1. Introduction. Much to our sorrow, many languages indigenous to North America are currently used on fewer and fewer occasions by rapidly diminishing numbers of speakers. In some communities, like those of the Malinche region so richly described by Jane and Ken Hill (1986), bilinguals draw on the resources of both of their languages for daily expression. Yet in many others, the sphere of usage of the indigenous language has all but disappeared. The few people left who are able to speak the language rarely use it even with each other. We must wonder what effect this fact will have on the shape of our descriptions of these languages.

Central Pomo, one of seven distinct languages of the Pomoan family, is currently in this situation. Central Pomo people first encountered Europeans early in the nineteenth century. During the first half of the century, Mexican land grants brought large numbers of Spanish-speaking colonists to their area. At midcentury, English-speaking settlers began to arrive. The Central Pomo, who lost their own land, settled on small rancherias on property owned by White ranchers and supplied cheap ranch labor. At the same time, missionaries were extending their efforts in the region through Spanish and English. By 1910, half of the Central Pomo children were enrolled in school. Intermarriage increased between Central Pomo people and Mexicans, Europeans, and Asians. After World War II, many Central Pomo people left their rancherias for work in the cities, and the exodus of young people has continued. (See McLendon and Oswalt 1978 and Bean and Theodoratus 1978 for detailed discussions of this history.)

McLendon (1980) has described attitudes toward language shift among a related people, the Eastern Pomo. She points out that even before European contact there was extensive intermarriage among the Eastern Pomo and neighboring groups, many of whom spoke other languages. The Eastern Pomo were accustomed to learning new languages, as many

---

1 I am grateful to Nancy Dorian and to an anonymous reviewer for helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.
of them moved to the community of a spouse, and easily gave up languages that were no longer useful. Their view of their language was essentially practical, with “no expressed admiration for its beauties, although full control of its complexities.” The Central Pomo seem to have followed much the same pattern, often intermarrying with neighboring groups and adopting the language of a spouse. Their pragmatic attitude toward languages led them to learn those of their new neighbors—first Spanish, then English. As contact with these neighbors increased, the sphere of usage of Central Pomo decreased. Mitchell Jack reports that when he left the Hopland rancheria in 1925 at the age of thirteen, Central Pomo was spoken in most homes, but when he returned home ten years later, it was used in few, and only by the elderly. Those alive today cannot remember anyone who was unable to speak English.

There are today perhaps a dozen relatively fluent Central Pomo speakers scattered among three communities a hundred miles north of San Francisco: Point Arena/Manchester on the coast, and the Hopland and Yokaya rancherias forty miles inland. These speakers rarely use the language now, even with each other, but six of them have generously made extensive recordings of conversation and narrative for me. Each of these six was born and raised in a Central Pomo community speaking the language, so none are semispeakers in the sense of Dorian (1981). Each left the community for a number of years, and each married a nonspeaker. All of them, now in their late seventies, have returned to live on a rancheria.

These speakers have clear ideas concerning their relative proficiencies in speaking Central Pomo, and speakers’ evaluations of their own skills seem to correlate with others’ judgments of them. I have been especially fortunate to work most with a speaker generally considered to be excellent, Mrs. Frances Jack. She controls a rich range of styles, uses elaborate syntactic and morphological constructions with ease, commands an astoundingly large vocabulary, and is frequently asked for help by other speakers. As we have worked over recordings of conversations among groups of speakers, I have wondered how different my view of the language would be if a speaker as skilled as Mrs. Jack had not been available, if instead my understanding of the grammar were based on the speech of individuals whose Central Pomo shows stronger effects of language contact and of its drastically diminished domain of usage. These effects will be examined here, both on the language as a whole and comparatively among speakers.

The descriptions which follow are based on natural connected speech, primarily animated conversation interspersed with narrative. This approach contrasts with some contact studies, where the primary source of data has been elicitation of specific words and structures. Elicitation has been used in those studies for several reasons.

(i) Direct elicitation permits the investigator to probe the boundaries of the skills of less fluent speakers. Speakers generally use the linguistic resources they have, of course, and semispeakers are notoriously adept at exploiting the structures they control; structures they do not control simply fail to appear in their speech. If sufficient material from speakers of varying degrees of fluency can be compared, however, differential use of major structures does emerge. Furthermore, the contexts in which the structures are used prove crucial to an understanding of their status.

(ii) Direct elicitation can provide a basis for statistical comparison of speakers. The Central Pomo speech community is so small and fragile, however, and so many of the language structures are unlike those of better-documented languages, that investigation of language use as a whole seems more appropriate here than a quantitative measure of selected constructions.

In fact, direct elicitation can end up testing translation skills as much as true language competence. The highly unnatural and often stressful context can prevent speakers’ skills from emerging. Translation tests may bring out only structures the interviewer has decided in advance are grammatical and interesting.

The speech examined here is unnatural in one way: the speakers were attempting to speak Central Pomo exclusively. They all knew I was interested in the language and generously attempted to produce a record of it for me, although I had never asked for Central Pomo only, and they are not otherwise overly concerned with purism. Most of these speakers see each other rarely, since they live in different communities, but when they do talk together, they normally use English. Arrangements for visits were made on the telephone in English, even when I was in the next room. The speakers used English with each other before the tape recorder was turned on and as soon as it was turned off. None ever seemed at all self-conscious because of the recorder.

All recordings were transcribed and analyzed jointly with Mrs. Jack, and judgments of fluency and correctness are hers. She was charitable, often not noticing mistakes until I asked about forms. Her repetitions of utterances simply incorporated corrections. The recordings contain numerous examples of comments from less fluent speakers that were so garbled grammatically as to make no sense (even to her), but these were uniformly followed on the tape by echoes of confirmation and exclamations of approbation from the group. After the first few minutes, speakers were clearly using the language more for communication than display of grammatical competence; in some cases they had decades of news to
catch up on. This fact contributed significantly to the quality of the record of Central Pomo they produced.

The examples presented here are representative in one sense: each illustrates a pattern that occurs repeatedly in conversation and narrative. Because the focus of this discussion is the effect of language contact, however, the examples do not mirror the usual proportion of interference in spontaneous speech at all. All of the speakers recorded produced long stretches of excellent Central Pomo.

2. Early contact. At the earliest moment of contact, before bilingualism was extensive, Central Pomo speakers created some descriptive names for introduced goods, and a few of these remain. Among such expressions are ḥts'im q'ale 'fork' (BY.POKING-to.stock=INSTRUMENTAL) and ṣak'us ḥṣaq' q'ale 'pants' (leg BY.POKING-to.push=INSTRUMENTAL).

Once Mexican colonists arrived, the Central Pomo quickly became bilingual. This layer of contact is evidenced by a large number of Spanish loans. As would be expected, the loans consist primarily of nouns referring to introduced objects and concepts, such as articles of clothing, foods, tools and utensils, domestic animals, etc.

The loans were fully integrated into Central Pomo phonologically. Spanish stressed vowels appear long in Central Pomo: piipa 'pipe' (Sp. pipa), dīulīse 'candy' (Sp. dulce), kūčiiya 'knife' (Sp. cuchilla), māyaš 'corn' (Sp. maiz). Stress is generally initial, as in the majority of Central Pomo words. Syllable structure was sometimes simplified: jārapo 'rag' (Sp. trapo).

Spanish b and v generally appear as w: wēleeko 'sheep' (Sp. borrego), pēolo 'city' (Sp. pueblo), sēwooya 'onion' (Sp. cebolla), nāwaaha 'jack-knife' (Sp. navaja). Initially, a bilabial stop sometimes appears: pāaka 'cow' (Sp. vaca). Voiceless dental stops were faithfully borrowed as dentals: tiina 'tub' (Sp. tina), tiunuku 'coat' (Sp. túnica). Intervocalic flap r was usually borrowed as its phonetic equivalent in Central Pomo, an intervocalic allophone of d: ṭadīina 'flour' (Sp. harina). Otherwise Spanish r often appears as i: seekla 'fence' (Sp. cerca). Spanish g was borrowed as Central Pomo k, the closest phonetic equivalent: kāajo 'cat' (Sp. gato), kāiyina 'chicken' (Sp. gallina). (Central Pomo contains b and d but no g.) Spanish mid vowels, especially word-finally, were usually raised: čikooji 'rope' (Sp. chicote), jomaaqi 'tomato' (Sp. tomate), pēesu 'money' (Sp. peso), kāwaayu 'horse' (Sp. caballo).2

The borrowed nouns were fully integrated into Central Pomo grammatically. They appear in lexicalized expressions, like jāasa below from Spanish taza 'cup'.

(1) jāasa mčámam
   dish set.PL-DOWN-IMPERATIVE
   'Set the table!'

(2) q'di qaⱵaⱵa bal sāntiiya ?el.
   good tastes this watermelon the
   'This watermelon tastes good'.

kūčaa-tay
   spoon-PLURAL
   'various spoons'

jēenṭa-l-il yów?khe
   town-AT-TOWARD to go
   'to go to town'

wāalsa-wi šdēiz'ie'in
   pocket-IN while carrying them around
   'carrying them around in their pockets'

Spanish loans appear in compounds with native nouns.

(3) hō kāleeta
   fire wagon
   'fire engine'

ʔādiina phⁿō
   flour acorn mush
   'flour mush'

kōči p/footer pig 'deer/meat
   'pork'

2 As pointed out by an anonymous reviewer, many of these loans are unique to Mexican Spanish. Chicote 'rope' and tomate 'tomato', for example, were originally Nahua loans.
In some cases, differences among the three communities in their contacts with Spanish and English speakers are mirrored by differences in borrowed terms. A descriptive phrase qamá jímq'ale, literally 'used for foot covering', is the Yokaya term for 'shoe', while the Spanish loan sápata (from zapato) is used on the Hopland rancheria seven miles to the south, where a mission was located. The word for 'coffee' on the inland Hopland and Yokaya rancherias is kápé from Spanish café, while that used on the Coast at Point Arena/Manchester is k'ápe, from English coffee. The word for 'sugar' at Hopland and Yokaya is siúkara or siúkada, from Spanish azúcar, while that used on the Coast is siúka, from English sugar.

Some loans have undergone slight semantic change, such as tása 'dish', from táza 'cup', and tjënsa 'town' from tienda 'store'. Modern speakers generally have a clear awareness of which words are of Spanish origin, whether they speak Spanish fluently or not.

3. More recent contact with English. The effect of the current intensive contact with English can be seen in spontaneous borrowing from all lexical categories. English loans retain their English phonology, but they are fully integrated into Central Pomo grammatically, as in (4)–(9). (English orthography is used for the English loans here.)

(4) Doctor = ya = jo
?aa míutu baāsinya...  
 doctor = TOPIC = PAT 1 him asked
'I asked the doctor...' 

(5) Mial illegal meen ?ném... sìy... ?e míutya.  
that illegal so set (PL) name (PL) COP they
'They named themselves to that (roll) illegally.'

(6) ?aa license pass-či-w-khë  čh ów ?n.  
1.AG license pass-SML-CAUS-PRF-INFV not it is
'It's because I can't pass the license (test).'

(7) Mida ?e ya  
there COP we

camp-ča-m-a-tč-č'  
camp-MULT.EVENT-MULT.AGT-PL.IMPRF-PL.IMPRF
?e.  
COP
'That's where we used to camp'.

(8) Tāy'kan míutu  
one-DIM COP = 3.PAT
sick-či-d-an.  
sick-SEMELEFACTIVE-IMPERFECTIVE-IMPERFECTIVE
'Once in a while he gets sick'.

(9) Mëen ?e ?aa ... khë sìy ?el too mëen...  
so COP I my mother the me so
learn-či-ka-w.  
learn-SML-CAUS-PRF
'That's how I... my mother... taught me'.

Such borrowing is highly productive, resulting in forms such as invite-či 'invited', adopt-či 'adopted', telephone-či 'telephoned', sell-čaw 'sell (multiply or distributively)' move-či-khë 'will move', help-čim 'help!' help-taw 'continually helping', use-čaw 'use (multiply)', use-taw 'use (multiply)', start-či-khë 'to start', start-taw 'if (you) start', and many more. Borrowed verbs are typically suffixed with one of two derivational markers, the semelfactive -či- or the multiple event marker -čaw-, before further derivational and inflectional morphemes are added.

Speakers of different degrees of fluency in Central Pomo show interesting differences in this kind of borrowing. Those considered the most fluent do this relatively seldom. When they do, it is usually to capture a meaning for which Central Pomo lacks a precisely appropriate term. In (4), the speaker was referring to a White medical doctor as opposed to an Indian curer, who would use different procedures. In (6), the speaker was referring to the kind of camping done recreationally. Midrange speakers use considerably more English loans of this type. Central Pomo contains words for 'sick', 'learn', and 'teach', but they failed to come to this speaker's mind. Such loans are frequently preceded by pauses as the speaker searches for a word. (Short pauses are represented here by two dots, longer ones by three.)

The speaker considered the least fluent in Central Pomo did almost no borrowing of this type at all. The reason is clear. Such borrowing requires the ability to manipulate derivational and inflectional morphology. When a word failed to come to mind, she simply switched to English.

(10) Bāyaa ?e šk'... lead... how you say, lead her around?  
man the only
'Her husband has to just (lead her around).'
4. Code switching. Speakers of all degrees of fluency in Central Pomo do switch to English on occasion. Since modern Central Pomo speakers usually speak English unless intentionally attempting to produce a record of Central Pomo, there is less socially conditioned switching than in some other bilingual communities. The contexts in which switching does occur are similar to those reported by Blom and Gumperz (1972), Hill and Hill (1986), and Thomason and Kaufman (1988). Discourse and conversational markers are frequently drawn from English: clause-initial orientation, conjunctions, exclamations, hesitation forms, evaluative terms, and various adverbials, especially time, are common.

The speakers considered the most fluent Central Pomo switch the least often. Midrange speakers switch somewhat more, as in:

11. You know hiniata years ago bëda bóóq'áda
   Indian=TOP here west-water-LOC
   ?mii
   COP-LOC
   ‘You know, Indians, years ago, when they
   gohlijin
   TOWARD=go.PLURAL-MULTIPLE.EVENT=WHEN
   lóq’ you know
   thing
came to the Coast, you know,

yal qaanëma’ hihdun you know when they...
us relation claim=WHEN
claiming to be our relatives,

bëda hlin yáa?q’á čáa ?mii
here go.PL=WHEN our house-LOC COP-this-LOC
overnight
when they came here,

smá baatíw and baa’á qaawáac’
sleep lie.PL-PRF food BITING-walk-PL.IMPRF
they would sleep at our house and eat

and every year they...

and they qaanëma’cing us.
relative
and they’d call us relatives’.

Sentence-initial adverbial complexes are often English.

12. Then eight o’clock that’s baa’á qaawáan, meen k’hápe
    food eat so coffee
    q’óm and drink
    ‘Then at eight o’clock, that’s when I eat, drink coffee, and . . .’

English conjunctions of all kinds appear.

    mussel our still now poison COP that
    ‘The mussels are still ours, but now they’re poison’.

14. Rancheria ?mii ?q’haw or jëenja ?mii?
    rancheria COP-there sit town COP-there
    ‘Does he live at the rancheria or in town?’

There is an occasional shift at a preposition.

15. ?udaaw k’liúy, . . . on the . . . màa.
    lots black-DISTR.PL ground
    ‘There are lots of black ones on the ground’.

Speakers typically shift to English for numbers, even though Central Pomo equivalents exist.

16. A: Siiñaw čá wa mii
    how many house Q there
    qaawímayaw?q’hé?
    build-MA-DEFOC-PRF-INFV
    ‘How many houses are they going to build over there?’

    B: Twenty-two.
Oh, twenty-two.Only [for] young people, I suppose'.

Not surprisingly, speakers considered the least fluent in Central Pomo switch the most often to English. Even when others are conversing primarily in Central Pomo, the least fluent speaker, B below, sometimes uses only a few Central Pomo words per sentence. The Central Pomo words usually convey the primary information or focus of the utterance.

(18) A: Mil č'ałk'eqe miyaa báyaa ?el kay
that sibling his man the also
'His older brother
č'ōw ńee'ti bá'duč' hícim.
ot-PRF ever married say
never married either, you say.'

B: č'ōw. No Melvin kiy k'üčii č'ōw...
oo no too children not-PRF
'No. Melvin has no children, either.
And Rosalie got báyaa, but k'üčii č'ōw.
man children not-PRF
And Rosalie has a husband, but no children'.

(19) B: My brother never likes to hinčil čaanón. ('Indian speak')
A: No.
B: But he listen . . . But čaanójan . . .
('speaking')

(20) A: Ma hö ?máhduwan čåw?
2.AG fire build-IMPRF-IMPRF house-IN
'Do you build a fire in the house?'

B: I always hó on, you know, electric.

At some points, her speech is essentially English with Central Pomo loans.

5. Grammatical patterns. The effect of language contact is not restricted to lexical borrowing and code switching. Grammatical patterns in the speech of those considered less fluent in Central Pomo do not always match those of more fluent speakers. Among the salient features of Central Pomo grammar are agent/patient case marking, elaborate number marking, a defocusing construction, and various devices for formal clause combining.

5.1. Case. Most Central Pomo nouns and pronouns referring to people are distinguished for agent or patient case. Case roles have been grammaticized, so that for the most part, only one case is grammatical in any specific context. Less fluent speakers do not always select the same case as would more fluent speakers. Note the patient case clitic in the sentence below.

(21) Muul mája ?el=fo wáa'wan q'o?ti hóoc?
that woman the=PAT walking around not even helping
h'ín.
not
'That lady is walking around not helping at all'.

As we transcribed this passage, Mrs. Jack commented, "Sounds like she's not walking around on her own power, something's making her walk. She should leave that fo out." The use of the patient clitic here is surprising. It might be expected that English contact would induce speakers to reanalyze agent forms as subject forms, and less fluent speakers do on occasion use agent forms for patient subjects. The opposite occurs as well, however, as in (21) where the patient clitic fo appears with the agent subject 'the lady'.

5.2. Number. Number is expressed in Central Pomo through a variety of devices. Pronouns referring to human beings obligatorily distinguish singular and plural in all persons. Nouns and adjectives may contain an optional distributive plural suffix, but number marking is not obligatory. An elaborate set of devices can mark various number distinctions in verbs. As in many other North American languages, some verb roots contain an inherent specification of number: for one to sit alone is considered a different event than for a group to sit together, for example. A multiple event suffix may imply that several participants are involved:
a derived stem meaning to wash repeatedly may imply that multiple objects were washed. A joint agency suffix implies that multiple agents are involved: a derived stem meaning 'carry together' implies multiple carriers. Different suffixes are used for singular and plural imperfectives, as well as for singular and plural commands.

Speakers less fluent in Central Pomo do not consistently use the number markers in the same way that more fluent speakers do. Since the last verb in the statement below describes a single van, the choice of the verb stem (many) walk' is unusual, as is the choice of the plural imperfective suffix.

(22) Bal van bêda qêch'aw; Consolidated bal yâ'kêh škê 'êe, this van here here-run Consolidated this our only COP 'This van comes here; our Consolidated van is the only 
müul hîl-a2-w-at'.

In the interchange below, it was clear that speaker A was discussing all Indians because of the distributive plural suffix -(l)ay on the adjective knowledgeable' and 'person'. Speaker B, considered less fluent, replied with a singular imperfective verb, inappropriate here.

(23) A: mân šâa-fay 'êe mîul hînîl čâač'-ay.
stuff knowledgeable-PL COP that Indian person-PL 'They are smart people, Indians'.

B: Mm. ?îdaaw màa really stuff šâa'a2-du-w.
know-IMPERFECTIVE.SINGULAR-PERFECTIVE 'Mm. Knows a lot.'

Mrs. Jack later commented, "She makes it sound like just one person is smart."

5.3. Defocusing. Central Pomo contains a verbal suffix that eliminates an argument from the verb, the argument that would normally function as topic. The result is similar in function to passivization in accusative languages, deriving verbs meaning 'be found' from 'find', 'be wanted' from 'want', or even 'there was dancing' from 'dance'. Since case marking in Central Pomo reflects an agent/patient distinction rather than a subject/object distinction, however, there is no resulting change in case relations. Patient arguments remain patients.

Speakers less fluent in Central Pomo occasionally use defocused verbs in unusual ways, as below.

(24) Mââjá hêlen 'êe müul Mââjaya woman seeking COP that woman=TOP q'âayaw 'êe,
leave-DEFOC-PRF COP.

'He's looking for a woman. His wife left him'.

During transcription, Mrs. Jack commented, "I would just say q'âayaw. Shouldn't say woman or anything. She doesn't know how to talk." The basic form of the verb for 'left' would be q'âaw. The defocused form in (24) would normally be used if the identity of the leaver were left unspecified and no noun appeared. The form of the noun mââjaya adds to the contradiction, since it contains the enclitic ya, normally used to emphasize a new topic. (The actual meaning of 24 would be more like 'The woman was left'.)

5.4. Complex constructions. Central Pomo contains an elaborate system of verbal markers, sometimes referred to as switch-reference markers, for specifying various kinds of temporal, causal, and referential relationships between clauses. Note the function of the suffix hîla in:

(25) Mîo müul . . . smâ múii-č-ka=ya-hîla
2.PAT that sleep-CAUS-IMMED-PRF COP 'If they put you to sleep
mîo q'â?i màdâmač'kê jîn.
2.PAT at all awake-CAUS-INFV not you're not going to wake up at all'.

The density of these enclitics appears to correlate with the fluency of speakers. The least fluent speaker clearly experienced difficulty in some situations where such markers would normally be used.

(26) ?âa qaawâan . . . somebody cook it.
1.AG eat
'1 eat it if somebody cooks it'.

A more fluent speaker would have used hîla on the verb for 'cook'.

6. Standard constructions. The examples cited above would suggest that speakers less fluent in Central Pomo do not control the intricacies
of case, number, defocus, and clause combining. Yet the speech of all of these individuals is full of examples of standard usages of each.

6.1. Case. The speech of even the least fluent Central Pomo speaker abounds with examples of standard case marking, even where the constructions involved are intricate.

(27) ?aa mën mihlauw Martin = jo.
1.AG so say PAT
‘I tell Martin,

bal k’ubayaa ?el máya-l čóq₃k₄e.
this child-man the 2-PL-PAT will shoot
this boy will shoot you all’.

This speaker used patient case marking appropriately even in contexts where patient arguments would function as subjects in English. Note the patient form of mütu in (28). She also used the appropriate nonpatient form of the resumptive pronoun, mütul. It does not appear in the patient form because it is external to the clause.

so-but 3.PAT old-INCH-PRF maybe 3
‘But maybe he got old, that guy’.

6.2. Number. The speaker considered least fluent in Central Pomo also produced appropriate number marking of all kinds. She used appropriate plural suffixes on nouns and adjectives, like the suffix -al on ‘old’ below.

(29) ?idaaw yëmaq’ ?e ya k₄m₄.
really old-PL the 1.PL.AG all
‘All of us are old’.

(Note the appropriate case choice for the pronoun here. Although the argument of the verb ‘get old’ must be a patient as in 28 above, the argument of ‘old’ must be an agent, here ya ‘we’.)

She selected appropriate plural verb stems, even in complex contexts like that in (30). She also selected the appropriate plural form -(a)c*e of the imperfective suffix.

(30) Mën múul k’i’ëbàyaa ?el q’h₄a čah₃a yhēc₄e’
so that child-man the water strong do-IMPRF.PL
mida h₃a’va’ë’ Ukiah.
that = AT go.PL-DISTR-IMPRF.PL
‘He’s going around drinking with young boys in Ukiah’.

She used the multiple event suffix -ja appropriately. Compare the two sentences in (31). (31a), without the suffix, involved one act of giving one tape. (31b), with the suffix, was said a few minutes later in the conversation, and clearly involved several tapes, so probably several events of giving.

so = but 1.PAT the at all give-PRF not
‘But they won’t give me the tape’.

(31b) They say promise to send em to me

q’ö?ti joq daaq₂yajë’
what-but 1.PAT give-MULTIPLE.EVENT-IMPRF.PL

‘But they didn’t give them to me’.

6.3. The defocusing construction. Both midrange and less fluent speakers of Central Pomo use defocusing constructions in some of the same contexts as speakers considered more fluent. The sentence below is from the speaker considered the least fluent.

(32) mét da?k₄e ?e múul,
such=AT=FROM COP that
‘It’s because of that

coffee ?e ṝwéy₃a’yaw . . . blood pressure

coffee COP forbid-IMPRF.PL-DEFOCUS-PRF

that (they) forbid coffee, . . . blood pressure’.

6.4. Complex constructions. This speaker also uses clause-linking enclitics appropriately in narrative. Note the use of the enclitic da ‘as’ in the passage below.

(33) A: Mën múul yënq ?elda múul Porky and múak’hëł’
so that south the=AT that his

måa’qta woman

‘So Porky and his wife went south

Santa Rosa h₃i’w p’zë q’hwey’q₄w.” Ukiah.
go.PL-PRF deer buy-PRF-INFV

to Santa Rosa to get some meat.
Lexical knowledge is in fact more central to fluency than might at first be assumed.

The speaker considered the least fluent in Central Pomo among those recorded is a delightful, animated, loquacious woman. Especially in the earliest portion of her recorded conversation, a number of her contributions are echoes of words or phrases said by others. She is speaker C in the passage below.

(35) A: Bél baači múuṣa,  
this day woman  
‘This woman and Frances
Frances ŋe bēda gōhliw,  
COP here TOWARD=go.PL-PRF  
came here today
yákbe čamú ŋel tsım’kbe.  
our word the mark-DOWN-INFV  
to write our words’.
B: Yal bayiič’kbe.  
us learn-INFV  
‘To learn from us’.
C: Yeah. (Laughter) Yal bayiič’kbe.  
us learn-INFV  
‘Yeah. To learn from us’.

B: Súŋiinya qawāč’me?.  
watermelon eat-IMPRF.PL-IMPERATIVE.PL  
‘Eat some watermelon!’
A: Mm. Díulse. Q’di qaaf’aw.  
sweet good tastes  
‘Mm. Sweet. Tastes good’.
C: Q’di qaaf’aw. Díulse.  
good tastes sweet  
‘Tastes good. Sweet’.

Many of the contributions of this speaker are familiar, lexicalized expressions. These, too, are of course common in most natural language.
They do constitute a higher proportion of her utterances, especially during earlier interchanges. The passage in (36) was part of the same conversation. Note again the remarks of C.

(36) A: Måa ʔel čałóčian ʔéh ʔów. ground the dry-SML-IMPRF rain not-PRF
‘The ground is drying up; no rain.

Maʔá báčkawʔkʰe ʔów. food grow-CAUS-PRF-INFV not-PRF
Can’t plant any food’.

C: ʔów ʔe q’ųʔį. not-PRF COP at all
‘Nothing at all’.

A: Yåʔkʰe baaʔ ʔel ŋdaaw baasėt ʔe. our food the really bad COP
‘Our garden is bad’.

B: Mm.

C: čałóč’. dry-SML-PRF
‘Dried up’.

A, B: Mm.

C: Qʰá ʔów. water no-PRF
‘No water’.

A: Mëen ʔe kʰe roses ʔel q’alútən. so COP my the die.PL-ME-IMPRF
‘That’s why my roses are dying’.

C: Q’alútən. die.PL-ME-IMPRF
‘Dying’.

Lexicalization does in fact play a fundamental role in differences in fluency among these speakers. As we transcribed and translated tapes of conversations, I asked Mrs. Jack how the speech of those now less fluent in Central Pomo differed from those more fluent. She replied, “They generally don’t know how to express themselves. Can’t say what they want to say in Indian. Don’t know the words.” On a number of occasions, Mrs. Jack noted that she would have used a more specific word than one chosen by a less fluent speaker. One midrange speaker, for example, was describing a time when she had been waiting for the bus to Santa Rosa.

(37) Bus ʔel čałwʔkʰe ŋdaaw and muul mii. bus the run-PRF-INFV that there
čałw ʔów. run-PRF not
‘The bus was supposed to go to Santa Rosa and it didn’t come’.

Mrs. Jack commented, “That’s the wrong word. She means to express herself in a certain way, but she can’t find the words.” Mrs. Jack would have used the verb čał-q-’‘run southward’ instead of simply čałw ‘run’. (The form of the perfective suffix is -ʔ after stops, -w after vowels.) Lexical choice accounts for many of the seemingly idiosyncratic grammatical patterns among speakers less fluent in the language.

7.1. Case. As noted earlier, case in Central Pomo reflects the grammaticization of agent and patient roles. The semantic basis of most case marking is apparent, but in any context there is usually only one grammatical choice possible. At one point, a midrange speaker said:

(38) Joo ŋdaaw dáʔduw. 1.PAT really want-RFL-IMPRF.SG-PRF
‘I really like it’.

As we later transcribed this comment, Mrs. Jack commented, “This is wrong. Means it likes her. Should be ʔau.” She noted that either the agent pronoun should be substituted for the patient form, as in (39), or a different verb should be used, as in (40).

(39) FJ: ʔau ŋdaaw met’ dáʔduw. 1.AG really such want-RFL-IMPRF.SG-PRF
‘I really like that’.

(40) FJ: joo met’ dáʔwa. 1.PAT such want-PRF=IMMEDIATE
‘I want that’.

The problem here is essentially a matter of lexical selection.
7.2. Number. As noted earlier, one way in which number can be expressed in Central Pomo is in the choice of verb root. Some roots describe events or states involving only one individual or object, while others describe those involving a group, something like English congregate or scatter. As the speaker considered least fluent in Central Pomo was describing her stay in the hospital, she said:

(41) Lady oranges

qódeeyaw
TOWARD = carry one round object - DEFOC - PRF
'A lady brought oranges and

needle qódeeyaw.
TOWARD = carry one round object - DEFOC - PRF
'brought a needle'.

Mrs. Jack later commented on this passage, "She just doesn't know how to use the right words." The verb root de- means 'carry (one round object)'. It is clear from the English word oranges that several round objects were brought. For this event, the appropriate verb root would be -̌di-. The problem is again one of lexical selection rather than inflection or syntax. The second line shows nearly the same situation. Certain verb roots in Central Pomo encode the shape or consistency of the object most affected by an event or state, something like English eat and drink, or sit, stand, and lie. The Central Pomo verb root normally used for 'carry' when the burden is long is be-. Again, this speaker simply chose the wrong word.

Her unusual use of number marking is not limited to the selection of verb roots. Consider the passage below.

(42) Met' šk 'yhétač'
such only do - MULT. EVENT - IMPRF. PL.
dāa?daw
want - RFL - IMPRF. SG - PRF
'That's all they want to do,
čaanú čaanów ... lówáč' lil.
word talk. SG - PRF talk. PL - IMPRF. PL. just
just talk'.

As we transcribed this passage, Mrs. Jack commented, "This isn't right. It doesn't make sense." This sentence was clearly intended to describe a group of people. The verb yhétač 'do' is appropriate, containing a multiple event suffix -fa- and the plural form -č- of the imperfective. The following verb, however, dāa?daw 'want', contains the singular form -du- of the imperfective, so the combination is contradictory. The following line shows an interesting repair. The speaker first chose the verb stem čaanó- 'talk', usually used for one person, then replaced it with lówáč', appropriate for a group.

Similar contradictory combinations occur fairly often. Discussing the van service, the same speaker said:

(43) Máya ṭee ḥliw dāa?daw ...
2-PL away go. PL - PRF want - RFL - IMPRF. SG - PRF
'There are others. Wherever you want to go,

máyal čāw?kpe.
2-PL-PAT run - PRF - INFV
it will take you'.

She was addressing the group, and the intended plurality is evident from her choice of the pronouns máya and máyal, as well as the verb ḥliw 'several go'. She again used the singular imperfective form of 'want', however, not a grammatical option. The other speakers present echoed her comment with changes of the final verb to others more appropriate for the grammatical context: šāw?kpe 'will haul' or šājagkpe 'will haul multiply' (several passengers, on several occasions, to several locations, etc.). Mrs. Jack later noted that the best form of this statement would be:

(44) Máya ṭeda ḥla? dāa?čiw,
2-PL there = TO go. PL - IMPRF want - RFL - IMPRF. PL - PRF
'There are others. Wherever you all want to go,

máyal
2-PL-PAT
šājagkpe.
PULLING-carry-MULTIPLE. EVENT - PL. ACT - INFV
it will take you there'.

Sentences like (42) and (43) might suggest that this speaker does not know how to form the plural imperfective, at least of the verb 'want'. Yet on many occasions, she used this very form. Note her response below. She is speaker B.

(45) A: Hinčil máa šāa?q'ačiw űčin š'a
Indian stuff know - IMPRF. PL not guess
'I guess they don't know
mua’u’tu ya h’ed’uu anyway met.’
3.PL lots such too much about Indian things anyway’.

B: q’o’?i daa’?e’w
at.all want-RFL-IMPRF.PL-PRF not ‘They don’t want to’.

7.3. Defocusing. A similar incompatibility of lexical choice seems to underlie many of the unusual constructions involving defocused verbs used by this least fluent speaker. A good example of this can be seen in example (42) cited earlier. The verb qödeeyaw contains the defocusing suffix, so its meaning is actually more like ‘was brought’ It would be a natural choice in this context, since the identity of the bearer of the oranges and needle is incidental to the narrative. The overt mention of the lady at the beginning of the clause, however, renders this defocused form inappropriate. A more fluent speaker would use the simple verb qödew ‘brought’ here or omit mention of the lady.

7.4. Complex constructions. An examination of the contexts in which less fluent speakers tend to use clause-linking enclitics reveals a pattern. The enclitic da ‘as, while’ appears much more often than the others, and the verbs with which da appears are especially common ones. In the passage in (32) above, for example, da appears with the verbs hlaanda ‘as they went’ and čianda ‘as it went’. In the passage below it appears with the verb ‘do’.

(46) Ma čaanömma ma Frances Allen. I mean... 2 sing-IMPRF.SG = FAC 2 ‘You were singing
Elsie Allen waf’ basket yhëen = da... POSS do-IMPRF.SG = AS while Elsie Allen was weaving her basket.

må khe čaanömma background. 2 song sing-IMPRF.SG = FAC You were the one in the background singing a song’.

Verbs with meanings like ‘go’ and ‘do’ are exactly the ones that appear most often in constructions of this type. Combinations of these imperfec-
tive verbs with the enclitic da occur with high frequency in normal speech. It is unlikely that this speaker actively created these constructions as she used them. She simply selected well-known, available lexical items.

Speakers’ recognition of the role of the lexicon in fluency is thus well founded. Familiarity with frequently used words and phrases permits all speakers to speak fluently and idiomatically. Lexicalization also has a powerful effect on the apparent shape of grammar. Nonstandard usages by speakers less fluent in Central Pomo are not well described as the products of nonstandard rules. They are better described as nonstandard selections of morphologically opaque lexical items.

8. The contributions of individual speakers. It is clear that if a grammatical description of Central Pomo were based only on the speech of formerly fluent speakers of the language, it would have a very different shape than one based on the speech of those still fully fluent. Almost any generalization concerning the functions of grammatical constructions would be contradicted by data too pervasive to ignore.

The contributions of less fluent speakers can be of great value, however. The woman considered the least fluent among those cited here is an exuberant, outgoing individual. Her Central Pomo pronunciation is flawless, and she manipulates word order effectively for stylistic purposes. Her comprehension and social interaction are fine. She was, ultimately, largely responsible for the wonderful quality of the conversations she participated in. A midrange speaker felt at first that she was not sufficiently competent to provide a good example of the language. Such modesty is certainly common among speakers who have not had occasion to use their language and who have little awareness of the intricacy of their linguistic knowledge, since they never studied the language consciously. The animated conversation of others, however, especially the least fluent speaker, soon drew this midrange speaker out, and she spent many happy hours producing a magnificent document of her language. The disfluency of her friend even served to strengthen her confidence. This least fluent friend also established a context in which more fluent speakers could use their skills in a way impossible in a vacuum. Telling a story to a tape recorder is important when no other resources are available. The record is incomparably richer, however, when more natural interaction is possible.³

³ The speaker who shows the strongest influence of language contact in Central Pomo also shows the strongest influence of contact in English. Certain features of Central Pomo have influenced the English of most Central Pomo speakers. Central Pomo contains no
In cases like that of Central Pomo, when the primary goal of documentation is to tap the knowledge that once fluent speakers have retained, rather than to discover what they have lost, perhaps the most effective approach is to allow them to do most what they naturally do best: talk. Direct elicitation of specific forms is likely to produce many “wrong” answers, many blanks, and much discomfort on all sides. Of course, spontaneous connected speech is likely to include a higher proportion of frequently used phrases and constructions than elicited data. But basing grammatical description on the most frequently used forms and structures, in their natural context, may well yield the truest picture of the language. Furthermore, these are exactly the parts of language that less fluent speakers will remember most accurately. Less fluent speakers may have fewer choices, but often what they do produce is still rich in grammatical structure. The least fluent speaker described here eventually produced hours and hours of good Central Pomo, full of morphological complexity. There may be little reason to assume that the forms she used were actively derived as she spoke, but the use of indefinite articles, nouns are not obligatorily marked for number, and pronouns distinguish number only for human beings, when they appear at all. (Pronouns referring to continuing topics are not obligatory.) Central Pomo verbs distinguish aspect but not tense. When speaking English, Central Pomo speakers sometimes omit articles, do not inflect nouns for number, do not use plural pronouns for nonhuman referents, and do not inflect English verbs. The speaker considered the least fluent in Central Pomo is very loquacious in English, but her English does show a higher frequency of the above characteristics than that of the others. She frequently omits English prepositions, the copula, and overt markers of subordination and coordination as well:

(i) Never drink, hardly coffee down the house. I got coffee all... she say I make too weak coffee.
(ii) Pear, I threw bunch of it away... I should have canned them.
(iii) Wasn’t Else teach her basketweaving?
(iv) Deathly sick. Stay too long. This year they only gonna stay three days. We go there for board meeting.
(v) They got round house there in park State park.
(vi) Dad say foolish.
(vii) Want to go to Santa Rosa, San Francisco, to doctor, and doctor recommends, our van will take them.

Her special style in no way interferes with her effectiveness as a conversationalist, however.

Sally McLendon reports a pertinent anecdote. The number of years ago in the course of a bilingual education project, two excellent linguists were asked to collect Central Pomo vocabulary from Mrs. Jack. The task proved frustrating for all. As they proceeded down the requested list, Mrs. Jack reportedly had considerable difficulty coming up with translations and could think of no equivalents for at least 40 percent of the words. It was concluded that she was probably not a very good speaker. Her magnificent, unceasing work over the past five years has since shown that nothing could be further from the truth.
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1. Introduction. Kalapuya is a family of three languages which were spoken along the Willamette River in Western Oregon. As far as I know, all three languages are now extinct. Northern Kalapuya was divided into two very distinct dialects, Yamhill and Tualatin (or Atfalati). Central Kalapuya was spoken over the largest territory of the three languages and was divided into about half a dozen dialects, all of them very similar to each other. Of these the best attested are Santiam and Mary's River. Southern Kalapuya was the smallest of the three languages in size of territory and is the most poorly attested. All of the material that we have is from the Yonkalla dialect. It is not known whether there were other Southern dialects.

This article is based on the Kalapuya material in the Melville Jacobs Collection at the University of Washington. The only previous study of Proto-Kalapuya phonology is Shipley (1970), which was based on the Kalapuya material in Swadesh (1965). Unfortunately, Swadesh's transcriptions contain many errors. He regularly omitted accent marks and

I wish to thank the trustees of the Melville Jacobs Collection for granting me access to the Kalapuya material. I also wish to thank Gay Lundell of the University of Washington Archives for his assistance with the material. I am grateful to Yvonne Hajda, Sharon Hargus, and Ellen Kaisse for their comments on earlier drafts of this article. Portions of this article are taken from a paper which I gave at the Hokan-Penutian Conference in Eugene, Oregon, in June 1988. The following abbreviations of languages and dialects are used: LMR, Lower McKenzie River; MR, Mary's River; PK, Proto-Kalapuya; S, Santiam from both Eustace Howard and John Hudson; SEH, Santiam from Eustace Howard; SJH, Santiam from John Hudson; TA, Tualatin recorded by Jaime de Angulo; TF, Tualatin recorded by Leo Frachtenberg; TG, Tualatin recorded by Albert Gatschet; TJ, Tualatin recorded by Melville Jacobs; YF, Yonkalla recorded by Leo Frachtenberg; YJ, Yonkalla recorded by Melville Jacobs; YM, Yamhill. Other abbreviations are dur., durative; intr., intransitive; n., noun; pl., plural; punct., punctual; sg., singular; subj., subject; tr., transitive. Gatschet's Tualatin, Frachtenberg's Lower McKenzie River, and some of Frachtenberg's Mary's River forms are taken from Jacobs (1945). These words are followed by the appropriate page numbers. All other examples are taken from the material in the Jacobs Collection. Some of Frachtenberg's Mary's River, Yonkalla, and Tualatin forms are phonemicized and the original spelling is given in parentheses. One should bear in mind that Frachtenberg's recordings of vowel length and consonant manner are not always reliable (see Jacobs 1945:146-47).