Classification

Washo is the only Great Basin linguistic group that is not part of the Numic family. Located in a relatively circumscribed area centering on Lake Tahoe at the western edge of the culture area, it contrasts with the members of this family in its minimal dialectal diversification and its isolation. It is not genetically related either to Numic or to the Maidu and Miwokan stocks that are its California neighbors, nor does it have either a close or universally accepted relationship to any other languages.

History. For a while after their discovery, the Washo were thought to be linguistically similar to the Numic groups to their east (cf. Bancroft 1886:469). Their linguistic distinctness was first pointed out by Collins (1876:467, 468) in the report of the Simpson expedition. This was also noted by Gatschet (1882:254, 255), relying primarily on material collected by Powers in 1876, although Heizer (1966:12) suggests a possible influence of Collins through Hayden (1877). It was reaffirmed by Henshaw (1887:xxx) on the basis of data he collected in 1883. A separate Washoan family was consequently recognized in the influential Powell classification (1891:131), with credit given to Gatschet; the rival Brinton classification (1891) unaccountably omits any mention of this group.

Washo is now commonly referred to as a member of the Hokan stock, or of larger groupings including Hokan, especially Hokan-Coahuiltecan (Hokaltecian) and Hokan-Siouan. Hokan contains 13 branches located in California and the western Southwest, with an outlier in southern Mexico (Tequistlatecan or Chontal de Oaxaca). It is important to emphasize that potential relationships among the Hokan branches remain controversial today and have none of the virtual certainty that applies, for example, to the relationship of Numic to the other Uto-Aztecan branches; consequently the Hokan construct must be used with the utmost caution in any inferences about prehistoric cultural contacts or migrations.

The hypotheses of Hokan and broader relationships have developed in successive accretions over the last century. Anticipatory studies include Brinton’s (1891:109-113, 148, 335) proposal of a relationship among Tequistlatecan, Seri, and Yuman (the latter thought to include Cochimi, Guaicurú, and Pericu of Lower California as remotely related dialects), and Dixon’s work in northern California, first (1905) presenting evidence for a relationship between the Shasta dialects and the two very divergent Palaihnihan languages, Achomawi and Atsugevi, to make up a stock called Shasta-Achomawi, and later Shastan, and subsequently (1910: 335-339) offering evidence for a relationship of Chimariko to these languages.

Some time after 1910, Dixon and Kroeber, tantalized by various similarities that they had noted among the California languages, undertook a pioneering lexicostatistic procedure for vocabulary comparisons (see the description in Dixon and Kroeber 1919:48-54), leading to the recog-
nition of four new families containing groupings of Powell stocks. Af- 
er a preliminary announcement (1912, 1913), a limited amount of evidence 
was presented (1913a), with the name Hokan introduced for a grouping of 
eight Powell stocks, and Iskoman for the combination of Chumashan and 
Salinan (along with Penutian and Miwavan for other groupings). These 
names were based on forms of the numeral 'two' in certain languages of 
the respective families.

The next decade saw a moderate enlargement of the Hokan membership 
and a considerable increase in the amount of evidence presented in its 
behalf. Harrington's announcement (1913) of a genetic relationship be- 
tween Chumashan and Yuman led to the merger of the Iskoman languages in- 
to Hokan. Picking up on Brinton's proposal, Kroeber (1915) added Seri 
and Tequistiatecan to the family, making comparisons to various Hokan 
languages, but primarily to Yuman Mohave. Sapir's important study 
(1917) starting out from Yana, on which he had done extensive fieldwork, 
offered some 202 sets of word comparisons among languages of all these 
branches, along with comments on sound correspondences and some suggest- 
ed reconstructed forms. By this time Hokan had come to be regarded as 
embracing all the branches except Washo: Karok, Chimariko, Shasta, 
Palaiahnihan, Yana, Pomo, Esselen, Salinan, Chumash, Yuman, Seri, and 
Tequistiatecan.

The relating of Washo with these languages was initiated by Har- 
reighton's announcement (1917) of his determination of a genetic rela- 
tionship between Washo and Chumashan. This was immediately answered by 
a comment of Sapir's (1917a) in which he pointed out that this connec- 
tion meant that Washo was a Hokan language, and reported that he had al- 
so amassed considerable data to this effect. Evidence appeared two 
years later (Dixon and Kroeber 1919:104-112) in two separate lists of 
comparisons of Washo forms to those of other Hokan languages, one made 
by Dixon and Kroeber and containing 60 sets, the other made by Sapir and 
containing 107 sets. Sapir also published (1921:72) a brief comment on 
Washo as a structurally typical Hokan language, and used a few Washo 
forms in another comparative note (1920a:294). Gifford (1922:230-233) 
included Washo in 19 of his sets of presumably cognate Hokan kinship 
terms.

Sapir (1920) initiated a wider-ranging series of comparisons with 
his presentation of data to demonstrate a relationship (already suggest- 
ed in 1917a:450) between Hokan and Coahuiltecan, this being a grouping 
of three Powell stocks, Karankawa, Tonkawa, and Coahuiltecan, that had 
been proposed by Swanton (1915), with a suggestion of the possible addi- 
tional inclusion of Atakapan. Having been drawn up a few years previ- 
ously, its 118 comparative sets include representation of all the Hokan 
branches other than Washo. Subtiaba-Tlapane (Supanec, Tlapanecc) of 
Middle America was offered as a third coordinate branch of Hokan-Coa- 
huiltecan in Sapir 1925. This had been inspired by some direct compar- 
sions to Washo made by Lehmann (1920:712, 941, 973-978), involving the 
nominal d- prefix and a few lexical items. (This is reminiscent of 
Kroeber's [1904:47, 1907a:277] comparison of Salinan and Washo noun in- 
flection, foreshadowing the Iskoman-Hokan connection.) Washo forms oc- 
cur in 37 of the 136 sets of lexical comparisons in Sapir's article, 
which also includes a comparative treatment of aspects of Hokan morpho- 
logy, especially derivational prefixes. Sapir went much further in his 
(1921a, 1929) reduction of stocks north of Mexico to just six "great 
groups". In this Hokan-Coahuiltecan became one of six components of
Hokan-Siouan. No evidence was presented for this grouping other than an indication of some of their shared structural characteristics.

A few other authors of the following period attempted to demonstrate wider relationships of Hokan, and included Washo among the languages compared. These are Rivet (1926) with Malayo-Polynesian and (1942) with Yurumangí of Colombia, and Harrington (1943) with Quechua. In 1953 Greenberg and Svadesh attempted a demonstration of a relationship of Jicaque of Honduras to Hokan-Coahuiltecan (including Washo in 16 of their sets of comparisons) in an article that has been a source of some subsequently cited but unreliable time depth figures.

Work on Hokan proper languished until new data was acquired in the 1950's. Haas (1954) included the Washo stem for 'to urinate' in her comparisons to Hokan-Coahuiltecan words for 'water'. Bright's studies of northern (1954) and southern (1956) branches do not include Washo, while Olmsted's articles comparing Palaihnihan and Shasta (1956, 1957, 1959) introduce a few Washo forms only in the third installment.

Having gathered Washo data in his own fieldwork, Jacobsen (1958) presented a binary comparison to Karok involving 123 sets of potential cognates. This included forms from other Hokan languages, with references to comparative sets of previous papers. Information on apparent sound correspondences was also given. Haas (1963) makes comparisons among all the branches, focusing on Shasta, with Washo included in seven of the sets. Other binary comparisons followed, centering on the following languages: Yana and Karok (Haas 1964), Eastern Pomo and Yana (McLendon 1964), Shasta and Karok (Silver 1954), and Seri and Yuman (Judith Crawford 1976); these contain comparisons to Washo in respectively 13, 22, 2, and 29 of their sets. Neither James Crawford's (1976) comparison of Chimariko and Yuman, nor Turner (1967, 1972) and Bright's (1970) interchange regarding a Seri-Chontal (Tequistlatecan) relationship contain comparisons to other languages. Waterhouse (1976) usefully adds Chontal words to sets of previous comparative articles, such as to 25 of the Washo-Karok sets in Jacobsen 1958.

Gursky (1974) has offered a valuable comparative compilation, using the most reliable recordings for all the Hokan branches. This greatly increases the number of comparative sets to 707, with Washo included in 136 (19.2%) of them. The utilization of Washo in this study has been commented on by Jacobsen (1979:567-570). He finds errors concerning the Washo forms that invalidate the comparisons in four of the sets, but adds additional Washo forms to 39 sets, 33 of which did not previously include any; Washo would thereby be represented in 165 sets (23.3%). Some comparisons of pre-Washo pronominal prefixes to other Hokan forms are made in Jacobsen 1977 (68-69); note also his brief comments (1979: 573-574) on Sapir's (1925:505-506, 519, 521-523) tentative recognition of Washo transitive verb prefixes.

Attempts at extending the boundaries of these relationships have continued more recently, in studies peripheral to Washo. Troike (1976) and Mixco (1978, 1979, 1979a) have now made it likely that both Northern and Southern Cochimi of Lower California form a sister family to Yuman. Gursky has attempted to relate to Hokan-Coahuiltecan as a whole two poorly-attested languages, Quinigua of northeast Mexico (1964) and Waikuri (= Britton's Guaicuru) of Lower California (1966). He has also undertaken (1965, 1966a, 1968) wider-ranging comparisons of Hokan-Subitaba to Gulf languages of the Southeast and to Algonkian-Gulf. Among the Middle American branches, Oltrogge (1977) compares Jicaque to both Te-
quistlatecan and Subtiaba, Campbell (1974) and Campbell and Oltrogge (1980:222-223) compare specifically to Tequistlatecan, while Rensch (1977) compares Subtiaba-Tlapanec to Otomanguean.

Evaluation. Broader criticisms of the evidence and methodology standing behind the concept of a Hakan group have also been offered. Jacobsen (1966:124-125; 1979:550-552) gives examples of incorrect recordings or analyses of Washo forms leading to untenable comparisons in Dixon and Kroeber 1919, Sapir 1925, Harrington 1943, and Greenberg and Swadesh 1955, as well as in the startling comparisons of Radin 1919. He judges that for Dixon and Kroeber 1919, better-controlled Washo data vitiate at least 10 (16.7%) of the comparative sets in the Dixon-Kroeber list, and 14 (13%) in the Sapir list. One assumes that comparable limitations may apply to the data from several other branches that was used in the earlier comparisons.

Another potential weakness in the case for Hakan that has been pointed out (Bright 1965:177; Jacobsen 1976:204-205; 1979:564; Shipley 1970:81) is the likelihood that many of the comparisons that have been made concernloanwords between languages, rather than old inherited matter, given the fact that so many of the branches are close to each other in California. Jacobsen (1979:564-566) finds that 20.5% of Gursky’s (1974) two-member sets are candidates for borrowing on geographical and semantic grounds; these are 12.6% of the total number of sets, to which could be added part or all of an unspecified number of sets with three or more members. Jacobsen also indicates (566) five likely borrowings into Washo that are included in Gursky’s comparative sets, as well as (552, 566-567) six such in the sets of earlier articles.

Yet another explanation of resemblance words would be onomatopoeia, especially for bird names (cf. Shipley 1978:81). Jacobsen (1979:567) indicates 23 such likely sets in Gursky (1974). Osgood’s (1976) observations on Pomo words derived from infantile sounds raise doubts about some often-repeated comparisons, such as the word for ‘water’.

The existence of a Hakan stock thus remains a debatable matter, given the absence of an agreed-upon methodology for establishing distant relationships. Several linguists have detected diffuse but striking characteristics of the language structures that give them reason to think that there may be a genuine, albeit distant, genetic relationship among at least several of these groups (cf. Sapir 1925:526; Hoijer 1954a:637-638; Jacobsen 1979:570). The wider connections, such as with Coahuiltecan, now seem less likely. This particular case is greatly weakened by the demonstration by Haas (1967), Troike (1967), and Goddard (1979) of a lack of adequate evidence for relating the three parts of Swanton’s (1915) Coahuiltecan, and even that one of these, Powell’s (1891) Coahuiltecan, must be in its turn separated into three stocks (Coahuilteco, Comercedan, and Cotoname); Jacobsen (1979:552-553) notes that this separation reduces the highest number of comparisons in Sapir 1920 to any one of these other groups (Tonkawa) to 62. Campbell and Oltrogge (1980:222-223) indicate that their evidence for linking Tequistlatecan to Jicaique is much stronger than that for linking either to the rest of Hakan.

Through the last fifty years the establishment of a Hakan family has usually been taken for granted, so that it has been referred to without expressed reservations or at least as a probable entity. Thus a contemporary consensus was certainly reflected by Lamb (1959:44) in his "probable truth" classification when he recognized the three separate
orders of Hokan (renamed Karok-Yuman) containing 13 families, Coahuiltecan (renamed Comecrudo-Karankawa) containing four stocks, and Subtiaba (renamed Subtiaba-Subtiaba). Similar recognition was given by Voegelin and Voegelin (1965:12-14, 128-129, 141-142; 1966) when they set up a Hokan phylum equivalent to Hokan-Coahuiltecan (including Tlapanscan) plus Jicaque but minus Tonkawa and Karankawa, which contains 17 families or language isolates. But through the years there have also been dissenters claiming that sufficient evidence had never been adduced to validate even the Hokan group, such as Holger (1946:17-18; 1949:1; 1954:5) and Newman (1954:632), and more recently Haas (1973:683) and Shipley (1976:81). Langdon (1979:592-596) advocates the retention of Hokan merely as a useful working hypothesis. In the listing by Campbell and Mithun (1979:40-43) which purports to reflect a newer, more conservative consensus demanding a higher level of evidence in support of relationships, Hokan is shown as 13 unrelated branches, Coahuiltecan as five (plus two more previously unrecognized stocks of the area), with additionally separate Subtiaba-Tlapansc and Jicaque.1

Dating and Prehistory

Degree of Separateness. Lexicostatistical figures for percentages of shared resemblant words in basic vocabularies were presented by Greenberg and Swadesh (1953:220-221) involving comparisons among Jicaque and some previously recognized Hokan-Coahuiltecan languages. These include comparisons of Washo to five other languages: Yana, Yuma, Chontal, Comecrudo, and Jicaque. Partly reproduced by Swadesh (1954:362) with presumed time depths in centuries added, these were completely converted to time depth figures by Kroeber (1955:94-96, 101-103), which were then interpreted in terms of geographical relationships; this source is in turn reflected by Taylor (1961:75) and Price (1962:61; 1963:79; 1963a:40-41). The percentages for Washo are the lowest on average for any of the languages, ranging between 15 (with Jicaque) and 10 (with Comecrudo); these are taken to indicate centuries of separation ranging between 45 and 55. The highest percentages obtained in this study are 24 (Jicaque-Chontal) and 23 (Jicaque-Yuma and Chontal-Comecrudo), implying times of 34 and 35 centuries. Kroeber understandably expresses surprise at the separation between Washo and nearby Yana (50 centuries) as well as the other "Pacific axis" languages (Chimariko, Yuma, Chontal). However, the methodology of Greenberg and Swadesh has been found wanting by several commentators (Bright 1956:47-48; Jacobsen 1966:123, 131; 1979:553-555; Campbell 1974:1, 8-16; 1979:965-966; Campbell and Oltrogge 1980:222).

In addition to the continuing problem of whether the languages are really related, it must be remembered that glottochronology has been calibrated with regard to cases where relationships are unquestioned and cognate words can be identified with relative certainty; unsure cases like these involving inspectional similarities are another matter, where the likelihood of obtaining falsely shallow time depths is high. This study is additionally flawed by bookkeeping errors, by not adjusting retention rates for varying lengths of word lists compared, and especially by allowing pairs of words to count as related even when semantic shifts are involved. With regard to Washo, Jacobsen reports that, although a few of the comparisons must be invalidated because of incorrect analysis of Washo forms, he is able to add more forms to from 23 to 29 additional
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sets of comparisons; this would make Washo share as many similarities with some other languages as does any of the others.

In a separate pilot study, Jacobsen (1966:123-124) reports a finding of 32% similarities between Washo and Karok (for a 100-word list), which would indicate, if these were all genuine cognates, a time depth of 38 centuries.

In a better-controlled study not involving Washo, Bright (1956) compared eight southerly branches (including Subtiaba, Cocomoro, Tonkawa, and Jicaque) and found percentages of similarities ranging from a high of 30 for Salinan-Seri to a low of 10 for Seri-Jicaque. For the three language pairs that this study shares with the Greenberg-Swadesh study, significantly different percentages were obtained. For Seri and Yuma, Bright found 14% similarities, while Hale and Harris (1979:173) indicate 10-12% for Seri-Yuman. Greenberg and Swadesh, on the other hand, take a Seri-Yuman group for granted, which is represented only by Yuma in their study. It is apparent that these figures involving Washo are not trustworthy in either an absolute or a relative sense.

Location. Due to the uncertainty of these relationships, and the complete uncertainty as to where a homeland for Hokan may have been located, there is no significant evidence either that Washo may once have crossed the Sierras from California or that it represents an old, formerly more widespread, Hokan-speaking area in the Great Basin. Both ideas were anticipated by Powers (1876, in Fowler and Fowler 1971:119; 1877:452, 453). The former is tentatively advanced by Kroeber (1925:569) and Sherzer (1968:272). Taylor's (1961) advocacy of the latter, in which he echoes Sapir (1920:290; 1921:72), rests unduly on the presumed relationship of Hokan to Cauhiltzcan, as well as of Uto-Aztecan to Penutian (cf. Miller 1966:87-88; Jacobsen 1966:113-114; 1966a:260; 1968:43-45; Goss 1968:9-11; Langdon 1974:73-75).

One can only assume that Washo has long been in approximately the same area in which it is now found (similarly Price 1963a:41). This is somewhat implied by a residue of unanalyzable place names (Dangberg 1968:101-102 indicates 9 out of 25 [36%] for the periphery of Lake Tahoe) and of apparent older loanwords from the surrounding stocks.

Internal Reconstruction. As the possibility of illuminating the history of the Washo language by comparison to any closely related languages is lacking, some studies have used the technique of internal reconstruction to arrive at inferences regarding its older forms and their later developments. Jacobsen (1960; 1960a; 1966:125; 1977:61-64) arrives at phonological changes involving both consonants and vowels. The origin of Washo reduplicated stem shapes, involving a discrepancy between their surface appearance and their underlying analysis, is accounted for differently by Winter (1970) and Jacobsen (1980b). For pronouns, Jacobsen (1977:54-68) envisages older systems underlying the present one, and (1980a:214-217) outlines the more recent introduction of the first person inclusive/exclusive category. He has also sketched the development of the gender-like system of numeral classifiers (1979a:75-77), and has traced the accretions to the system of instrumental prefixes (1980:97-98).

Dialectal Differentiation

The Washo language displays very little dialectal differentiation, implying the maintenance of a high level of intercommunication among its
speakers. Differences in words mostly concern details of their pronunciation rather than completely different lexical items to express the same meaning, and other differences in the language structure are minimal. No sharp dialect boundary has been found. Jacobsen (1976:116-123; 1986:108; 1966:129) gives information on the nature of the differences. Variant versions of a rule for vowel harmony account for some cases of a vs. o in prefixes, and there is a tendency for vowel harmony patterns to take hold in borrowed words more in the northerly than in the southerly area. Other random vowel changes and assimilations also occur. Some differences involve consonants, especially ʔ; some other consonants are involved in variant forms of 'borrowed words. A few lexical items show replacements: 'mosquito’, 'husband’. For the introduced animals 'cow’ and 'horse’ there are alternative borrowings from other Indian languages vs. Spanish, while for 'sheep’, 'beans’, 'gold’, and 'money’ there are alternative, less geographically differentiated, borrowings from Spanish vs. English. A few other differences concern alternative neologisms for new items ('chair’) or borrowings opposed to neologisms.

Interaction with Adjacent Languages

A continuing contact of Washo with languages of the surrounding stocks is attested to by the occurrence of a modest number of loanwords from all of them, as well as by the sharing of several phonological and grammatical characteristics that may have diffused among the contiguous groups.

Loanwords. Borrowed words have the clearest cultural implications (cf. Bright 1973). Jacobsen (1966:127-128) lists separately presumed borrowed words from each of the three surrounding stocks, Miwokan, Maiduan, and Numic. He notes that they are predominantly words for living creatures (insects, reptiles, fish, birds, and mammals). Few borrowings are seen to have gone out from Washo into other languages. Some patterns of replacement for foreign sounds are indicated, as well as some phonological characteristics that tend to stigmatize words as having been borrowed.

Utilizing fuller data that had become available in the intervening decade, especially on Numic, Jacobsen (1978:118, 123-142; cf. 1976:226-227, 232-233) treats in more detail of an increased number of borrowings. There remain many uncertain cases, but at least 90 likely loanwords in Washo are now recognized, their sources being fairly evenly split between westerly Miwokan and easterly Numic. This article includes discussion of the attestation of the words in the donor languages or families, and of the geographical distribution of the flora and fauna in question. Evidence is presented suggesting that some words may be older borrowings, and some problems of interpretation are discussed. See now also Jacobsen 1966:108-110, which includes selective citation of forms in the donor families.

Semantic Categories. When the borrowings are grouped into semantic categories, certain patterns emerge. Among fauna, a few borrowings of words for insects are primarily from the west: Miwokan ʁa'æsiʔ 'flea’, ge'æuʔ 'angeworm’, ʔa'ni'nəyiʔ 'ant sp.’, and lū{luma}/lū{luma} 'worm sp.’, Maiduan ʁa'æk' 'spider’, beside Numic ʁa'niʔ 'ant sp.’ and perhaps ʁa'yaʔ 'nit’. A few words for reptiles similarly come from Maiduan: pîtîl' 'lizard’, kàwànaʔ (and variants) 'turtle’, mûs’gulhu 'water snake’, and perhaps ge'ætaʔ 'frog’. Two fish names seem to come from Numic: ʁa'waku/
'ñwakhu 'cui-ui sucker' and bákwanhu 'Tahoe sucker'. The limited number of likely borrowings of words for birds mostly stems from the forested regions to the west: Maiduan hū'šim 'buzzard', mámkən/mámkəku 'woodpecker sp.', ċękəkə/čəkəkə 'pelican', ʔə'a 'crow', and perhaps lə'la k 'goose sp.', Miwokan ču'šim 'buzzard sp.', and balatday 'woodpecker sp.', beside Numic kuku'/guku 'burring owl'. Words for two large mammals, hil'ə 'mountain lion' and máʔe/maʔe 'black bear' come respectively from Miwokan and Maiduan. The Numic word for 'buffalo', gisu, comes to mean primarily 'cow' in the northern area. The word səkəu 'dog' (formerly and northern area also 'horse') is probably from Nisenan (Southern Maiduan), with similar forms in Miwokan and other languages to the west (noted already by Dixon and Kroeber 1903:16; cf. Shipley 1957:270, Bright 1960:231, Shipley and Smith 1979:68). Borrowed words for smaller mammals have more varied origins, but the clearest cases involve Numic: bə'mu 'muskrat', səwət 'porcupine', wásəkə/wásəkə 'red fox', and perhaps həʔəla 'badger'; from Miwokan comes dəlem 'mole, gopher' and perhaps pələx 'jackrabbit' and bə'wi 'squirrel sp.', and from Maiduan, tulkə 'small squirrel sp.'.

Turning to flora, a few borrowings come from the west, for plants that are characteristic of the western slopes of the Sierras: Miwokan wələsə 'oak sp.', šəqə'sə 'oak sp.', tə'yə 'green manzanita', and probably də'mi 'golden brodiaea' and hələ 'medicinal plant sp.', and Maiduan tə'nə? (and variants) 'digger pine nut'. Over twice as many words for plants or their products seem to be from Numic, most of them being characteristic of a desert or marsh environment: kəkə 'sego lily', kəgi'dəsəi'/gəgi'dəsəi 'death camas', nə'bu 'prickly pear cactus', cə'tə 'tule', sə'bu 'seeds of cat-tail tule', wə'əmə 'seed sp.', cə'pəpə 'brush sp.', sə'nə 'grass sp.', šəwa 'white fir', ə'gə 'gila 'prickly poppy', də'ca 'Indian balsam', mə'cək 'medicine', and probably bənkə 'tobacco', də'hul 'mountain mahogany', and bə'yə 'onion sp.'.

Among artifacts, a complex of words relating to wearing apparel has apparently come from Numic: məkəo 'shoe', wə'cəp 'stocking, sock', təfəp 'sack, bag, pocket' (from a word for 'stocking'), qəmə 'skirt, dress', and wə'gəs 'trousers'. Nichols (1981:26) suggests that kəna 'cave' and ənə'la 'house' to build a house' may be borrowed from older Uto-Aztecan. Trade relationships are implied by the borrowing of mákəw 'bead' from Maiduan (cf. Jacobsen 1976:226-227), and of ʔunə'bi 'salt', tə'wi 'knife', and šəla 'pitch' from Numic, as well as by the verb dənə'la 'to trade, exchange' from Miwokan. Less certain candidates for borrowing are šu'me'li 'snowshoe' from Miwokan and mu'də 'close weave tray basket' from Numic. Food processing is implied by bə'li 'to fish with hook and line' and məmələ 'to boil' from Maiduan. Other friendly relationships are suggested by the likely borrowing of pə'lu 'hoop' (and extended meanings) from Miwokan and of the two related words hinə'ya 'women's hand game' and hinayəpyi 'men's hand game' from one or more of the contiguous groups. The probable borrowing of the two words for 'paternal grandparent', bə'ba 'father's father' and ʔə'mə 'father's mother', from Miwokan indeed suggests instances of intermarriage. More abstract concepts borrowed include, from Miwokan, (the first syllable of) tənə 'west', and from Numic, də'nu 'to name', ə'nu'ʔəhə/ə'nu'ʔə 'spirit', meqə 'water baby', and wə'nu 'name of a monster'. A few miscellaneous borrowed words are bə'mu 'polite word for 'penis' from Maiduan, and də'ne 'to thunder', ni'ə 'exclamation when cold', and probably bə'yə 'have intercourse' from Numic. Borrowed names for ethnic
groups are, from Maiduan, kâmbom/kâmbom 'Yana' and from Numic, dabô/o/dabibô/o 'white man', šísá/wi?/sisá/wi? 'Achumawi', dâ'guni? 'Pit River Indians (?)', sô-sôni? 'Shoshoni', and a man's name bânâyk (from 'Bannock'). On balance, it seems that the borrowings from Numic imply a more intimate cultural contact than those from the west. Miller (1986: 10) notes that Numic has exchanged more loanwords with Washo than with any other contiguous group.

Potential Early Borrowings. Some of these words may have been borrowed at a moderately earlier date, as do not reflect the contemporary forms or meanings in the contiguous languages. In borrowings from the west, čî-kâ 'spider' is identical to the Konkow (Northwestern Maidu) form, whereas different forms are seen in Maidu makâtî and Nisenan pâsê. Washo mûkâw 'bead' shares the -k- with Konkow hâwoko 'beads', while we find just -k- in Nisenan hâwoko 'wampum beads', Maidu wâkkolâ 'small sea shell punched with a hole, acquired by trading', and more distant Northern Yana wakâ 'shell beads'. Washo pî'îlî 'lizard' is clearly similar to the western Miwok forms Lake petéêli, Bodega pet(t)éêli, and Plains pî't-ê-ê, and even Yahi paskîwâla(la), whereas in Sierra Miwok we find forms represented by Central pîc'ak'-a-, which are probably borrowed from Maiduan, such as Nisenan pitca'â (cf. Jacobsen 1976:232-233). Washo pû-lul 'hoop' resembles Lake Miwok polâolo 'ball, dry oak ball, baseball (the game), Ball Dance', pôîyolo, pîwâlo, pûwâlo, pûwâlu 'to be round' and Kashaya Pomo pol-â-lo 'round (spherical)', pîlî-lî 'circular, hoop, wheel', but in Sierra Miwok we find less similar forms, such as Central pôsko-, Southern pohko- 'ball'. The word for 'west', tânîlî, is also probably from Miwok, such as Central Sierra tânîl-, but the nearby languages show the meaning 'north'; Washo may preserve an older meaning seen in Bodega tânîl 'west, west coast'.

Similar considerations apply to some of the words taken into Washo from the Numic languages to the east. Washo mu'çuk 'medicine' resembles the Southern Numic forms, Kawaisu matusuk'wî and Southern Palute musutuk'wî, more than the nearer Northern Palute natâsu or Shoshoni natâswa. Washo kôkô 'sego lily' shows more resemblance to Kawaisu kôgosî-û 'root of nagusi' than to Northern Palute kôgoi, sîgo 'sego lily', pâñogá 'death camas' or Shoshoni sigoo 'sego lily', pâxigoo 'camas'; the first part of Washo kôgôdêmî?/pôgôdêmi? 'death camas', on the other hand, does resemble Northern Palute kôgoi. Washo amû 'skirt, dress' seems entirely dissimilar from Northern Palate nakî/undâ 'dress'. It is thought that this was borrowed from an earlier Numic form more like Southern Palute nan'wî 'apron'. The -n- would have been reproduced as ã-, giving dâmû?, after which this initial consonant was equated with the Washo nominal prefix ã-, allowing its replacement by possessive prefixes. Washo kâ'âna 'cave' resembles Shoshoni kâhni (objective form kâhniâ) 'house, wickiup, tipi' and Southern Palute qan'î 'house' rather than Northern Palute nobâ 'house' or tôö, tâpeâwâka 'cave'. Less certainly borrowed ânal 'house' might be from a Uto-Aztecan source related to these Shoshoni and Southern Palute words, as well as to Tubatulabal hâni-1 'the house'; Central Sierra Miwok hâni- 'ceremonial-house' and Southern Sierra Miwok hâni- 'dancehouse', with their specialized meanings, are likely borrowings from a similar source.

Some Etymological Problems. A few additional source forms of loanwords may be discussed to illustrate some problems encountered in their detection. Some of the words from Numic appear to reflect compound words no longer felt as such in Washo. Thus wî'gîs 'trousers' is proba-
bly taken from a compound of stems corresponding to Northern Paiute vιwά 'calf' and kus-ά 'breachclout, trousers'; this is matched by Southern Paiute vιzexus-ά 'buckskin' leggings'. Similarly, fά'wi- 'knife' seems to be modeled on a compound of Northern Paiute tah' 'white' and whi- 'knife', yielding tobά'whi/tobά'whi; this was recorded by Powers (1876, in Fowler and Fowler 1971:141) as To-bah-eth 'a flint knife set in a wooden handle'. Waso bá-pas 'tobacco' probably corresponds to an (unattested) Northern Paiute compound of pa-hmá 'tobacco' and kus-ί 'ashes'; the first part has counterparts to the west, such as Nisenan pa-hmá 'tobacco', parno 'to smoke', and Central Sierra Miwok pa-má- 'to smoke'. Waso tόsap 'sack, bag, pocket' is doubtless modeled after Northern Paiute tas-όpa 'stocking', which is analyzable as tά- 'foot' and -όpa 'sack' (for a comparable semantic relationship, cf. Northern Paiute mόkό 'shoe' beside mάgό 'sack', Shoshoni mo-gó 'sack, bag'). Waso wеđ'āp 'stocking, sock' also has a likely Numic pedigree as a passive participle comparable to Southern Paiute viča-pé 'tied around, band, ribbon'; note the attestation by Powell as Tong-a-wichup 'leggings' (where the first part means 'knee') (Fowler and Fowler, eds. 1971:153), and compare Tùbatulabal wά-hiip-ό 'the mocassin'. A partial loan-translation is seen when Waso međ'urό 'water baby' is compared with Northern Paiute pa-nag-ά, Shoshoni pe-ōmea-ą: Waso has replaced the Numic 'water' prefix pa- with its own ma-/me-. An uncertainty of source obtains for two Waso words for 'hand game', 'women's' hίn-ya and 'men's' hίn-awgί, as they resemble, in overlapping fashion, both forms to the west, Nisenan helay 'hand game', he:lay 'to gamble', Maidu helay 'to gamble', Central Sierra Miwok hί-n- 'to gamble', and forms to the east, Northern Paiute nάyawkí 'to play the hand game'.

Linguistic Areas. Languages are often found to share structural characteristics with their neighbors to thereby constitute linguistic areas, and Waso is no exception. Diffusion of traits is especially salient in this case, where the neighbors are genetically unrelated.

Early work of Dixon and Kroeber (1903:18; cf. Kroeber 1907a:314) placed Waso rather tentatively as a member of the Central or Maidu type of California languages, on the basis of certain syntactic criteria. Kroeber (1907a:253, 314-317) also discussed the general question of whether Waso displays greater similarities with languages to the east or to the west. In other early area studies, Dixon (1906) noted the occurrence of the Waso pronominal dual in the California context. Dixon and Kroeber (1907) mapped the distribution of Californian numerals, placing Waso in a quinary/decimal type which turns out to be most like the Maidu system; this is a striking anticipation of a later study by Haas (1976:355-358), who notes that one of two competing Maidu systems appears to be like that of Waso. Kroeber (1911) discussed the distribution of phonetic constituents in California languages, including Waso, and he later (1917:363-365) noted great similarities between the Waso and the Northern Paiute systems of kinship terminology, and further similarities between these two and the Miwok and Yokuts systems.

In an influential more recent series of studies, Sherzer has considered whether the culture areas of North America are also linguistic areas over which at least some traits have diffused. He is led to recognize a Great Basin linguistic area, subsuming Waso and Numic (Sherzer 1968:266-286, 547-570, 634-637; 1973:782-783; 1976:153-167, 245-247; cf. also Bright and Sherzer 1976). However, this approach of starting out from culture areas seems to introduce some distortions as applied to
Washo, in that it minimizes the comparably great similarities to the California stocks (some of which Sherzer indeed notes, e.g. 1976:128, 164, 167, 238-239, 246). For example, considering the inventory of segmental phonemes, the two striking points of agreement with Numic, presence of ʰ and ʰ̊, are also shared with groups to the west, while other features—presence of glottalized stops, ʰ̊, and a ʰ̊/ʰ̊ contrast, and absence of ʰ̥̊—separate Washo from Numic and unite it with one or more of its western neighbors.5

Phonological Characteristics. Let us consider more fully these diagnostic phonological distributions. The vowel ʰ̊ was early noted to be distributed in a continuous area in California along the western fringes of Uto-Aztecan, but due to inadequate recordings Washo was wrongly thought to lack it (Dixon and Kroeber 1903:8; Kroeber 1907:329-330; 1907a:315; 1911:3-4; and still Callaghan 1972:8). This is present in all three stocks surrounding Washo, and probably has considerable antiquity in them (Miller 1961:188; Jacobsen 1966:126, 131-132; 1968a:828-829; Sherzer 1968:233-234, 259, 262, 270-271, 286, 287-288; 1973:779, 782; 1975:105-106, 134, 245). It also occurs in some easterly Yokuts dialects and in Chumash. Jacobsen (1960; 1964:20; 1966:125) indicates its innovational status in Washo. It would have been present in Proto-Numic, and the theory of Voegelin and Hale (1962) of its occurrence in Proto-Uto-Aztecan (rather than previously assumed ʰ̥̊) has now found widespread acceptance following on the demonstration of its occurrence in Proto-Takic by Langacker (1970) and in Proto-Aztecan by Campbell and Langacker (1978, 1978a, 1978b). It is reconstructed for Proto-Maidu by Uhland (1964:356) and Shipley and Smith (1979:68-69) and for Proto-Miwok as well as Proto-Miwok-Costanoan by Callaghan (1972:4-8). Although Kroeber (1907:329-330; 1963:229) and Silverstein (1970) think of it as having diffused into Yokuts, Golla and Whistler (1983) suggest its occurrence in Proto-Yokuts. Cf. also Applegate (1971) for the diffusion of this vowel into Chumash.

Turning to consonants, the velar nasal ʰ̊ is distributed in an area more narrowly centered on Washo, as noted already by Dixon and Kroeber (1903:8). Although not an independent phoneme in all Numic languages, it is present in dialects of Northern Paiute, as well as in Uto-Aztecan Tübatulabal, and it occurs also in Sierra Miwok and certain southerly Yokuts dialects (Kroeber 1907:330-331; Jacobsen 1966:126-127, 132; Sherzer 1968:254-255, 259, 263, 280, 285-288, 629, 631, 635; 1973:780, 782; 1976:115, 158, 238, 239, 246; Bright and Sherzer 1976:250-251). It was probably a phoneme of Proto-Numic (Voegelin and Hale 1962:123-129). Callaghan (1972:4-8) reconstructs an ʰ̊ in Miwokan only as far back as Proto-Sierra-Miwok. Kroeber (1907:330) and Golla and Whistler (1983) suggest its likely occurrence in Proto-Yokuts.

Washo has a series of glottalized stops (ʰ̊ ʰ̊ ʰ̊ ʰ̊), in addition to voiceless (ʰ̊ ʰ̊ ʰ̊ ʰ̊) and voiced (ʰ̊ ʰ̊ ʰ̊ ʰ̊). In this Washo is matched only by Maidu among the surrounding stocks, but the feature is shared with the preponderance of stocks west of Uto-Aztecan in California (Kroeber 1911:4-6, 9; Sherzer 1968:239-240, 259, 262, 273, 283, 284, 627; 1973: 779; 1976:108, 155, 237; Bright and Sherzer 1976:238-239; Haas 1976:351, 353, cf. also 349-351 for phonetic charts of the consonants of 16 northern California languages). Washo has an ʰ̊ phoneme, in addition to ʰ̊. In this respect it differs from Numic, which has only ʰ̊ (Sherzer 1968:278, 283; 1976:157; Bright and Sherzer 1976:247). The ʰ̊/ʰ̊ contrast of Washo is shared with

Washo differs both from Maidu and from nearby Numic branches in possessing two sibilant phonemes, $s$ and $z$ (Sherzer 1968:276; 1976:157, 246; Bright and Sherzer 1976:244). Only $z$ was present in Proto-Maidu (Ulan 1964:356) and Proto-Numic or deeper Uto-Aztecan (Voegelin and Hale 1962:30, 127). But a contrast of two sibilants is found in most Miwokan, reconstructed as $s/z$ for Proto-Miwok by Callaghan (1972:4).

Maidu shares the one-sibilant pattern with some other languages to its north and west, including Yana and Wintun, but the preponderance of California languages again agree with Washo in contrasting two sibilants (Sherzer 1968:246, 259; 1976:111; Bright and Sherzer 1976:244-245; Bright 1978).


Among other phonological phenomena, Washo has a stress phoneme typically occurring on the penultimate of stems and on some suffixes. This is most like Maidu of the surrounding stocks, whereas Numic and Miwok display a rhythmic, predictable stress placement. Jacobsen (1973) thinks of a possible influence of the latter on Washo patterns of placement of stressed and unstressed suffixes. In discussing possible origins of the Washo reduplication pattern, Jacobsen (1980b) makes comparisons to a productive reduplication pattern of Numic and to a reduplicative shape for color stems in Maidu and, less centrally, in Sierra Miwok.

Grammatical Characteristics. Grammatical characteristics may also diffuse among languages and families of an area. Echoing some partial observations by Kroeber (1907:376-377; 1907a:263, 268-269, 286, 314), Sapir (1916:84) pointed out the sharing by Washo of instrumental verb prefixes with Maidu, Numic, and Shasta-Achomawi, and of local verb suffixes with Maidu, Shasta-Achomawi, and Yana. (This was before Washo was recognized as being Hokan along with the latter two.) Kroeber (1955:94) pointed out the uniqueness of instrumental prefixes to Numic within Uto-Aztecan, and more recent writers (Taylor 1961:77; Jacobsen 1966a:262-263; Sherzer 1968:535-537, 542-543, 545-546, 560-561, 564-565, 566-567, 570, 630, 635; 1973:780, 783; 1976:125-126, 128, 130-131, 163-167, 238-239, 245-246; Bright and Sherzer 1976:260-262, 264) have commented on these areal features.


Another characteristic that may have spread over a large area in-
cluding Washo is the syntactic device of switch-reference (Jacobson 1966:127; 1967:259-261; 1978:134; 1979:574-575; 1983:172-174, 176-177; Sherzer 1968:562; Oswald 1976a:296, 303; Langdon 1979:633-634). This is found in contiguous Maiduan and Numic, but is also in many languages of the Southwest: Yuman-Coconino, Hopi, Zuni, Pima-Papago, and Seri, as well as in some bordering Numic on the west: Tubatulabal, Yokuts, and Klamath.

On the other hand, Washo differs from its neighbors in its lack of syntactic case suffixes (Dixon and Kroeber 1903:12; Kroeber 1907a:262, 266, 314; Jacobsen 1966:127). It is only partly similar to Western Numic in its use of pronominal prefixes on nouns and verbs (Dixon and Kroeber 1903:9-10; Kroeber 1907a:262, 316; Jacobsen 1966:127). The three-way gender-like classification imposed by the lower numerals is seen to be something of an anomaly for its area (Kroeber 1907a:300; Sherzer 1968:556; 1976:162, 166, 246; Bright and Sherzer 1976:263; Jacobsen 1979a:77-78). More negatively, Jacobsen (1985) calls into question a suggested diffusion of evidential suffixes into Washo (Sherzer 1968:560, 564, 567; 1976:163, 166) on the grounds of a lack of match of the specific semantic areas. Gorbet (1977) suggested an areal diffusion of the pattern of headless relative clauses in the Southwest; although Washo also displays this pattern, it is not close to the area in question (Jacobsen 1981; 1983:183).

Linguistic Acculturation

Some 20 words reflecting innovations introduced by the white man are ultimately from Spanish, considerably fewer than in languages to the west and south. Most of these are thought to have come to Washo through Miwok (cf. Shipley 1962 for assumed trajectories, as well as phonemic substitutions). Most are listed by Jacobsen (1966:128; cf. 1978:122, 132-133; 1986:111, Bright 1960). They relate to domesticated mammals: 'horse', 'cow', 'bull', 'mule', 'sheep', and 'pig'; foods: 'beans', 'flour', 'soup', 'chewing tobacco', and perhaps 'tortilla'; cash economy: 'dollar' (from 'peso'), 'money' (from 'silver'), and 'gold'; clothing: 'overcoat', 'coat'; ammunition: 'lead' (from 'bullet'); games: 'to play cards', and the ethnic label 'Mexican' (from 'Spaniard').

Not surprisingly, there are numerous borrowings from English, which can be sorted to some extent into earlier and later strata on the basis of meanings and of the extent of phonological divergence from the English model. Jacobsen (1966:128-129) gives a sampling, of which seven are quite divergent ('quicksilver' also in Kroeber 1907a:256) and nine less so. Bright (1960) includes five English borrowings for introduced mammals and two for fowls.

In a few cases, labels for newly introduced items have been obtained by a broadened application of words for indigenous items: 'bow' to 'gun', 'fire drill' to 'match', 'hoop' to 'wheel' to 'wagon' to 'automobile', 'dog' to 'horse' (Jacobsen 1966:129; 1978:122; Bright 1960:217).

Much more prevalent is the coining by affixation of new words descriptive of the appearance, or especially, the function of an item. Bright (1960) lists eight for introduced mammals. Jacobsen (1966:129; 1978:123) gives a few examples, mostly words for artifacts. Danberg (1922:150) indicates two in translation.

In a unique study, Van Winkle (1977) demonstrates a largely shared residue of lexical items among Washo whose major language is English.
This paper was presented in the 1984 Workshop on Linguistics and Archaeology. It grew out of the preparation of my article "Washoe Language" for the Great Basin volume of the Smithsonian Institution's Handbook of North American Indians (Jacobsen 1986). In surveying the literature on this language, I found that I had amassed more data on several topics than could appropriately be included in that context: the history of the establishment of the Hokan grouping, dating and glottochronology, internal reconstruction, philological problems in the detection and dating of loanwords, and technicalities in the trajectories of diffused phonological features, along with references to the relevant bibliography. Accordingly I have prepared this fuller account for presentation here, hoping especially that it will serve archaeologists as a guide to findings of interest to them. The reader should, however, consult the Sources section of the Handbook article (pp. 111-112), as well as Jacobsen 1966:118-120 and d’Azevedo 1986:498, for information on descriptive attestation of Washo data in various categories. I am grateful to the editorial staff of the Handbook for consenting to an inevitable proportion of overlap between the two reports.


In similar fashion, the introduction of a cash economy has led to the borrowing from English of the verb běyu 'to pay' (from pay you'), from which is derived dəwə̱bəyu 'Captain, leader', lit. 'one who pays out' (d’Azevedo 1986:488-489).

Note that this borrowing from Miwok, which has only these two grandparent terms, makes the Washo system like Numic, which has four.

As Nichols (1981:26, 36) notes, Washo dānāl has long been compared to forms in other Hokan languages (already Dixon and Kroeber 1913:653; cf. Jacobsen 1958:201, 206; Gursky 1974:194). Rather than a Uto-Aztecan source form like *kə̱nə̱l, as suggested by Nichols, I would think of one with the better-supported *kə̱; this would lead to Washo dānāl, where the g- would have been equated with the third person subjective possessor prefix, allowing other paradigmatic forms such as absolutive dān̪al. A counter-indication to a specifically Numic source would come from the *kə̱l, from Proto-Uto-Aztecan absolutive *kə̱l, lacking from this branch.

Sherzer at first (1968) included Cahuilla as a Great Basin language. Though this was corrected in his later versions to put it into California, it added to the initial impression of Washo phonological inclusion in the Great Basin, in that Cahuilla also has an ə̱r and, in its Mountain dialect, lacks kə̱ (in favor of gə̱).

Note that Bright’s (1978:46, 49) inventory of the Washo sibilants should be corrected from s/ş to s/ç.
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PREFACE

In 1981 the Hokan-Yuman Languages Workshop began meeting jointly with the Penutian Languages Conference. In 1982 the Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference began meeting with specialists from other disciplines, anthropologists, archeologists, geographers, and others. Because of the very diverse nature of such a group, various specialists desired to publish their papers in a variety of places in order for specialists in their disciplines to have ready access to them. This meant that there were no proceedings for the 1983, 1984, and 1985 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conferences. Papers from linguists who gave papers at these three meetings have been assembled in this volume.

The papers are presented in the order in which they were read at the meetings except the Callaghan paper on patridominance and Proto-Utian, which was discussed at length at the 1984 meeting, though it was not formally presented.

The 1983 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference met at the University of California, San Diego, June 16-18, 1983. We greatly acknowledge all the work done by Margaret Langdon and others in the Department of Linguistics at UCSB, which made the meeting so enjoyable and useful.

The 1984 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference met at the University of California, Berkeley, June 22-24, 1984, and was held in honor of Abraham Halpern. Our thanks go to Leanne Hinton and others in the Department of Linguistics at UCB for all they did to make the meeting enjoyable and productive.

The 1985 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference met at the University of California, San Diego, June 19-21, 1985. We are again indebted to Margaret Langdon and the Department of Linguistics at UCSB for all the work they did in hosting another pleasant and useful meeting.

The 1986 Hokan-Penutian Languages Conference will be held at the University of California, Santa Cruz, June 23-27, 1986, as part of the Mary Haas Festival Conference.

Only a very few copies of the proceedings of earlier meetings are still available from the Department of Linguistics, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901. We are endeavoring to have the ERIC Clearing House on Languages and Linguistics offer these publications in some demand form.

James E. Redden
Carbondale, May 1986
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