

UCLA

American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title

Wintu Dictionary. By Harvey Pitkin.

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6t66083d>

Journal

American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 12(4)

ISSN

0161-6463

Author

Shiple, William

Publication Date

1988-09-01

DOI

10.17953

Copyright Information

This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, available at <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>

serious questions as to the nature of indigenous realities, and highlight the confrontation of the Western mind with the prey of its colonizing conquests.

Leo Schelbert

University of Illinois, Chicago

Wintu Dictionary. By Harvey Pitkin. University of California Publications in Linguistics, Volume 95. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985. 922 pages. \$25.00 Paper.

Many years in the making, this work is, to my knowledge, the most extensive published dictionary of any California Indian language. The main section—Wintu to English—is 812 pages long, providing somewhere between 2,500 and 3,000 basic morphemic entries along with several thousand derived forms of widely varying provenience. A basic morpheme entry is one which gives the underlying phonological form of a root—the most efficient way of organizing the lexicon of a language like Wintu, which has a few prefixes and many suffixes of various kinds, some of which change the forms of the basic morphemes under certain conditions. (An example from English will make this clear. We have the word “able” which may be taken as a morpheme in its basic form. However, in the word “abil-ity” the pronunciation of the basic morpheme is changed when the suffix “-ity” is added.) In the present work, Pitkin refers his readers to his *Wintu Grammar* for the rules which alter the forms of basic morphemes. (University of California Publications in Linguistics, Volume 94, 1984: 40–55). The dictionary does not supply this information.

The phonological underpinnings of the lexical entries are based on a systematic phonemic (or morphophonemic) level which is, as P makes clear, essentially phonemic in the traditional sense except for two vowel morphophonemes, E and O, representing predictable phonemic alternations as follows: E becomes phonemically /i/ before any consonant followed /a/. e.g., *lEla*. “to transform” is phonemically /lila/; otherwise, E becomes phonemically /e/, e.g., *lElu*. “transform!” is phonemically /lelu/. Similarly, O becomes /u/ under the same conditions, e.g., *kOra*. “to make a web” is phonemically /kura/ while *kOro*. “net” is phonemically /koro/. A brief examination of the dictionary entries will clarify this.

In his preface, Pitkin provides a subtle, insightful analysis of the semantic organization of the Wintu language. He makes a strong case for a wide semantic domain for many Wintu morphemes (consider, for example, the various meanings of an English morpheme like "get"). The preface contains a remarkable discussion of the way in which language and culture interact and interpenetrate—a discussion which bears on the general problem of translation. Although translation is one of the oldest of intellectual issues, dating back, as it does, to classical times, it has only in recent years become a major concern for those working with Native American languages, particularly in connection with the translation of mythic and other texts as literary art forms. It is in this connection that Pitkin's preface seems particularly apposite.

The most important scholar before Pitkin to work on Wintu was Dorothy Demetrapoulou Lee, an anthropologist and linguist of great skill and insight whose work was published mostly in the forties (A useful bibliography of her relevant publications may be found in Pitkin's *Wintu Grammar*, page 304). For the dictionary, Pitkin had Lee's unpublished field notes in hand. He reelicited the forms which she had recorded, thereby augmenting his lexical material with items originally collected a generation before his own investigations. This augmentation, along with the fact that Pitkin's field work was done between 1956 and 1959 when several good speakers of Wintu were still alive, accounts for the impressively large number of entries in the dictionary.

Between 1975 and 1980, another Berkeley scholar, Alice Schlichter, did field work on Wintu. Basing her grammatical analysis on Pitkin's earlier work, she published, in 1981, a dictionary of the material she collected as Report #2 of the Survey of California and Other Indian Languages. Smaller in format—running to some 381 pages—her dictionary is considerably more abridged than Pitkin's. It is, nevertheless, carefully prepared and provides some variant dialect forms not recorded by Pitkin.

It is important to take note of who the dictionary is written for and what Pitkin assumes will be the main use to be made of it. It is written for linguists and anthropologists with linguistic training. It is designed to be used primarily as a reference for research in the historical reconstruction of the California (and, probably, North American) Indian language families. From the point of view of scholarly research, Pitkin had no choice but to present the material exactly as he has done. Any other procedure would

have resulted in the loss of much information which is vital and necessary for the work of other scholars. A few years ago, no one would have thought to bring up this point. Now, however, there are a number of people, notably Native Americans, who are *not* linguists but who are, nevertheless, very interested in the pre-Columbian languages of the continent. For them, using Pitkin's dictionary presents real problems.

How was Wintu pronounced? What did it sound like? These questions can only be completely resolved by exposure to a native speaker of the language (or perhaps to some extent by access to an extensive audio recording). Short of that, Pitkin's transcription offers the next best thing—an accurate, consistent, sound-by-sound written record. Unfortunately, this does not solve the problem for the non-linguist. There is no simple, non-technical way to make clear how the consonant and vowel symbols which Pitkin uses are to be pronounced. Wintu has sounds which are absolutely unlike anything in English. The dictionary does not contain any information, even in linguists' terms, on how to pronounce Wintu. Very properly, Pitkin refers his readers to his grammar—specifically, pages 17 to 39—for an explication of Wintu sounds.

Pitkin's Wintu dictionary is a work of monumental scope, the result of many years of careful analysis and preparation. Though many other excellent dictionaries of California Indian languages have appeared over the last thirty or forty years, none approach his work in sheer size nor do any surpass it in clarity and elegance. It presents us with a record of the Wintu lexicon which is in many ways comparable to that which we have for much more important and widely-known languages in the world. Though some thirty-five years have passed since Pitkin's field work began, the long delay in publication is well justified in light of the splendid result. The dictionary constitutes a major contribution of lasting and definitive value to our knowledge of Native American languages.

William Shipley

University of California, Santa Cruz