Title
The Plank Canoe of Southern California: Not a Polynesian Import, but a Local Innovation

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1977t6ww

Author
Meroz, Yoram

Publication Date
2013
The Plank Canoe of Southern California: Not a Polynesian Import, but a Local Innovation

Yoram Meroz

By nearly a millennium ago, Polynesians had settled most of the habitable islands of the eastern Pacific, as far east as Easter Island and as far north as Hawai‘i, after journeys of thousands of kilometers across open water. It is reasonable to ask whether Polynesian voyagers traveled thousands of kilometers more and reached the Americas.

Despite much research and speculation over the past two centuries, evidence of contact between Polynesia and the Americas is scant. At present, it is generally accepted that Polynesians did reach South America, largely on the basis of the presence of the sweet potato, an American cultivar, in prehistoric East Polynesia. More such evidence would be significant and exciting; however, no other argument for such contact is currently free of uncertainty or controversy.¹

In a separate debate, archaeologists and ethnologists have been disputing the rise of the unusually complex society of the Chumash of Southern California. Chumash social complexity was closely associated with the development of the plank-built canoe (Hudson et al. 1978), a unique technological and cultural complex, whose origins remain obscure (Gamble 2002).

In a recent series of papers, Terry Jones and Kathryn Klar present what they claim is linguistic, archaeological, and ethnographical evidence for prehistoric contact from Polynesia to the Americas (Jones and Klar 2005, Klar and Jones 2005). At the core of their argument is the proposal that the sewn-plank canoe appeared among the Chumash and neighboring Gabrielino people of Southern California through the arrival there of Polynesians using similar boats.² This work has generated interest among students of North American and Oceanic prehistory (Nicolay 2005, 2007; Rick et al. 2005:208; Clarke et al. 2006:894; Kirch and Kahn 2007:200; Weisler and Green 2008; Bentley et al. 2007:645; Matisoo-Smith 2009:160; Raab et al. 2009:220, Matisoo-Smith and Ramirez 2010:85), attention in the popular press (Edgar 2005; Davidson 2005; Smith 2011), and some criticism (Anderson 2006; Arnold 2007; Lawler 2010:1347).

In this paper, I give a comprehensive review of Jones and Klar’s arguments. I conclude that they fail to demonstrate prehistoric contact between Polynesia and Southern California. Instead, a review of the linguistic, technological, archaeological and ethnological evidence supports a new scenario in which the plank canoe was independently elaborated in California from earlier dugout boats, long before the settlement of East Polynesia.

¹ Storey et al. (2007) have recently claimed that chicken remains found in Chile are genetically Polynesian and are in a pre-European context (see discussion in Gongora et al. 2008a, 2008b; Storey et al. 2008; Storey et al. 2011). There is preliminary evidence that human remains from near the Chilean coast may be Polynesian (Matisoo-Smith and Ramirez 2010; Matisoo-Smith 2011). Green (2000) and Clarke et al. (2006) present suggestive but not fully conclusive evidence for an American origin of some varieties of the Polynesian bottle gourd. Other than the word for sweet potato, there is no accepted linguistic evidence for early Polynesian-American contact.

² In this paper, I use the name Gabrielino for the language now usually called Tongva by the descendants of its original speakers. I use the common ‘Hawaiian’ for the more correct Hawai‘ian, ‘Maori’ for Māori, ‘Samoa’ for Sāmoa and ‘Tubuai’ for Tupua‘i. For other Polynesian languages I follow common but inconsistent conventions: ‘Tongan’, not ‘Tonga’, but ‘Tikopia’, not ‘Tikopian’, etc.
Introduction

1.1 Jones and Klar’s Proposal

Jones and Klar’s proposal was presented in several papers, which I will refer to by single letter abbreviations. The proposal was first presented in Jones and Klar (2005), hereafter A, and, its linguistic arguments were elaborated in Klar and Jones (2005), hereafter B. Anderson (2006) presented a critique of A, which was followed by a rejoinder in Jones and Klar (2006), hereafter C. Arnold (2007) is a detailed critical review of A, with a reply by Klar and Jones (2008), hereafter D, another version of which appeared as Jones and Klar (2009), hereafter E. I summarize Jones and Klar’s arguments as follows:

- Planked canoe construction was practiced prehistorically in the Americas only by the Chumash and Gabrielino of Southern California and by the Mapuche of Chile, yet widespread among the Polynesians, who are known from other evidence to have reached the Americas.
- The Chumash and Gabrielino planked canoe appears in the archaeological record at about the time Polynesians first reached East Polynesia and the Americas, or soon afterwards.
- A certain style of fishhook, the curved-barb compound fishhook, is of a Polynesian form, and appears in the Chumash archaeological record at about the same time as the planked canoe.
- Several Native American words describing plank canoes have no apparent internal etymologies but can be derived from relevant Polynesian vocabulary:
  - The Chumash word for the planked canoe, reconstructed to the earlier form *tomolo or *tomoloʔo, can be derived from a Polynesian word, *tumuraʔau, meaning something like ‘useful wood’, and referring to the material from which the canoe is built.
  - The Gabrielino word for the sewn-plank boat, tiʔat, can be derived from a Polynesian word, *tia, ‘to sew’.
  - Another Gabrielino word for ‘boat’, taraina, can be derived from a Polynesian word,

---

3 At the time of this writing, most of Jones and Klar’s papers are available online at Terry Jones’s website, http://cla.calpoly.edu/~tjones/. In this paper I attribute linguistic arguments to ‘Klar and Jones’ and archaeological ones to ‘Jones and Klar’. Summaries of their arguments are also published in Jones (2010), Klar (2010), throughout Jones et al. (2011), and in Jones and Klar (2012).

4 Jones and Klar’s papers concentrate on contact between Polynesia and Southern California, but they also suggest contacts between Polynesia and the southern Chilean coast (A:461; D:93-94; E:179-180; Klar 2010; Klar 2011; Jones and Klar 2012). That topic is discussed more marginally; the linguistic part of it is brought up in paper D, but not in its revised version E. I will therefore not go into it in detail here. The linguistic argument suffers from similar weaknesses to the ones discussed here.

5 The single liquid consonant phoneme of Proto East Polynesian is sometimes marked as <\(R\)> with an undetermined phonetic value reconstructed as either \([r]\) or \([l]\). In the attested East Polynesian languages, \([l]\) occurs only in Hawaiian, and early records show that \([r]\) existed in Hawaiian as an allophone or a dialectal variant of that phoneme. I therefore reconstruct the PEP phoneme as \([r]\); this makes for clearer reading as well. Which liquid is reconstructed is not significant for this study, as has been noted by Klar and Jones (B:386), since all Chumashan languages have only one liquid, \(/l/\), and either a Polynesian \(/r/\) or an \(/l/\) would be borrowed into a Chumashan language as \(/l/\). The same argument applies to Gabrielino, which only has one liquid, \(/r/\).
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*taraina*, analyzed as *tarai*, ‘to hew, to carve’ + *-na* ‘nominalizer’, i.e., ‘carved object’.

- The above are explained by a scenario in which Polynesian voyagers have reached the American Pacific coast, and passed to the Native American populations the technology of planked boat construction along with related vocabulary, as well as particular fishhook styles.

I find that each of the arguments above is either flawed or entirely unsupported by the evidence, and that individually or together, they do not demonstrate Polynesian-American contact. I argue that the available linguistic, ethnographic and archaeological data point to a local origin for the planked boat of Southern California.

1.2 The Sweet Potato in Polynesia as an Example

That Polynesians have reached South America is established with certainty through the evidence of the sweet potato (*Ipomoea batatas*) and its native name (Yen 1974). The sweet potato, a South American cultivar, was present as a staple food crop throughout East Polynesia at the time of European contact, and archaeological evidence has indicated its presence centuries earlier (Hather and Kirch 1991; Higham and Gumbley 2001). The reconstructed Proto East Polynesian name of the sweet potato, *kumara*, is accepted as a borrowing of the form *kumar*, recorded in some dialects of Quechua, and more recently traced to the extinct Cañari language of the Ecuadorean coast (Scaglion 2005; Scaglion and Cordero 2011).6

The certainty given to the evidence of the *kumara*, even without any other evidence of trans-Pacific contact, rests on two factors. The first is uniqueness: there is no possibility that a species could have independently arisen in two different places, and the sweet potato, a cultivated plant, would need to be purposefully transported and planted to get from one place to another. Secondly, the linguistic argument is straightforward. The meanings of the South American *kumar* and of the Polynesian *kumara* are identical. The only formal change in the word is the addition of the final -a to the Polynesian form, where closed syllables are prohibited, a process ubiquitous in borrowings into Polynesian languages. The length of the word argues against chance similarity.

Taking the case of the sweet potato as a standard for establishing such prehistorical contacts, I examine the evidence given by Jones and Klar. Here the material evidence of boat construction and fishhooks does not meet the standard of uniqueness, in that the technologies were innovated independently elsewhere. The linguistic evidence given by Jones and Klar requires several unattested or unlikely formal and semantic changes, and so opens more questions than it answers. And finally, the material and linguistic evidence can all be better explained through a scenario of local development within California.

1.3 Plan of the Paper

I will first examine the claim for the uniqueness of the plank canoe and show that planked boat construction is more widespread in the Americas and elsewhere than Jones and Klar suggest, and will argue for independent innovation as the preferred explanation for the appearance of planked

---

6 Rensch (1991b) proposes that the Hawaiian form of the word, *ʻuala*, may indicate a separate introduction of the sweet potato to Polynesia from a source further north on the South American coast.
canoe construction in Polynesia and the Americas.

Next, I will compare the techniques of planked boat construction by the Chumash and in East Polynesia. I will demonstrate that there is no clear evidence to link the two, and that differences in technique favor separate origins.

Next, I will examine issues of chronology, first of the appearance of the plank canoe in Southern California, then of Polynesian settlement in the eastern Pacific; I argue that the California plank canoe has either predated the Polynesian entry the Pacific, or else occurred very soon thereafter. This point is important in evaluating the linguistic arguments to follow.

I will then examine briefly the evidence for relating the Polynesian two-piece fishhook to the Chumash one, and will show that the two are unlikely to be related, based on chronological and stylistic arguments.

Moving to the linguistic evidence, I will first review the relevant issues in Polynesian historical phonology. I will then examine each of the American forms, and show that their claimed Polynesian sources are unlikely as such, on grounds of phonology, semantics, or both.

Finally, I will offer alternative etymologies for the Gabrieno and Chumash forms, and discuss other scenarios relating to the appearance of the planked boat in Southern California.

2 Technologies of Boat Construction in California

Broadly, three types of boat were built and used in California before European contact: tule bundle boats, wooden dugout canoes, and planked boats. Their distribution has been reviewed elsewhere (Cunningham 1989; Heizer and Whipple 1951:11-14; Heizer and Massey 1953). I will mention a few salient points and add more details toward the end of this paper.

The planked canoe, around which this discussion turns, has been described in great detail by Hudson et al. (1978), based on all known sources, but especially the notes of John P. Harrington. This boat, most commonly known by the Barbareño Chumash name *tomol*, was constructed of planks, which were usually split from logs of redwood which had drifted south from this tree’s range in northern California. The edges of the planks were carefully glued together by a heated mixture of asphaltum and tree pitch, and then lashed tight by cords passed through holes drilled along the edges of the planks. The *tomol* was a large and seaworthy vessel, capable of reliably transporting people and goods between the mainland and the Channel Islands. These boats were used by the southern Chumash, on the coast facing the Channel Islands, by the Gabrieno further south along the coast, and by the Channel Islanders themselves. No similarly constructed boat appears elsewhere in California.

Tule boats (balsas) were widespread in California, and their distribution roughly complements that of dugout canoes (Kroeber 1922:267-269). They were constructed of several bundles of reeds (common tule, *Scirpus acutus*), each bound tight; one bundle would serve as a keel, and one or more bundles would serve to build up the boat on either side. Tule boats are relatively easy to construct in a short time, and the materials for their construction were easily available in the wetlands near where the boats would eventually be used, including the former Buena Vista Lake and Tulare Lake in the San Joaquin Valley, rivers throughout the Central Valley, and estuaries on the southern and central California coasts.

Tule boats were a significant form of water transport in coastal Southern California, though their significance has been overshadowed in the literature by the more elaborate and better-attested plank canoe. They were utilized for ocean travel by the Luiseño, Gabrieno, Chumash and Salinan people, and on beyond to the north and south. Tule boats were seaworthy enough to travel between the coast and the Channel Islands. The Chumash, and perhaps others,
sealed tule boats with asphaltum to waterproof them, which increased the time they could spend in the water before needing to be taken out and dried.

Dugout canoes are even more sparsely documented in the region. The Luiseño and Channel Chumash built dugout canoes, and likely the northernmost Chumash as well. Dugout canoes were historically used mostly for near-coast travel and fishing, but the Luiseño are said to have used them in earlier times for crossing to the southern Channel Islands. In historical times, at least, dugout canoes in Southern California were never as large or as ubiquitous as those of far northern California or the Pacific Northwest.

The Channel Islands were occupied by humans since the early Holocene (e.g., Rick et al. 2005). Since the archaeological evidence for plank canoes does not reach back more than one or two millennia, tule boats, dugouts or both must have been the predominant mode of oceanic transportation in Southern California for the past 10,000 years or so.7

3 Sewn Boat Technology: Worldwide Distribution

Linguistic issues aside, the argument for an external origin of the Chumash sewn plank canoe depends on the claim for its uniqueness in the Americas, or at least its rarity. Jones and Klar (A:461) state that the California plank canoe is the only example of planked canoe construction in the Americas, except possibly the dalca of southern Chile, and that the Chumash tomol is similar in details to Polynesian canoes in details of its construction. In this section, I show that sewn plank canoes are distributed worldwide, indicating multiple independent inventions of the technique. In particular, dugouts with sewn-on strakes, using a similar technique to fully planked construction, were used elsewhere in the Americas. Finally, despite Jones and Klar’s claims, the Chumash tomol was significantly different in its construction from East Polynesian sewn plank canoes.

Sewn-plank canoes in the narrow sense — canoes built entirely of planks sewn together — existed in Ancient Egypt (the ship of Cheops, 2600 BC, McGrail 2004) and elsewhere in the Mediterranean, Western Europe and Northern Europe (the Ferriby boat, 1900 BC, McGrail 2004) well into northern Russia (Litwin 1985), in inland western Africa (Insoll 1993), the Indian Ocean, China and Japan (McGrail 2004), and possibly southern Brazil (M. Brindley 1924:129, following Bates 1873:36). The dalca of southern Chile (Cooper 1917:198-200; Latcham 1930; Finsterbusch 1934; Heizer 1941b; Edwards 1965:21-34, Medina 1984; Puente 1986) was constructed of three planks, one serving as keel and the others serving as sides, and apparently originated with the Huilliche of Chiloé Island (Lothrop 1932). Another type of three-planked sewn boat is the xodol or eksil’ of the Yukaghir of the Kolyma River, near the Arctic coast of eastern Siberia (Jochelson 1926:375-378; Mudge 1880:290), almost antipodally from the dalca.8

7 Fagan (2004) has suggested that plank canoes were present in Southern California for much of the Holocene. He does so by dismissing tule balsas as a viable means of transportation to the islands, which I consider unjustified, for the reasons discussed by Des Lauriers (2005). Cassidy et al. (2004:125-126) argue that Middle Holocene tool assemblages in the area are strikingly similar to those used for planked boat construction. Their argument is better, but still circumstantial and not conclusive, and is inconsistent with other evidence showing later appearance of the tomol (Arnold 2007:202).

8 Rousselot (1994:244-245) mistakenly states that the Yukaghir board canoe was an adaptation of Russian boats. In this he must refer to the garbas, a sewn-plank canoe with a clearly European design and a borrowed name, rather than to the older 3-board design.
The technique of plank sewing was used to a less complete degree in built-up boats, that is, boats consisting of a dugout base or a keel with one or more rows of planks attached to its sides, so as to increase the boat’s freeboard. Such boats were used by the Ainu of northern Japan (Ohtsuka 1999) and elsewhere in eastern Siberia (H. H. Brindley 1919-1920, II:104, III:139-140); and, in the Americas, in the Pacific Northwest (Kwakiutl, Boas 1909:334-337, 446; Haida, Stewart 1984:50 and Durham 1960:57, see also Howay 1941:207-208; Tlingit, Emmons 1991:84, 91), where the same technique was also used to repair cracks (Stewart 1984:45-47; for Coast Salish, Lincoln 1991:30); and in the Caribbean (McKusick 1960:5-7) and the Orinoco basin (Roth 1924:612-614, after Gumilla 1791, 2:113-116).9 In the Old World they are recorded from West Africa (Durand 1806:111), Russia (Litwin 1985) and elsewhere.

Both fully planked boats and dugouts with raised sides existed throughout Oceania, and in East Polynesia in particular (Best 1925; Haddon and Hornell 1936; Bataille-Benguigui et al. 2008). Where both forms existed, the choice of boat form depended on balancing the additional labor involved in building plank boats with the necessity of obtaining large logs for dugout bases (Haddon and Hornell 1936:345; Kamakau 1976:118).

The technique of sewing flat pieces of wood together into boats was also used in the construction of bark canoes, which employs bark peeled from trees, often as thick as planks split from a log. Sewn bark canoes were used at least in East Africa, Australia, Borneo, the Solomon Islands, northeastern North America, the Orinoco and Amazon basins, and Tierra del Fuego (Vairo 2002:97-125).

Lashing planks to each other side by side requires perfecting several techniques: truing the edges of the planks for a close fit; drilling holes; sealing the joints by calking them; and establishing a series of tight lashings which will not loosen or fall apart even after absorbing water. These techniques need to be established and relied on whether one attaches a single row of strakes to a dugout, builds a canoe of tree bark, or builds a fully planked canoe. Among American boat types, the Chumash plank canoe is hence much closer technologically to the built-up boats of the Pacific Northwest and the Caribbean than any of those are to a simple dugout, and the argument for the uniqueness of the tomol in the Americas is therefore weaker.

Anderson (2006:759-760), in his comment on Jones and Klar’s original paper, mentions the wide use of sewn plank boats elsewhere in the world.10 Jones and Klar did not address this issue in their reply (C). Anderson does not describe just how widespread sewn boats are, and his argument veers toward advocating a different external source for the Chumash canoe. My

9 Jones and Klar, referring to the addition of strakes to Pacific Northwest canoes, comment that “When strakes or gunwales were added to the sides of these craft to increase freeboard, they were generally attached by mortising, not by sewing” (A:461). This is clearly not true in general, as seen in Boas’s account of Kwakiutl techniques and in the other references mentioned here. On the other hand, Jones and Klar’s quote comments by the eighteenth century observers, Crespi and Peña, about Northwest canoes made of ‘several pieces’. These may well have referred to separate bow and stern pieces, not to raised sides.

10 Anderson (2006:760) distances the Chumash boat from Polynesian designs by drawing a distinction between fully sewn-plank boats (like the tomol) and built up boats with strakes sewn to a dugout base. As I argue here, that is a minor distinction, since the technique is mostly the same for both. In any event, early Polynesian voyaging canoes may well have been fully planked boats (e.g., Kamakau 1976:118), like those built in the Tuamotus through historical times (Haddon and Hornell 1936:67, 131 and elsewhere; Bataille-Benguigui et al. 2008). Polynesia, like almost every culture with seagoing tradition, had a great variety of boat types, specialized for different purposes and different effort of production.
argument is different: the more evidence there is for an innovation occurring independently many times, the stronger the argument is for the innovation occurring yet once more, and the lesser the need for external introduction as an explanation.

4 Sewn Boat Technology: Comparing the Details of Construction

Jones and Klar claim that “...tools, and techniques used in the construction of Polynesian sewn-plank boats are remarkably similar to those associated with the Chumashan tomoło,” and enumerate what they consider parallels between the details of Chumash and East Polynesian canoe styles (A:465-466). I will examine these criteria, followed by the traits Prins (1986) uses in his typology of sewn plank canoes, and finally discuss several additional distinguishing technological traits.

Jones and Klar’s comparative traits are:

• **Adze form.** “…hand-held adzes of nearly identical design (a short handle to which was lashed a shell blade) used as the primary tools to work planks. In the Tuamotu group, adzes were commonly made with clam shells as they were among the Chumash.” This is not a significant trait. Short handles are universally necessary on carpenters’ tools used for smaller work, and vice versa; this has no special connection with boat construction. The ‘elbow adze’, with a bent-down handle, was used by the Chumash for shaping wood; a similar form is widely distributed in northwestern North America (Olson 1927:7). Both stone and shell adzes were used in Polynesia and by the Chumash (Kamakau 1976:122; Hudson and Blackburn 1987:52), showing that both people, reasonably, used all the materials available to them as they found them suitable; this provides no evidence at all for cultural transfer. The details of adze form provide a valuable archaeological tool, and have been studied closely in Polynesia and elsewhere, but Jones and Klar give no details for comparing adze forms in these two areas, nor compare them to adze forms elsewhere; their claim of a ‘nearly identical design’ is unsupported.

• **Sandpaper.** “Wood was finished with sandpaper — in Polynesia derived from a plant source, not the Chumashan sharkskin.” A tight seal between joined planks depends on a precise fit. The final shaping of the joined surfaces was achieved in Polynesia by fine adzing (Haddon and Hornell 1936:135). Though sharkskin and coral rocks were known in Polynesia as sanding materials, I am not aware of any account of the use of sanding for shaping the matching edges of boat planks.

In Chumash technique, boat planks were first assembled and glued in place with pitch, before the final sewing. That required a particularly tight fit and smooth joint surface, which was achieved by polishing with sharkskin (Hudson et al. 1978:73, 75). The Gabrieline also sanded the outer surfaces of planks by weighting them down and dragging them on wet sand (Alliott 1917:42-43). Smoothing the outer surface of a canoe with sharkskin was also practiced in the Pacific Northwest (Stewart 1984:54). In other words, the use of sharkskin as sanding material is neither exclusive to Polynesia and the Chumash coast, nor is it universal in these areas. Sanding is a general woodworking technique, not especially linked with boat construction. There is nothing in sanding technique to connect Chumash and Polynesian boat-building.

• **Caulking tools.** “As among the Chumash, caulking in Polynesia was done with wooden caulking tools, although those of Hawaii were of more complex design.” The Chumash caulking
tool was a wooden stick whittled at its end to a sharp edge, with which to force caulking material into the gap between planks. Similar tools were also made of bone (Hudson et al. 1978:41-42, and n. 56). There is nothing remarkable or unique about using wooden tools for such a purpose: the mere use of wood here does not imply a cultural connection.

• Canoe sheds. “Plank canoe construction in much of Polynesia was undertaken within a specially constructed canoe shed that protected the craft from the elements during its construction. This is very similar to the structure of mats and poles used by Chumash canoe builders for the same purpose.” To begin with, building shelters against the sun and the weather is a common activity in all human cultures. Their use in boat construction is not remarkable. More specifically, as Arnold (2007:203) has noted, Polynesian canoe sheds were large, permanent structures meant to completely enclose the boat under construction and protect it from the rain and the sun (at places evolving to the size of hangars, Haddon and Hornell 1936:328). The Chumash built small temporary frames of three poles and leaned a mat against them to protect the canoe from the sun, while the pitch used to glue its planks together was hardening (Hudson et al. 1978:44). The Chumash boat hut, as described, matches larger structures elsewhere in the area (e.g., Wallace 1978a:451) and indicates no external character. The purpose and form of the Polynesian and Chumash shelters were entirely different from each other. Jones and Klar (D, E) do not address this point as raised by Arnold.

In sum, none of the traits mentioned by Jones and Klar offer any support for Polynesian-Chumash contact. The traits they enumerate are either widespread, or are in fact not comparable.

Prins (1986) is an extensive comparative survey of sewn plank boat construction techniques worldwide. Although not quite complete in its coverage and details, it is the only work of its kind and scale. One of Prins’s aims was to select a small number of binary typological traits by which sewn planked boat traditions may be broadly distinguished, and use them to show the geographical distribution of different techniques. I note that Prins’s study focuses on highlighting world-scale patterns, and his traits are not always optimal for distinguishing boat building traditions within smaller areas. His four basic traits are: the presence (or absence) of continuous sewing; the presence of hole plugs; the presence of aligning dowels; and edge-to-edge versus overlapping plank construction. Their significance here is as follows:

• Continuous sewing. Continuous sewing is the practice of lacing a running cord back and forth through many pairs of drilled holes in adjacent planks. In discontinuous sewing, one short cord is passed through each pair of holes, tightened to pull the planks together, and tied off. In this regard East Polynesian canoes are clearly different from Chumash ones. The tomol was lashed with individual short cords, one for each pair of holes (Hudson et al. 1978:83-85), while continuous sewing was nearly universal throughout East Polynesia (Haddon and Hornell 1936 passim). Discontinuous sewing was used, however, elsewhere in Oceania, from Samoa westward, suggesting that continuous sewing was an East Polynesian innovation. Both continuously and discontinuously sewn boats occur in many parts of the world (Prins 1986:168).

• Plugs. In some plank sewing, a peg or plug is jammed into the hole after the cord was passed through it, in order to maintain the tension in the cord and provide additional sealing. This technique is not used in the Chumash canoe (Hudson et al. 1978:83-85). It was sometimes used in East Polynesia (Haddon and Hornell 1936:142), but not universally, and may be a later
innovation. It may have been developed in East Polynesia specifically for better tensioning of continuously sewn cords.

• **Dowels.** In some sewn plank boats, blind holes are drilled into the edges of the planks where they meet, and dowels are inserted, so as to align the planks and keep them from shifting past each other. Dowels were not used in East Polynesia, except perhaps in the largest Tuamotuan sewn plank canoes (Haddon and Hornell 1936:80). This technique may have been used in the construction of the Chumash *tomol* (Hudson et al. 1978:95), only in attaching the uppermost round of boards, and not always even then; the Chumash used dowels for other purposes, likely under European influence (Hudson et al. 1978:92-93). Horridge (1986:57-58, quoted in Pawley and Pawley 1998) notes that in western Oceania dowels were a later development, which generally followed the introduction of metal tools.

• **Plank positioning.** In overlapping (‘clinker’) construction the planks partly overlap each other, as they are joined face to face. Otherwise they are joined edge to edge. Polynesian and Chumash canoes are both edge-joined. This is not a diagnostic feature, since edge to edge construction is common worldwide, except mainly in Northern Europe and the Solomon Sea (Prins 1986:168).

Of Prins’s four traits, The use of non-continuous sewing in the Chumash canoe weakly argues against a Polynesian connection. However, continuous sewing could conceivably be a late innovation which spread through East Polynesia after the time in question; in that case, this trait is not diagnostic. The other three of Prins’s traits are not relevant here. In total, Prins’s traits do not offer evidence in favor of Polynesian-Chumash contact.

Other distinctive traits not discussed by Jones and Klar or by Prins include:

• **Battens under cords.** In East Polynesian canoes, a long batten — a flat strip of material — was placed so as to cover the seams between the planks, and the cords would pass over the batten and hold it tightly in place. This provided further sealing against leaks, kept the caulking material within the joint, and helped to keep the lashing taut. This technique was used at least in the Marquesas (Handy 1923:157-158), Tuamotus (Haddon and Hornell 1936:58, 68, 69, 71, 89), Societies (Nordhoff 1930:145), the Northern Cooks (Haddon and Hornell 1936:178) and New Zealand (Best 1925:77; Haddon and Hornell 1936:202). Though widespread, the technique might not have been universal in the area. Battens were not used in Chumash boats.

• **Recessed groove (countersink) for cord.** In the Chumash canoe, grooves were carved into the planks between the holes, in which the cord could pass without projecting above the surface. This kept the cords from being abraded, and on the inside it prevented the rough cords from chafing against the skin of the crew (Hudson et al. 1978:82). Clearly, countersunk cords cannot be wrapped over battens as described above, and in fact countersinking was not usually used in East Polynesia (but see Best 1925:72 for countersinking when lashing together hull sections in Maori canoes).

• **Bent planks.** In Chumash boat-building technique planks were first cut and formed, then bent using heat and moisture (Hudson et al. 1978:68-72). This technique was never used in East Polynesia, where planks were shaped entirely by splitting and carving (Handy 1923:157; Henry 1928:549; Fornander 1917, 5:612).
• **Frame.** The Chumash canoe is built up of planks held to each other, without a supporting frame of ribs and with a single thwart, or cross-brace (Hudson et al. 1978:92); this is an unusual and distinct form of sewn plank construction. Of the fully planked canoes of the Tuamotus, the largest had frames (Haddon and Hornell 1936:80, 83). These very large boats presumably were close in design to the voyaging canoes which had voyaged to the American coast. Smaller sewn-plank boats of East Polynesia, closer in size to the *tomol*, did not use ribs or a frame, though they utilized thwarts.

• **Caulking.** In Polynesia, caulking — sealing the gaps between the planks — was done by placing between the planks fibrous matter, typically coconut fibers with breadfruit juice, which would then be compressed as the planks were lashed together. The Chumash, on the other hand, used *yop*, heated asphaltum diluted with tree sap, which would fill the gap between the planks and then harden. Secondary caulking was of tule was added along the of the joints and sealed with more *yop*. Gamble (2002:307) has found traces of asphaltum on the edge of canoe planks from every archaeological context she studied, including one dated to the late first millennium AD. The Chumash use of *yop* goes beyond mere caulking, in that it has a significant structural function. Each round of planks of the Chumash boat was assembled by gluing the planks to the lower round using *yop*, and sewing them together only after it has hardened. This technique no doubt owes its origin to the availability of asphaltum in Chumash territory, and is possibly unparalleled anywhere else; certainly it is quite different from Polynesian technique.

The above five traits all represent techniques, some clearly beneficial, which are not clearly shared between East Polynesia and Southern California. Several of these characteristics can be noticed in a few minutes inspection of a finished boat, and could have easily been transferred to the Chumash even through brief and casual interaction. By the simplest interpretation, the difference in technologies argues against a Polynesian origin for the Chumash canoe. Of course, the Chumash and Polynesian canoes of AD 1800 are no doubt different than those of, say, AD 1000, and some of the technologies discussed here may be later developments. Even so, there are no distinctive traits shared by the two areas. At best, the the evidence of boat-building techniques provides no proof of the Polynesian-Chumash contact hypothesis. At worst, the evidence disproves it.11

Beyond the specifics of planked canoe construction, Anderson (2006:760) and Arnold (2007:203) have already pointed out other characteristics of Oceanic boat construction absent from the Chumash canoe, namely outriggers or double hulls, which add stability, and sails. Jones and Klar (C:766) deflect this argument by saying that the Chumash, for whatever reason, have chosen not to adopt these elements. Elsewhere (A:469) they suggest that perhaps the lack of suitable sail material kept the Chumash from adopting that technology, and the double hulled boats were too complex to copy. This is a weak argument, absent any convincing reasons why the Chumash would ignore these elements while adopting other complex technologies. As above, this argument at best trades counterevidence for lack of evidence.

---

11 Robinson (1943:17) also sees no connection between Chumash and Oceanic boatbuilding techniques, but provides no details. Heizer (1940:83-88) examines in detail several details of construction in the Chumash and other plank boat types of construction. He concludes that the Chumash boat was an independent innovation, which he believes evolved from the design of the tule boat.
5 Archaeology: Chronological Issues

At best, the inferred dates for the appearance of the Chumash canoe and the initial settlement of East Polynesia are uncomfortably close. The very closeness of the dates would fit nicely in a scenario of rapid settlement of the eastern Pacific, culminating with American contact soon thereafter. However, if the Chumash canoe turns out to have appeared even slightly before humans had reached East Polynesia, this would clearly rule out Polynesian contact as its source. Therefore, the knowns and the uncertainties in both dates have to be well understood. Additionally, if the Chumash canoe was indeed developed after the settlement of East Polynesia, the chronology turns out to narrow down the details of the language of the Polynesian populations which could have landed in California. This aids the analysis of the proposed Polynesian etymologies.

5.1 The Chronology of Settlement in East Polynesia

Polynesians were the first people to inhabit the islands of East Polynesia, also referred to as triangle Polynesia — most of the area encompassed by Easter Island, Hawaii, and New Zealand — and they reached them from the west, in the final stage of the Austronesian expansion. The dating of the initial settlement of East Polynesia, or of any of its islands, is an active field of research. Jones and Klar (A:461, 477; C:767-768; D:92-93; E:179), and the critiques of Anderson (2006:760), and Arnold (2007:202-203) touch on these issues; I review here the history of East Polynesian settlement chronology and its current status in greater detail.

Radiocarbon dating has been utilized in Polynesian archaeology since soon after its invention in the late 1950s, and remains the tool of choice for obtaining absolute dates. Early on, a sequence of settlement dates emerged for the major East Polynesian island groups, and was used together with archaeological and linguistic evidence to evolve what Kirch (1986), in a detailed review, called the “orthodox scenario”. In that scenario, East Polynesian settlement started with the settlement of the Marquesas from West Polynesia around AD 300, progressing to the rest of East Polynesia in the following few centuries, up to the settlement of New Zealand in AD 800-1000 or earlier. Some variations on the model called for even earlier East Polynesian settlement dates, as early as the first millennium BC. This model, with some modifications, was the predominant one from the 1960s to the 1990s, and still occasionally appears in the literature.12

Early models of East Polynesian settlement chronology were anchored by relatively few radiocarbon dates of the first millennium AD, and a few even earlier ones, in East Polynesia as a whole as well as in individual island groups, in contrast with much more abundant post-AD 1000 dates. This paucity of older samples was usually taken to show small initial populations growing slowly, and so producing fewer datable artifacts, which with greater age would also be less likely to have survived.

A decisive turn in Polynesian chronology came with Atholl Anderson’s work, beginning with Anderson (1991). In it he examined the entire corpus of radiocarbon dates existing for New Zealand, then thought to have been settled sometime in the first millennium AD. Anderson applied what is known as chronometric hygiene, systematically rejecting samples based on a set

---

12 Jones and Klar refer to “the era of greatest Polynesian exploration (ca. A.D. 500-1000)” (A:461) and “the era when Polynesian seafarers discovered the most distant outposts of the Pacific (A.D. 500-1100)” (A:477). They quote no source for these dates.
of internal criteria (such as materials prone to producing erroneous dates) and external ones (such as samples with aberrant ages among others from the same context). Without these questionable samples a large set of dates still remained, but showing no dates earlier than the twelfth century AD, and abundant later dates. This suggested a model significantly different than the ‘orthodox scenario’; here New Zealand was not settled until the twelfth century, and its population grew rapidly after settlement. Conversely, this study has shown that earlier New Zealand dates are all likely the result of technical errors. Subsequent studies have shown strong evidence for an even later settlement date, in the late thirteenth century (Hogg et al. 2003, Wilmshurst and Higham 2004, Wilmshurst et al. 2008), further weakening the remaining arguments for early settlement (Sutton et al. 2008; see also Butler 2008 and Matisoo-Smith et al. 2008).

The successful revision of New Zealand settlement chronology was extended by the same principles beyond New Zealand as well. Spriggs and Anderson (1993) applied the procedures of chronometric hygiene to the rest of East Polynesia, resulting in a similar rejection of many early dates, and tentatively estimated the settlement of East Polynesia at AD 600-950, based on several dates with large uncertainties. Since then, abundant additional work has consistently reinforced later chronologies throughout East Polynesia. Moreover, new techniques of sample selection, preparation, measurement and correction, not available in the first wave of East Polynesian chronometry (Spriggs 2010), have failed to turn up early first millennium dates, and several claimed early samples and sites were shown to be of a younger age (Kirch and Kahn 2007:198-201). Even some supposedly early sites which passed the criteria of Spriggs and Anderson (1993) turned out on fresh reanalysis to be much more recent (Anderson and Sinoto 2002; Kirch and Kahn 2007:199; Dye and Pantaleo 2010). Additional support for these shorter chronologies comes from recent geological studies (Pirazzoli and Montaggioni 1988, Dickinson 2003, 2009), which show that some islands were still submerged or otherwise not habitable during the times suggested by some earlier chronologies. A review of the literature by Kirch and Kahn (2007:201) puts initial East Polynesian settlement at no earlier than AD 800. Weisler and Green (2011) place it at ca. AD 800. Finally, Wilmshurst et al. (2011), following the chronological hygiene methodology of Spriggs and Anderson but employing more accurate and far more abundant data, places the earliest settlement of East Polynesia at about AD 1000.

While unknowns and controversies remain, the extent of the debate has shrunk. Initial settlement of East Polynesia not much earlier than AD 1000 is now generally accepted, and the controversies cover a range of a few centuries rather than a millennium. Data from some island groups are sparse, and chronometric data cannot yet be used to resolve the order in which they were settled, with a few exceptions. In addition, the interpretation of environmental proxies for early settlement, particularly pollen and charcoal records from wetland deposits, remain hard to interpret and less decisive. While earlier chronologies in the region continue to be argued (Sutton et al. 2008; Kirch and Ellison 1994, see also Anderson 1994), they are at this point on the decline. To call the shorter chronologies ‘controversial’, as Jones and Klar do (D:92, E:179) is an exaggeration, as is their claim that “there is no consensus on the proposed short chronology for

---

13 The term ‘chronometric hygiene’ is due to Wilfred Shawcross, and was popularized by Spriggs (1989).
14 Polach (1976) is an older but very useful survey of radiocarbon measurement and its pitfalls.
15 In one recent paper, the authors disagree among themselves whether a settlement date of ca. AD 800 or ca. AD 1000 is a better fit to the chronometric data for one island group (Anderson et al. 2003:137). This is fairly representative of the current range of opinions for the initial settlement date of East Polynesia.
eastern Polynesia” (C:768).16

In Hawaii, a departure point for California suggested by Jones and Klar, no clear evidence exists for human presence before AD 1000. Three recent regional syntheses — Athens at al. (2002) for the ‘Ewa plain in southern O‘ahu, Carson (2006) for Kaua‘i, and McCoy (2007) and Kirch and McCoy (2007) for Moloka‘i — independently find no certain dated evidence for human presence in their particular areas before ca. AD 1000, and Wilmshurst et al. (2011) and Rieth et al. (2011) place Hawaiian settlement at no earlier than AD 1200.17 To support an early date for Hawaiian colonization, Jones and Klar (C:768, D:92-93, E:179) quote a single datum from the compilation of Spriggs and Anderson (1993:202). That date, Beta-30860, is from a sample from the Honokaua site in Maui. Its calibrated date interval is AD 650-770 (1σ, uncalibrated date 1330±60 BP). There are no other accepted samples in Spriggs and Anderson’s compilation whose entire 2σ calibrated range falls earlier than AD 1000, or whose entire 1σ range falls earlier than AD 800; in other words, none of them decisively indicates a pre-AD 800 presence.18 Jones and Klar’s claim here rests heavily on this single sample. This sample comes from charcoal of an unidentified plant source (Theresa Donham, p.c. 2010), and could therefore be of a wood significantly older than its time of deposition. Jones and Klar’s argument, already chronologically precarious, can not safely depend on a revision of Hawaiian chronology based on this single questionable date.

In their later papers Jones and Klar suggest Central East Polynesia as another possible departure point for California, apparently to better accommodate the linguistic evidence. Central East Polynesia must have been reached before Hawaii, but apparently not by much. There is no direct unquestioned evidence for human presence anywhere in East Polynesia before ca. AD 800 in earlier scenarios (Kirch and Kahn 2007) or AD 1000 in the more recent ones (Wilmshurst et al. 2011).19 The overall picture is of rapid settlement of East Polynesia beginning not much earlier than AD 1000, over a period of a few centuries. This is comparable to the span of time over which the first European explorers reached all the Pacific archipelagos, though of course the circumstances of discovery were different in the two cases.

In sum, the emerging consensus, stated twenty years ago and bolstered and refined since by additional data, is that Central East Polynesia and Hawaii have been reached and settled not much earlier than AD 1000. Polynesians could not have been the source of the Chumash plank canoe if it appeared earlier than that time.

---

16 Even shorter chronologies for Easter Island settlement were proposed by Hunt and Lipo (2006, 2008), on the basis of chronological hygiene, and mentioned by Jones and Klar as examples of short chronology controversies. Hunt and Lipo’s Easter Island settlement date (ca. AD 1200) is indeed even younger than other recent estimates (pre-AD 1000, Martinsson-Wallin and Crockford 2001; Weisler and Green 2011). However their arguments do not directly affect the chronology for Central East Polynesia or Hawaii, and are separate from them.

17 Dye (2011) argues for moving the Hawaiian settlement date back, perhaps to ca. AD 1000. His argument relies on including in the radiocarbon corpus two dates rejected by Wilmshurst et al. (2011), one from a Kukui nut and one from a rat bone. Rat bones are notoriously hard to date correctly (e.g., Anderson 2000, Wilmshurst et al. 2008), which leaves the revision dependent on a single date.

18 1σ ranges were calculated from the data of Spriggs and Anderson (1993) using CALIB 5.1 (Stuiver et al. 2006).

19 Kirch and Kahn’s early date, AD 780-1000 (cal 1σ) has been presented for Henderson Island (Weisler 1993:210 and Weisler 1994); however, this is based on unidentified charcoal and may represent old wood.
5.2 Dating the Appearance of the Chumash Plank Boat

The accepted dates for the appearance of Chumash plank canoe derive from two sources: artifacts, in the form of drilled planks, and the remains of fish thought to have been caught from plank canoes.

Gamble (2002) is the most recent work on the dating of plank boat-related physical artifacts. The older of her two dates for clearly identified canoe planks is AD 625-700 (cal 2σ; CA-SMI-261, Daisy Cave, San Miguel Island). However, as she points out, this plank is from driftwood, and is subject to the old wood effect: if redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) or other large tree species was the source of this plank, the driftwood log used for making the plank could have been hundreds of years old when the plank was made. This date is thus of little value for distinguishing a definitely pre-Polynesian, pre-AD 800 tomol from one definitely later than Polynesian settlement. The other canoe plank dates to no older than the fifteenth century AD.

Other canoe planks, as well as stone drills possible used for plank drilling, have also been identified in a burial from the cemetery of Simo’mo. This burial was assigned to phase 4 (M4) of the Middle period of the cultural sequence of King (1981), or possibly as early as M3. M4 is bracketed chronologically by dates known to belong to the preceding phase M3 and the younger phase M5a (King 1981: 47, 59, 64), and the chronology is further reinforced by dates associated with California beads found in the desert Southwest, hundreds of kilometers inland. King places the boundaries of M4 around AD 700-900. However, one artifact assigned to M5a yielded a radiocarbon date of AD 690-860 cal 1σ (1246±60 BP; UCLA 1886). If this date is correct, it would shift the M4/M5a boundary to the early ninth century, and make it likely that the M4-era Simo’mo planks are older than AD 800. The invention or introduction of the tomol would be older still.

The advent of the Chumash plank canoe can also be estimated using the proxy of fish remains (Bernard 2001, 2004; Arnold and Bernard 2005). In particular, swordfish (Xiphias gladius), shortfin mako shark (Isurus oxyrinchus) and tuna (Thunnus sp.) remains are considered to be a strong indicator of tomol fishing, as any other boat known to have existed in the area would be too small to handle these strong, determined fish or to haul them back to shore (Bernard 2001:21-29). Bernard (2001) has assembled records of remains of what she considers ‘tomol-acquired species’ and correlated them with dated strata from a variety of known sites.

In Bernard’s ‘high resolution’ data set (Bernard 2001:65-70) there are four sites with reasonable stratigraphic control containing apparently pre-AD 900 remains of tomol-acquired species. SMI-481 (Otter Point, San Miguel Island) yielded a few swordfish vertebrae, from a context dated to AD 730-800 (range of medians of calibrated dates), based on the data of Rick

---

20 The cultural seriation of King (1981) is based on the analysis of bead ornaments in funerary contexts.

21 Both dates used for bracketing M4 are on human bone collagen samples. They are thus free from issues of old carbon. However, human bone collagen may appear too old by several decades if it came from people with a significantly marine-based diet (Polach 1976; Walker and DeNiro 1986). King (1981) provides no other details of sample preparation protocol. The oldest M5a sample, UCLA 1886, is reported as “a radiocarbon date on collagen from Burials 35 and 36 from LAn-264” (King 1981:64); this was apparently a commingled burial (Chester King, p.c. 2010). The dates are calibrated here using CALIB 5.1 (Stuiver et al. 2006), assuming the raw dates are corrected for fractionation appropriate for bone collagen. If not, a fractionation correction of 80±35 years (Polach 1976:268) would make UCLA 1886 older by several decades. King (1981:64) gives the calibrated date of UCLA 1886 as AD 730-790 and comments on the discrepancy with his chronology.
LAN-52 (Arroyo Sequit, west of Malibu) has some remains of tuna from a layer dated to AD 600-750 (1σ, 1340±100 BP), with more at lower strata ca. 100 years older, by extrapolation using an estimate for the deposition rate. This date was obtained in 1963, and details of sample selection and preparation are not given; its accuracy is therefore questionable. Another site, LAN-227 (Century Ranch) yielded tuna remains from strata dated to the seventh century. This date, again, is obtained by interpolation based on depth and on imprecise and possibly uncalibrated radiocarbon dates from the early 1960s. A fourth site, SBA-72N (Tecolote Canyon, near Santa Barbara), yielded a single tooth of a shortfin mako, with an associated date of ca. AD 500; I consider this find too inconclusive. Bernard (2001:105) synthesizes her findings into a significant increase in *tomol*-caught species beginning around the 8th-9th centuries AD; she reads the the gradual slow increase in the remains of such fish as indicating a period of refinement in boat-building technology.

One particularly spectacular swordfish remnant is the swordfish dancer’s mask described by Davenport et al. (1993). The mask is assembled from a swordfish skull, and attached to a cape of abalone shells. An ‘ornament’ (apparently of mother-of-pearl) from the cape was used to obtain a corrected radiocarbon date of 2040±90 BP, which yields a calibrated date of AD 480-680 1σ or AD 380-780 2σ (Stuiver et al. 2006, ΔR=230±35); I note that the shells used for the cape may have been old ones collected inland, and so the cape may be younger than the shells. Jones and Klar (C:767) correctly point out that this cape is younger than the uncorrected radiocarbon age would indicate.

In sum, the canoe plank remains of Simo’mo indicate the presence of plank canoes ca. AD 900 or before, with some uncertainty. The evidence of fish remains points at an earlier time for appearance of the *tomol*, but depends on more uncertain interpretation and less reliable dates. The current data for the Simo’mo cemetery and for the fish remains sites are consistent with the appearance of the *tomol*, by a very rough estimate, no later than AD 800 and probably a century or more earlier.

### 5.3 Chronology: Discussion

To summarize the chronological issues: there is substantial direct evidence for human presence in Central East Polynesia and Hawaii after AD 1000, and only circumstantial and uncertain evidence for such before AD 900. In Chumash country, there is some evidence for the plank canoe existing by AD 800 or even AD 700.

Both these date estimates suffer from uncertainties. Earlier dates may yet be found in East Polynesia, though earlier remains of Chumash plank boats may be found as well. Much of Chumash boat chronology is based on uncertain dates and overreaching assumptions. Better data from both areas may confirm and strengthen the current chronologies, or provide new chronologies with dates moved either forward or back. For now, the likelier conclusion is that the Chumash plank canoe predated the presence of Polynesians in the east Pacific and the Americas by a century or two, and that the two are therefore unrelated. A less likely, but currently still tenable position, is that Polynesians settled East Polynesia at about the time the

---

22 See also Erlandson et al. (2005). At the time Bernard (2001) was written, these data were still unpublished. Rick (2004:147-149) identifies the remains of what are apparently three Swordfish or Marlin vertebrae from his unit 1a/1b. Three calibrated dates were obtained from the unit (Rick 2004:134, also Erlandson et al. 2005), roughly AD 970±70, AD 795±85 and AD 740±50 (1σ corrected).
tomol first came to be. That would require finding compelling evidence for pushing the dates associated with the plank canoe a century or more toward the present, and East Polynesian settlement a century or more back, to converge on a date of, say, AD 800-850. Jones and Klar have attempted to push both these chronologies in that way, but have not conclusively succeeded (C:768; D:92-93; E:178-179).

For the rest of my discussion here, I will adopt this second, less probable, position: that East Polynesia had been first settled just before the plank canoe appeared in California. By implication, any Polynesians arriving then in Chumash territory would manifest the culture and language reconstructed for ancestral East Polynesia. This point is used below in evaluating the evidence of fishhooks and the linguistic evidence.

6 Archaeology: The Evidence of Fishhooks

To support their scenario, Jones and Klar compare the forms of a particular style of fishhook, the two-piece fishhook, from East Polynesia and Southern California. This fishhook is assembled of two parts: a barb, which hooks the fish, and a shaft, which connects to the fishing line (Hudson and Blackburn 1982:179-181; Kirch 1985:200-203). The two parts are tied together at the bottom with cordage, and in California are also glued with asphaltum. The fishhook barb, often made of bone or shell, may be well-preserved in archaeological contexts. Jones and Klar (A:466-468, C:766-767) do not claim the Chumash two-piece fishhook is a Polynesian import; they only associate a more curved, s-shaped form of the barb with similarly shaped fishhook barbs of Polynesia, which they believe were the model for the Chumash ones.

Artifacts which may be interpreted as two-piece fishhook barbs appear relatively early in the Chumash archaeological record, in King’s phases M2b and M3 (200 BC-AD 300 and AD 300-700 respectively, King 1981:47), and are uncontroversially a local development. The curved form in question is recorded from as early as phase M5 (AD 900-1150). No two-piece fishhook barbs are recorded from M4 contexts. These data, though fragmentary, are consistent with a transition to the curved form of fishhook some time during M4 or early M5. Jones and Klar associate it with the appearance of the tomol, at roughly that time.

However, the East Polynesian two-piece fishhook did not yet exist then. It is recorded from the margins of East Polynesia: Easter Island, New Zealand, and Hawaii; in Hawaii, the curved form mentioned by Jones and Klar appears only late in the chronological sequence (Kirch 1985:205-207; Emory et al. 1959:26). It does not appear at all in the archaeological record from Central East Polynesia (Sinoto 1979:125). It is believed that it was innovated later, and separately, in those three marginal locations. The most common ancestral East Polynesian fishhook was made of one piece, carved from a single round shell. Kirch and Green (1987:173) cite the two-piece fishhook as an example of convergent technological evolution: it was developed in Polynesia where strong shell material was not available for producing the older one-piece style of fishhook. Other examples of the independent invention of similar fishhooks are known from the Baltic region (Anell 1995:195, fig. 20), even showing the curved barb which Jones and Klar regard as a distinctive trait linking Polynesia and Southern California. In sum, chronology and geographical distribution argue against the Chumash fishhook originating in Polynesia, and the independent historical emergence of formally similar fishhooks within Polynesia and worldwide agrees with their independent development in California, with a similar functional motivation.

Notably, the one-piece circular shell fishhook also appears in very similar styles in Chumash country and in East Polynesia. Several have suggested this striking similarity as evidence for
trans-Pacific cultural contact (Rau 1884:138; Olson 1930:21; Kroeber 1939:44; and others). However, as Jones and Klar have already discussed (A:459, 466), the oldest Chumash circular fishhooks predate East Polynesian colonization by millennia, and are therefore unrelated. The methodological lesson here is to use caution in equating artifacts based on formal similarities, however striking. This is especially true with items whose form is mostly functional, such as fishhooks; I believe that this applies to sewn-plank boats as well.

7 East Polynesia: Historical Linguistics

The Polynesian language family is a typologically close family of several dozen languages and dialects. It and its nearest relatives, the Fijian languages and Rotuman, make up the Central Pacific language family. The subgrouping of the Polynesian languages is mostly uncontroversial, and its accepted subgroups have been supported by a large and growing body of grammatical and lexical evidence (Green 1966, 1985; Pawley 1966; Howard 1981; Wilson 1985; Marck 1996, 2000). The following sketch summarizes an accepted subgrouping of the Polynesian languages, omitting some languages irrelevant to this discussion and some less established subgroupings:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLYNESIAN</th>
<th>TONGIC</th>
<th>Tongan</th>
<th>Niuean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NUCLEAR POLYNESIAN</td>
<td>East Futuna, East Uvea, Rennellese, Tikopia, Pukapuka, various other languages of Western Polynesia and Vanuatu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELLICEAN</td>
<td>Sāmoan, Tuvaluan [Tūvalu (Ellice islands)], Luangiua, Takuu, Sikaiana [Solomon Islands], various other languages of Vanuatu, the Solomon Islands and Micronesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAST POLYNESIAN</td>
<td>Rapanui [Easter Island]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CENTRAL EAST POLYNESIAN</td>
<td>MARQUESIC</td>
<td>Hawai‘ian</td>
<td>Marquesan [dialect complex, divided into North and South Marquesan]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAHITIC</td>
<td>Tahitian [Society Islands, including Tahiti]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuamotuan</td>
<td>Austral languages: Rimatara, Rurutu, Tupua’i (Tubuai), Ra’ivavae</td>
<td>Māori [New Zealand. Several dialects]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Island Māori: Rarotongan, Mangaian, Aitutaki, Tongareva</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 Recent work (Walworth 2012) questions the validity of Marquesic and Tahitic as valid taxa. The arguments in this paper do not rely significantly on that part of the classification.

24 The position of the closely related Austral languages within Tahitic is unclear, as they are poorly documented and have been heavily influenced by Tahitian since European contact.
All Polynesian languages have a small phonemic inventory, of which only the stops and the nasals matter to this discussion.\textsuperscript{25} Proto Polynesian had the stop consonants \(*p\), \(*t\), \(*k\) and \(*\!,\) and the nasals \(*m\), \(*n\), and \(*n\). The PPN bilabials \(*p\) and \(*m\) are unchanged in all the Polynesian languages.\textsuperscript{26} The following discussion is based on Marck (2000), Biggs (1978), Hovdhaugen (1986) and Fischer (1999).

The three non-bilabial stops participate in a pull-chain shift, \(\emptyset < \!*< \!*< \!,\) which has progressed to some stage in nearly every Polynesian language. Examples of the stages of this chain shift are given in table 1. Each set of reflexes here indeed corresponds to a stage in the pull-chain: no language has shifted \(*k\) to \(\!\) until after \(*n\) had been lost, and no language has shifted \(*t\) to \(k\) until after \(*k\) had shifted to \(\!\). The \(*t>k\) shift in Hawaiian is late, and has not affected most of Hawaii until the nineteenth century, progressing from east to west (Blust 2004). This shift has a similar history in Samoan, where it is at present only reflected in the colloquial register (Blust 2004; Hovdhaugen 1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>(*p)</th>
<th>(*t)</th>
<th>(*k)</th>
<th>(*!)</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rapanui, Tongan, East Uvea, East Futuna, Rennellese; Proto Polynesian (PPN), Proto East Polynesian (PEP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Polynesian languages not elsewhere in this table, including North Marquesan, Mangarevan, Maori and Niuean; Proto Central East Polynesian (PCE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>(t)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
<td>Hawaiian (modern Ni‘ihau and most older dialects), South Marquesan, Tahitian (standard), Austral languages, Samoan (formal)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>(k)</td>
<td>(?)</td>
<td>(\emptyset)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hawaiian (modern standard and some old Hawai‘i dialects), Tahitian (western dialects), Samoan (colloquial), Luangiua</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Reflexes of Proto Polynesian stops in the Polynesian languages. The stages of the chain shift are numbered here to highlight the chronological progression.

As for the nasals, PPN \(*n\) has persisted as \(n\) in all Polynesian languages except Luangiua and Colloquial Samoan, where its reflex is \(\eta\), merging with that of PPn \(*\eta\). PPn and PEP \(*\eta\) is reflected as \(\eta\) in most Polynesian languages, with the following exceptions: \(*\eta>n\), merging with \(*n\), in Hawaiian, South Marquesan, the Bay of Plenty dialect of Maori, and the Austral languages of Rimatara and Tubuai; \(*\eta>k\), merging with \(*k\), in North Marquesan (except in Taipivai on Nuku Hiva), and in South Island Maori; and \(*\eta>\!\) in Tahitian. It is possible that Tahitian \(*\eta\) had once merged with \(*k\), as in North Marquesan, followed by the plosive shift \(*k>\!\) as described

\textsuperscript{25} Other sound changes which affect various East Polynesian languages are \(s\!>h\) (all except Tongareva), \(f\!>h\) (various), \(l\!>\!\) (Mangarevan, Rarotongan, some Austral languages) and \(r\!>\!\) (Marquesan). Sound changes are of little use in the subgrouping of the Polynesian languages, since many of them recur independently in separate branches of the family.

\textsuperscript{26} I use the following standard abbreviations: PPN (Proto Polynesian); PEP (Proto East Polynesian); PCE or PCEP (Proto Central East Polynesian).
The Plank Canoe of Southern California

above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*m</th>
<th>*n</th>
<th>*ŋ</th>
<th>Languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>All Polynesian languages not elsewhere in this table</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>North Marquesan (except Taipivai), Ngāi Tahu (S. Island) Maori</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>Tahitian, Rurutu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>ʔ</td>
<td>Hawaiian, South Marquesan, Bay of Plenty Maori, Rimatara, Tubuai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Colloquial Samoan, Luangiua</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Reflexes of Proto Polynesian nasals in the Polynesian languages

Some degree of documentation exists for nearly all Polynesian languages, and extensive dictionaries exist for many. POLLEX (Biggs and Clark 1993) is an extensive comparative lexical database of the Polynesian languages, maintained since the 1960s, and an invaluable tool in Polynesian comparative linguistics.

8 Terms for ‘boat’ in Southern California: The Documentary Evidence

In this section I will review the sources for the Californian words for ‘boat’ under discussion, so as to start from reliable and precise phonetics and semantics, as far as sources allow.

8.1 The Gabrielino Record

Gabrielino was spoken in what is now the Los Angeles basin, adjacent inland valleys, and the southern Channel Islands. It belongs to the Takic language family; Takic is a subgroup of Northern Uto-Aztecan, along with Numic, Tübatulabal, and Hopi. The Takic languages all are or were spoken in Southern California. The following chart omits a few poorly documented languages not germane to the discussion.

TAKIC

SERRAN

Serrano [San Bernardino Mountains and adjacent Mojave Desert and inland valleys]

Kitanemuk [Western Tehachapi Mountains, SE Central Valley, Antelope Valley]

GABRIELINO

Gabrielino proper [Los Angeles basin south past Newport Bay, and inland valleys]

Fernandeño [San Fernando Valley]

CUPAN

LUISEÑO [Coast from south of Newport Bay to Carlsbad, and adjacent mountains]

27 Standard dictionaries used in this paper are: Rapanui — Englert (1978); Hawaiian — Pukui and Elbert (1960); Marquesan — Dordillon (1904); Mangarevan — Rensch (1991a); Tahitian — Andrews and Andrews (1944); Maori — Williams (1971); Cook Island Maori — Buse and Taringa (1995); Mauriati et al. (2006); Shibata (2003); Tuamotuan — Stimson (1964). Other sources are mentioned as necessary.

28 Klar and Jones refer to the 1994 version of POLLEX. The 1993 version, which I use, is not substantially different (Marck 2000:6). An updated version is available online at http://pollex.org.nz.
Luiseño proper [Southern coastal part of the above and mountains]
Juaneño (Acjachemem) [Northern coastal part, around San Juan Capistrano]
CAHUILLA-CUPEÑO
Cahuilla [Inland area, from San Bernardino to Salton Trough]. Three dialects:
Pass Cahuilla (Wanikik) [San Gorgonio Pass]
Desert Cahuilla [Coachella Valley]
Mountain Cahuilla [Santa Rosa and San Jacinto Mountains]
Cupeño [Around Warner Springs, near San Luis Rey River headwaters]

Fernandeño was one of several closely related dialects of Gabrielino, accorded its own name through the presence of the mission at San Fernando. Juaneño, likewise, is closely related to Luiseño. Serrano and Kitanemuk were mutually intelligible.

All Takic languages are largely suffixing languages. Isolated, non-possessed nouns take one of several language-specific and lexically determined suffixes, known in the Uto-Aztecan literature as absolutes. Possessed nouns take a possessive prefix and omit the absolutive suffix, e.g., Luiseño ‘hur-la {arrow-ABS} ‘arrow’, no-’hu: {1SG-arrow} ‘my arrow’ (Elliott 1999:22). The historical phonology of Takic is fairly well understood (Bright and Hill 1967; Langacker 1970; Munro 1990; Hill 2007; and others).

Gabrielino is poorly documented. Some of the what is known about the language comes from several early wordlists (Hale 1846; Taylor 1860c; Gatschet 1879 — all published in McCawley 1996; Kroeber 1907, 1909), of varying phonetic quality. The greatest amount of information of the language comes from two indefatigable linguists-collectors of the early twentieth century, C. Hart Merriam and John P. Harrington, both of whom documented otherwise barely-known languages. Merriam collected extensive wordlists for Gabrielino (and other languages), including words for precisely identified animals and plants. While his vocabulary is the largest existing lexical resource for Gabrielino, his orthography was phonetically naive, and his transcriptions were imprecise, inaccurate and inconsistent. Harrington’s notes, while covering somewhat less lexical material, are extensive, phonetically accurate, and detailed. Most of Harrington’s materials are unedited and unpublished, but Munro (2000) includes many elicited sentences from his notes, and Bright (1976) contains basic vocabulary based on his notes.

8.2 The Gabrielino Record: tarainxa

One Gabrielino word for ‘boat’ is known from the following records:

- `<trainxe>` ‘canoe; boat’ [Hale 1846; McCawley 1996:282]
- `<Ta-rin-ha>` ‘canoe, boat’ [Taylor 1860c; McCawley 1996:272]
- `<Tah-ri’ng-hah>` ‘boat (bundles of tules)’ [Merriam 1903a; McCawley 1996:246]

29 Merriam’s notes, digitized from the microfilm, are available at http://www.archive.org. Finding lists are available through the Bancroft Library’s website.

30 Where Harrington’s notes are quoted here, they are referenced by microfilm series, reel and frame; e.g., Harrington (3:102:582) is reel 102, frame 582 of microfilm series 3 (Southern California). Harrington’s Gabrieliino work was carried out in 1914-1917, and again in 1933.

31 Hale gives another Gabrielino form for ‘canoe, boat’ as well, `<nikin>`, not recorded elsewhere. I believe it is the result of an elicitation error. In Gabrielino, the independent possessive 1SG pronoun, ‘mine’, is given as `<ne-hin>` by Merriam (1903a). It appears that what Hale actually elicited was not ‘boat’, but ‘my things’. A similar
"/ta'rainxa/ (without specifying vowel lengths) is the most straightforward underlying form consistent with all three elicitations, where /x/ is realized as [x] or [χ]. I read Hale’s <trainxe> as [ˈtrain.χa], with reduced vowels in the final and initial unstressed syllables. I emphasize that the nasal is /n/ not /ŋ/; this point is important in the later analysis. For Hale’s exemplar, this is straightforward, as he consistently uses the symbol <ŋ> for the velar nasal, e.g., <atōnjin> ‘mouth’, cf. Kroeber (1907:74) ni-tojín. In comparing Hale’s wordlist to others, it appears that <ŋ> and <n> are always transcribed correctly.

Taylor’s <Ta-rin-ha> is also consistent with /ta'rainxa/, within the limits of variation in his orthography. Taylor’s orthographic <i> usually corresponds to [i], and [q] and [x] are usually represented by <k>. However, Taylor’s form for ‘blood’ is <a-hin>, representing [ʔa-χain] ‘his blood’. In other words, Taylor’s <h> may stand for [χ] and <i> may stand for [ai] (as in English). With these orthographic variants, Taylor’s <Ta-rin-ha> fits with the phonetic form tarainxa suggested here. Again, the nasal is not [ŋ], which Taylor consistently transcribes <ng>.

In Merriam’s <Tah-rī’ng-hah>, <i> represents [ai], as it does elsewhere, following common English dictionary phonetic spelling. The first <i> in <hah> could represent [h] or [χ], <ng> appears to be a nasal velar, in contrast to Hale and Taylor. I read the phonetic form as [ta'rainχa] or [ta'rainq̪a], underlyingly /ta'rainxa/ with n assimilating to n under the influence of a following χ. The affrication of [q] to [q̪] also occurs in Serrano (Hill 1967:4). Merriam’s informant, Narcisa Rosemyre, had a Serrano father and a Gabrielino mother, and she spoke both languages (McCawley 1996:17); the pronunciation here might be influenced by her Serrano.

I emphasize again that the χ or N does not represent an underlying back consonant. If the phonetic form recorded by Merriam had been [taraiŋa], he would have recorded it as something like <Tah-rī’ng-ah>, as in his <Ah-soo’ng-ah> ‘inside’, cognate with Luiseño -sun-ŋa ‘inside’, literally {heart-LOC} (Elliott 1999).

Merriam lists another Gabrielino form, <Hoo-pā’-kah tar-rī’n-hah> ‘A kind of pointed instrument’ (Merriam 1903a [McCawley 1996:245]). I will discuss this form and its semantics below, but for now I will only mention that I believe <Tah-rī’n-hah> in this compound is the very same word as <Tah-rī’ng-hah> ‘tule boat’, the differences reflecting either phonetic variation or Merriam’s inconsistent transcription.

Klar and Jones claim a different form of the word, taraina, <tarayna> in their orthography (A:474; B:388, 390, 396n10; C:766; D:89; E:175). They base it on a comment by Pamela Munro, but mention no primary sources or any other justification for it. They mention the form tarainxa only in B (p. 396, n. 10), basing it on a comment by Jane and Kenneth Hill, and again quoting no primary sources. Evidently, Harrington also considered taraina a possibility, as he

misunderstanding appears in Hale’s Luiseño (‘Netēla’) grammatical notes (Hale 1846:567). There he has <tɔomīχ> ‘our boat’, <ɔom omīχ> ‘thy boat’, etc. But these are clearly the Luiseño ča’mix ‘our property’ and ʔom ʔo’mix ‘you, your property’ (Elliott 1999). I suspect Gabrielino <nīkin> is the result of a similar misunderstanding, maybe even through the same informant. A similar interpretation of <nīkin> was suggested to me by Pamela Munro (p.c. 2009).

---

32 “The χ is, in those tongues, a somewhat deeper guttural than the Spanish jota.” (Hale 1846:535)
33 Orthographically <ni-tojín>. In Kroeber’s notation <i> is the velar nasal ɣ: “ŋ, nasal of k as n is to t” (Kroeber 1907:90). The stems here are preceded by the possessive prefixes ʔa-, 3sg, or ni-, 1sg.
34 Kroeber (1907:76) <mu-xain> ‘their blood’ (in the Fernandeño dialect); Hale (1846) <aχain>; Gatschet (1879) <akhir>. In Gatschet’s vocabularies, <kh> is “a surd guttural aspirate, the German ch...” ; <ai> is “as in aisle (‘long i’ in pine);” (Gatschet 1879:423). Compare also the affrication in Cupeño darangxa ‘orange’, from Spanish naranja (Hill 2005:180).
attempted to elicit both taraina and tarainxa from three separate informants while reeliciting Hale’s and Taylor’s wordlists. My guess is that he considered the possibility that the <h> in Taylor’s <Ta-rin-ha> was a record of non-phonemic aspiration, although there’s no other evidence for such aspiration in the language. In any event, taraina is inconsistent with Hale’s and Merriam’s forms, while tarainxa is consistent with all three, as I have shown.

Klar and Jones refer to taraina/tarainxa as the Gabrielino “word for ‘boat’ in general”. This is inaccurate. Both Hale and Taylor give an imprecise gloss for the word, without specifying the type of boat in question, but they did not attempt to elicit the words for different types of boats, and their informants may have been familiar with only one type. On the other hand, Merriam’s Gabrielino wordlist was based on a questionnaire tailored for work with California Indian languages. There are separate entries in Merriam’s questionnaire form for ‘Boat (log dugout)’, ‘Canoe’, ‘Kayak or bidarka’, and ‘Boat (bundles of tules)’. In the Gabrielino vocabulary the first three entries are left blank, but <Tah-i’ng-hah> is recorded for ‘Boat (bundles of tules)’. This suggests that the word refers specifically to tule boats, and not to boats in general.

I have no details on Hale’s informant. Taylor’s informant, Juan de Parma, was born and raised near the San Gabriel mission, some 30 km from the coast. Merriam’s informant, Narcisa (Mrs. James) Rosemyre, grew up there as well (McCawley 1996:17). It may be that the inland Gabrielino were the first to lose the collective memory of the ocean-going plank canoe, while still remembering the more widespread tule boat.

8.3 The Gabrielino Record: ti?a:t

The presumed Gabrielino word for ‘planked canoe’ is recorded only once in Harrington’s notes, and apparently nowhere else. Its source is the informant José María Zalvidea:

> t’i’at lancha, cayuco. Z[alvidea]. t’i’at, canoe. Z. It was so called because it carried many people. ’at, people. Made with boards, calked with mineral tar, and tied together with string made of horsenettle, he volunteers. [Harrington 1986, 3:102:582]

In two later attempts to elicit the word, Harrington’s informants were not familiar with the form. Both times Harrington spells the word as <te’áat>; Either te’at or ti’at is an acceptable reading, since Gabrielino neutralizes the /ae/ contrast in unstressed positions. Both informants were familiar with tule boats. I agree with Klar and Jones (B:388-389) that Zalvidea’s

36 Harrington apparently had no access to Merriam’s vocabulary.

37 “N[esct] te’áat but ev[idently] sic. Informant] heard that the island indians came over here to mainland in the tule fixed some way” (Harrington 1986, 3:103:515). “N[esct] G[abrielino] *te’aát, canoe. Informant] supposes they are of tule, for he heard that tejian [they wove] these boats of tule. Pl[ural] tet’i’aatam” (Harrington 1986, 3:103:87). For the plural form, Harrington notes that the first a is indeed long and the second is indeed [a], not [o], confirmed by repeated elicitations. Klar and Jones (B:389) quote Pamela Munro as saying this plural, te’i’aatam, is anomalous, te’i’aatam with a short a being the expected form (and see Munro 1983:291-297), and Harrington obviously found the plural form odd as well. But since the informant did not know the singular form te’at, he must have produced what was to him the regular plural inflected form, perhaps an idiosyncrasy of that informant’s speech.

Harrington’s Serrano informant, on a visit to San Pedro, produced t’i’at as the word for ‘boat’, as well as ‘basket’ (Harrington 1986, 3:101:416). This Serrano word is recorded elsewhere with the meaning ‘basket’ alone. This might be an interpretation of the Gabrielino ti’a:t by folk etymology.
explanation is unsatisfactory. As they point out, Zalvidea’s <’at> (/?at/) is obscure, and the usual Gabrieleno word for ‘person, people’ is taxax. ?at might have occurred to Zalvidea based on its phonetic similarity to the Luiseno ?atax, ‘person, people’. His explanation does not address the first part of ti’at, and appears to be a folk etymology.

I see no reason to doubt Zalvidea about ti’at meaning specifically a plank canoe, as opposed to a tule boat or a boat in general. Zalvidea’s father was from Santa Catalina Island, some other ancestors of his were coastal as well (McCawley 1996:17-18), and so he was more likely to know about ocean-going boats than Harrington’s and other linguists’ informants, who were near the San Gabriel mission, tens of kilometers away from the coast.

8.4 The Chumash Record: tomol(o)

By and large, I agree with Klar and Jones’s reconstruction of the Proto Southern Chumash *tomolo (B:372-373, 379-381) based on the attested forms in the Chumashan languages. The word is attested in various sources and dialects as to’olo, ‘molo, ‘tomol and ‘tomol; some of the variation is between dialects, and some different forms appear among speakers of the same dialect. to’olo appears to be an variant of to’olo, following a general process of devoicing of l word–finally and elsewhere (Klar 1977:21-22). ‘molo appears in Ineseño and Isleño Chumash, a variant of to’olo with a reduced unstressed syllable. The m is glottalized in some Barbareño elicitations. The earliest record of Barbareño ‘tomol, ‘lancha o canoa’, is from the Portolá expedition of 1769 (Costansó 1770:40); it appears in various later wordlists and throughout the notes of John P. Harrington.

Based on the forms to’olo and to’olo, Klar and Jones reconstruct the protoform *tomolo, with to’olo the result of final vowel deletion. That is the reconstruction also given by Klar (1977:76). Arguably, one could reconstruct the protoform as *tomol, with an echo vowel appearing in some dialects and then further phonologized.

Klar and Jones (B:380-381) further attempt to use internal reconstruction to derive the protoform *tomolo from an earlier *tomoloʔ (phonetically [tomoloʔo]), which would better fit their proposed Polynesian source. As far as I can tell, the additional syllable is adduced to explain the glottalization of the Barbareño variant to’ol and the Ventureño plural tomtomoʔol, and which is explained as a result of regressive assimilation to the of the following syllable, since lost. While this scenario is possible, it is not clear to me whether the glottal might not be explained through other routes, which do not require the longer older form. In any event, any of the proposed earlier forms *tomol, *tomolo or *tomoloʔ agrees with my discussion of the word below.38

9 The Proposed Polynesian Etymologies

In the following sections, I will discuss the Polynesian etymologies suggested by Klar and Jones for the California words for boat, tarainxa, ti’at and to’olo. The California words would have to match those Polynesian words spoken at the inferred time of contact. As discussed above, the

---

38 Tomol is commonest form of the word in the archaeological and ethnographic literature (Hudson et al. 1978, Gamble 2002, Bernard 2004, etc.) Tomolo is used by Klar, by Jones, and by Heizer (Heizer 1941a, Heizer and Massey 1953). I generally use tomol in this paper as a matter of convention, not as a statement on what I think is the underlying form or the protoform.
Polynesian language spoken then would have been something like reconstructed Proto East Polynesian. I find that none of the three proposed Polynesian etymons match the meanings Klar and Jones would assign to them. Moreover, for *tarainxa and *tomol(o), the phonological shapes of the Polynesian words fail to match those of the Californian words. In other words, the Polynesian words did not sound as Klar and Jones claim they did, did not have the right meaning, and so cannot be the sources of the proposed borrowings.

9.1 Gabrielino *tarainxa as Polynesian

The case for Gabrielino *taraina or *tarainxa as a Polynesian loan is first brought up in A (pp. 475-476) and elaborated in B (pp. 390-394, 396). According to Klar and Jones, the stem to be analyzed is *taraina (B:396). They explain the form *tarainxa, suggested to them by Jane and Kenneth Hill, as the Polynesian *taraina, with a Gabrielino “adjectival suffix” -xa, which is given no further explanation or justification.

Leaving -xa for the moment, I next examine Klar and Jones’s claimed etymology, Gabrielino *taraina ‘boat’ < Polynesian **taraina ‘carved object’ < PPN *tarai ‘hew, carve’ + **-na ‘nominalizer’, which they compare to the attested Hawaiian kalaina ‘carving’ < ka:lai + -na (Pukui and Elbert 1986; Elbert and Pukui 1979:81).39

The Hawaiian nominalizer -na is a regular reflex of Proto Polynesian *-ŋa (Biggs and Clark 1993, Krupa 1982:52). Phonologically regular reflexes of *-ŋa are attested in all the major languages of East Polynesia and in many outside it.40 As noted above, *ŋ changed to n only in Hawaiian, South Marquesan, one Maori dialect, two neighboring Austral dialects, and nowhere else in Polynesia. According to Elbert (1982), the South Marquesan and Hawaiian *ŋ > n shift may have a common origin, in which case the shift occurred independently at most three times; very likely one or more of the occurrences of *ŋ > n are due to some old language contact. In any case, it occurred in the two Marquesic languages, Hawaiian and S. Marquesan, after the differentiation first of Marquesic and then of the Marquesan dialects, in Bay of Plenty Maori after the differentiation of Tahitic and after the settlement of New Zealand, and in Tubuai and Rimatara after the differentiation of the Austral languages. There is thus no evidence of *-ŋa > **-na anywhere in East Polynesia at the time the plank canoe first appeared in California. An East Polynesian word for ‘carving’, cognate with the Hawaiian kalaina, would have been at that time *taraĩja, not *taraina, and would have been borrowed into pre-Gabrielino as *taraĩja.

If the word had been borrowed into Gabrielino as taraĩja, it would not have changed since then to *taraina. The distinction between n and ŋ in Gabrielino goes back at least to Proto Takic, as the following examples show:41

---

39 I use ** to mark forms which I believe did not exist, in reconstructed or putative languages.
40 In Nuku Hiva Marquesan the nominalizing suffix -ka < *-ŋa is no longer productive, but still appears with a small, closed set of verb stems (Zewen 1987:100).
41 The n/ŋ distinction goes even farther back, to Proto Northern Uto-Aztecan, and possibly to Proto Uto-Aztecan (Campbell 1997:136-137; Dakin 2001). See Kroebber (1907) for examples from elsewhere in Northern Uto-Aztecan.
Gabrielino -ŋa ‘locative’ (Munro 2000, ex. 8, 38, 68); Luiseño -ŋa ‘in’, ‘on’, ‘among’, etc. (Elliott 1999).42 Gabrielino ni- ‘1SG possessive’ (Merriam 1903a); Luiseño ni- (Elliott 1999); Kitanemuk ni- (Anderton 1988).


42 The Gabrielino -ŋa locative suffix still appears in some present-day Southern California place names: Cahuenga, Topanga, Tujunga, Cucamonga. Many more are recorded in Harrington’s notes.

Gabrielino no- ‘tongue’ (Hale 1846; Taylor 1860c; Merriam 1903a; Kroeber 1907); Cupeño naŋ- (Hill 2005); Kitanemuk niŋi- (Kroeber 1907; Anderton 1988).

Gabrielino sun- ‘heart’ (Kroeber 1907); Proto Cupan uŋi- (Munro 1990); Serrano huan- (Ramón and Elliott 2000:563; *s is often reflected as h in Serrano and Kitanemuk.)

In other words, n and ŋ have existed side by side in Gabrielino and its ancestors from well before the advent of sewn plank boats and up to the historical period.43 If a Polynesian word *taraiŋa were borrowed into an earlier stage of Gabrielino, it would still appear in the historically attested form as **taraiŋa, not taraina or tarainxa, contrary to what is recorded. On phonological grounds, then, the Polynesian derivation fails.

As mentioned before, Klar and Jones don’t explain the -xa at the end of the form tarainxa, beyond mentioning that -xa appears as a Gabrielino adjectival suffix, and suggesting the decomposition taraina-xa. The ending -xa indeed appears in a few Gabrielino adjectives: kwahoxa ‘red’ (Kroeber 1909:251), junaxa ‘black’ (Fernandeño; Kroeber 1907), hupaxa ‘sharp’ (Merriam 1903a), and some others. But of the ca. 75 adjectives in Merriam (1903a), only about 10 end with <kah>, <chah> or <hah>-x. -xa is thus by no means an obligatory or common marker of adjectives. More essentially, there is no explanation why an adjectival suffix would be added to a borrowed noun to create another noun. If anything, one would expect that a noun borrowed into Gabrielino would take an absolutive suffix, resulting in something like **taraiŋa-t, just as Klar and Jones propose for forming Gabrielino tiʔa-t from Polynesian *tia. Their explanation, Either form — with or without a Uto-Aztec suffix — could be borrowed from a Polynesian language, with *tarainxa being more fully nativized in Gabrielino than is tarayna. [B:396]

does not hold. There is no morphological path by which to go from Polynesian **taraina (even if that form had existed) to Gabrielino tarainxa.

On semantic grounds there are difficulties as well. The reflexes of the PEP nominalizer *-ŋa have two functions, in which they resemble the English -ing. Most commonly they produce pure nouns associated semantically with the parent verb stem. For example, Hawaiian kalaina ‘carving’ < kaalai ‘to carve, hew’. In some languages, they produce verbal nouns, similar to English gerunds, which share some syntactic properties of both nouns and verbs; for example Maori moega ‘sleeping’ (and also ‘bed’) < moe ‘sleep’ (Krupa 1982:50). Klar and Jones are not clear as to which sense their presumed Polynesian word *tarai-na would have. They refer to a “hewn object” (D:89; E:175), but elsewhere to “the process of adzing or hewing — the quintessential technique in maritime construction” (A:476; B:390).

With the first use of *-ŋa, **taraina would mean something like ‘a carved object’. A reflex of *taraiŋa is recorded only in Hawaiian. It is not used anywhere to refer to boats, hulls or planks. For boat planks, the word usually used is papa (Kamakau 1869 and Kamakau 1976:118 for Hawaiian; Handy 1923:157 for Marquesan), from a stem of pan-Malayo-Polynesian distribution

43 By some estimates, Proto Takic started diverging around 1500 BC (Sutton 2009).
While *ka:lai* refers to boat-making in general in some Hawaiian compounds (e.g., *kahuna ka:lai wa?a* ‘boat-building master’, Fornander 1917(5):613), there is no indication of *ka:laina* ever being used to describe a boat or any of its parts. Moreover, this use only appears in Hawaiian, and is therefore a late innovation, well past the permitted time range of Polynesian-California contact. This Hawaiian innovation fits well with the historian Samuel Kamakau’s account, in which the Hawaiian settlers arrived in plank canoes but changed their predominant boat type to the more easily built dugout, taking advantage of the availability of the Hawaiian *koa* tree (Kamakau 1976:118).

If **taraina** is to be a verbal noun, it would be referring to the manufacture of some part of a Polynesian canoe, such as the hull, strakes, or planks. However, as with English gerunds, it would only be used within longer sentences, and would not be easily borrowed into Gabrielino, especially in the scenario of brief and casual interaction Klar and Jones envision for the Polynesian-Chumash contact.

In sum, there seems to be no way by which Proto East Polynesian *tarai*#a ‘carving’ — itself speculated and unsupported — could have become Gabrielino *tarainxa* ‘tule boat’. The phonological, morphological and semantic evidence all compel rejecting the proposed Polynesian source for this Gabrielino word.

### 9.2 Gabrielino tiʔa:t as Polynesian

Klar and Jones would have Gabrielino *tiʔa:t* derive from a Polynesian word, *tia* (A:474-475; B:388-390, 393, 394; C:766; D:89; E:175-176). As shown here, the PEP *tia* did exist, and is a good phonetic match to Gabrielino *tiʔa:t*, after the addition of the Gabrielino absolutive suffix. The semantics, however, argue against that borrowing scenario.

Throughout their papers, Klar and Jones suggest several Polynesian words — ‘to sew’, ‘mast’, ‘type of boat’, ‘small sticks used in boat construction’, ‘to pierce’ — all of the form *tia*, some cognate, but of different semantics and historical distribution:

...suggesting that the Gabrielino named their sewn-plank boat not after the source material (as did the Chumash) but after some feature of it (short pieces of wood or a mast (cf. the Hawaiian metaphorical extension ‘mast’), or a technique associated with building it (piercing the short pieces of wood to sew them together). [Klar and Jones B:389-390]

For any one of these etymons to be right, all the others have to be wrong. Casting a wide net for etymons in this way depends on semantic imprecision, and makes the argument less convincing than an argument based on a single more certain etymology. In any event, I examine here all of the proposed etymons.

#### 9.2.1 *tia* ‘to sew’

The following are the documented senses of apparent reflexes of Proto East Polynesian *tia*, arranged by language and family, based initially on POLLEX (Biggs and Clark 1993) and supplemented using the standard dictionaries listed in section 7. Translations and slight rephrasings are mine:
EAST POLYNESIAN

Rapanui: *tia. To sew (as a cape of tapa cloth).

CENTRAL EAST POLYNESIAN

MARQUESIC

Hawaiian: *kia. Spike, nail; post; pillar; mast; (?) type of boat (in compounds).

Mangarevan: *tia. To stick in, to drive a wooden piece into the ground, to drive in a nail.

Marquesan: (none)\(^{44}\)

TAHITIC

Tahitian: *tiatia. Small posts.

Tuamotuan: *tia. To stick in, as bunch of flowers; penis.

Maori: *tia. Peg, stake; to stick in a peg or a thatching needle; to adorn by sticking feathers in.

Rarotongan: *tia. Wedge, peg; to drive in peg or stake, to wedge in.\(^{45}\)

Tongareva: *tia. Stake; wedge; stuff, filling (as small stones jammed between large ones).

According to POLLEX, the root *tia ‘pole, stake’ is reconstructed as far back as Proto Malayo-Polynesian. Another sense, ‘to weave a net’ appears in the Tongic languages and in the outliers Tikopia, Takuu and Sikaiana, but not in any East Polynesian languages. The East Polynesian sense can be reconstructed as ‘peg’, ‘stake’, or any such object pushed into yielding matter; or as a verb signifying that action.

Klar and Jones most often associate *tia with the sense ‘to sew’, referring to the lashing together of canoe planks. For this sense they rely on the sense of PPN *tia reconstructed in POLLEX, ‘sew, stick in a peg or a needle, make a net’. But these three senses cannot all be reconstructed at every level of the Polynesian family tree. ‘Stake, peg’ and ‘to push in’ seem to be pervasive and stable throughout Polynesia. The specialized sense of ‘weaving a net’ appears in a number of Polynesian languages but nowhere in East Polynesia. The sense ‘to sew’, however, appears only in Rapanui, in what must be a local innovation in that language. Therefore, pace POLLEX, the sense ‘to sew’ cannot be reconstructed for Proto East Polynesian or Proto Central East Polynesian. In other words, *tia ‘to sew’ did not exist in the language of the Polynesians who would have sailed the eastern Pacific when sewn plank boats appeared in California.

---

\(^{44}\) Marquesan ti?a ‘mast’ is unrelated: it is a regular reflex of Proto Polynesian *tila ‘mast, boom’, going back to Proto Oceanic. The sound change r>\(r\) occurs in Marquesan but in no other Polynesian language.

\(^{45}\) POLLEX also lists Rarotongan *tia ‘to close a sack by sewing’, quoting Savage (1962). Savage’s gloss actually reads “to bind or lash, such as in binding or lashing the lugs of the mouth of a sack filled with copra; after sewing up the mouth securely, the sewing twine is wound round the lugs on each side and the final fastening is done and a secure knot made to secure by binding or lashing and knotting”. This refers, then, not to the sewing but to the tying-up of the ends of the sack. The sense of tying or sewing does not appear in the later, comprehensive Rarotongan dictionary of Buse and Taringa (1995) or in any other Polynesian language, and is best left out of this cognate set.

Since Savage’s dictionary omits glottal stops, his <tia> could represent ti?a, which would be the regular reflex of PCEP *tifā ‘to close up, seal, patch, inlay’, cf. especially Tahitian tifā ‘to join things together; to dovetail’ (Davies 1851) and Marquesan tīfa ‘to close, seal, plug, cover’ (Dordillon 1904). But neither *tia nor tīfa appear with that sense in any other Cook Islands dictionaries.
There are other reasons to reject *tia ‘sew’ as a Polynesian word describing the lashing together of boat planks. Although much traditional Polynesian boat-making knowledge has been lost, there exist records of several verbs used to describe this action, which I will review here. None of them is a reflex of *tia.

Some of the most extensive published native records of traditional Polynesian boat-building are from Hawaii.\(^{46}\) I rely on the accounts of the nineteenth century native historians Samuel Kamakau and Davida Malo, of the ethnographer Abraham Fornander, and on one anonymous account, all published in Hawaiian and English.\(^{47}\) I go in some detail here into the existing records of Hawaiian boat construction, not only to document the extent of the relevant Hawaiian vocabulary, but also to give some of the flavor of the various terms in context. The following are citations mentioning the lashing together of planked boats, and the lashing of strakes and end pieces onto dugout hulls.\(^{48}\) Corresponding Hawaiian words and phrases and their English translations are marked in boldface:

(1) A laila, kāpili ‘ia ka lā‘au, he ‘ahakea paha, he lā‘au ‘ē a‘e paha; e kāpili mua ‘ia nā mo‘o, a holo ‘ia i ka ‘aha a pa‘a ia; e kāpili ‘ia nā maka ihu a pa‘a ia mau wahi, e kāpili ‘ia nā kupe hope, a holo ‘ia a pa‘a i ka ‘aha; a laila, pau ke kāpili ‘ana o ka wa‘a. \[Malo 1987:89\]

“After that were attached the carved pieces made of ahakea or some other wood. The rails, which were attached to the gunwales, were the first to be fitted and sewed fast with sinnet. The carved pieces at bow and stern were the next to be fitted and sewed on, and this work completed the putting together of the body of the canoe.” \[Malo 1903:171\]

(2) Kālai ihola nā kāhuna i ka wa‘a a oki, a kāpili ihola, a kau ka pu‘aki, pā‘ele a maika‘i... \[Kamakau 1865\]

“The expert canoe builders hewed the canoe hulls, attached the parts, put on the rigging, and painted the canoe black” \[Kamakau 1991:3\]

---

\(^{46}\) Traditional boat construction is also described in many early Maori texts. Much of the specialized Maori terminology is already available in complete quotations within the dictionary of Williams (1971). At the time of European contact, New Zealand Maori did not have fully planked canoes, though they had boats with washstrakes sewn on.

\(^{47}\) There are other Hawaiian language sources, published and unpublished, on traditional canoe construction. I present here all the sources known to me for which both the Hawaiian texts and their English translations have been published. The nineteenth century Hawaiian newspapers quoted here can be accessed online through http://nupepa.org or http://uluakau.org.

\(^{48}\) Longer texts in Hawaiian are given in standard orthography: ‘\(\cdot\)’ is the glottal stop, and the macron indicates a long vowel. The published Hawaiian texts of Kamakau and Fornander do not indicate glottal stops or vowel length, and Anonymous (1939) uses them inconsistently; for those, the vowel macrons and glottal stops given here are mine. I am grateful to Puakea Nogelmeier for reviewing my transcriptions and translations and providing corrections. Some of the published translations have been rephrased.
(3) Ua ‘ōlelo ‘ia mai nō ho‘ī e ka po‘e i ‘ike maka i ia mau wa‘a, he mau wa‘a ku‘i,49 a he mau wa‘a ‘āpana lā‘au i humuhumu ‘ia a pa‘a i ka ‘aha. Pēlā aku paha ka wa‘a o ka po‘e kahiko o Hawai‘i nei. [Kamakau 1867a]

“People who have seen these canoes [war canoes of eighteenth century O‘ahu chief Pele-iō-hōlani] have told me that they were ‘joined canoes’, made of pieces of wood sewn securely with coconut husk cords. It would seem that this is the kind of canoe that ka po‘e kahiko [the people of old] had.” [Kamakau 1991:117-118]

(4) Ua ‘ōlelo ‘ia, ‘o Kā‘eia ‘ia mā, nā wa‘a kaua o Pele‘iō-hōlani, he mau wa‘a ku‘i, a he mau wa‘a ‘āpana i hana akamai loa ‘ia. [Kamakau 1867b]

“It was said that Kā‘eia ‘ia and such, the war canoes of Pelei ‘io hōlani, were joined canoes, boats pieced together and very skillfully crafted.” [translation mine; see Kamakau 1992:240]50

(5) ...he kālai ‘āpanapana, a nui ka ‘āpana, a laila kāpilipili, a lilo i wa‘a...

‘O kēia mau lā‘au, ‘o ia ka papa o ka wa‘a o ka po‘e kahiko i kāpili ‘ia i kahiko, i ke au o Wākea mā, a mamua aku a mahope mai, ‘o nā wa‘a o Wākea, ‘o Kumu‘elī ka inoa, ua kāpilipili ‘āpana ‘ia...

... o ka wa‘a o ka po‘e o Kahiki mā i holō mai ai i Hawai‘i nei, he wa‘a ‘āpana kāpilipili kō lākou... [Kamakau 1869]

“The woods were shaped into pieces — many pieces — then attached together; this became a canoe.”

“From these trees were made the worked woods that ka po‘e kahiko fitted together for canoes in the time of Wākea and before and after his time. Wākea’s double canoe, named Kumu‘elī, was of pieces of wood fitted together and so was kaloloamaile [kaloliamaiele], the double canoe of Kuha‘ilima. In the time of Laka mā [‘Laka and his people’] canoes were hewn out of koa — one large koa tree made one large canoe. This made the work less burdensome and wearisome, and shortened the labor. This was also true in the times of Hakalanileo, Niheu and Kana. But the canoes of the voyagers who sailed from Kahiki to Hawaii were made of joined pieces…” [Kamakau 1976:118-119]51

(6) ...a laila, houhou nā puka o ka wa‘a, ‘o ka holō nō ia o ka ‘aha, no ka mea, ua pau i ke kauli ‘ia mai ka uma o ka ihu a hiki i ka uma o ka lā‘au hope...

[Kamakau 1869]

“Then he drilled holes in the canoe for the sennit cords, and readied the lashings of the canoe from the curve of the bow to the back curve of the back end piece.”

[Kamakau 1976:121]

(7) A ma ka uma o nā lā‘au hope o ka wa‘a, a pa‘a ia i ka holo ‘aha ‘ia, a laila, hahau ka pola i waena konu o nā wa‘a...

[Kamakau 1870]

“After the clamping down of the rear pieces of the canoe and the fastening with running sennit-cord, the platform midway between the canoes was lashed on.”

[Kamakau 1992:42]

49 ku‘i is spelled <ku-i> in Kamakau’s published text, presumably being explicit about the presence of a glottal stop.

50 It is not clear from the context whether the text refers only one boat, Kā‘eia ‘ia, or many. The plural is sometimes used to refer to singular double-hulled boats.

51 Kahiki is not only Tahiti in the Societies, but distant lands in general, in this case Central East Polynesia: Kahiki place names earlier in the text include locations in the Societies and the Marquesas.
(8) ‘O ka mea e pa’a ai kēia mau lā‘au he kaula ʻaha.
   “These pieces are tied on to the canoe [rims] with the sennit.” [Fornander 1917(5):612-613]52

(9) ‘O ka hoʻopa’a ʻana, me ke kaula ʻaha e humuhumu ai a pa’a i ka wa’a.
   “In fastening, the sennit is used to tie these [braces] on to the canoe.”
   [Fornander 1917(5):636-637]

(10) ...Houhou nō ho‘i ka puka ʻaha ma ia mau lā‘au mai mua a hope, hoʻokomo ka iwi lā‘i. Pau kēia, hoʻopili pili mai mua a hope; kau koaʻekea, kauli mai mua a hope. Pau kēia, hoʻokomokomo ka ʻaha ma nā puka a pau mai mua a hope...
   “[Holes were also bored into those pieces of wood from front to back (and) ti leaf stems inserted. After this was done, they were fitted from prow to stern; adjusted and perfectly fitted from front to back. When this was done the sennit braid was threaded into all the holes from prow to stern...” [Anonymous 1939:158-159]

(11) ...A pa’a ka wa’a i ke kāpili ʻia, hoʻokomo ka wae, hoʻa a paʻa.
   “...When the piecing of the canoe parts was done, the thwarts were put in [and] tied firmly in place.” [Anonymous 1939:158-159]

The verb roots in these texts referring to sewing together of boat parts are (see also Pukui and Elbert 1986): humu ‘sew’, kauli: ‘lash’ (perhaps < li: ‘lace, as shoe”; also used as a noun), and ku?i ‘join; sew’; more specifically holo ‘thread through’, literally ‘run’ (cf. English ‘running stitch’); and more generally pa?a ‘join’ (also used adverbially, a pa?a ‘tightly’), hoa ‘tie, lash’, kapili and ho?opili ‘attach’, koa?ekea ‘adjust and fit parts to the canoe body’, and ho?okomokomo ‘insert’ (< ho?o ‘causative’ + komo ‘enter’, reduplicated for repeated action), referring to sennit cords pushed through plank holes.

Of the roots specifically referring to plank sewing, humu has cognates in Marquesan (Handy 1923:157) and some non-East Polynesian languages (< Proto Nuclear Polynesian *sumu ‘tie, lash’). li: has cognates throughout Polynesia and beyond. The etymology of the Hawaiian verb ku?i, however, is unclear. It is glossed ‘join, stitch, sew, splice, unite’ (Pukui and Elbert 1986). Conceivably, it could be a reflex of Proto Polynesian *tui ‘to thread pierced objects on a string; to sew’ (Biggs and Clark 1993), a very widespread root, reconstructed back to Proto Austronesian and with reflexes in nearly every Polynesian language.53 *tui is in fact reflected in Hawaiian as kui, ‘to string pierced objects; to thread as beads’. However, *tui > ku?i would require an epenthetic glottal stop, an irregular and unusual change of form.

kia, the Hawaiian reflex of Klar and Jones’s *tia, does not appear in these texts in any context, and as noted above, it is not documented elsewhere in Hawaiian with any sense resembling ‘to sew’.

Outside Hawaiian, I found one mention of a Tahitian verb referring to lacing canoe planks. In an account of the great canoe of the legendary Hiro, by tradition the inventor of the Tahitian plank canoe, the pahi (see also Handy 1932:46), there appears the Tahitian text of a song sung by the boat builders as they lashed together the boat planks, working on opposite sides and passing the cords to each other through the drilled holes:

52 Koakanu, Fornander’s source here, was a professional canoe builder.
53 *tui ‘thread pierced objects on a string’ is reflected in all the major East Polynesian languages. It also has the sense ‘to sew’ in all except Rapanui, Hawaiian and perhaps Tahitian (Handy 1932:5 has Tahitian tui ‘to sew on thatch [of house]’).
The Plank Canoe of Southern California

...E tui i roto, e puputa i vaho,
E tui i vaho, e puputa i roto.
Nati hua, nati mau...

“...Thread it from inside, it comes outside,
Thread it from outside, it goes inside.
Tie it fully, tie it fast...” [Henry 1928:550]

Here is a reflex of the ubiquitous Polynesian *tui ‘sew, thread’. It is also used in this context in Maori, another Tahitic language: “tui, Lace, fasten by passing a cord through holes. Used of fitting a canoe, lashing the rauawa [washstrake], etc.” (Williams 1971).

Other verb roots referring to plank lashing and the like are Tongareva hau ‘lash together’ (Buck 1932:193) and Hawaiian hau ‘to lash’, from PPN *faʔu, used in other contexts of boat building and fitting; Maori aukaha ‘lash the bulwark to the body of a canoe’ (Williams 1971), probably cognate with the Tongan haukafa ‘to lash (a boat or canoe) with sennit’ (Churchward 1959) and Samoan sauʔafa ‘to tie with sennit’ (Pratt 1893), ‘lash canoe plank to keel’ (Krämer 1994, 2:291 after Krämer 1902, 2:253); 54 Maori mimira ‘to fasten an end piece to the hull of a boat’ < mira ‘lash’ (Best 1925:73; Williams 1971); Mangaian tamoumou < mou ‘hold together’ (Mauriaiti et al. 2006, under kiri); Aitutaki (Cook Islands) tutaki ‘join’ referring to boats built from two dugout bases joined end to end (Hiroa 1927:259); and Tuamotuan faro: ‘tighten the final lashing of a canoe’ (Stimson 1964) and Rarotongan ?aro: ‘to lash or lace, as the sides of the canoe with sinnet’ (Savage 1964, as <aro>). The verb *fono ‘to join pieces together’ has reflexes throughout Polynesia. It is used in the specific sense ‘to attach canoe planks’ in West Polynesia and the outliers, but not in East Polynesia (Biggs and Clark 1993). Some of these verbs also refer to the lashing of booms and other parts to the body of a boat.

To sum the Polynesian evidence regarding *tia ‘to sew’: there is a respectable amount and variety of available materials in several East Polynesian languages describing the lashing on of canoe planks and end pieces. There exist several verbal roots of varying ubiquity referring to the sewing together of boat planks. *tia is not used in any of these texts, nor does it refer to sewing in general anywhere except Rapanui. The only words meaning ‘to sew’ associated with plank canoe construction are the Tahitian verb tui and the Hawaiian kuʔi in the expression waʔa kuʔi ‘sewn boat’.

When a language (attested or reconstructed) is imperfectly known, guesswork is sometimes the only available option when trying to find the form of an unknown word, in this case ‘to lash together boat planks’. But here, a great deal of vocabulary specific to that meaning has already been recorded or reconstructed, and it is less likely that yet another common synonym has somehow slipped through undetected.

As shown, all East Polynesian verb roots reflecting *tia have the primary sense of forcing a sharp implement into a material. The shift from ‘spike’ to ‘sew’ makes sense only for sewing with a needle, where the hole for the thread is created as the thread is pushed through it. That is not the case in the so-called sewing of planked boats, where a hole is first drilled, and a cord is then passed through through the existing hole, in what would be more accurately called in

54 The Maori sound correspondences are irregular. Assuming a PPN form *sauʔa (Biggs and Clark 1993), from *sau ‘?’ + *kafa ‘sennit’, its regular reflexes would be Tongan haukafa and Samoan sauʔa, as observed, but Maori shows aukaha, not the expected haukafa (orthographically <*haukawha>). ð-h occurs sporadically and dialectally elsewhere in Maori (Marck 2000:43-44), and in fact *kafa ‘sennit’ is reflected as Maori kaha, but the initial <Ø is irregular. Note that this putative sau is unrelated to the Tahitian, Hawaiian and Tongareva hau ‘to lash’ < PPN faʔu.
English ‘lacing’ or ‘lashing’; that meaning is accurately reflected in the root *tui ‘to string through’, which also happens to serve as the commonest metaphor for sewing cloth and such in the Polynesian languages, and for plank lashing in a few. In other words, *tia is unattested as the term for ‘sewing’ boat planks not by accident, but because its meaning is not the right one.

9.2.2 titia/tiatia ‘short sticks’

In their earlier papers (A, B) Klar and Jones suggested other possible meanings for *tia to fit their hypothesis. Tahitian titia is glossed in one dictionary as ‘short sticks used for fastening together the pieces of a canoe when building it’ (Davies 1851);\(^{55}\) that may be the titi’a ‘cross pieces in a canoe’ of Andrews and Andrews (1944), from ti’a ‘straight; across’ (<PEP *tika). In other words, the reference is not to details of hull construction, but to the assembly of the boat, cf. ti?ati’a ‘uprights attaching float to outrigger’ (Handy 1932:39). The form tiatia ‘small posts’, is given in POLLEX, following one vocabulary (by Frank Stimson), with no further context.

It could also be that Davies’s titia parallels the recorded Tahitian titi ‘peg’, from ti ‘peg’ (Andrews and Andrews 1944), itself a shortened form of tia, discussed above. In the context of planked boat construction, titi is a short wooden peg which is forced into the hole in the planks of a sewn canoe, in order to hold the tension in the cord passing through it (Bataille-Benguigui et al. 2008:81); this technique is practiced in the Tuamotus, Tahiti and elsewhere in East Polynesia (see e.g., Haddon and Hornell 1936:89, 107, 142); the reduplicated form titti probably signifies a diminutive (e.g., Krupa 1982:49-50). As vague as the given gloss for titia is, it clearly does not refer to short planks sewn together, as Klar and Jones suggest it is (A:475).

Even supposing titia (recorded only from Tahitian) is related to titi ‘pegs for securing plank lashings’, it would make a poor candidate for borrowing with the meaning ‘boat’. These pegs are perhaps the smallest and least conspicuous parts of a sewn plank boat. To use them to refer a planked boat would be akin to using ‘spark plug’ or ‘lug nut’ to refer to a car. Moreover, such tightening pegs were never used in the plank boats of California. The Gabrielino would not have named their new boat after a part of the boat which they did not use.

9.2.3 tia ‘mast’

The Hawaiian kia ‘mast’ (*tia in most pre-1800 dialects) reflects two unique semantic developments, ‘stake, post’ > ‘vertical pole’ > ‘mast’, neither of which is recorded from any other East Polynesian language. It is used in metonymic compound expressions referring to particular kinds of boats, e.g., kia lua ‘brig, two-masted schooner’ (lit. ‘two masts’), but never refers to ‘boat’ by itself. There are two problems with using this word as a source for the Gabrielino loan. First, the word is a Hawaiian innovation, and involved two semantic shifts, from pole (stuck in the ground) to pole (any tall stick-like object), and then to mast. Between Proto East Polynesian and tia ‘mast’ there are the splits of Proto Central East Polynesian, Proto Marquesic, and Hawaiian, and then these two semantic shifts. These five events must have been separated from each other by some time, and each stage removes the word further from the putative time of Polynesian-Gabrielino contact.

Secondly, the boats of Southern California never had masts, since they never had sails, as was discussed and emphasized by Jones and Klar (A:469; C:766). As with titia above, it is hard

\(^{55}\) Davies (1851) does not mark vowel length or glottal stops. The dictionary of the Académie Tahitienne (1999) attempts to clarify the pronunciation for every item in Davies, but marks titia as having an unknown pronunciation.
to imagine why the Gabrielino would use for their new style of boat the name of an item which their boats did not have.

9.2.4 *tia* ‘type of boat’

Another Hawaiian innovation is the bound morpheme kia- (*tia* in pre-nineteenth century Hawaiian) evidenced in the words for several types of boats (Pukui and Elbert 1986; Andrews and Parker 1922): kialoa–kioloa, ‘long, light and swift canoe’ (< loa ‘long’); kiapoko ‘short canoe with rounded hull, used for fishing near the shore’ (< poko ‘short’); kiapoho ‘a canoe with deep, curving hull’ (< poho ‘depression, hollow of a canoe [etc.]’); kiapa: ‘swift-sailing canoe’, and in nineteenth century Hawaiian ‘any vessel equipped with cross spars, bark’. Not much is known about these boats. Some additional details are available on the kialoa, described as a small, fast boat with low sides, seating one or two people, used for racing but especially in leading a fishing fleet (Holmes 1993:70, 123); such a small boat would have been a dugout, not a plank boat. Since even ‘a long kia’ is a small boat, it seems that kia is not a class of boat which includes large voyaging vessels and such. The morpheme kia might have come about by metonymy from the sense ‘mast’, or may have some other etymology.

Thus, Gabrielino ti?act is not a loanword from a Polynesian root related to Hawaiian *tia*-, which describes a small dugout, entirely different from the type of boat which would have reached the Americas. And as above, this sense appears in Hawaiian only, a late development and past the appearance of the plank canoe in California.

9.2.5 *tia* ‘to pierce’

Finally, Klar and Jones mention a Mangarevan word, tia ‘to pierce, bore’, which they would like to relate to the drilling of holes in boat planks (A:475; B:389). In general, as I have shown above, *tia* refers to pushing through with a pointed instrument, not to drilling. The gloss ‘to pierce, bore’ is inaccurate. The only source for it, as mentioned by Klar and Jones, is Tregear’s Polynesian comparative dictionary (Tregear 1891). Tregear’s own dictionary of Mangarevan (Tregear 1899) has ‘to pierce, to stick in’, with no mention of boring or drilling. Tregear’s source for Mangarevan was a manuscript prepared decades before by French missionaries resident in Mangareva (Rensch 1991a:11).56 I presume the French gloss in his source was percer, which can refer to either piercing with a sharp tool or to drilling, unlike the narrower Mangarevan sense of ‘piercing’ only. Tregear’s earlier English translation appears to have mistakenly reflected the broader semantics of a French gloss.

As with the words for plank sewing, there is direct evidence for a word referring to drilling holes in canoe planks. For Hawaiian, we have houhou (Kamakau 1869 and Anonymous 1939:158-159 quoted above). hou and its reduplicated form houhou, ‘to drill’, have cognates throughout the Polynesian Languages (Biggs and Clark 1993).

9.2.6 *tia*: Conclusion

Klar and Jones propose various Polynesian words, all reconstructed as *tia*, each with a separate semantic route toward being borrowed as Gabrielino ti?act. Their most prominent one, ‘to sew’,

56 Rensch (1991a) is a compilation of all published Mangarevan dictionaries and several manuscript vocabularies. It does not mention percer or any similar gloss for tia.
cannot be reconstructed to Proto East Polynesian and was certainly never used to refer to boat construction. The Mangarevan ‘to pierce’ suffers from the same flaws. The Hawaiian root for one particular boat type is a late innovation which does not refer to voyaging boats. The words for ‘short sticks’ (in Tahitian) and ‘mast’ (in Hawaiian) are late innovations which refer to features not used in Californian plank canoes. Their explanation,

...the Gabrielson named their sewn-plank boat not after the source material (as did the Chumash) but after some feature of it (short pieces of wood or a mast, cf. the Hawaiian metaphorical extension ‘mast’), or a technique associated with building it (piercing the short pieces of wood to sew them together). [B:390]

is a haphazard reach for a range of would-be etymons, each of which excludes the others, in the hope one of them would fit the desired result. As it turns out, none of them does.

9.3 Chumash tomol(o) as Polynesian

Klar and Jones claim that the reconstructed Chumashan *tomolo* can be explained as a loan from a Polynesian form, *tumura*au, meaning something like ‘useful wood’, and designating the material used in constructing sewn-plank canoes. I show here that this etymology fails on semantic and phonological grounds.

Klar and Jones’s proposed etymon *tumura*au is a reflex of Proto East Polynesian *tumu ra*akau, a compound of PEP *tumu* and *ra*akau. *tumu* is a stem reflected in many East Polynesian languages with the meanings ‘origin, source’ (in the abstract), ‘base, foundation’ (of concrete objects), ‘trunk (of tree)’, and in some languages ‘tree’, either as a stand-alone noun or in compounds denoting specific kinds of trees.

EAST POLYNESIAN

Rapanui: *tumu* tree trunk; origin, source of an idea.

CENTRAL EAST POLYNESIAN

MARQUESIC

Hawaiian: *kumu*. bottom, base, foundation; main stalk of a tree.

Mangarevan: *tumu*. tree trunk, stump; cause, origin, source.

Marquesan: *tumu*. tree trunk, stem; tree; bottom, base, foundation; the stumps of a beard [Crook et al. (1998)].

TAHITIC

Tahitian: *tumu*. base or trunk of a tree or plant (below the first leaves), stump, stem; root metaphorical); base, foundation, reason, cause [additional sources: Wahlroos (2002), Lemaître (1973)].

Tuamotuan: *tumu*. source, root, cause, origin; trunk, stump.

Maori: *tumu* foundation; stump, post.

Rarotongan: *tumu*. cause, reason; source (e.g., of a river), place of origin; foundation of a house, base of a mountain; tree stump, tree trunk, tap-root.

Tongareva: *tumu*. buttocks; base; cause, reason.

Reflexes of *ra*akau occur throughout Polynesian, with the meanings ‘tree’ or ‘wood’. In some languages reflexes of *ra*akau mean ‘piece of wood’, ‘stick’; in some they refer to specific
wooden implements. In several East Polynesian languages the word means ‘medication’ or ‘medicine’, through metonymy akin to the English ‘herb’. ‘Wood’ or ‘tree’ are reasonable metonyms for ‘medicine’ in the context of Polynesian medicine; of the two dozen principal plant species of the traditional Tahitian pharmacopeia, about half are trees or woody shrubs (Petard 1972). Klar and Jones attempt to somehow use this secondary meaning to interpret the semantics of the protoform *tumu ra?akau. However the two have clearly separate histories, and no such relationship is apparent.

**EAST POLYNESIAN**

**Rapanui:** ra?akau. castor bean; goods, property; medicine.

**CENTRAL EAST POLYNESIAN**

**MARQUESIC**

**Hawaiian:** la?au. tree, plant, wood, timber, forest, stick, pole, rod, splinter, thicket, club; medicine; canoe end-piece (in compounds).

**Mangarevan:** rakau. wood; tree; medicine.

**Marquesan:** ?akau, ka?:au. wood, tree, plant; type of club.

**TAHITIC**

**Tahitian:** ra?:au. plant, tree, wood, timber; medicine.

**Tuamotuan:** rakau. medicine; tree, plant; stick, twig, piece of wood in general; log; spear, weapon.

**Maori:** rakau. tree; wood, timber; stick, spar, mast; weapon.

**Rarotongan:** ra?kau, ra?ka. tree, bush, plant; timber, piece of wood, stick, pole, plank, board, bat, racquet; medicine.

**Mangaia:** rakau. tree, bush, plant; piece of wood, stick, wooden object; medicine.

**Tongareva:** rakau. stick, plank, timber, wood.

The compound of the reflexes of *tumu* and *ra?akau* appears in Tahitian, Rarotongan, and the Marquesic languages, meaning either ‘tree trunk’ or ‘tree’. In none of these languages has this compound undergone any other semantic extension. From its distribution, the form can be reconstructed to Proto Central East Polynesian.

**EAST POLYNESIAN**

**Rapanui:** —

**CENTRAL EAST POLYNESIAN**

**MARQUESIC**

**Hawaiian:** kumula?:au. tree.

**Mangarevan:** tumu rakau. tree trunk.

**Marquesan:** tumu ?akau, tumu ka?:au (with metathesis). tree.

**TAHITIC**

---

57 In Hawaiian boat construction, the projecting bow and the stern pieces are sometimes made of separate pieces sewn on to a dugout base, and respectively called la?:au ihu ‘bow wood’ and la?:au hope ‘stern wood’. I have not seen either of those called just la?:au.

58 The meaning ‘medicine’ is attested in the first substantial Rapanui dictionary (Roussel 1908; Churchill 1912), but not in later wordlists. Modern Rapanui uses ra?akau only in the sense of ‘castor bean’ (Fuentes 1960; Arredondo 1988; Blixen 1972). The Tahitian form ra?:au appears in loanwords (Arredondo 1988).


Tahitian: *tumu ra?au* tree.

Tuamotuan: —

Maori: —

Rarotongan, Mangaia: *tumu rakaup* tree; trunk, log.

Tongareva: —

Reflexes of *tumu ra?akau* never mean ‘wood’, only ‘tree trunk’ and hence ‘tree’. It appears that the compound is used specifically to avoid the ambiguity between ‘wood’ and ‘tree’, and in some languages it has largely replaced the reflex of *ra?akau* as the word for ‘tree’. That argues that the word never meant ‘wood’, as Klar and Jones would have it, even if it was present in Proto East Polynesian.

Klar and Jones are not precise in describing the semantic path from Polynesian *tumu ra?akau* to Chumashan *tomolo*. By their original proposal (A:474, 476; B:384), a reflex of *tumu ra?akau* meant ‘wood’, ‘source of wood’, or ‘economically useful tree’ in the Polynesian donor language, and was borrowed into Chumash with the sense of ‘tree for making boat planks’, while at the same time expanding its Chumashan meaning through metonymy to signify ‘planked boat’; elsewhere, they suggest the Polynesian word for ‘wood’ was misunderstood by the Chumash to have meant ‘boat’ (A:476). In later papers (B:397; D:89; E:175), they advocate a more complex scenario within Chumash from ‘wood’ to ‘planked boat’. In all these variations, the Polynesian *tumu ra?akau* is taken to have meant ‘wood’ or ‘wood source’.

But as shown here, no reflex of *tumu ra?akau* ever meant ‘wood’. Nor would the Chumash borrow a word for ‘wood’, to them a familiar and much-utilized material, for which the word has been reconstructed back to Proto-Chumashan *pono*, and is reflected in all its daughter languages (Klar 1977:115-116).

Semantically, the closest one can come to rescuing Polynesian *tumu ra?akau* as a source for Chumashan *tomolo* is by positing that the Polynesian word ‘tree’ was borrowed into Chumash with the sense ‘yellow pine’, a tree favored for boat construction, which then became the word for plank boat (this semantic path has not been suggested by Klar and Jones.) The metonymic extension from ‘yellow pine’ to ‘boat’, which I discuss at length below, is certain. However, the Chumash would not have been likely to borrow a Polynesian word to replace the name of a tree long familiar to them, after a very brief and superficial encounter.

Phonologically, Jones and Klar’s suggested Polynesian source for the borrowing, *tumu ra?au*, does not fit what is known of Polynesian historical phonology. To get from PPN *tumu ra?akau* to *tumu ra?au*, two shifts are required, namely *?i>*∅ followed by *k>*?, as discussed in section 7. The change *?i>*∅ can be reconstructed as having affected PCE, since no Central East Polynesian language has preserved PEP *?*. But the change *k>*? occurred separately and later in several Central East Polynesian languages and cannot be reconstructed to any older subgroup.

As I have shown above, the Chumash *tomol* came to exist, at the latest, just as people were entering East Polynesia, and therefore speaking Proto East Polynesian (not PCEP, as Klar and Jones suggest at times). The split of PEP into Rapanui and PCEP would have yet to occur, the PCE shift to *?i>*∅ would be later still, and the shift from *k to ? would occur in some daughter languages even later. Even if some unattested dialect of PEP existed in which *? had already been lost, the subsequent *k>*? shift would still be unexplained. Klar and Jones refer to this phonological mismatch (B:384) and propose, ad hoc, such an unattested Polynesian dialect. But to acknowledge the earlier sound change, they propose that this would be a dialect of PCEP, which would have to be considerably later than the date of contact.
Put another way, if Polynesians had reached the California coast at the end of the first millennium AD, the only time at which the chronologies of both the earliest *tomol* and the settlement of East Polynesia might overlap, their phonetic form of the word in question, if they had it, would then be *tumu ra?akau*. I won’t attempt to predict the exact form this word would evolve to in the Chumashan languages by AD 1800, but it is certain that the *k* would persist, since Proto Chumashan *k* is reflected as *k* in all Southern Chumashan languages (Klar 1977:11-13, 29). Since the word *tomol(o)* and its reconstructed protoforms contain no *k*, it cannot have come by that route.

To summarize, *tomol(o)* is not a Polynesian loan. There is no evidence that a reflex of the Polynesian protoform which Klar and Jones propose existed when the *tomol* was invented. If it did, it did not sound as they claim it did, did not mean what they claim it did, and would not have been borrowed as they suggest.  

### 9.4 Discussion: The Linguistic Case for Polynesian Contact

Klar and Jones’s linguistic argument for Polynesian-Chumash contact is not supported. The three Polynesian sources proposed would be reconstructed as *taraiga* ‘carving’, *tia* ‘spike’ and related meanings, and *tumu ra?akau* ‘tree trunk’ in the Polynesian language spoken at the time of the proposed Californian contact. None of them are semantically plausible as sources for a term for boat in a borrowing language, as detailed above, and none of them are reflected in boat-building terminology anywhere in East Polynesia. Two of the words, *taraiga* and *tumu ra?akau*, are also excluded for phonological reasons as the sources of the Gabrielino *tarainxa* ‘tule boat’ and Chumash *tomol* ~ *tomolo* ‘plank boat’, and neither of the two can be securely reconstructed to proto East Polynesian.

While each of these claimed etymologies fails to stand on each its own, the combination of all three is even less plausible. This combination would require a scenario in which a brief encounter between the Polynesian visitors and the indigenous Americans would result in no less than three different borrowed terms, one into Chumash and two separate ones into Gabrielino, with each requiring a separate set of implausible semantic and phonological changes. As Anderson (2006:759) points out, the Chumash would be more likely to have borrowed directly a reflex of the near-universal Proto Polynesian *waka*, ‘boat’.  

On closer look, the case for Polynesian-Chumash contact turns out to have no foundation in archaeology, linguistics or boat technology. While it remains possible that prehistoric Polynesians reached North America, there remains no evidence to prefer placing this contact in Southern California over any other location between the Aleutian Islands and Colombia. Any

---

59 Terry Hunt (quoted in Lawler 2010:1347) proposes that *tomol(o)* might have been a late borrowing into Chumashan, through one of the many Polynesians recruited as sailors aboard European ships in the late 18th and early 19th centuries. Aside from the same semantic objections which apply to an old borrowing, *tomol* ‘boat’ was recorded in 1769 (as mentioned above), only two years after the first European contact with Tahiti and a decade before Cook reached Hawaii, and long before any East Polynesian sailors were so recruited.

60 Klar and Jones (A:476; B:392-393; D:766) argue that the Chumash would not have borrowed the generic word for ‘boat’, as they doubtlessly already had terms for boats in general and for specific types of boats. However, American English has borrowed from Mexican Spanish the generic terms *sombrero* ‘hat’ and *salsa* ‘sauce’ to refer to more specific meanings associated with Mexican culture. The Chumash could likewise have borrowed a generic Polynesian term to refer to a Polynesian type of boat.
such contact remains in the realm of pure speculation.

10 Local Etymologies

I have shown above that the proposed Polynesian etymologies do not hold, which reopens the question of the linguistic history of the Gabrielino and Chumashan words under discussion. In the etymological study of any language, one encounters words resistant to historical analysis. This is true even for languages such as English, with its wealth of documentation, historical materials from the language itself and from related languages, and centuries of intensive study. Certainly many opaque etymologies will be expected for a poorly documented language such as Gabrielino, or in members of an isolated language family such as Chumashan. Therefore, the lack of an internal etymology for a Chumashan word does not strengthen the case for an external origin, as Klar and Jones (A:473, B:381) argue for.tomol(o). As it turns out, I will show here that all three words in question — Gabrielino tarainxa and ti?at, and Chumashan tomol(o) — have discernible linguistic histories, which do not involve borrowings from other languages.

10.1 A Local Etymology for tarainxa

Besides the early wordlists, nearly all the extant data on the Gabrielino language comes from the field notes of John Peabody Harrington, who worked with some of the last speakers of the language and collected a great deal of phonetically precise and linguistically sophisticated lexical and grammatical data. Harrington made an effort to re-elicit the earlier wordlists of Hale and Taylor. After several failed attempts to re-elicit Hale’s or Taylor’s forms for ‘boat’ from his informants (Harrington 1986, 3:103:632, 747), one informant (perhaps Jesús Jauro) produced the following:

\[
g. [Gabrielino] \text{taráaynxa’} \text{ está horqueteado, tiene horqueta,} \\
\text{e.g., está horqueteado el palo, tiene horqueta el palo.} \\
[\text{is forked, has a fork, e.g., the stick is forked, the stick has a fork}]
\]

\[
g. \text{taráayn’exáa, abre las piernas, spread your legs.} \\
\text{Tr[anslate]s. una horqueta: pokúu’ taráaynxa’}, \\
\text{e.g., the palo de sauco horqueteado [forked stick of elder] used by game players.} \\
\text{N[escit] “tarayna”} \\
[\text{Harrington 1986, 3:103:112. Comments in brackets are mine. Gabrielino forms are bolded for clarity}]
\]

There seem to be two forms here, the adjectival ta’rajnxa\(^2\) ‘forked’ and the imperative verb ta’rajn?exa: ‘be forked (imperative)’. Both forms are based on a stem ta’ra: ‘fork’. In the neighboring Takic language Kitanemuk there exists a nominal root tara- ‘fork’ (Anderton 1988:516), as in \text{tara-hu’t}, ‘cradleboard’, lit. ‘forked willow’, and \text{tara-ka}’j: ‘cloven (said of deer’s hoof)’, ‘forked pole’. In the closely related Serrano, the word for ‘forked stick’ is tará’qa’, also meaning ‘cross’ (Ramón and Elliott 2000:58, 59, 149, 553). In Kitanemuk, the derivational suffix \text{-ka}’j produces from a nominal stem X another nominal or adjectival stem meaning ‘characterized by X’ (Anderton 1988:143), in this case ‘fork’ > ‘forked, forked object’. The Serrano example appears to exactly parallel the Kitanemuk one. Possibly the Luiseño placename taráxa, originally referring to Saddleback Mountain (Elliott 1999), is related. I thus tentatively parse the Gabrielino form ta’rajnxa\(^2\) as tará-i-n-xa\(^2\) {fork-?-?-characteristic}, with the stem and final suffix corresponding exactly to the Kitanemuk forms. The medial morpheme or...
morphemes are obscure to me at present.

Merriam’s Gabrielino wordlist also includes the following pairs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;O-hā’&gt; ‘sand’</td>
<td>: &lt;O-hā’ting&gt; ‘sandy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Kwe-nar&gt; ‘mud’</td>
<td>: &lt;Kwe-nahíng&gt; ‘muddy’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;To-tah’&gt; ‘rock’</td>
<td>: &lt;To-to’-ting-ah&gt; ‘rocky’ [Merriam 1903a]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All three pairs show a pattern of deriving an adjective from a corresponding noun by adding a suffix, transcribed as -<ngah> or -<ingah>, to the stem. If these can be read as -(i)-<nxa>-<nxa>, they would provide further examples of the adjectivizing morpheme in tarainxa. In Merriam’s orthography these morphemes would normally be read as -<nxa>-<nxa>, but the locative suffix -pa does not easily fit here semantically, unless, perhaps, ‘sandy’, actually refers to ‘a sandy place’, etc. I cannot at this point easily choose one of these interpretations over the other.

As mentioned in section 8.2, Merriam (1903a) records the Gabrielino form <Hoo-pā’-kah (a point) tar-ri’-n-hah> ‘A kind of pointed instrument’, following a list of other tools (but separate from the list of musical instruments), and across the page from the term for ‘tule boat’. <Hoo-pā’-kah> is also glossed elsewhere as ‘sharp’ and as ‘stone-pointed arrow’. I read this as hu’paka tarainxa, lit. ‘split point’. This might be a a tool like a fork, or it might refer to a musical instrument, the split-stick clapper (Wallace 1978b:644). Harrington’s po’ku’-ta’rajixa (po’ku’:=‘one’, translating Spanish una) may refer to a game piece, or again to a clapper, as used for musical accompaniment during gambling games.

Harrington’s verb ta’ra’rajixa, the imperative ‘be split’, is distinct from ta’rajixa, its final morpheme derives from xa: ‘be, have’. It does not relate directly to the issues here.

Although the full parsing of the form is not fully clear, the meaning ‘forked’, is unambiguous. In Harrington’s examples the word is used as a noun as well as an adjective, i.e., ‘forked’, forked thing’, as with the Serrano and Kitanemuk cognates. It would be very unusual for such a long phonetic form, ta’rajixa, to represent two unrelated homonyms, ‘forked thing’ and ‘boat’. I propose here that the forms given by Hale, Taylor and Merriam for ‘boat’ are in fact the same word as Harrington’s form for ‘forked’. In the three-bundle and five-bundle tule canoes of Southern California and elsewhere, each side was formed of a long bundle of tule reeds tied together, with the bundles pushed apart over the keel bundle in the middle; the ends of two side bundles are tied to each other at either end of the boat, giving the appearance at each end of a single bundle forking into two thinner side bundles; hence ta’rajixa ‘forked thing’ refers to a tule-bundle boat, as glossed by Merriam. When the early vocabularies were collected, the old plank boats and their name had been mostly forgotten, but Gabrielino people, even those living near the San Gabriel mission, far away from the coast, were still familiar with tule boats and some knew their name.

With a native etymology for this word, an explanation based on borrowing from another language is no longer necessary. Certainly the word cannot be considered ‘anomalous’, as Klar and Jones put it (A:475; B:390, 396; D:90; E:176), at least not in the usual sense of a odd phonotactics or opaque morphology, which often characterize borrowings.

### 10.2 A Local Etymology for ti?at

Here I propose an etymology for the Gabrielino word for ti?at, ‘planked boat’, though I consider it less certain than that of tarainxa. I propose that it comes from an otherwise unattested
Gabrielino verb stem, \(ti'\text{a}-\) ‘to stack up’, and that the word literally means ‘stacked up thing’.

Luiseño has a verb stem, \(te?\text{a}-\) (intransitive form), glossed ‘be supported, be braced; get stuck; be stacked up’ (Elliott 1999), and ‘exert opposing force, parry a blow, prop up a structure’ (Bright 1968). It is used to refer to wood stacked up in a fire. The transitive form, \(te?i-\), glossed ‘to support, brace’, also refers to a bird building its nest (Bright 1968); this verb underlies the noun \(te?:\text{if} 'bird’s nest’.

Hill and Nolasquez (1973) and Hill (2005:199) list the Cupeño place name \(\text{a}sw\text{a}t p\text{o}'ti\text{a}\) ‘Eagle’s nest, place where baby eagles where captured’, which they gloss \(\text{a}sw\text{a}-t p\text{o}'-ti-\text{a}, \{\text{eagle-NPN 3SG-roost-PSD}\}, and a corresponding item, \(ti\text{a}-\) ‘to roost, of birds (class VI verb)’. I propose that Cupeño verb \(t\text{i}\text{a}-\) is cognate with the Luiseño one, and means not ‘to roost’ (as in Hill) but ‘to build by stacking up’ (as in Luiseño). I reconstruct the Proto-Cupan form *\(t\text{i}\text{a}-\), since Luiseño e often corresponds to Proto Cupan *\(i\) (Bright and Hill 1967:115).

This sense, of a structure made of smaller things stacked and holding each other up, fits a boat whose sides are made of rows of attached small planks set atop each other like rows of bricks. I do note that a plank boat is different from pile of firewood or a bird’s nest.

Based on the limited records for the language, Gabrielino always lengthens the second vowel of CVCV verb stems. Other, similar lengthening processes occur in the language for other verb stem shapes and for non-verbal stems, under more complex conditions. Consider the following examples from Munro (2000), based on Harrington’s notes, with some Takic cognates (K. = Kitanemuk, Anderton 1988; L. = Luiseño, Elliott 1999):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{kwa?a:} & \quad \text{‘eat’} & \quad \text{K. kwa?, L. qwa?} \\
\text{maxa:} & \quad \text{‘give’} & \quad \text{K. mak, L. ma'xani (transitive)} \\
\text{pefa:} & \quad \text{‘leave’} & \\
\text{moka:} & \quad \text{‘kill’} & \quad \text{K. mik, L. 'mokna ‘kill’} \\
\text{jake:} & \quad \text{‘dance’} & \quad \text{L. 'jaki ‘[kind of dance]’} \\
\text{c\text{e}?:e:} & \quad \text{‘sing’} & \\
\text{jari:} & \quad \text{‘remain’} & \\
\text{kovi:} & \quad \text{‘be hungry’} & \\
\text{pako:} & \quad \text{‘enter’} & \\
\text{hoho:} & \quad \text{‘fart’} & \quad \text{K. huhu?} \\
\text{koko:} & \quad \text{‘kill’} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

And so, a Gabrielino cognate of Proto Cupan *\(t\text{i}\text{a}-\) ‘stack up’ would surface as \(t\text{i}\text{a}-\). It remains to be shown that a nominal form can be constructed from this verb stem by adding the absolutive suffix -\(t\), with the derived noun taking on the sense of the patient or object of the verb.

The most common way of deriving an unpossessed patient noun from a verb stem in the Takic languages is by adding the absolutive suffix -\(i\text{f}\)~\(~i\text{d}~\text{i\text{f}S}\), for example, Luiseño \(te?:\text{if}\) ‘bird’s nest’ mentioned above, Kitanemuk \(mak-i\text{f}s ‘gift’ < mak ‘give’ (Anderton 1988), or Gabrielino \(kwa?-i\text{d} ‘food’ < kwa?\text{a:} ‘eat’ (Merriam 1903a). However, there exists in some Takic

\(^{61}\) The gloss \{\text{eagle-NPN 3SG-roost-PSD}\} is following Hill (2005:199). NPN is a non-possessed noun suffix, the so-called Uto-Aztecan absolutive suffix. PSD is a suffix marking a noun as possessed. An alternate analysis would be \(\text{a}sw\text{a}-t p\text{o}'-ti\text{a}, with \(ti\text{a} a\) stem which does not take a possessive suffix (Hill 2005:170-171).
languages a more marginal derivational pattern involves adding the absolutive suffix -t. In Kitanemuk, what Anderton (1988:150, 692-697) calls the ‘general nominal’ is formed by suffixing -at~ats to an unpossessed verb stem, e.g., mayha‘give birth’ > mayha-t ‘child’; punita‘play game’ > punita-t ‘game’. In Cupeño (Hill 2005:298-299), an unpossessed noun can be formed from a transitive verb stem by adding the absolutive suffix -t~t; this derived noun may be a patient of the verb.

The Cupeño and Kitanemuk evidence makes it plausible that the -t nominalizer existed throughout Takic, including Gabrielino. The Cupeño semantics do not exactly match those expected for Gabrielino ti?at-t, but the semantics of nominalization in Gabrielino may differ. There may be enough material in the notes of Merriam and Harrington to clarify this issue in future work. At present, the possibility remains that Gabrielino ti?at has the etymology ‘stacked-up thing’, from an otherwise unrecorded root but with recorded cognates in Luiseño and Cupeño. In any case, as with ta'rainxa‘above, the word cannot be considered ‘odd’ as Klar and Jones suggest (B:389), at least in the sense of morphological shape or phonotactics.

10.3 A Local Etymology for tomol(o)

As Klar and Jones themselves have mentioned (A:476; B:376-378, 392, 397), in some Chumashan languages the word for ‘planked boat’ is formally identical to that meaning ‘yellow pine’. This has been noted in print at least as early as Kroeber (1910:268 n.3), and later by Heizer (1941a:60-61), Heizer and Massey (1953:298), and Hudson et al. (1978:23). Klar and Jones (B:376-378) present in detail the recorded Chumash forms. In their interpretation, tomol ‘plank boat’ is a later semantic development from tomol ‘yellow pine’ (for which they apparently advocate a Polynesian origin), with the sense of ‘wood suitable for plank boat making’. They contrast tomol ‘yellow pine’ with Chumash terms for other types of pines.

I argue here that tomol ‘yellow pine’ is an old Chumash word, of unknown etymology, and is the source for the term for plank boat, as was already suggested by Heizer (1941a), Hudson et al. (1978: 22-23) and perhaps others.

The following sources attest the Chumashan ‘tomol ‘pine’. The list is not exhaustive, and

---

62 Hill sees an aspectual distinction between the Cupeño -its nominalizer and the -ot nominalizer, following the earlier analysis of Jacobs (1975:71). In Hill’s analysis, the -ot deverbal nouns refer to the objects of verbs describing actions in the immediate past, or ones still relevant within the current discourse context. This does not seem to apply in the Kitanemuk examples, nor, I speculate, in Gabrielino.

63 Klar and Jones’s comment about ti?at being ‘odd’ is attributed to a personal communication with Pamela Munro. They never clarify whether that refers in fact to any aspect of the word itself. Elsewhere (A:475, B:390) they quote Munro as saying that “ti’at is somewhat odd in having no stress or length marked”, which refers to the transcription, not the word itself. This comment of Munro’s may be based on the secondary source (Hudson et al. 1978) used by Klar and Jones, which quotes Harrington but omits his stress and length marks.

64 In western U.S. English, the term ‘yellow pine’ encompasses ponderosa Pine (Pinus ponderosa) and Jeffrey Pine (Pinus jeffreyi), two species of closely similar appearance, lumber quality and geographic distribution within California.

65 Klar and Jones (B:376) mention Kroeber (1910) as a source for tomol ‘pine’; Kroeber’s sources are Taylor and Gatschet, as given here. They also mention Harrington as another source for Island Chumash tmol ‘pine’. Harrington only recorded tmolo ‘boat’ when reeliciting Taylor’s wordlist. His informant, Fernando Librado, speculates that “since make cayucos [canoes] out of pine, might call the latter also tmolo” [Harrington 1986,
more instances probably exist in Harrington’s notes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'tomol'</td>
<td>‘pine’</td>
<td>Purisimeño [&lt;Tómol&gt;, Arroyo de la Cuesta 1837:8].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomol</td>
<td>‘pine-tree’</td>
<td>Barbareño or Cruzeño. The informant was born on Santa Cruz island ca. 1781 but was baptized and lived at the Santa Barbara mission [&lt;tomol&gt;, Taylor 1860b].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tomol'</td>
<td>‘Pine’</td>
<td>Barbareño (Kaswa, near the mission) [&lt;to’-molgh&gt;, Gatschet 1879:444].</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomoł</td>
<td>‘pine’</td>
<td>Barbareño. “The kind of pine we see on top of the ridge here are called tomoł — that is what the people called it.” [&lt;tomol&gt;], Luisa Ignacio, informant; Harrington 1986, 3:20:283, recorded 1913-14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tomtol</td>
<td>‘pines’</td>
<td>Barbareño [Juan de Jesús Justo, informant; Blackburn 1975:209].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The form given by Juan de Jesús Justo displays a glottalized m, as do some of the Barbareño variants for the homonym signifying ‘boat’. This further reinforces the identity of the two forms, especially in light of Klar and Jones’s reconstruction of the earlier form, based on the presence of this glottalization, discussed in section 8.4.

The identification of tomol specifically as ‘yellow pine’ comes from Harrington, who distinguishes it from tak, a class of trees including all other pines of the area (Hudson et al. 1978:48 n. 3), and less suitable for plank boats. This seems reasonable, but remains to be verified.

Of the sources here, Arroyo de la Cuesta’s form is in Purisimeño, which was spoken well outside the range of yellow pines, but the word could have been borrowed from the neighboring Barbareño or Ineseño. Taylor’s informant gives the forms for both ‘pine’, <tomol>, and ‘canoe, boat’, <tomolo>. The different forms in this doublet might be due to free phonological variation, but more likely, the informant used the Cruzeño form for ‘boat’, but had borrowed a Barbareño term for ‘yellow pine’, since no pines grow in the Channel Islands except a stunted form of the Torrey Pine (Pinus torreyana), now restricted to parts of Santa Rosa Island (Griffin and Critchfield 1972). Luisa Ignacio’s comment, if recorded near Santa Barbara, would refer to the top of the Santa Ynez mountains, which are too low to support yellow pines; perhaps her identification was inaccurate.

It appears that tomol can only be demonstrated to mean ‘pine’ in Barbareño. Although terms for various types of pines have been recorded from Ventureño and Ineseño speakers (Klar and

---

3:68:31] and “since cayucos made of pine, might perhaps call a pine tree t’molo” [ibid., 3:68:196]. These appear to be ad hoc etymologies, fashioned in response to Harrington’s inquiry. Jones and Klar (2012:221) read this as saying that “the primary meaning of tomol was not pine,” but Librado is clearly non-committal, and would not have known the early history of the word.

66 Taylor gives the informant’s name as Joseph Camuluyaset. In mission records he appears as José Crespín Camuluyatset, born in Liam [Santa Cruz Island], and baptized in Santa Barbara in 1819 at age 38 (Huntington Library Early California Population Project, http://www.huntington.org/Information/ECPPmain.htm ).

67 In Gatschet’s orthography <gh> is ‘a sonant guttural aspirate (Arabic ghain)’ [1879:423]. Oscar Loew, the collector, probably heard tomol’ or perhaps tomol, compare his <ulgh> ‘foot’ to hii (Whistler 1980).
I know of no record of *tomol* as a term for pine in these languages, nor any other term specifically for ‘yellow pine’. Whether a cognate existed in Ventureño or Ineseño is unknown.

Drift logs of redwood were the preferred material for canoe planks, but *tomol*, or yellow pine, was considered a workable material as well (Hudson et al. 1978: 46-50). Could *tomol* pine have taken its name from the word for the plank canoe?

In English, for example, there are many artifacts named for the material from which they were manufactured: ‘glass’, ‘wood’, ‘box’, ‘broom’, ‘iron’, ‘silver’, ‘cloth’, ‘clothes’, ‘marble’, ‘horn’, and many others. On the other hand, I know of no clear examples of materials named after items made of them. A simple explanation is that in general a material is known, and thus has a name, long before any particular use is made of it: glass (the material) was known and named before glass (the vessel), and so on.68

In the specific case of trees and woods named after artifacts, a search in a large English dictionary for ‘-boat’ and ‘-wood’ compounds yields only ‘bowwood’, ‘buttonwood’, ‘greasewood’, ‘coachwood’, ‘lancewood’, ‘leatherwood’ and ‘bottle tree’. These are all species exotic to England, and became known to English speakers together with the use to which they were put. In no case was an older name for a native tree replaced with the name of an artifact or a compound based on an artifact.

In the languages of California, I know of three examples of trees named for their use as sources of boat lumber; all are from far northern California. In Karuk, the word for ‘redwood’ is *ʔutanpahip*, lit. ‘oceanward canoe tree’ (*ʔutan-pan-pah-ʔiip* {ocean-LOC-canoe-tree}, Bright 1957). In nearby Chimariko, the word for ‘redwood’ is *mutumana*, ‘canoe plant’ (*mutuma-NA {canoe-PLANT}), Dixon 1910:314). These examples parallel the English ones: redwood trees do not grow in Karuk or Chimariko territories, and dugout canoes, when used by these peoples, were obtained from the Yurok who lived in the redwood belt to the west (Davis 1961). As in the English examples, the words are compounds, not straight metonyms, and refer to an exotic wood known primarily for one use. In Klamath, the suffix -*ʔim* is used to derive *wondoʔim* ‘fir species used for canoe making’ from *wondo* ‘canoe’. Here the species is not exotic to Klamath territory, but the word relies on a derivational process which is productive in Klamath (cf. *ʔamda* ‘digging stick’, *ʔamdalam* ‘mountain mahogany’), but very rare elsewhere.

Yellow pines were undoubtedly familiar to the Chumash since well before the advent of the plank canoe. Yellow pines grow at high elevations in the mountains north of Santa Barbara and Ventura, within Chumash territory. Their range overlaps much of that of the piñon pine (*Pinus monophylla*), whose seeds, i.e., pine nuts, were a significant food source of the Chumash and other California Indians (Grant 1978:516; Timbrook 2007:142-146; Barrows 1900:63); pine pitch, too, was collected in the mountains on pine-nut collecting trips (Hudson et al. 1978:52). Yellow pines must have had a Chumash name before plank canoes came to be, and this name would not have been replaced by the word for ‘plank canoe’, especially as pine was secondary to salvaged redwood in plank canoe construction (Hudson et al. 1978:46-50). This parallels the earlier argument against the replacement of the word for ‘yellow pine’ by a Polynesian borrowing.

Klar and Jones attempt to bolster their case for a Polynesian source of the word *tomol(o)* by

---

68 In Chumashan languages one finds the sets *poʔn* ‘tree’, ‘wood’ and ‘board’, ‘plank’, ‘stick’ (Whistler 1980); *pox* ‘agave’ and ‘agave fiber cord’ (Hudson & Blackburn 1982:90); *ʔaxpiʔil* ‘nerve, sinew, muscle’ and ‘bowstring’ (Whistler 1980). I believe that here as well the materials preceded the objects.
arguing that the word (or its suggested protoform *tomolo?) is unusual in being so long without being a transparent compound (B:381, 385). I will not attempt to offer an etymology of *tomol(o) ‘pine’, but a counterexample is Barbareño *toq’olo ‘armpit’, with the same phonotactic shape as *tomolo or its variant *tomolo. *toq’olo is morphologically opaque, and as a term for a body part is not likely to have been borrowed from another language. Perhaps *toq’olo or *tomolo ‘pine’ will some day find full etymological explanations.

10.4 Pine Trees and Wooden Boats in Southern California

Chumash is not the only language in the area where words for ‘pine’ and ‘boat’ are formally identical. Pine/boat homonymy exists in Luiseño, some 200 km south of Chumash territory, and in Kitanemuk, adjacent to Chumash territory in the interior. These two Takic languages are the only languages known to me, in California or elsewhere, in which ‘boat’ and ‘pine’ (or any wood for that matter) are homonyms. The rarity of this semantic equation and the close proximity of the languages which exhibit it imply a historical connection.

The following are the lexical items under discussion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luiseño</td>
<td>*wi’xe-t</td>
<td>‘tree sp. (pine?)’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘tule boat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luiseño</td>
<td>*pawxi-t</td>
<td>‘yellow pine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>‘wooden boat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serrano</td>
<td>wiakt</td>
<td>‘sugar pine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitanemuk</td>
<td>kw’akt</td>
<td>‘tule boat’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proto Cupan</td>
<td>*weket ~ *wexet</td>
<td>‘pine sp.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitanemuk</td>
<td>kwekt</td>
<td>‘tule boat’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I derive all of the above, ultimately, from Proto Uto-Aztecan *wokon-, ‘pine’ or ‘ponderosa pine’ (Fowler 1983:248), and relate the parallel meanings to the Chumashan ones, through contact.

10.4.1 Takic Terms for ‘pine’

The following lists all the Takic reflexes of Proto Uto-Aztecan *wokon- ‘pine’, which vary

---

69 I have done a cursory survey of words for ‘boat’ or ‘canoe’ in standard dictionaries of several California languages. Often the word is a short morpheme with no obvious etymology (Klamath, Shasta, Yurok, Karuk, Achomawi, Yokuts [several varieties]). In a few languages the word has a clear morphology based on a verbal stem: Wiyot, lit. ‘it comes’; Hupa, ‘they travel in it’; Wintu, ‘travels by water’; Maidu, ‘bridge which floats things’; Salinan, ‘travels by water’ (Harrington 1986, 2:84:233); Mesa Grande Diegueño, ‘that which floats’. In a number of others the word recorded is a Spanish or English loan word (Yuki, Nisenan, N. Sierra Miwok, S. Sierra Miwok, Plains Miwok, Tümpisa Shoshone, Chemehuevi), though other words may turn up in older materials. The Gabriélino etymologies suggested in this paper, ‘forked thing’ and ‘stacked-up thing’, are in a class of their own, and so are the Chumash, Luiseño and Kitanemuk ones based on ‘pine’.

70 Manaster Ramer (1993) reconstructs PUA *wokon- ‘pine’; earlier authors reconstruct *woko-.
formally and semantically within the family. These almost never refer to the piñon pines (*P. monophylla, P. edulis*), PNUA *tiba-* (Fowler 1983:237), which form an unambiguously separate lexical category in the NUA languages.71

Direct reflexes of Proto Takic *woko-:
- Cahuilla *wexe-t* ‘pine’ (desert dialect), ‘ponderosa pine’ (mountain dialect)
- Luiseño *wi’xe-t* ‘tree sp.’, *we’xe’ta* ‘pine sp.’
- Gabriéno *wexa-t* ‘pine’ (a loanword?)
- Kitanemuk *wokah-t* ‘gray pine (*P. sabiniana*)’
- Serrano *wo’xo’h-t* (?) ‘pine sp.’72

A reflex of Proto Takic *woko-, of unclear provenance, and its loans:
- Serrano *wiakax-t*–*wiak-t-*wi*ax-t* ‘sugar pine, Coulter pine (*P. coulteri*)’
- Cupeño *wiçaka-t* ‘piñon pine’
- Gabriéno *wifjaxa-r*–*wefjaxa-r* ‘pine’
- Kawaiisu (Numic, not Takic) *wiyahaka-ti-bi* ‘sugar pine’

Loans within Takic:
- Gabriéno *woxo-t* ‘gray pine’ < Kitanemuk *wokoh-t* ‘gray pine’
- Luiseño compounds based on *wi’xe-t*:
  - Luiseño *’pa-wxiti* ‘yellow pine’

---

71 The following are the sources for this list; the forms are transcribed into standard orthography, except where they are phonetically imprecise: Desert Cahuilla — *wexet* ‘pine’, Seiler and Hioki (1979); *<Wëch>-ah-tut’* ‘ponderosa pine’ (Merriam 1907a); Mountain Cahuilla — *<Wëch>-et*, *<Wëch>-et* ‘ponderosa pine’ (Merriam 1910); Cupeño — *wo’xiti-t* ‘pine’, Hill (2005:472), Hill and Nolasquez (1973); *<We’-chuk>-ket po-wel’-lah* ‘[the base of] piñon pine’, Merriam (1933), analyzed as in Hill (2005:191); Luiseño — *pawxit* and *wi’xe’tut*, Elliott (1999); *wixet* and *pawxit* are identified as unspecified kinds of tree in Hyde and Elliott (1994:90); *wixenivfla*, Bright (1968); *we’xenvefla* (Soboba dialect), Harrington (3:103:650); Gabriéno — *<wach-o’t* ‘gray pine’, Merriam (1903b); *<ushi-a’gar* (Gatschet 1879), *<wish-y-arkr* (Taylor 1860a), *wefjaxar* (Harrington 1986, 3:103:650), *wifjaxar* (Harrington 1986, 3:102:626); *<wexat>* ‘pine’ (Galloway 1978, probably after Harrington); Kitanemuk — Anderton (1988), specifically *wokoh* (after Harrington) or *wo’koh* (after Zigmond) ‘gray pine’; *<Waw’-kot* ‘gray pine’ (Merriam 1903d); Serrano — *<Wi’-yahkt* ‘sugar pine’, *<We’-aht*>, *<We’-hah’-kut* ‘Coulter pine’, Merriam (1907b,c); *<wuxa’ot* ‘Has edible seeds. a smaller pine sp., lots at Big Bear’ (Harrington 1986, 3:101:23); Munro (1977:312) quotes Donald Crook as saying Serrano stress tends to fall on initial and long vowels, but is generally lexically determined; but Ramón and Elliott (2000:xxxiv) state that Serrano has no word-level stress. Kawaiisu — *wiyahaka-ti-bi* ‘sugar pine’, Zigmond (1981:50); Proto Cupan — Bright and Hill *we’xet* (1967:183); the justification for the form *we’ket* is given here in the text.

The word *we’xe’ta* ‘another kind [of pine]’ appears in Harrington (1986, 3:103:650), among several Luiseño (‘Reyano’) words, which themselves appear within the Gabriéno notes. From the context *we’xe’ta* appears to be Luiseño, not Gabriéno. In addition, the glottalization and the absolutive -ta are characteristic of Luiseño, and the stressed syllable xe is not long, as would be typical for Gabriéno.

72 Harrington’s *<wuxa’ot>* is irregular either in the language or in its transcription. Harrington usually uses <o> to mark the sound [ɔ] (Anderton 1991) but a root *wixi- or such cannot be related to the protoform *woko- by any known Takic sound changes. On the other hand *wo’xo’h-t* would be a straightforward cognate for Kitanemuk *wokoh*, the recorded regular reflex, but that would have Harrington transcribing Serrano o’ as <o> instead of his customary <or>.
Luiseño *wi’xe-nivifḻa, we’xe-mevefḷa ‘pine sp.’
Derived form of Proto Cupan *we’ke~*we’xe–:
Cahuilla *wexatu-t ‘ponderosa pine’ (desert dialect)
Luiseño *wi’xe’tu-t ‘sugar pine, Coulter pine’
Cupeño wa’xiti-t ‘pine’

Some of these etymologies need further comment. Cahuilla *wex-e-t, a regular reflex of the Proto Takic, is semantically broad, and possibly reflects an earlier situation in the Takic languages, where the mountain flora were not yet familiar in detail; this may be the situation in Luiseño as well, though details on the semantics of Luiseño *wi’xe-t are lacking. In Serrano, the word was specialized to refer to sugar pines, and to the similar Coulter pines; and in Luiseño, this root was used to form a new stem to refer to the yellow pines.

Forms deriving from *wiakat and its loans appear in Serrano, Gabrielino, Cupeño and Kawaiisu. The Gabrielino and Cupeño forms show strengthening of the glide ia, to j and ç respectively. Serrano shows variable syncope of the last vowel, which regularly occurs following a stressed syllable (Hill 1967:261). In Gabrielino, the -t absolutive has changed to -r, as occasionally occurs elsewhere (Kroeber 1909:269). The spirantization of the velar in Serrano indicates that it is a back k, since k does not spirantize (Hill 1967:256).

The root wiak- is not a regular reflex of PUA *wokon- in any of the Takic languages or reconstructed proto-languages. I tentatively assume that it ultimately derives from that proto-root. A possible path would be through a Cupan *wiike-, borrowed into Serrano or Proto Serran, and undergoing an irregular change *i > ia, as for example Serrano *po’niava-t ‘skunk’ (Fowler 1983:237) corresponding to Kitanemuk poniva-č ‘id.’ (Anderton 1988) and PNUA *poni- ‘id.’ (Fowler 1983:237). The Gabrielino and Kawaiisu forms could then be loans from Serrano. The shifts *i > *ia and the strengthening of *ia in the Cupeño form argue for a Gabrielino loan.\footnote{Merriam’s Cupeño vocabulary, the source of wičako-t, has other apparent Gabrielino loans.}

For Luiseño *paωxi-t ‘yellow pine’, Bright (1968) proposes the etymology paω-wi’xe-t, {water-pine}. Phonologically, this etymology is a good match, since it explains the initial stress of the compound as a consequence of the long vowel of paω. While it is tempting to relate ‘water’ in the proposed compound to the Luiseño use of the tree as boat material (discussed below), I suggest a different etymology. paω- occurs sporadically in several Northern Uto-Aztecan languages, as an augmentative morpheme.\footnote{Sources for examples showing the paω- augmentative: Luiseño: Elliott (1999); Cahuilla: Seiler and Hioki (1979), Strong (1929); Kitanemuk: Anderton (1988), Merriam (1979); Kawaiisu: Zigmond et al. (1991); Tübatulabal: Voegelin (1958), Merriam (1979); Hopi: Hopi Dictionary Project (1998).}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luiseño</th>
<th>‘naqwut ‘sumac, Malosma laurina’</th>
<th>‘paωnaqwut ‘sumac, Rhus ovata’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Luiseño</td>
<td>‘sukat ‘deer’</td>
<td>‘paωsukat ‘elk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cahuilla</td>
<td>‘puωl ‘curing doctor’</td>
<td>‘paωvuωl ‘bear shaman’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitanemuk</td>
<td>haŋaʔatf́ ‘bee’</td>
<td>pahaŋaʔatf́ ‘yellowjacket’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kawaiisu</td>
<td>tihija ‘deer’</td>
<td>parihiija ‘elk’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tübatulabal</td>
<td>?aʔnint ‘yellow ant’</td>
<td>paωʔaʔnint ‘red ant’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{Intervocalic *p > υ, as in *puωl > paωVuωl, is common in Takic and elsewhere in Uto-Aztecan.}
The Plank Canoe of Southern California

Hopi  

\textit{kunja} ‘fringed sagebrush, \textit{Artemisia frigida}’  

\textit{pakunja} ‘tarragon, \textit{A. glauca}’

This list is not exhaustive, and several other examples exist in the languages listed and in others. However, there are not enough examples in any one language to judge whether this morpheme is productive in it, and so to judge whether words containing it have been borrowed from somewhere else. The \textit{pa}- morpheme is likely cognate with Southern Paiute \textit{pa}\text{?}a ‘high’ (Sapir 1931) and Kawaiisu \textit{pa}\text{?}a ‘high, long, tall’ (Zigmond et al. 1991). In Luiseño, at least, the \textit{a}: is long and attracts stress, just as \textit{pa}: ‘water’ does. The existence of the \textit{pa}- augmentative has been briefly noted by Hill (2005:201) for Cupéno and Takic in general.

Some dictionaries of various Uto-Aztecans languages etymologize the \textit{pa}- morpheme in various compounds as ‘water’ without any semantic justification, where the augmentative clearly makes sense. I suggest that in this case reading \textit{pa}-\textit{wxi}-\textit{t} as ‘water pine’ is not well-supported, and that it is better interpreted as ‘big pine’, distinguished from smaller, economically unimportant pines.\footnote{Serrano has the pair \textit{ju³hat} ‘pine, ponderosa pine’ and \textit{pa-ju³hat³} ‘bigcone spruce (\textit{Pseudotsuga macocarpa})’ (Ramón and Elliott 2000:210; Merriam 1907b, 1909). In contrast to the Luiseño \textit{pawxit}, here \textit{pa}- probably does mean ‘water’, referring to the sap-rich heartwood of this tree.}

Whatever the details of the etymologies for the various reflexes of Proto Takic *\textit{woko}-*, that simple stem is the only one for ‘pine’ that can be reconstructed for Proto Takic, with various branches of the family innovating terms for specific pine varieties. This fits with a scenario where speakers of Proto Takic originated in an area with little diversity of economically useful pines. The speakers of the daughter languages would then have separately developed terms for the varieties of pine in the mountain terrains which they came to know or occupy.

\subsection*{10.4.2 Luiseño Boat Words: \textit{pawxit} and \textit{wixet}}

The identity between the Luiseño forms for ‘wooden boat’ and ‘yellow pine’, \textit{pawxi}-\textit{t}, had been noticed before by Kroeber (1925:654). Kroeber (1910:268) had previously noted the ‘pine’=‘boat’ semantic equation in Chumash; but the connection between the Chumash and Luiseño examples was noted before only by Heizer and Massey (1953:298).\footnote{‘This peculiar canoe-pine linguistic parallel can hardly be fortuitous, and leads one to suspect some specific connection between the Luiseño dugout and the Chumash plank canoe. This possibility is enhanced by the fact that for a long distance north of the Chumash and south of the Luiseño wooden canoes of any kind are unknown. How the development of these types occurred is impossible to say, nor is it easy to imagine what relationships the two boat forms have, since their occurrences are geographically exclusive and they are technologically distinct.” (Heizer and Massey 1953:298)}

Harrington (1986, 3:115:141) translates \textit{pawxit} as ‘board boat’; and in his notes to Boscana (Boscana 1978:112-113) he has the Juaneño forms \textit{pawxi}-\textit{kuluwtal lo³xa³-k} ‘plank canoe’, lit. ‘canoe made of pieces of wood’, \{wooden.boat-ABS wood.piece.\text{INST} make-NMLZ\} (see Elliott 1999:408, 463); and \textit{pawxi}-\textit{ha³ku³-l³-i³}\footnote{Harrington (1986, 3:115:141) translates \textit{pawxit} as ‘board boat’; and in his notes to Boscana (Boscana 1978:112-113) he has the Juaneño forms \textit{pawxi}-\textit{kuluwtal lo³xa³-k} ‘plank canoe’, lit. ‘canoe made of pieces of wood’, \{wooden.boat-ABS wood.piece.\text{INST} make-NMLZ\} (see Elliott 1999:408, 463); and \textit{pawxi}-\textit{ha³ku³-l³-i³} ‘canoe made of wood’ (\{wooden.boat-INST wood.\text{ABS} make-NMLZ\}).} ‘canoe made of wood’ (\{wooden.boat-\text{ABS} wood.\text{INST} make-NMLZ\}).
The Luiseño *wixe-t ‘tule boat’, formally identical to the tree word, is recorded as early as Hale (1846), as wa'xe-t; by Sparkman, “tule canoe formerly used by Luiseño fishermen” (Elliott 1999); by Harrington, “wixet, made of pevéega, round tule” (Harrington 1986, 3:115:141), also with the form *wi:xe:et, and by Bright (1968). The data are summarized by Elliott (1999).

10.4.3 Kitanemuk *kwiakt and *kwekt ‘boat’

Two forms in Kitanemuk are recorded for ‘canoe’: *kwiakt~*kwiaxt and *kwekt, used to describe the tule boats of the neighboring Yokuts of Buena Vista Lake (Anderton 1988). The forms resemble no Yokuts words, but do resemble the Serrano *wiakt~*wiakt~*wiaxt ‘sugar pine, Coulter pine’ and the Proto Cupan *wexet ‘pine’. Kitanemuk territory bordered Chumash territory up to historical times, and there are Chumash loans in Kitanemuk. This would make a Kitanemuk ‘boat’=‘pine’ equation plausibly related to that in Chumash, if one could explain the Kitanemuk form.

To establish a connection between Serrano *wi'akt and Kitanemuk *kwiakt, the shift of the initial consonant from *w to *k has to be explained. Both consonants are present in all Takic languages, normally as reflexes of the same consonants in the proto-language, e.g., in the reflexes of PUA *wokon- ‘pine’, discussed above, and *kwa ‘eat’. However, at least one other example occurs in Kitanemuk showing *w>*k:

Kitanemuk *k'atskaveykə : Serrano waf<k'ubik, watʃkuvik ‘seven’ [Anderton (1988); Merriam (1907d); Hill (1967:27)]

Other than ‘seven’, the numerals 1-10 correspond nearly exactly between Kitanemuk and Serrano, e.g., Kitanemuk *wafts, Serrano *waftah, ‘four’, from which the word for ‘seven’ is derived. A likely explanation for the initial consonant of Kitanemuk *k'atskaveykə is that the *w assimilated to *k under the influence of the subsequent *k.

With this, I posit *w>*k as a sporadic sound change in Kitanemuk, witnessed by the word for ‘seven’. I suggest it operated on an older Kitanemuk form *wi'akt, ‘pine’, either cognate with the identical Serrano form or borrowed from it. Thus at some point Kitanemuk *wi'akt became *kwiaxt, either before or after taking on the secondary meaning ‘boat’, following the semantics of the neighboring Chumash.

This scenario rests on the existence of a sporadic sound change, attested by only one other word, which adds uncertainty to the explanation. Further support to its existence comes indirectly from a well-established similar change in another language: in Italic, word-initial labial *p may assimilate to labiovelar *k, conditioned by *k in the following syllable. This change is sporadic, and is witnessed in Latin by only three instances: *k'ink'e ‘five’ < PIE

---

79 Compare Crespi’s *piut> ‘tobacco’ to the later recorded form *pivat (Elliott 1999).
80 Hale’s list is in the Acjachemem (Juaneño) variety, which usually shows *i>a in unstressed syllables (Lobo et al. 2005:45; Woodward 2007:90).
81 The second k of *kwiakt is marked as retracted by Harrington, with k and k possibly distinct in Kitanemuk, as in Serrano. Zigmond and Merriam, the other transcribers of the language, do not mark this distinction.
*penkʷe, kʷerk-us ‘oak’ < PIE *perkʷ-o-; and kokʷ- ‘to cook’ < PIE *pekʷ- (de Vaan 2008). Such a change is therefore possible, though it may operate only sporadically. Two of these three Latin words happen to be a numeral and a tree, as in Kitanemuk.

As mentioned above, the identity of the velar consonant in the Serrano form wiakt is supported by its occasional spirantization to x, though that phonetic detail is not indicated by Merriam, the source for the form. The presence of the k in corresponding place in the Kitanemuk form further supports the historical connection between the two forms.

Anderton (1988:380) notes that kwiakt is a likely borrowing, because of the final stress, which is atypical for Kitanemuk. It is not clear where the stress falls in the Serrano source proposed here, but stress on the a, which would fit with Anderton’s observation, is not excluded by the data.

The other Kitanemuk form, kwekt, follows similar reasoning. I start with a loan from a Cupan source, *weket; the Cupan languages are the only ones which front Proto Takic *o to e or i. Although all the Cupan languages show spirantization of k to x, this change may have occurred in Proto Cupan after the vowel change, which justifies this protoform. Next come *w>kʷ and lenition of the unstressed vowel, producing kwekt, exactly as with wiakt > kwiakt above. The Cupan source is necessitated by the vowel change, but the location and sociolinguistic situation of this borrowing are unclear.

Serrano and Kitanemuk are closely related and geographically adjacent languages, and the Serrano word could plausibly be borrowed into Kitanemuk for a species of pine distinct from wokoh-t ‘gray pine’, the directly inherited word. Alternatively, the doublet *wokoh-t / *wiak-t could have existed in Proto Serran and inherited by its daughter languages.

There is nothing to indicate at what stage of the formal development of this word it took on the secondary meaning ‘boat’.

10.4.4 Roseño Chumash tak ‘pine’, ‘dugout canoe’

Woodward (1934:121) quotes an earlier publication where a Santa Rosa Chumash of ca. 1820 described the use of dugouts and of plank canoes, and gave two words for ‘boat’, recorded as <toak> and <comow>. As discussed by Klar and Jones (B:378), these words resemble the Central Chumashan words for two types of pine, tak and tomol. Klar and Jones are uneasy with the odd sound changes which the quoted Roseño forms show. I concur, though I believe that these apparent sound changes could be the result of copying errors. I think it is unlikely that <toak> represents tok~toq, the word for the milkweed cordage used for lashing boat planks.

If these forms are correct, then Roseño tak provides another example of a ‘pine’=’boat’ semantic loan. If <comow> refers exclusively to a plank boat, then perhaps <toak>, by contrast, refers to the dugout canoe; both are described in the same source and in the same order.

10.4.5 The Areal Spread of ‘pine’ = ‘boat’

---

82 I have not seen the original form of this text, published in the Santa Barbara Gazette. Woodward accurately quotes a version published in the San Francisco Herald of Dec. 11, 1859.

83 Barbareño and Ineseño tak ‘Pinus sp.’ (Timbrook 2007); Barbareño taq ‘white pine’ (Whistler 1980). Hudson et al. (1978:48 n.3) are not certain about the identity of tak, but believe it refers to all pines other than piñon pines and yellow pines.

84 tak as an example of the boat/pine equivalence has been suggested before by Heizer (1941a).
The distribution of ‘pine’/‘boat’ words — clustered in Southern California and nonexistent elsewhere in the region — indicates a historical connection. As in the Chumash case, the original sense of Luiseño wixet and pawxit was ‘pine’ (going back to Proto Uto-Aztecan), with the sense ‘boat’ coming later. The appearance of this unusual semantic equation in Chumash and the geographically close but unrelated Luiseño can be explained as a semantic loan from one language to the other. Semantic borrowing (Durkin 2009:136; Hock 1986:398) is the process by which a language adopts a meaning for a word on the model of another language. As an example, the English star, originally referring to the celestial object, later came to take on the additional meaning ‘performing celebrity’; on that model, the Spanish estrella ‘star, celestial object’ took on the same secondary meaning, as did the equivalent words in Russian, Turkish, Hebrew and other languages.

In the scenario I suggest here, both the Luiseño and the coastal Chumash had dugout canoes constructed from pine logs; whichever of the two was the first to develop dugout canoes named the boat after its source material, yellow pine; and this type of boat construction and the semantics of its name passed together from one people to the other. At some later time, the Chumash developed the plank canoe, which mostly replaced the dugout but retained its name.

A similar scenario holds in Kitanemuk, where the dual meaning of kwii’akt ~ kwekt is explained as a semantic loan from the neighboring Chumash. No wooden boats existed in inland Southern California, and so the shift ‘pine’ > ‘wooden boat’ > ‘boat’ could not be explained by internal development alone. The semantics of the Kitanemuk word are comfortably explained as a result of contact with the dual meaning of tomol(o) in a Chumashan language.

As a working hypothesis, I will assume that the Chumash built wooden boats before the inhabitants of Luiseño country, and named them after pine trees. Chumash tomol(o) ‘yellow pine; wooden boat’ would then be the source of the semantic development of Luiseño pawxit ‘ponderosa pine; wooden boat’ and wixet ‘pine, tule boat’. But it is possible, in principle, that wooden boats were first built in the south, where Luiseño is now spoken, and that the technology and the term were later taken up in the north, where the planked canoe was later elaborated. It is even possible that the ultimate source was some coastal Yuman language (Hinton 1991:152), which was spoken where Luiseño is now.

The Luiseño doublet pawxit ~ wi’xet could have developed in several ways. By one scenario, wi’xet first took on the general meaning ‘boat’, as in Kitanemuk. ‘pa-wxit would derive separately for the two senses of wi’xet, to mean ‘large pine’ and ‘large boat’, the latter referring to wooden boats. The semantic range of wi’xet ‘boat’ would then shrink to refer only to the lesser, tule-made boats.

In another scenario, Luiseño ‘pa-wxit ‘ponderosa pine’ would derive from wi’xet ‘pine’. Next, ‘pawxit would have taken the secondary meaning ‘wooden boat’, after the Chumash model. And finally, wi’xet would have taken on the meaning ‘lesser boat (i.e., tule boat)’ by back-formation based on pawxit, i.e., ‘big pine’ : ‘big boat’ → ‘(smaller) pine’ : ‘(smaller) boat’. This scenario is more complex, but, as in Chumashan, associates the wooden boat with the particular type of pine from which it is made.

Notably, Gabrielino did not adopt ‘pine’ as a metaphor for either the tule boat or the plank boat. Semantic shifts are in general not predictable, and so any historical conclusions based on this are uncertain; however, it may be that the ancestors of the Gabrielino were not initially bilingual in Chumash, and so used neologisms unmotivated by Chumash semantics to describe the local boats.
10.5 Other Boat Terms in Southern California

Some other boat terms occur in Southern California, which are of interest to the discussion here.

10.5.1 Kawaiisu kwijakata ‘tule boat’

Zigmond et al. (1991) give the Kawaiisu form kwijakata, ‘tule balsa said to be used by the Yokuts’. This is clearly a loan from kwiakt of the neighboring Kitanemuk, showing its irregular w>kw. This implies that the Kawaiisu came to be in the vicinity of Lake Buena Vista after the Kitanemuk, and after the Chumash had developed the word tomol(o) ‘boat’ and passed it as a semantic loan to the Kitanemuk. This is consistent with the chronology of Sutton (2010a).

10.5.2 Kitanemuk tomoʃ ‘large boat’

Anderton (1988:380) gives Harrington’s form tomoʃ, ‘big ship, canoe, steamship’, and notes it as a subset of the more general kwekt/kwiakt ‘boat’ discussed above. This Chumashan loan refers to European ships, but it is not clear whether it refers to the Chumash plank boat as well. ʃ is not a native Kitanemuk phoneme but occurs in Chumashan as an allophone of ʃ. This appears to be a late loan, perhaps even post-mission.

10.5.3 Ventureño Chumash ?axipeneʃ ‘dugout canoe’

Klar and Jones (A:472, B:374) discuss the Ventureño form ?axipeneʃ, ‘dugout canoe’, analyzed as ?axi-pen-ef ‘work.wood-strip.off-RESULTATIVE’ ‘worked timber’ (see Hudson and Blackburn 1982:338). The verbal stem ?axi-pen ‘to work wood’ is recorded in Barbareño and Ineseño as well (Whistler 1980; Applegate 2007) and the etymology is transparent. But Klar and Jones’s statement that “the word is probably from an old stratum of Chumashan development” is not necessarily true. The word is as easily explained as a later replacement for an earlier term, tomol(o), which went from signifying ‘dugout boat’ to ‘plank boat’, as I propose, with ?axipeneʃ filling the semantic gap left behind.

10.5.4 Purisimeño Chumash <swaʃwax> ‘canoe’

Pinart’s 1878 vocabulary of Purisimeño gives the form <swaʃuax>, ‘canoe’ (Heizer 1952:44-45). This is the only known record of this form. Klar and Jones (B:395-397, D:89, E:174-175) discuss it as a possible older word for ‘canoe’ in general, one predating tomol(o).85

The exact phonetic form heard by Pinart is uncertain. Some of the words he recorded bear a final <x> which corresponds to a phonemic /x/ in other, more phonetically reliable sources. For example, his Ventureño <tsitsalsax> ‘thumb’, coresponds to Barbareño ʔs’alxax (Whistler 1980), and his Ineseño <suaʃax> and Ventureño <cuaʃax>, ‘arm’, match Barbareño waʃ‘ax. In other cases the final orthographic <x> occurs where the word actually ends with a phonemic vowel or semivowel, e.g., Ineseño <mohox> ‘beach’ for muhuw (Applegate 2007), or Roseño <huimax> ‘Santa Rosa Island’ for wiʔma or wimaʔ (Whistler 1980; Applegate 1974:194). In the

85 Klar and Jones suggest that the name swaxil, a village on Santa Cruz Island, derives from this root and means something like ‘boat place’ (B:395, 397). They do not give any other examples of a Chumash suffix -il or a similar compound-forming root, in placenames or elsewhere, and I haven’t found any either.
latter cases I read Pinart’s <x> as a mishearing of a devoiced echo vowel, e.g., [wimaʔa] in the last example.

With the latter interpretation, <swašwax> could be [fwafwaʔa], a reduplicated form of fwaʔa. If we allow for f~s alternation (Applegate 1972:60-61; Klar and Jones E:182; but see Klar 1977:127), then this root could be read as swa or swaʔa, ‘tule, Scirpus sp.’ (Heizer 1952:55; Timbrook 2007:203, 206). With that, fwaｆwa could have meant ‘tules’ and referred to a tule boat.

Other than the f~s alternation, this etymology suffers from uncertainty in the identification of the particular species of Scirpus which swa refers to. Of the several species of tule which grow in the area, only round tule, Scirpus acutus, is suitable for building tule boats. Timbrook (2007) has Ineseño swaʔ ‘S. americanus, S. pungens’, but also has Ineseño swow ‘S. acutus’. Pinart (in Heizer 1952:54-55) records <sua> as ‘tule’ in Purisimeño but <súa> ‘round tule’ in Barbareño. It is not clear if this variation reflects true dialectal differences or if it reflected imperfect knowledge of plant names by the speakers who supplied these words.

10.5.5 Miscellaneous Luiseño Words for ‘boat’

Harrington (Boscana 1978:113) records several additional Luiseño boat words. wotilaf ‘rowboat’ (also Harrington 1986, 3:115:141) derives from woti ‘to row’. yalilaf ‘floating thing, boat, raft’ (see also Elliott 1999) derives from yala ‘to float’, possibly a loan translation from ‘lipay ‘Aa (Mesa Grande Diegueño) kutuyalp ‘boat’, lit. ‘that which floats, is carried by water’ (Couro and Hutcheson 1973). The root yala itself is a Yuman borrowing with cognates elsewhere in the family (‘lipay ‘Aa tuyalp ‘carried away by water’; Cocopa yalyal ‘float, as paper on water’, Crawford 1989).

Harrington also records the Spanish loans votti (< bote ‘dinghy’), vuksi (< buque ‘ship’) and vapo(< vapór ‘steamship’).

Gatschet (1879) has the Luiseño (‘Kechi’) word <ê-val> for ‘canoe’, recorded by Eric Bergland. This appears to be ?êva-l ‘large wooden spoon, trowel, stirring paddle; species of wood used in making earthenware’ (Elliott 1999). It could be a semantic extension of the word referring to the implement, or refer to a dugout made from that type of wood.

11 Reconstructing the Prehistory of Wooden Boats in Southern California

In historical times, Chumash canoe planks were usually fashioned from driftwood, of which coastal redwood (Sequoia sempervirens) was the preferred species (Hudson et al. 1978:47-49). Redwood is resistant to weathering, strong, light, straight-grained, shrinks little, and is easy to

86 The Chumashan swa~swax or fwa~fwax resembles words for ‘boat’ or ‘canoe’ in several California languages: Northern Paiute saki (Hale 1846); Coast Miwok šaka (Callaghan 1970); Plains Miwok soka (Merriam 1903c); Northern Valley Yokuts fua (Kroeber 1959:10). Some of these might be related genetically or through contact; that remains to be investigated. Callaghan (2001:322) suggests linking Coast Miwok šaka and Proto Maiduan *diŋak ‘bridge, boat’ through contact.

The Chumashan swa ‘tule, Scirpus sp.’ and Gabrieno swa-r ‘Mission tule (Juncus textilis)’ (Merriam 1903b) may be related to each other, and perhaps to some of the words for ‘boat’ above. Munro (1983:290) derives Gabrieno swa- from a protoform *siya-. Cf. also the Ventureño syit ‘base of stems of Juncus textilis’ (Timbrook 2007) and the Gabrieno <Se’-e> ‘Round tule, Scirpus lacustris’ (Merriam 1903b).
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work (Anonymous 1999:1-16 and passim), which makes it a superior material for planked boat construction. Abundant driftwood is carried south to the Santa Barbara Channel by the California current. Why, then, was *tomol(o) ‘pine’ used as the Chumash metaphor for the planked boat, rather than *wi’ma ‘driftwood, redwood’?*

According to Hudson et al. (ibid.), pine and other wood types were considered potential boat timber. *tomol* (yellow pine) was the next best thing to redwood, and it appears that even inferior woods such as Torrey pine could be used when nothing else was available. Blackburn (1975:209) quotes a Chumash tale in which Coyote travels to a location called *tomtomol* or *hultomtomol* (*‘the pines’) to buy “*tomol* pine boards” from an old man there. He then carries them home and goes on to build some plank boats with them. While this story lends weight to accounts of the occasional use of pine for boat planks, it also highlights the difficult requirement of transporting a boat’s worth of wooden planks, some 100-200 kg, from deep in the mountains to the seashore.

I propose here that the Chumash plank canoe evolved from dugouts, similar to those attested in historical times among the Luiseño, and that it was this type of boat that was first named after yellow pines, the material used in their construction.

11.1 Dugout Boats in Southern California

11.1.1 Channel Chumash Dugouts

The Chumash built dugout canoes in addition to the *tomol*, though these are less well documented (Woodward 1934:120; Heizer 1955:151, after Henshaw; Hudson et al. 1978:31-37; Hudson and Blackburn 1982:338-340, mostly after Harrington; Cunningham 1989:61-63). Woodward’s ultimate source, Father Antonio Ripoll, lived in Santa Barbara around 1820. He describes dugout canoes, symmetrical in shape, 10m long by 1m deep and wide, carved out by stone tools. There is no mention of the use of fire to hollow the logs. Hudson et al. describe dugout construction as recounted to Harrington by Fernando Librado and perhaps others. These boats were made of willow (*Salix* sp.) or cottonwood (*Populus trichocarpa*). These are large, fast-growing trees which grow near streams at low elevations, but their wood is very heavy when unseasoned, and therefore makes boats of low freeboard which are not suitable for the open ocean; such heavy boats also carry less weight. In general, dugouts were hollowed by repeated burning and gouging. The boats were not stable, and were not used in the open ocean. Henshaw appears to describe the canoes of Santa Rosa island as dugouts made with stone tools alone, without fire. Some post-missionary dugouts were hollowed by mechanical means alone, and were outfitted with benches and oarlocks in European fashion.

Several studies (Heizer 1940; Robinson 1942:208-209; Lee 1981:51; Cunningham 1989:61-63) provide additional insights into Chumash dugout construction. Woodward (1934:120) describes dugout canoes as being hollowed by stone tools alone, without the use of fire. These boats were not stable, and were not used in the open ocean. Henshaw (1955:151) provides additional information on the construction of dugout canoes, stating that they were hollowed by repeated burning and gouging. The boats were not stable, and were not used in the open ocean. Henshaw also notes that the dugouts were made with stone tools alone, without the use of fire.

---

87 Barbareño *wi’ma ‘plant sp.: red pine’ (Whistler 1980); Ineseño *wima ‘redwood’ (Applegate 2007). In Hudson et al. (1978) the word refers to driftwood in general and redwood in particular, and is also the name for Santa Rosa Island, presumably because much driftwood is found there.

88 *to’mol* {REDUP-pine} ‘pines’, *hu=l-to’mol* {REMOTE=DEF-REDUP-pine} ‘the pines’ in Barbareño, the native language of the storyteller, Juan de Jesús Justo; see Wash (2001:59, 61). In the story, coyote announces he will be gone for three days, then finds the plank seller, buys the planks, and takes them back in a carrying net. It seems clear that he is carrying the wood from a mountain location, where the trees are, not a coastal one. Therefore I read *tomtomol* as ‘pines’, rather than ‘boats’. I don’t know the actual location of the place.
1989:62-63) describe miniature boat effigies which have been found in Chumash areas on the mainland and the channel islands. Some of these effigies can be confidently recognized as depicting Chumash-style plank canoes, but recognizing other as depicting dugouts is more ambiguous. For example, the boat effigy of Sequit Canyon described by Cunningham has nearly symmetrical pointed ends, consistent with the descriptions of Harrington and Henshaw, but a strongly curved keel, which does not fit easily with the description of the Chumash dugout.

Heizer and Massey (1953:298) argue that the Chumash dugout was a post-missionary introduction, probably from the Luiseño. They base this on the observation that many planked canoes were seen among the Chumash by early travelers, but no dugouts were described until Ripoll’s account of the 1820s. This argument is weak, since the lack of early observations indicates only that planked canoes were predominant, and does not exclude dugouts as a minor type of boat. The Chumash probably had the knowledge of producing dugouts at the time, but not utilized it very often, as was the case with tule boats, which are missing from the early records as well. In any case, the existence of the pine=boat equation in Luiseño, Chumash and Kitanemuk indicates earlier sharing of boat-building knowledge among the people of the area, and certainly predating Costansó’s record (Costansó 1770:40) of the Barbareño Chumash word *tomol*.

### 11.1.2 Northern Chumash and Salinan Dugouts

Further north, some record exists of dugout boats at the northernmost corner of coastal Chumash territory, where it meets Salinan territory. On his voyage south from British Columbia in 1793, Vancouver spotted a few kilometers off the coast between San Simeon and Morro Bay a boat, “neatly formed of wood, much after the Nootka fashion” (Vancouver 1984:1087, Menzies and Eastwood 1924:314), and paddled by four people. He got close enough to recognize the shapes of the paddles, which suggests that he would have recognized the boats as built of planks if they were so, but instead recognizing them as dugouts, as are those of the Nootka (the Nuuchahnulth of Vancouver Island). Alternatively, Heizer and Massey (1953:301) propose that the canoe was one of two plank boats purchased by the mission at San Luis Obispo from the Santa Barbara Chumash, some twenty years earlier.

Early in the twentieth century, Harrington’s Miguéleño Salinan consultants Pacífico Archuleta and Juan Solano described dugout canoes made by burning the interior of a log of oak or live oak (*Quercus* sp.), or of sycamore (*Platanus racemosa*). Archuleta had seen them on the beach in what is now Cayucos (Harrington 1986, 2:84:233, 127, 128; Immel 2007). The Antoniaño Salinan David Mora told Harrington only of tule boats, which he considered superior to plank boats by being lighter and harder to sink (Harrington 1986, 2:87:461). It appears from these fragmentary data that the Antoniaño, whose territory reached the coast (Gibson 1982), did not use dugouts. The testimony of the Miguéleño Salinans, who lived inland, refers to dugout usage by their neighbors of Estero Bay, but no further north. As in the description of the dugouts of the channel Chumash, the use of heavy timber, here oak and sycamore, precludes the use of these boats on the open ocean. Notably, there is no historical record of the use of ponderosa pine, even though stands of it grow near the coast, north of San Simeon. As with the

---

89 Cayucos, the point in question, is on what may have been the boundary between the northernmost Chumash and the poorly described Playanos to the north. Whether the Playanos were a distinct ethnic group, and if so whether they were Chumashan, Salinan, or something else, is not known (Milliken and Johnson 2003:128-134).
Chumash dugout, the use of fire rather than just mechanical means argues against a European source for this technology. Despite this ethnological record of the use of dugout canoes, the archaeological record shows no significant evidence for offshore fishing in the area at any time in the past (Joslin 2010).

11.1.3 Luisenño Dugouts

The Luisenño are the only group in the area which used dugouts as a significant means of water transport in historical times:

Some wooden canoes were also made from the trunks of trees. It is stated that voyages were formerly made with these as far as San Clemente Island. [Sparkman 1908:200]

_Pauhut_, canoe (also a box hollowed out of a log to keep things in)..._pauhit_, yellow pine, also dug-out canoe [of cottonwood?]. [DuBois 1908:131]

[Marcus Golsh] reported stories that his grandfather had told of making canoes on the forest-mantled slopes of Paauw [paʔaʔaw, Mount Palomar], at the Pine Camp of Uuszkun [ʔuʔufkun, Doane Valley]. These fire-and-abrasion hulls of yellow pine were finished late in the fall, so that after abatement of winter storms they could be paddled down tributary streams to the River San Luis Rey and out to the coast, where they were sold to shore-side villages for use at sea. [Cunningham 1989:61-62]

Cunningham’s account highlights the significance of log transportation methods to the feasibility of constructing dugout canoes. Ponderosa and Jeffrey pines grow in Southern California at elevations above 1500m (Burns and Honkala 1990). Mt. Palomar, some 50 km from the coast, is the nearest location where these pines grow. Doane Valley, according to Harrington (Boscana 1978:113), is the only place on Mt. Palomar where yellow pine grows. According to Golsh, the Luisenño also traded logs burned into charcoal to the islanders; these were brought down from the mountains, presumably in the same way, then tied together into rafts and floated across the channel (Cox 1968). Water transport through swollen rivers, as described, is the only practical way to get logs or dugouts from these mountains to the coast.

11.1.4 Explaining the Distribution of Dugout Boats

This constraint on log and canoe transportation severely limits the locations where dugout canoes can be built and launched. The only large rivers in Southern California which drain an area where yellow pines grow are the San Luis Rey, discussed above; the Santa Ana, which travels

---

90 Boscana (1978:24) wrote in his 1822 Luisenño ethnography, “they constructed out of logs very swift and excellent canoes for fishing.” From the context, however, this appears to refer to the Chumash, not the Luisenño. This quote is known only from a translated version (Robinson 1846:240). It does not appear in the only known version of the Spanish original (Reichlen and Reichlen 1971).

91 Marcus Golsh (1890-1988) was a Rincón Luisenño tribal leader. His grandfather was Santiago Duro. This passage is to be read with some caution, since Cunningham may have woven together Golsh’s report with some of Harrington’s notes to Boscana (1978). However, the passage is consistent enough to be acceptable in its entirety. Cunningham say he elicited this account from Golsh on several different occasions.
from the San Bernardino mountains to the shore in Orange County; the San Gabriel, which drains the San Gabriel mountains and ends near Long Beach; the Santa Clara, which meets the Pacific in Ventureño Chumash territory; and the Santa Ynez, which reaches the coast in Purisimeño Chumash territory, near Lompoc. Stands of ponderosa pine also grow very close to the coast to the north, around San Simeon and south of Big Sur. As with the San Luis River, heavy flow in these rivers is limited to the late winter and early spring (see Horne 1981:20 for the Santa Clara River).

This partly explains the distribution of dugout canoes in Southern California: dugouts existed only where they could be built out of suitable material (yellow pine) and transported to the coast. The Gabrielino, by this argument, did not have dugouts because the long, shallow and intermittent San Gabriel River was not adequate to carry pine dugouts from the San Gabriel mountains to the coast.92 Other rivers, such as the Santa Ana and Santa Ynez river, may have been capable of transporting logs and boats but required a long travel from source to coast.

In all three areas — Luiseño, Santa Barbara Channel Chumash, and Northern Chumash — heavier woods such as cottonwood, sycamore or oak were used in historical times for building dugout boats for coastal use. This appears to be a late development, probably later than the arrival of Europeans, the establishment of the missions, and the cessation of travel to the islands. For traveling and fishing near the shore and in esteros such boats would have sufficed, and the woods from which they were built were from easily accessible coastal trees. It is very possible that the transportation of dugouts from inland always required a large number of people, even assisted by rivers, and that the depopulation of native communities after European contact made such projects harder to carry out.

There is no record of dugout canoes used on the California coast from north of Salinan territory until reaching Wiyot territory some 500 km to the north (e.g., Kroeber 1922:269), although tule boats were used in Monterey and San Francisco bays.93 This cannot be be explained entirely by the lack of appropriate wood. For example, redwood grows abundantly in the Santa Cruz mountains south of San Francisco, and reaches close to the coast near Santa Cruz, and could have been fashioned into dugouts. Even in far northern California, ocean-going dugout canoes are not designed for open ocean navigation (Hudson 1981b).

By one argument, oceangoing boats, including dugouts, were scarce along the central California coast because of the difficulty of navigation in that exposed area (Arnold and Bernard 2005:110). There may be some truth to that, but sailing in that area is not always excluded, and even in the supposedly sheltered Santa Barbara Channel safe sea and weather conditions are not guaranteed (Fagan 2004:7-8).

It appears, then, that the distribution of wooden boats in coastal California was not conditioned solely on availability of wood, on ocean conditions, or on access to offshore

---

92 There is one mention of the transportation of a large log from the mountains among the Gabrielino (McCawley 1996:161-164). A certain mourning ceremony, held every few years, required the erection of a 10-15m pole, which was cut from a pine tree and brought back to the ceremony area in the valley. There are no more details about the method of transportation, but it cannot have been easy, and transporting logs or dugouts all the way to the coast would have been more difficult still.

93 Pinart’s vocabulary of Esselen records the item <ualkošex> ‘canoe (dugout)’ (Heizer 1952:76). There is no other indication that the Esselen ever used any boat other than a tule boat. Fish remains from Esselen territory (Breschini and Haversat 2004:119) are limited to near-shore species, suggesting minimal use of boats. Esselen territory is mountainous down to the coast, and lacks large coastal plains suitable for settlements.
fisheries. The best predictor of the their presence is the need for transportation to the islands off the coast. As Sparkman has noted for the Luiseño, dugouts were used for travel to the islands (pace Fagan 2004). Dugouts were built in Southern California because they provided a good means for reaching the Channel Islands, and were built wherever appropriate wood was available.

The dugouts of the northernmost Chumash, far from the Channel Islands, are an exception to this. Apparently they were used for fishing, in preference to tule boats, but at present I do not know if that was due to absence of tule, the availability of ponderosa pines near the coast, or some other reason.

11.1.5 Dugouts: Summary

I have argued that dugout boat construction was traditionally known throughout Southern California, and that dugouts were built for the purpose of travel to the Channel Islands. The Luiseño dugout is known to have been constructed of yellow pine transported from the mountains to the coast, and took its name, pawxit, from the name of the tree. The boat of the neighboring Chumash likewise took its name from the Chumash word for the yellow pine, tomol, and must have likewise been a pine dugout, with one language borrowing the secondary meaning from the other. This is easily consistent with the Chumash plank canoe developing after the dugout but retaining the earlier name, but not with scenarios involving an introduced plank canoe accompanied by a borrowed name.

11.2 From Dugouts to Plank Boats

Dugout construction required the transport of a heavy and unwieldy boat from the mountains over rough terrain or by the lucky placement of a river. The Chumash plank canoe did not have this disadvantage. Logs can be split into planks, which can be transported to the coast in several trips and even uphill. Easier yet, planks could be fashioned from driftwood found in coastal areas, which often was of the more durable redwood.

This provides clues to the transition from dugout to plank boat among the Chumash. Increasing contact with the islands and exploitation of ocean resources required more numerous and larger boats, while the number of dugouts which could be transported to coast through the Santa Clara river at times of high flow (Horne 1981:20) was limited. The development of planked canoe technology overcame this limitation and allowed for the production of a great number of voluminous and seaworthy boats, as was already suggested by Heizer (1938:221).94

This scenario of transitioning from dugout to plank canoes finds a parallel in East Polynesia. At the time of European contact, the most elaborately developed fully-planked boats in East Polynesia were found in the Tuamotus, a chain of low-lying atolls, poor in large, high-quality trees. Tuamotuan planked canoes were seaworthy, and often very large; they were so highly valued that they were exported to the richer and larger Society Islands, and sometimes Tuamotuan boat-builders would be brought there as well (Haddon and Hornell 1936:79).

94 It is also conceivable that sometime in the past climatic conditions in Chumash territory were favorable to the growth of yellow pine at lower elevations, including the slopes of the Santa Ynez mountains above Santa Barbara, and that changing conditions moved the range of yellow pine further inland and forced the Chumash to find more accessible wood and techniques for its use. Direct evidence for the past abundance of pine, based on pollen records from the region, is ambiguous (Heusser 1978; Heusser 1995; Davis 1992), and provides no species-level detail; this scenario remains a speculation.
Evidently the lack of large timber and the necessity of frequent travel among many small, widely-scattered islands led to the development of these boats, which were more labor-intensive, but ultimately more versatile than the dugouts fashioned from the larger trees of the high islands. I believe that this same path was followed in the development of the Chumash plank canoe, especially on the timber-poor but driftwood-rich northern Channel islands.

There is no remaining evidence of the intermediate stages between the simple dugout and the *tomol*, but dugouts may well have been more complex in the past. For example, they may have been made more seaworthy by widening and flattening the hull, or by the addition of one or more layers of strakes. If dugout canoes were used for deep sea fishing before the transition to fully formed plank boats, the timing of the invention of the *tomol* based on early fish remains, as proposed by Bernard (2001, 2004) and Arnold and Bernard (2005), may have to be reconsidered.

### 11.3 Plank Boats Outside the Santa Barbara Channel

Outside the Santa Barbara channel, plank boats were used by the Gabrielino to the south as far as San Pedro. Plank boats were encountered in the northern Channel Islands, and on San Clemente and Santa Catalina islands (Wagner 1928:47; Vizcaíno 1959).

Details on the Gabrielino plank boat are lacking, but it was apparently similar to the *tomol*. The only known difference is the shape of the prow and stern, inferred from boat effigies (Hudson et al. 1978:96-97); this detail might reflect different uses of the boat in these two areas. While there exist abundant early observations of Chumash boat construction, no such evidence exists for plank boats manufacturing in Gabrielino territory. Triangular stone drills, with which the Chumash drilled holes in canoe planks, do not appear in the Gabrielino archaeological record. These two observations have led Cunningham (1989:76) to propose that the Gabrielino obtained plank boats from the Chumash, rather than manufacturing them themselves. And indeed the Gabrielino would not have been able to obtain boat construction material easily, whether redwood drift logs, probably limited to the eastern part of the Santa Barbara Channel, or pine planks, which would require transportation by land over a great distance and mountainous terrain. The same argument applies to the island Gabrielino of Santa Catalina, and possibly to the people of San Clemente as well; more information about driftwood abundance there would clarify the issue.

Plank boats were expensive to produce, and the Gabrielino would have needed material wealth to trade for them. Such wealth was generated through the natural resources of Santa Catalina, including shells for ornaments and steatite (McCawley 1996:112). As the inhabitants of the southern Channel Islands were Gabrielino (Hudson 1981a; Sutton 2010b) or anyway Takic speakers (Munro 2002), their boats may have ultimately been supplied through the mainland Gabrielino. In any event, plank boats were not as ubiquitous among the Gabrielino as among the Chumash, as attested by the use of tule boats for ocean travel among them (McCawley 1996:125).

The Luiseño did not use plank canoes. Their dugouts, as mentioned before, have gone as far as San Clemente, and would have reached Catalina even more easily. But in both places the more distant Luiseño and their boats must have had a lesser presence than the Gabrielino. Accordingly, their share of the wealth of these islands would be small, and they would not have had the means to trade for Chumash plank boats. This lack of plank canoes may explain why the Luiseño continued to use dugouts up to the early historical period.
Explaining the Distribution of Planked Boats in the Americas

Plank boats are rare in the Americas, especially compared with the rest of the world. As I have shown, plank canoes developed in Southern California from dugout canoes, out of the necessity for seaworthy boats capable of crossing from the mainland to the Channel Islands, over distances of tens of kilometers. On the west coast of the Americas, no other such islands or wide bights exist between the Olympic Peninsula on the Canadian border and Chiloé Island in Chile, with the exception of the Coiba and the Perlas Islands off the coast of Panama. In the Pacific Northwest, very large trees were available for building beamy dugouts, and even those required sewn-on strakes for handling the waves through long crossings, as was discussed above in section 3. Other offshore islands throughout that area were either too small to be useful (e.g., the Farallon Islands, off San Francisco), too remote to be familiar, or close enough to shore to be reachable by boats of modest capabilities (e.g., Cedros Island off Baja California). In polar and sub-polar areas of the Americas, where workable lumber is rare, bark boats and animal skin boats are seaworthy substitutes for wooden boats. The sewn-plank boat of the Patagonian coast, the *dalca*, was developed by adapting the sewn-bark boats of the Chono from the south for use with the wooden planks of the Huilliche from the north (Lothrop 1932:249, 251). The *dalca* was developed not only for seaworthiness, but also to be easily disassembled and transported over land (Lothrop 1932:247). Southern California is the only locality on the west coast of the Americas where large islands off the coast required open crossings, and where arid climate limited the availability and accessibility of suitable trees for dugout construction.

On the east coast of the Americas, a similar situation holds. The only place where offshore islands required open crossings was in the Caribbean, and there large logs suitable for dugout construction were available. As in the Pacific Northwest, the technique of sewing planks on to a dugout base was developed there to increase the seaworthiness of the boats.

In contrast, the coasts of Asia, the Mediterranean and Europe are surrounded by abundant targets for seaworthy boats. And, of course, ocean navigation was at the heart of the settlement and daily life of Oceania. In all of these areas, dugouts with sewn-on strakes and fully planked boats were known until the advent of metal nails and metal tools.

The east coast of Africa, while free of islands or large bays, was frequented until recently by planked boats, part of the large trade network which stretched across the Indian Ocean. The area most analogous to the smooth coasts of the Americas is the west coast of tropical Africa south of Senegal, where ocean navigation was mainly along the coast, and where planked boats and sewn-on strakes were unknown (Smith 1970), as in most of the Americas.

Conclusion

Jones and Klar have presented what they consider archaeological, ethnological and linguistic evidence for a Polynesian origin of the plank canoe of Southern California. I have shown here that none of that evidence is valid. There is nothing to show that the Chumash *tomol* and the Gabrielonmi *ti’at* were inspired by external contact.

Linguistic and ethnographic evidence from Southern California suggests a long history of pine-built dugout canoes, which would be the ancestors of the Chumash plank canoe. The homonymy of the words for ‘pine’ and ‘boat’ in Barbareño and Roseño Chumash, in Luiseño, 95The natives of Coiba and of the Perlas archipelago were exterminated soon after European contact. I know of no information regarding their boats.
and in Kitanemuk supports this model, and points out some new historical detail.

The equivalence of Chumashan *tomol* ‘yellow pine; plank boat’ and Luiseño *pawxit* ‘yellow pine; dugout’ and *wixet* ‘pine; tule boat’ indicates that both communities shared the technology of dugouts built of yellow pine. The Chumash later elaborated the dugout into the familiar plank boat, with the dugout remaining a marginal form. It would be difficult to reconcile an external introduction of the plank canoe into Chumash territory with the usage of the parallel term by the Luiseño to describe their dugouts.

The semantics of the Chumashan *tomol* guide those of the Kitanemuk *kwekt* and *kwiakt*, originally meaning ‘pine’, but later referring to the tule boats of the Yokuts of Buena Vista Lake. Buena Vista Lake has existed since ca. 2000 BC (Kennett et al. 2007:537), and was presumably navigated soon thereafter, by whatever people lived by its shores. According to Sutton (2010a), the ancestors of the Kitanemuk arrived at their historical homeland at about that time. By the simplest linguistic scenario, these Uto-Aztecan settlers then came in contact with Chumash speakers, and fashioned their word for ‘boat’ after the Chumash model. Coastal Chumashan speakers therefore already had dugouts made of yellow pine and called something like *tomolo* by ca. 2000 BC. That places the origin of the word thousands of years before the arrival of humans in Polynesia, and before the earliest evidence of planked boats in California. Since dugouts appeared millennia before the first evidence of deep-sea fishing in the area, their creation was motivated by some other needs, such as safety or increased cargo weight, in which they were superior to tule boats. Lastly, when the ancestors of the modern Kawaiisu arrived at their present location, perhaps about AD 1000 (Sutton 2010a), they borrowed the Kitanemuk word for the Buena Vista tule boats, *kwiakt*, as *kwijakata*.

In the model given here, the plank canoe was innovated in southern California because of the increased need for large, seaworthy boats which could frequently travel to the offshore islands of the channel, coupled with the lack of accessible trees suitable for building large dugouts. This model explains the rarity of sewn-plank canoes in the Americas, and helps explain their distribution in the rest of the world.
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