

Author: FP McManamon at NP-WASO-DCA

Date: 2/23/00 2:32 PM

Priority: Normal

TO: hunn@u.washington.edu (Prof. Eugene Hunn) at NP--INTERNET

CC: FP McManamon, Jason Roberts, Brooke Blades, Allison.Rumsey@usdoj.gov at NP--INTERNET,  
Carla\_Mattix@ios.doi.gov at NP--INTERNET

Subject: Comments on final draft, cult. affil. linguistics study

Gene--Thanks very much for the final draft you sent. I was pleased with all the additional text you provided to address the questions we raised about the first draft. We have a few additional comments that I would appreciate you addressing for the final. If these are unclear or you disagree with them, please call me at 202-343-4105.

Let me know by return email whether you are willing and able to address these additional comments and when you can do so by. I either can make changes to the electronic file we have here, or you can make changes on your copy and send a new copy to me for use as the final.

Specific Comments:

\*\* Maps 3 and 4: Can you give me a key for the abbreviations used in Map 3. Can you point out on a copy of Map 4 the locations of Lalik and Gable Mountain.

\*\* pp. 5-6, #(6), discussion of proto-Penutian dialects: I still am uncomfortable about relying so heavily upon Greenberg's method of historical linguistics due to its controversy among linguistics. Your ultimate statement in this section, "it is thus more than likely that Kennewick Man spoke a proto-Penutian dialect." depends mainly upon Greenberg's "controversial" approach to historical linguistics. I am wondering if you want to qualify your statement, as you have qualified others later in the text. Mainly I am concerned that "more than likely" could easily be translated, perhaps mistranslated, by the lawyers in this case into reflecting a "preponderance of the evidence", yet, I don't think that is what your meaning is.

Regarding Greenberg's linking Amerind with Clovis, the consensus among archeologists doing research on the earliest Americans is shifting, may already have shifted, to pre-Clovis initial populations in North America. If this is correct, the temporal calculations of Greenberg's formula probably would be affected and the directions of population migration (initially coastal, later through the "ice-free" corridor) also could be affected.

Both of these factors might call for some qualifiers to your statement above and also on p. 20, "In sum, I believe there is a strong possibility that Kennewick Man spoke a Proto-Penutian language."

\*\* pp. 14-15, Greenberg's method: We appreciate the addition of qualifications regarding Greenberg's method, e.g., that it is "highly controversial" and "many historical linguists remain skeptical of Greenberg's claims." The controversy over use of Greenberg's method seems to reflect the problem of determining actual length of "linguistic half-life" or, perhaps better analogized as the rate of "linguistic mutation." As I understand it, rates of genetic mutations still are debated and have a strong effect on estimates of human evolution and population differentiation. On the other hand, radiometric dating determinations provide an absolute age determination that may be replicated and have "half lives" that are determined by the realities of chemistry and physics. It might be useful to add qualifiers regarding the more general statement that a language structure or vocabulary has been in place for a long time and

DOI 07236

suggesting an absolute date for its use.

Is it possible to determine that absolute age without reference to Greenberg's method? My understanding is that this is possible, but that more traditional and accepted methods provide dates that are more recent.

Again, Gene, thanks for the clear, understandable report. It will be very useful for all of us at DOI in evaluating this matter.

FPM

DOI 07237