yumanists who provided information; the reconstructions are the consensus of those at the conference): *i*-pal 'tongue'; *i*-a- 'mouth'. The reflexes for 'tongue' display complications as great as, or greater than, those in Pomoan and include compounding with the word for 'mouth', insertion of an affective nasal, and symbolic variation in the final lateral. There are diverse cognate sets for 'tail'; most pertinent is Kiliwa (M. Mixco, personal communication) plga. Also relevant are Kiliwa pi'n 'lick' and pin 'suckle'.

Seri (Becky Moser, p.c.): -pλ 'tongue'; -paaλ 'lick'; -iip 'tail'.

Tequistlatec (the first of the pairs of forms is from Waterhouse 1970, the second from Turner 1971): -patl, -båλ 'tongue'; -petl-, -beå- 'lick'; -po, -bo 'tail'.

Salinan (Wm. Jacobsen, field notes): -epal 'tongue'; -etsew 'tail' is unrelated.

Chimariko (J. P. Harrington, field notes): h-i-phen '[third singular possessor] tongue'; -phen 'lick'; h-awa 'mouth'.

Yana (Sapir and Swadesh 1960): Yahi bawa?na, Northern bawa?la, bawa?la (with a suggested reading of bawal?-la) 'tongue'. This could be constructed of ba- 'call [and some other actions of the mouth]! plus 'flexible object lies', attested in Yahi as ba?la-. Compare also Yahi and Northern bo?la- 'handle a flexible object'; and bal- 'mouth' in Yahi and Central, 'cheek' in Central and Northern. Certain forms display a morphophonemic alternation of b- with -w-; hence bal-, in noninitial position, appears as Central -wal-, Yahi -wan-. 'Tail' is pulsu.
Shaasta (S. Silver, p.c.): -ehen-a 'tongue'; -ehen-i 'lick'; -i'hiwa 'tail'.

Atsugewi (L. Talmy, p.c.): Except between phonemic slashes, underlying forms are given. apl, /apl/ 'tongue'; -ip 'place the tongue'; pla'fy 'lick'. The verb prefix is pri, /pri-/ ~ /pli-/ 'ingressive mouth action (lick, suck, taste, swallow, etc.).'

Achumawi (B. Nevin, p.c.): *ipn̓i 'tongue'; -ph̓la- 'do with the tongue'. From Olmsted (1966) ap 'mouth; ippi 'tail'.

Karok (Wm. Bright 1957): ápri'h 'tongue'; párax 'lick (acorn soup) off cooking stones'; víraxe 'lick'; vif 'suck (on)'; apma'n 'mouth'; pa- 'by mouth'; ápvy 'tail'. Most of Karok forms are polymorphemic and will require analysis; the segments that seem most pertinent are p(a)r 'tongue, lick' and p(a) 'mouth'.

Washo (Wm. Jacobsen, p.c.): kmá'dud 'tongue'; mů 'do in the mouth'; -alp 'lick'; and haŋa 'mouth' are aberrant from the forms in other languages. More pertinent could be apil 'tail'.

* * * * * * * * * * *

NOTES

1. The forms in Western Pomo were collected by me in the course of field work supported by the Survey of California Indian Languages (on Kashaya) and National Science Foundation grant GS-711 (on Southern, Central, and Northern Pomo). The Eastern Pomo material is from S. McLendon and the Southeastern from J. Moshinsky. The sources for other languages are cited in the text.

2. McLendon (1973:82) reconstructs 'mouth' as ?ahx̣, using *-hx̣- for the correspondences exemplified in the set for 'mouth' and *-h- for those cases in which all the languages have h from an intervocalic (ignoring length) *h. I reconstruct both sets of correspondences as *h and recognize a distinctive conditioning environment which obviates the need for a proto-phoneme *x̣. That environment consists of those situations in which the initial syllable of the proto-word is lost in Eastern and Southeastern. Most commonly that syllable is *V-:

   *h → X in Eastern
   *h → X in Southeastern /?V-V
   h in the other lg's.

We also differ on the treatment of length and accent and on the symbolization of certain palatal-velar correspondences.
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In 1970 numerous linguists working on Hokan and Yuman languages were invited by Margaret Langdon to attend a conference at the University of California, San Diego. This made it possible for specialist to get to know each other and to learn in detail what each other was doing. The meeting was so successful that participants soon began asking when we would meet again. In 1975 Margaret Langdon invited the Yumanists to a workshop in conjunction with the research being done at the Yuman Languages Archives which she had established with the aid of a National Science Foundation grant. Again, the participants felt that the workshop was so successful that we ought to meet every year if possible. In 1976 another workshop was held at UCSD to which both Hokanists and Yumanists were invited. These proceedings are the result of that workshop. It is now expected that Hokanists and Yumanists will meet every year. The 1977 meeting will be at the University of Utah in Salt Lake City.

The participants of the 1976 Hokan-Yuman Languages Workshop gratefully acknowledge all the work that Sandra Chung and Pamela Munro did in organizing and running the workshop. Thanks are also due to Donald Crook and Susan Norwood for looking after the many details that helped make the workshop run smoothly.

Unfortunately, everyone who presented a paper at the 1976 Hokan-Yuman Languages Workshop was not able to prepare a final version for inclusion in this volume before it went to press. All the papers in this volume were presented in an earlier version at the 1976 workshop except the ones by Langdon and Webb, which were not ready in time for presentation for the workshop. However, since many of the points they contain were discussed at the workshop, they are included here.

The papers are presented according to the groups of languages presented at the workshop. Since there were some last minute changes in the program, I must plead faulty memory if I inadvertently placed some papers in an order different from that of the workshop presentation. The Langdon and Webb papers are included in the appropriate groups.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, May 1977
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