By necessity, those who deal with Chumash linguistics must do so as philologists; there are no living Chumash speakers. Perhaps partly because of this, Chumash data are too rarely available for comparison with other languages although the family continues steadfastly to be grouped with other Hokan languages, possibly for lack of anywhere else to put it in the absence of good and substantial data being available. I hope this paper will do a little bit toward remedying the situation. I will present some facts of Chumash grammar and suggest a working hypothesis to explain them. These, when compared with data from other Hokan languages (I think particularly of Margaret Langdon's paper on Seri and Yuman elsewhere in this volume) may suggest something about the position of Chumash within or without Hokan.

Chumash, along with Yuman and Pomoan, are the great "families" of languages grouped under the Hokan label. Chumash as we know it historically consists of six distinct linguistic groups usually called dialects—Obispeño, Cruzeño, Barbareño, Ineseño, Ventureño, and Purisimeño. In fact the family actually consists of three languages, one of which (Central Chumash) is characterized by a division into four dialects, namely Barbareño, Ineseño, Ventureño, and Purisimeño. Obispeño stands alone as Northern Chumash. Cruzeño along with its sub-dialect Roseño constitute Island Chumash. The three language groups were not mutually intelligible. What little we know about Central Chumash dialectology suggests mutual intelligibility of the four dialects, though speakers recognized distinct "accents" and substantial grammatical differences are apparent. Two of the Central languages have sub-dialects: Embidiano for Barbareño; Alilik for Ventureño. Island Chumash is a far more unified idiom that Central Chumash. It appears that differences between Cruzeño and Roseño were slight (though it is possible that fuller attestations of these idioms might suggest more divergence). For Northern Chumash there are hints in the corpus that there were sub-dialects and that Obispeño was not an isolate. As with Island Chumash, the corpus is so small that such indications are very tantalizing but very hard to document. I believe that some of the problems Chumash scholars have encountered with "irregular" or "exceptional" sound correspondences may be due to the last Northern Chumash speaker reporting forms in two dialects. It is a problem I will continue to investigate.

Ten years of work by Madison Beeler, Richard Applegate and myself have revealed a family whose internal relationships are both more complex and more certain than was previously thought. There is no doubt, for instance, that Obispeño is an integral member of the family, though it comprises a distinct branch of the family tree.
Close affinities with Purisimeño, which led to occasional suggestions of a special relationship between that dialect and Obispeño, are due to close cultural contact in an otherwise isolated geographical setting. Deep structural similarities shared by Obispeño and Purisimeño are also shared in common with other Chumash dialects and are a fact of family relationship. The position of Island Chumash in relation to other family members has also become somewhat clearer. It has been generally assumed (on little evidence) that Cruzénó was more similar to Central Chumash—particularly to Ventureño—than to Northern Chumash, and that Island and Central Chumash formed a higher sub-grouping, set against the isolated Northern Chumash. In lexical matters this appears to be the case for Cruzénó, but in matters of structure, a different picture is emerging. Island Chumash may in fact constitute an entirely separate branch of the family, as distinct from Central Chumash as is Northern Chumash. Extensive contact in fairly recent times between the Islanders and their nearest mainland neighbors the Ventureño has probably obscured some of the more superficial differences. This brings me to the topic of this paper: Although there are several areas I could discuss with respect to historical Chumash dialectology, I will here concentrate on only one, namely the prefixes which mark person and number in nominal possession and verbal inflection. My remarks constitute the results of work in progress, and I do not intend that they be the final words on the subject.

My data for Barbareño come from Madison Beeler's notes on the subject. In all other cases, the information is directly or indirectly from John P. Harrington's field notes in the National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution. (The direct source of the Ineseño data are the unpublished papers and thesis of Richard Applegate; his data derive directly from Harrington.)

As a very general statement we can say that Chumash dialects use the same prefixes to mark person and number in both nominal possession and verbal inflection. It is easiest to begin with Central Chumash to see how this works.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal (possessive prefixes)</th>
<th>Verbal (subject prefixes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 k-</td>
<td>k-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 p-</td>
<td>p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 s-</td>
<td>s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 k-iš-</td>
<td>k-iš-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 p-iš-</td>
<td>p-iš-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 s-iš-</td>
<td>s-iš-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 k-iy-</td>
<td>k-iy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 p-iy-</td>
<td>p-iy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 s-iy-</td>
<td>s-iy-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possessive prefixes are almost always preceded by a particle, especially in examples found in texts rather than elicited as isolated forms. Examples of the use of the possessive and subjective prefixes include the following:

**Nominal Possession:**

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Possessive Prefix</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hihe?</td>
<td>2 kap</td>
<td>'my house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noCAP</td>
<td>2 his house</td>
<td>'his house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noSTEqlq</td>
<td>2 his tail</td>
<td>'his tail'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hihoSTu</td>
<td>2 her ear</td>
<td>'her ear'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hiho?PnoqS</td>
<td>2 your head</td>
<td>'your head'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hekpu</td>
<td>2 my hand</td>
<td>'my hand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hisiyShhe</td>
<td>2 their bones</td>
<td>'their bones'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Possessive Prefix</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 kap</td>
<td>2 my house</td>
<td>'my house'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>makiSTiwal</td>
<td>my carrying-net</td>
<td>'my carrying-net'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sp?l</td>
<td>2 its (pine tree's) pitch</td>
<td>'its (pine tree's) pitch'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kiyisku</td>
<td>2 our guests</td>
<td>'our guests'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Possessive Prefix</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>kakapan</td>
<td>2 my knees</td>
<td>'my knees'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kapni?l</td>
<td>2 your back</td>
<td>'your back'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a?l</td>
<td>2 his leg</td>
<td>'his leg'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Verbal Inflection:**

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Inflected Form</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>s?l?p hekpu</td>
<td>2 there is a nick on my hand</td>
<td>'there is a nick on my hand'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ksuxiyoxon</td>
<td>2 I stirred up the water</td>
<td>'I stirred up the water'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siyax?cawawan</td>
<td>2 they (the frogs) are croaking</td>
<td>'they (the frogs) are croaking'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Inflected Form</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(no ?an)</td>
<td>k?h?cis?niw?sa</td>
<td>2 I saw you at Ventura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>si?S?hiluleqpeyus</td>
<td>2 they (2) want to follow it</td>
<td>'they (2) want to follow it'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

P

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Subject Prefix</th>
<th>English Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smomo</td>
<td>2 it is foggy</td>
<td>'it is foggy'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This neat and regular system has generally been cited in the past as the Chumash system. It was previously believed that Proto-Chumash when reconstructed would look much like Barabareño since it agreed so well with the other Central dialects. Indeed, if all Chumash dialects looked this regular, there would be little to reconstruct or talk about. But I believe that Central Chumash has simplified what was originally a far more diversified system. Evidence for this can be seen by comparing the Island and Northern Chumash paradigms with each other and then with Central Chumash.

**Island Chumash (Cruseño)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal (possessive prefixes)</th>
<th>Verbal (subject prefixes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 pa-ç-/mi-ç-</td>
<td>ç-/m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 pa-p-/si-p-</td>
<td>p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 pa-s-/pa-c-</td>
<td>ç/çala- (nominalizer)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Cruzeño, the use of the definite article pa- or another particle is obligatory in noun possession. Examples of the Cruzeño case include the following:

Nominal possession:  
- pačš 'my mouth'  
- paššš 'your mouth'  
- papš 'his arm'

Verbal Inflection:  
- makuluan 'I am going to dance'  
- myaya 'I am well'  
- xisín 'I lose my'  
- t'uwuma 'I want to eat black mussels'  
- piššžloólto 'you are looking at me'  
- gqóóúa 'he emerges again'  
- tayetla 'he is from Ventura'  
- (< tala-yet-la)

Of particular interest are the first and second person noun prefixes (and the first person verbal prefixes). Though the corpus is regrettably small for Cruzeño, it is easy to see that the distribution of pač- vs. miš- and pap- vs. sip- is not random. miš- is used in the corpus for the following items: father, grandfather, grandmother, mother, brother/sister-in-law, older brother, older sister, paternal aunt, maternal uncle, maternal aunt, maternal uncle, orphan, good friend/companion, nephew, God, and nose. sip- is attested as occurring with the following items: grandfather, grandmother, mother, brother/sister-in-law. (pač- is also attested with: father, orphan. pač-/pap- are attested with: younger sibling, daughter, son, grandchild, niece.)

It should be noted that with one exception (nose) these are all in the category of kinship terms, or more generally, terms of personal relationship of one kind or another (orphan, good friend/companion, God). The one non-kinship term is a body part term, and I will have more to say about this subsequently.

Beeler and Klar, in their unpublished Cruzeño sketch say:

"These data appear to reflect an older system of noun classification based upon distinctions made in the
kinship structure, a system which has begun to break
down and to be replaced by the universal p(a)....On one
of Harrington's file slips is written what appears to
be a paradigm: 'my, your, his grandmother'; the prefixes
are mi- with si- and pa-. If that was part of the
older system, it suggests an origin for the Cruzénó
article in the third person singular prefix. It may
or may not be significant that mi- and si-
share the
element meaning 'near, or belonging to, me or you' and
contrasting with the -- of pa- 'farther away'.

If this view is correct, then in can be argued that Island Chumash had
a system which recognized degrees of closeness of noun possession
which were reckoned from the speaker's point of view.

With respect to verbal inflection, Cruzénó in the first person
has two different prefixes, one of which is cognate with Central
Chumash and which seems to be a reduced form of the first
person marker of noun possession. Actually the m- is the more
usual form, but the number of examples is too small to make any
comfortable generalizations about this point. The unmarked third
person is unique to Cruzénó, though the nominalized third person
is not.

The situation for Northern Chumash lies somewhere between
that of Central and Island Chumash.

**Northern Chumash (Obispeño)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal (possessive prefixes)</th>
<th>Verbal (subject prefixes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1 ya- / mi-</td>
<td>mi- / m- (mi- before V,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2 ya-p-</td>
<td>m- before C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3 ya-t- / ya-tš-</td>
<td>tš, s/- (nominalizing form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D1 ya-k-si-</td>
<td>k-si-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D2 ya-p-si-</td>
<td>unattested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D3 ya-t-si-</td>
<td>t-si-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1 ya-k-ši-</td>
<td>k-ši-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2 ya-p-ši-</td>
<td>p-ši-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P3 unattested</td>
<td>tš-ši-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Obispeño, the use of the definite article ya-
or another
particle is obligatory in noun possession, as in Cruzénó (but not
Central Chumash dialects where it is customary but not obligatory).
Examples of the Obispeño case include:
Nominal Possession: 
miʔe=x=he 'my tongue'
miʔ=atx=a 'my bow'
yam=qni=pu 'my house'
yakʰ=bi=sa=si 'the father of us two'
yakʰ=isaqʰ=si 'our rope'

Verbal Inflection: 
mə̱qui 'I burned' (transitive)
minu=ma=x=he 'I went down'
(miʔ=ʌ) miʔ=aliqam=x=hawk 'I am a twin'
pə̱xanaq=x=am=x= 'you are sick'
piʔis=x=ai=x=ini 'we want'

Again in Obispeño we find a morphological classification of nouns. There is a distinct prefix for kinship terms, body parts, and things one feels particularly attached to. mi- is used with the following items: bow, staff/walking stick, needle, charcoal, throat, tears, soul/spirit, heart, hair, tongue, forehead, eyebrows, mouth, heel, foot, fingernails; husband, mother, grandfather, uncle, aunt, older cousin, nephew, wife, sister- or brother-in-law. These categories are virtually the same ones which comprise the class of inalienably possessed nouns in Central Chumash. In Central Chumash there are morphological markers of inalienably possessed, but no special, distinct personal possessives for these categories.

To expand a little on the statement about Island Chumash quoted above from Beeler and Klar, I think that these variant forms point to the shape of the old Chumash system of verbal and nominal inflectional markers. In Proto-Chumash, I propose, there was classification of nouns and morphological material to reflect it. We can see it in the daughter languages now only in the singular forms, and it is possible—perhaps even likely—that it never extended to the plural and dual forms. In any case, we cannot tell for sure. At the time for which we have written records, the Island and Northern languages were in a state of change, tending toward regularization of the type found in Central Chumash, perhaps even partly because of pressure from the Central languages in a tribe whose numbers were rapidly dwindling. However, the languages died before the change was complete. One can't say that Obispeño was more "advanced" than cruzeno in this respect in that only the first person forms maintained the distinction whereas Cruzeno had it in both first and second persons. Cruzeno had already regularized to the extent that both the first and second persons used the same morphological formation—particle plus person/number marker—whether the particle was the definite article (pa-) or the special form (mi-/si-), thus doubly marking the person and number. Obispeño maintained in the first person what may have been the original usage, namely using only mi- without redundancy.
Concluding Statement. To conclude, then, the systems of person and number marking in Chumash are not neat and tidy, and several hypotheses could be advanced to explain the anomalies. What I think is clear, however, is that the Central Chumash paradigm is not representative of Proto-Chumash. Island and Northern Chumash retain remnants of the older system, but they are also probably incomplete having undergone morphological leveling and depletion in their development from the proto-language. It is also certain that a complete internal study of the origin of the person/number markers in Chumash would be greatly enhanced by a thorough study of all the particles, both nominal and verbal, and this I intend to do. The Proto-Chumash system may well turn out to be something quite different that this present study suggests—in fact, the means by which nouns and verbs were inflected, though they look so similar during the brief time in which there are attestations for these languages, may have been quite different from one another and may have undergone massive reshaping even before the three language groups diverged. Although internal reconstruction is necessary here before conclusive statements are possible, I believe that wider studies of Hokan languages may be very important to Chumash studies as well as we try to sort out the facts of Chumash prehistory and explain the family tree on the basis of our finite and limited body of data.

Edward Sapir pointed to particles of various shapes and functions as a distinguishing feature of Hukan. If Chumash does belong with Hukan, forms such as the definite article, used in inflecting nouns, and special bound forms for kinship terms, body parts, etc., must have had their beginnings in the same set of items from which other Hukan idioms drew their forms for similar functions. I'd like to think that the origins are accessible and will continue working on the basis of that belief. I think that Chumash studies is ready to contribute its share to Hukan studies, and I further think that it is productive to proceed on the assumption that Chumash does indeed belong somewhere in the Hukan stock.

Addendum. As a working hypothesis of what the Proto-Chumash nominal and verbal inflectional system may have looked like, I offer the following schema. I would like to emphasize its tentative nature; it is only offered at this point as a guide to others working on Hukan languages on what one interpretation of the data suggests.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td>*k₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td>*p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td>*s (or *ts)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The S1 form *k₁ became k- in Central Chumash, s- in Island Chumash, and would have became, regularly, t₇- in Northern Chumash. However,
in Northern Chumash, the m- or the verbal system was taken into
the nominal system as the regular first person marker, perhaps
because of its similarity to mi-, the inalienable nominal possessive.
*p- remained as p- in all dialects. *s- (or *ts-) was realized in
Central and Island as s-; in Obispeño as s- or ts-. In the verbal
system, the Central languages took the *k- from the nominal system
and moved it into the S1 verbal position as well (compare the
Obispeño case where the opposite happened). This suggests that
the distinction of special forms for inalienably possessed items
was already diminished or gone from Central Chumash. With all the
appropriate levelings and substitutions, the daughter languages
end up looking like this:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominal</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Central k-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Island ê-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Northern m-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Central p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Island p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Northern p-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Central s-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island</td>
<td>Island ø or nominalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern</td>
<td>Northern t-/ts-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These forms, of course, were always used with the appropriate
particles.

1I use the term Obispeño interchangeably with Northern Chumash in
this paper. Similarly, Island Chumash is interchangeable with
Cruzeño unless otherwise specified.

2Kroeber, however, was not of this opinion. See "The Chumash
and Costanoan Languages", UCPAAE vol.7, no. 2 (Nov. 19, 1910) p. 264.
Other Chumash observers implied a greater uniformity of the family
based solely upon lexical inspection.

3See, for instance, Beeler, Madison, "Barbareño Chumash Grammar:
A Farrago" in Hokan Studies (1976). I also relied upon unpublished
notes and personal communications with Beeler.

4The papers of John Peabody Harrington are lodged in the
National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, and
consist of hundreds of thousands of sheets on all the Chumash
dialects and the ethnography of the tribe. They are our main
source of grammatical information on dialects other than Barbareño.
The abbreviations S, D, and P stand for singular, dual, and plural, respectively. 1, 2, and 3 used after them stand for first person, second person, and third person, respectively.

The quotation is from the unpublished grammatical sketch and lexicon of Island Chumash by Beeler and Klar. The sketch is currently being prepared for publication.

I think that a few words on Chumash particles are appropriate. All Chumash lexical items can be divided into three categories: noun, verb, and particle. Some particles are free, some are bound. Particles are a very large class with several subclasses, the largest of which is loosely called "demonstrative particles." This includes the definite article and numerous forms designating relative distance from the speaker (see the text). Other types of particles include nominalizers, predicates, and adverbials. Particles are not well-studied in Chumash and show an amazing diversity even among groups which have the same morphological and semantic function. Take, for instance, the variety of forms of the definite article in the different dialects:

Ineseno ma-/ha-
Barabeno (ha)1-
Ventureno si-
Purisimeno ka-
Cruzeno pa-
Roseno ka-
Obispeno ya-

Proto-Chumash had two velar consonants, which I designate *k¹ and *k², which may have arisen as a phonemic split of an original *k in certain environments. *k¹ was markedly more palatal than *k², and whereas *k² is realized in all Chumash dialects as k (or occasionally even q), *k¹ is variously realized as k in Central Chumash, & in Cruzeno, and t³ in Obispeno.

The possibility that Obispeno mi- 'my' is of Spanish origin seems unlikely for several reasons. Though late contact with Spanish speakers may have reinforced its use, the evidence of Cruzeno and other internal indications in Chumash make it appear most likely that it is a native feature, which only coincidentally resembles the Spanish form.

Chumash has rules for aspiration of stops in consonant clusters. The shape of the Obispeño forms as given here is morphophonemic; phonetically they are yäkai-, yapä'i-, yatäi-.

See Applegate, Ineseño Chumash Grammar, p. 235 et seq.
Cruzeño does appear to have one form which may indicate some type of special marking in non-singular forms. There is an occasional use of a prefix mas- 'our, plural' but its occurrence in the corpus is so rare that general statements about it are impossible. Perhaps further investigation of particles will shed light on it, but for now, it must be said that virtually no evidence exists for special dual or plural forms.


At the present time it is difficult to determine exactly how to reconstruct this third person nominal form. The - is certainly correct; the - is doubtful. It is possible that it is an old noun classifier which is retained only in Obispeño and Cruzeño. There is other evidence within Obispeño, however, which suggests that the inherited form is in fact - , and that Central and (usually) Island Chumash have reduced the form to -. I feel certain that the matter will yield to further investigation.

See note 3.
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Unfortunately, everyone who presented a paper at the 1980 Hokan Languages Workshop was not able to prepare a final version for inclusion in this volume. All papers in this volume except two were presented in an earlier version at the 1980 workshop. The papers are arranged in the order they appeared on the program.

The paper by Birgitte Bendixen was presented at the 1979 Hokan Languages Workshop. The camera-ready manuscript for her article arrived at the editor's office more than three months before the publication deadline. The editor is so used to having to call up contributors and begging them to get their manuscripts in that he totally forgot Dr. Bendixen's paper was in his files and left it out of the 1979 volume. The editor humbly apologizes for this oversight. The second paper by Pamela Munro was discussed in part at the 1980 workshop, and the editor asked her to include it in this volume.

The participants of the 1980 Hokan Languages Workshop gratefully acknowledge all the work done by Leanne Hinton and several of her students, which made the workshop run so smoothly and enjoyably. We also wish to thank the College of Letters and Sciences at the University of California, Berkeley, for a grant to help defray the costs of holding the workshop.

Copies of the 1977, 1978, and 1979 workshop proceedings are still available from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901. The volumes for the 1975 and 1976 workshops, which appeared in the SIU-C series, University Museum Studies, are now out of print, but copies may be obtained in microfiche or hardbound volumes from ERIC Clearinghouse on Languages and Linguistics, Center for Applied Linguistics, 3250 Prospect St., N.W., Washington, DC 20007.

The 1981 Hokan Languages Workshop will meet jointly with the Penutian Language Conference at Sonoma State University, Rohnert Park, California, June 29 to July 2, 1981. The proceedings of the 1981 workshop will appear in Occasional Papers On Linguistics in early 1982. For the first time, the papers of the Penutian Language Conference will be published in the same volume as the Hokan papers. Copies may be ordered from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, June 1981
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