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Reviewed by E.N. ANDERSON
University of California, Riverside

The mining of John P. Harrington’s notes continues in spite of the incredible difficulty of making order from the vast and scattered hoard. Among the more impressive discoveries are the materials under review: Harrington’s notes on Fernando Librado Kitsepawit and the latter’s information. Librado, originally from Santa Cruz Island but living around Ventura most of his life, was over 100 years old when he served as Harrington’s informant, a mine of information on songs, dances, ceremonies, rituals, cosmology, traditional oratory and advice, and the Chumash/Christian accommodation. With a more sensitive and humane ethnographer, he could have produced a record of experiences that at the very least would be comparable to those of Black Elk or Lame Deer. Unfortunately, Harrington was in search of language, not people. His notes on Librado are summary and disorganized. The editors of this volume had to use all their efforts and skill to produce a coherent account. Given the inevitable problems Librado had in remembering events of a century or so before, and Harrington’s scrappy and summary notes, it is amazing that they did so well—but no one should expect this book to be a totally comprehensive account of the Chumash. It is, instead, a collection of remembered observations and insights on major ceremonies and dances of Santa Cruz Island and the Ventura area.

The amazing thing is that this book was possible at all. A long, detailed, major monograph on Chumash ritual and cosmology as seen through the eyes of a sensitive and expert individual Chumash is a product of obvious importance for American Indian ethnology. In-depth accounts by single informants are all too rare for California, even among tribes who were less shattered, or shattered later, by European contact. Cosmology, ceremonial and social organization, and accounts of individual Chumash and of tribal history are especially well represented in this work.

As in many Harrington materials, there is some problem in deciding what is the Chumash informant’s own words, what is Harrington’s summary of it, and, in the present case, where the editors have cut or summarized Harrington’s notes. The present book also suffers from a more serious and indeed infuriating problem: the editor of the “Bicentennial Historical Series” forced the editors of the book to reduce considerably their annotations, with the intent of making the book a more “popular” effort. This is inexcusable. A few more pages of notes would hardly have reduced the book’s popular appeal, but would have made it enormously more valuable to scholars. Much comparative material, detailed parallels with other informants’ testimony or with recent archaeological discoveries, and similar invaluable annotation by the editors was sacrificed. I sincerely hope that this review will shame the Santa Barbara Museum of Natural History into publishing a
In the meantime, Californianists should be grateful to the editors of this volume for making the material available, and especially for making this Fernando Librado's book. Librado must have been one of the most amazing figures in southern Californian history. I share many of Robert Heizer's reservations, expressed in this journal, about Harrington as ethnographer, but I have no reservations about acknowledging Librado as a man whose memory and memories deserve to be kept alive. The editors of this work are to be commended for their scholarly and sensitive achievement of this goal.


Reviewed by ROBERT L. OSWALT
California Indian Language Center
Kensington

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

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

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