This paper argues that Chinook Jargon is a true pidgin and not a jargon in Silverstein’s (1972) sense of a structurally targetless speech form created anew by each speaker, or rather by each pair of speakers, as an independent individual compromise. The argument falls into two parts. First, though Silverstein’s notion of cross-language compromise in the formation of a contact medium makes excellent sense diachronically, it seems weak synchronically, as a scenario for day-to-day communication among individual speakers. Second, Silverstein’s belief that the attested Jargon contains no features that are not relatable to English is not justified by the facts. Moreover, and more importantly, when we abandon Silverstein’s socially and linguistically simplified picture of CJ as an exclusively English-Chinook compromise, we find ample evidence in both the phonology and the syntax to support the view that CJ is a real language, with grammar as well as lexicon. That is, there is clear evidence that CJ, though functionally and linguistically restricted in typical pidgin fashion, possessed a grammatical norm that all its speakers aimed at — and, for the most part, achieved. This evidence is presented in the paper in the context of a comparison of CJ materials provided by Indians (Twana, Upper Chehalis, Tsimshian, Nootka, Upper Coquille Athabaskan, Snoqualmie, Samish, and Santiam Kalapuyan) with structural features of their native languages.

Finally, I suggest that the structure of Chinook Jargon has historical implications for the old controversy as to whether or not CJ existed before Europeans established permanent trading posts in the Northwest. The most significant point is that certain phonological features of Indians’ CJ are so consistent among Indian speakers of the Jargon, and so rare in English (and French) speakers’ CJ, that the Jargon must have been learned by Indians from other Indians, not from whites. This fact weakens the case for a post-European origin for the Jargon, since it is hard to explain on the assumption that the Jargon’s earliest and (at least at first) primary sphere of usage was Indian-white communication.

1. Introduction

Chinook Jargon (CJ) is a pidgin whose attested history in the Pacific Northwest of the United States and Canada covers a period of more than one hundred years. It had only a limited range of usage along the Columbia River and in neighboring coastal areas during the first half of the nineteenth century, but reached its peak during the second half of the century, eventually spreading south along the coast to northern California and north through British Columbia to southern Alaska. In the middle years of the century it was the major lingua franca in the region, and as late as the 1880’s Boas used CJ as a contact language with speakers of Bella Bella, Bella Coola, Tillamook, Clatsop, Chinook proper, Lower Chehalis, Songish, Kwakiutl, Tsimshian, and Haida [Boas 1933:209]. CJ gradually fell out of usage in the first half of the twentieth century, as English replaced it as the lingua franca in the area, and today only a few elderly people, both Indians and whites, remember the Jargon.

The origin of CJ is unclear; in fact, it has been a source of controversy since the nineteenth century. The controversy revolves around the question of whether CJ existed as a means of communication among Indian tribes before the appearance of Europeans in the region, or whether it arose only after the Europeans arrived to provide a stimulus for the emergence of a contact medium. More recently, a new controversy has arisen about the linguistic status of CJ. In his well-known 1972 article Silverstein argues that the grammatical structure of the Jargon ‘is defined only in relation to a particular component first language of its speakers’ [I:378], so that Chinook Jargon itself actually consists only of a lexicon; it has no grammar of its own and is therefore not a language if, pace Silverstein [II:622-3], we insist on the usual criterion that speakers of the same language have a shared grammar. In producing
CJ utterances, says Silverstein, each speaker starts with his own primary language and reduces it drastically in ways that are predictable by universal principles, until it converges with the analogously reduced primary language of his interlocutor into a mutually intelligible surface structure onto which CJ lexical items are mapped. Starting from a careful contrastive analysis of Chinook and English, Silverstein claims that 'it is possible...to modify either grammar to produce' CJ [II:618] and that, in fact, 'it is just the systematic non-appearance in Jargon of anything not relatable to both Chinook and English which seems to me to render this goal of independent grammatical analysis of Jargon unattainable' [II:616].

In the present paper I will argue that Chinook Jargon is a true pidgin and not a jargon in Silverstein's sense of a structurally targetless speech form created anew by each speaker, or rather by each pair of speakers, as an independent individual compromise. My argument falls into two parts. First, though Silverstein's notion of cross-language compromise in the formation of a contact medium makes excellent sense diachronically, it seems weak to me synchronically, as a scenario for day-to-day communication among individual speakers. Second, Silverstein's belief that the attested Jargon contains no features that are not relatable to English is not justified by the facts. Moreover, and more importantly, when we abandon Silverstein's socially and linguistically simplified picture of CJ as an exclusively English-Chinook compromise, we find ample evidence in both the phonology and the syntax to support the view that CJ is a real language, with grammar as well as lexicon. That is, there is clear evidence that CJ, though functionally and linguistically restricted in typical pidgin fashion, possessed a grammatical norm that all its speakers aimed at -- and achieved. This evidence is presented below in the context of a comparison of CJ materials provided by Indians (Twana, Upper Chehalis, Tsimshian, Nootka, Upper Coquille Athabaskan, Snoqualmie, Saanich, and Santiam Kalapuya) with structural features of their native languages.

Finally, I will suggest that the structure of Chinook Jargon has historical implications that apply to the older controversy about CJ. The most significant of these is that certain phonological features of Indians' CJ are so consistent among Indian speakers of the Jargon, and so rare in English (and French) speakers' CJ, that the Jargon must have been learned by Indians from other Indians, not from whites. This fact weakens the case for a post-European origin for the Jargon, since it is hard to explain on the assumption that the Jargon's earliest and (at least at first) primary sphere of usage was Indian-white communication.

2. Speaking Chinook Jargon: How Do You Know When You've Got It Right?

In arguing that CJ has no grammar of its own, Silverstein continues (though in a far more sophisticated form) the very traditional line of argumentation that once held that pidgins in general are grammarless. This older view, now universally abandoned by workers in pidgin and creole studies, encompassed a belief that speakers of pidgins produce a mere hodgepodge, stringing words together in random order. Much of the research on pidgins over the past twenty years or so has been devoted to description of their grammatical regularities and, particularly in the phonology, of their orderly heterogeneity. Now, Silverstein certainly does not claim that CJ is a mere hodgepodge. His position on the question of structural regularities in the Jargon is not entirely clear, however. On the one hand, he believes that a Chinook-tinged version of CJ is to be expected from a Chinook speaker [I:379]; on the other hand, he devotes considerable attention to the problem of deriving identical CJ sentences from very different English and Chinook syntactic deep structures, so it is reasonable to assume that English and Chinook speakers will, on his model, produce
syntactically similar or identical sentences -- that is, to take
just one example, that the regular CJ word order pattern SVO is
the cross-language compromise to be expected from English and
Chinook speakers.

But if we have well-defined expectations about the particular
common-denominator structures that speakers will produce in a
given contact situation, and if those expectations do not match
the results of a hypothetical simplification of either language
in isolation, then we must ask how a speaker knows which route to
follow in simplifying his native-language syntax. This problem is
compounded if we assume further -- as is in fact the case with CJ
-- that native speakers of typologically diverse languages arrive
at the same cross-language compromise. For instance, Silverstein
argues convincingly that SVO word order is just what we would ex-
pect from an English-Chinook compromise, since English does not
admit a verb-initial structure in declarative sentences, while
Chinook, a verb-initial language, does freely admit SVO order
through topicalization of the subject noun phrase [II:612]. Surely,
though, a spontaneous simplification of Chinook without reference
to English (or to some other SVO language) would result in verb-
initial sentences. The only way I can see of accounting for the
SVO order of Chinook speakers' CJ, on Silverstein's model, is to
conclude that CJ speakers had a target to aim at in producing CJ
sentences. This target must have been, in effect, a grammatical
norm for CJ.

The question then arises as to the usefulness of Silverstein's
model. In order to communicate in CJ, English and Chinook speakers
would have to have learned both the CJ lexical items and the
appropriate structural outcomes (e.g. SVO word order) of their
independent syntactic simplifications. If they have learned
both lexicon and grammar in order to speak CJ, then what reason is
there to believe that they produce CJ utterances derived from their
native-language syntactic deep structures rather than directly from
independent CJ syntactic deep structures? Silverstein presents
one major structural argument that is applicable here. Jargon
is, he claims, in every way much simpler than either English or
Chinook [I:386], and it is therefore possible to derive Jargon
sentences from either language's deep structures. Since it is
possible to do this, we should do it. Even if we grant his premise
for the moment (though it is false), his conclusion does not
follow from it. Chinook Jargon, it is true, is a typical pidgin
in that it is extremely shallow derivationally in the transforma-
tional sense. As Silverstein observes, there are no syntactic
embeddings; clauses are conjoined rather than subjoined. Bound
morphemes occur very rarely. There are few function words (these
include prepositions, negative particles, and the occasional
interrogative particle). The category of auxiliary verb is rather
well developed, providing for most of the complexity in the verb
phrase. But any argument to the effect that a relatively simple
grammatical structure is not susceptible of independent grammatical
analysis would have to rest on some standard measure of minimum
acceptable complexity, and no such standard exists. CJ is not
unusual among pidgins in its simplicity, and grammatical descrip-
tions of other pidgins abound in the literature.

Although I do not see the force of Silverstein's argument against
the existence of an independent CJ grammar, his notion of a cross-
language compromise has a very important application to the
general problem of the origin and development of a pidgin language.
He expresses this notion synchronically in the following way: 'If
each speaker retains in his grammar for Jargon sentence production
essentially these more basic and expectable features of his pri-
mary language, then of course we expect the surface forms to merge
as the result of universal tendencies' [II:620]. Restating the
idea diachronically, we would expect that each speaker of a
developing pidgin would retain those features of his native
language that are most likely to be understood by his interlocutors.
These would not always be the most basic features of the language;
This approach to the study of the origins of pidgin grammar is not new, but it was unfashionable for some time and has only recently been explored vigorously again. A major stimulus for current elaborations of this view is recent work on language universals and markedness theory -- the same theories Silverstein appeals to in his synchronic analysis of Chinook Jargon. For presentations of the diachronic approach, see Kay & Sankoff 1974, Thomason 1980, and Thomason & Kaufman, Forthcoming.

I hope to persuade Kaufman to publish his grammatical notes in the near future, because they constitute the only description in existence of CJ grammar as a whole, as far as I know.

Throughout this paper I use the terms 'velar' and 'uvular' to refer to the front and back dorsal series respectively. For some of the Indian languages, and possibly for CJ itself, the actual places of articulation are prevelar or even palatal vs. velar; but the opposition type is the same for all the languages, so in using just the one set of terms I am emphasizing the structural feature (contrast between two dorsal series) at the expense of phonetic precision.

Unfortunately, postvocalic h after a vowel a is also sometimes used to indicate a pronunciation [a], so care must be taken in its interpretation. The second h in Parker's yahkah is an example; another is Winthrop's mahcook 'buy' (1863:301) for /makuk/. These words never had CJ /h/ or /x/ in these positions.

This word is anglicized to chuck in later sources, including some Indian ones; see the Appendix for attestations. Harrington's Chehalis informant gave

if all speakers have typologically similar native languages, then features that are highly marked in universal terms might well turn up in the pidgin. Moreover, VSO word order is more basic than SVO order in Chinook, and neither pattern has a clear edge universally. The SVO norm of CJ may therefore indicate that, for at least some speakers of the developing pidgin, verb-medial sentences were easier to understand than verb-initial sentences. In any case, only those marked features that are shared by all or most of the native languages would be expected to appear in the resulting pidgin, and thus we expect (and indeed find) relatively few universally marked features in pidgins in general. On this view, the grammatical structure of a fully crystalized pidgin language is a function of the structures of the native languages of its developers and original speakers. I will return to this point, with its implications for a theory of CJ origin, in §4.

The Structure of Chinook Jargon vs. Its Speakers' Native Languages

3.0. In this section I will address the specific questions Silverstein raises about the attested Chinook Jargon: do CJ structures represent a lowest common denominator, phonologically and syntactically, of the structures of speakers' native languages? Do speakers retain their own native inventory when pronouncing Jargon words [1:384], and is Jargon syntax 'basically a drastically reduced form of each speaker's primary language'[1:386]? Is CJ 'in all respects greatly simplified in relation to both Chinook proper and English' [1:386]? Silverstein answers all these questions in the affirmative; my answer to all of them is no. In testing his claims I will concentrate on showing that, as far as we can
tell from the attestations of CJ, all its speakers had a specific target to aim at—a grammatical norm—and some of the target grammatical features of CJ differed markedly from structures in their native languages. That is, if Silverstein is right, then we ought not to find any systematically occurring nonlexical features in any one person's CJ that do not occur in that person's native language. But in fact, as we will see below, such features occur in almost all of the sources.

I will begin by considering English and Chinook structures in relation to CJ, because Silverstein emphasizes these languages to the virtual exclusion of all the others whose speakers used CJ. Then, since my hypothesis about a systematic, consistent CJ grammar must be tested against as wide a variety of attestations as possible, I will compare CJ to the native languages of Indians who provided CJ material directly to linguists.

To facilitate the comparison of CJ phonology with the native-language phonologies of its speakers, I give below the CJ phonemic inventory presented by Kaufman in his unpublished 1968 grammatical notes. Each item in the chart is a single phoneme; the complex symbols follow Kaufman's proposed normalized CJ orthography.7 Every phoneme in this set except /t's'/ is attested in at least two independent sources and in unambiguous environments, e.g. /xw/ (*= [xʷ]) /C/, where a cluster analysis is not attractive. The only phonemic opposition that some (not all!) Indians clearly lack is /r:/ /l/ (no /r/). The only opposition type that is not directly attested in any French or English source is velar : uvular,8 in addition, the glottalized phoneme /t'/, and perhaps also /p'/ and /ts'/, are not directly attested in French or English sources, though the other glottalized phonemes are. None of the European sources I've seen indicates non-initial glottal stop, so this phoneme is dubious for non-Indian speakers of CJ. In the Appendix I have presented the evidence I have collected so far on the non-European oppositions and distributions: plain : glottalized, velar : uvular, plain : labialized, the three laterals, the dorsal fricatives, non-initial glottal stop, and certain consonant clusters.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>p</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>ts</th>
<th>t's</th>
<th>k</th>
<th>kw</th>
<th>q</th>
<th>qw</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p'</td>
<td>t'</td>
<td>t's'</td>
<td>(t's')</td>
<td>k'</td>
<td>kw'</td>
<td>q'</td>
<td>qw'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>hw</td>
<td>xw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(q)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 
- /h/ = [h] */#* elsewhere;
- /x/ = [x] everywhere.
- /'/ = [?] but _ after a consonant symbol is the usual glottalization sign.

Table I
Chinook Jargon Phonemes
3.1. Chinook Jargon vs. English

Except for Boas and later linguists representing CJ as spoken by Indians, all English-speaking authors use an English-based orthography in writing CJ words. Given the deficiencies of English spelling for representing non-English sounds, we would not expect to find much direct linguistic evidence either to confirm or to refute Silverstein's claim that English speakers' CJ contains no phonological features that are not relatable to English. The reason is that the lack of a feature like glottalization in these sources could mean either that English speakers did not make the distinction between, say, /t/ and /tʃ/, or that they made it but could not represent it with English letters (just as, for instance, the distinction between insult and nsœit is not represented in English spelling).

The strongest evidence in the literature in favor of Silverstein's view is the undoubted existence of a set of phonological correspondence rules used by English speakers (and apparently known also to at least some Indians) in speaking the Jargon. The best known of these rules is mentioned as early as Hale 1846: the non-resonant laterals /r/ and /ɾ/ 'become kl at the beginning of the word, and tl at the end' [640]. This rule is not used consistently by all English-speaking authors (see below), but Elendorff [p.c. 1980] attests to its currency in Indian-white communication as late as 1939.

Nevertheless, enough evidence exists to refute Hale's early claim (and Silverstein's, following him) that 'as the Jargon is to be spoken by Chinooks, Englishmen, and Frenchmen, so as to be alike easy and intelligible to all, it must admit no sound which cannot be readily pronounced by all three' [1846:640]. The most common non-English feature in the English speakers' texts is the presence of postvocalic h, which represents both CJ /h/ and /x/ (since velars and uvulars are not distinguished by Europeans). Some authors use the spelling gh for this purpose, e.g. Ross's Tekeigh and Shaw's Tik-ehn - Tiky 'want, like' for /tʃ'ix/ (alternating with /tʃki/, which is more common and presumably due to anglicization); Shaw's Tshug 'split', Lagh 'lean (over)', and Pe-chugh 'green' for /ts'ox/, /lxw/, and /ptʃh/; Ross's stoghkin 'eight' for /stuxtkin/; and Parker's ĕght 'one' for /iht/. Other authors, notably Hale himself, use h: Hale tōkēn - takēn 'want, like', stōhtkin - stūhtkin 'eight', and even išhka - yāhka 'he, she' for /ya(x)ka/ (the variant /yaka/ is more common); Parker also has yahkah, alternating with yakk; and Palmer has iht 'one'.

There is even a small amount of evidence indicating that at least one English speaker recognized, and kept in intersonant position, the distinction between CJ /h/ and /x/. Parker transcribes the word for 'high', for instance, as saghalle (CJ /saxali/); compare his spelling illaha 'earth' for CJ /ili7i/-/ilahi/ (the latter no doubt represents an anglicization; it is used by all whites and some Indians).

The lateral nature of word-initial /t/ is indicated by at least two English-speaking writers. Ross uses tl for word-initial /t/: Plutchën-men for /tut'emen/ 'woman' and Plšh for /tuʃ/ 'good'; Shaw usually follows the normal kl practice, but in one word he uses initial tl: Tl'kope for /tk'up/ 'chop' (presumably the odd cluster accounts for his deviation here).

Other non-English features in English speakers' writings come under the general heading of syllable-initial clusters, like Shaw's Tl'kope, that are not possible in English. A borderline case is the initial ts sequence that occurs in most of the sources I've seen. This is an affricate in CJ as spoken by Indians, but it may well have been a consonant cluster in whites' CJ. In either case, of course, the ts sequence is non-English. Examples are
Hale's tsɔk - tsɔk - tsuk - -tɔk for /tɔɡ/ 'water'; Palmer's T-sit-still and Shaw's chillchil - tsiltsil for /tɔɛlts/ 'button, star'; Shaw's Tsugh for /ts'ux/ 'split', Tsee'pie for /tspl/ 'miss', and Tsik-tsik - Chik tchik for /ts'ikts'ik/ 'wheel; wagon'.

The word for 'white', /t'k'u/ , turns up in three of the sources I have with the initial cluster intact: Parker t'k'op, Shaw T'k'ope, and Winthrop Tee-Coop - t'k'ope (cope); compare Hale's tʊkʊp.

Finally, the word /dlay/ 'dry'; which is of English origin but which appears in all sources, English as well as Indian, with CJ //./, turns up in several writers' lists with the non-English d1 (or t1) cluster: Hale tlai, Winthrop D'ly - De-ly.

This word is particularly interesting because it provides a striking bit of counterevidence to Silverstein's claim that 'all speakers clearly simplify to a certain extent the phonetic realization of words derived from their own languages and yet pronounce them with their sound structures more intact than do non-native speakers' [1:384]. It is difficult to imagine an English speaker simplifying his /r/ to /l/, even with an epenthetic vowel inserted between the word-initial stop and the following resonant; it is even harder to imagine him simplifying an ordinary /dr/ cluster to a cluster that violates English syllable structure constraints.

The completely consistent presence of /l/ in this CJ word can only be accounted for if we assume that English speakers learned it as a CJ word rather than rephonologizing the native English word dry as they spoke the Jargon.

The direct linguistic evidence of the English writers thus strongly indicates the existence of a consistent CJ phonological norm containing certain distributional features and perhaps one phonemic distinction, /h/ vs. /x/, that cannot be claimed as simplifications of English phonology. English writers cannot be shown to distinguish glottalized from nonglottalized sounds, though Shaw's spelling Tiss-zum (- Tsun, Tsun) for /ts'am/ 'mark' may represent an effort to indicate glottalization. They do not distinguish /t/ from /tʰ/ nor velar stops from uvular stops, and they do not indicate non-initial /V/. Labialized dorsals are treated as CW clusters in syllable-initial position; elsewhere labialization is usually not indicated, though Hale's vərənt məkust (- məkst) for /makwst/ 'two' probably reflects a labialized velar.

Before turning to the indirect evidence for an independent CJ phonology, let us look at the most important direct evidence from French-speaking writers. Of all the European-language writings on CJ, the one that is closest by far to the pronunciation of the Indian sources is the little book from the Quebec Mission, containing brief grammatical notes, a dictionary, catechism, prayers, and hymns. This book was composed in the first years of the Mission (1838-1839) by Father Modeste Demers, who, according to his colleague Father Blanchet, 'possessed [the Jargon] sufficiently well [after three months' residence in the region] to be able to explain the catechism and give instruction to the catechumens without having to force himself to write what he had to tell them' [Notices of the Quebec Mission, 1956:19]. Blanchet revised, corrected, and completed the book in 1867, and Father St.ONGE modified it, made additions, and published it in Montreal in 1871.

The result is a remarkable work, and it shows beyond any doubt that these Europeans, at least, heard most of the CJ distinctions presented above and tried to reproduce some of them orthographically. Dorsal fricatives are represented by a truncated letter p (in contrast to ordinary ʃ); CJ /h/ and /x/ are thus consistently distinguished in syllable-initial position, e.g. helo 'it is) not' vs. holosea 'different' (CJ /hilo/ , /xluima/) and elehi 'earth' vs. sabali 'high'. Plain and glottalized dorsal stops are also distinguished regularly. The glottalized stops are written with a truncated k (or lower-case k), as opposed to nonglottalized k and k.
The lateral fricative is always written țl; the lateral affricate /tș/ is usually written tl, but one word, /tșep/ 'deep' is written variously as Tlep, Tlig, or Klip -- the last showing glottalization of the stop by the only orthographic means available. Similarly, the spelling ppens for /p'e'ns/ 'baked in ashes' may represent an attempt to indicate glottalization of the initial stop. Besides these distinctions, Demers et al. regularly show initial ts and the non-English clusters, which are also non-French: Tikop 'chop', tsok 'water', Tal 'dry', and others. A glance at the Appendix will show how closely the transcriptions in this work agree with later transcriptions of CJ elicited from Indians by linguists. Now, it might be argued that the French Canadian missionaries and the English-speaking travelers and missionaries could have heard different versions of the Jargon, and that this circumstance, rather than mere orthographic (or auditory) difficulties, made the English speakers' CJ look so very different from Demers', Blanchet's, and St. Onge's. But a look at the relevant dates and places shows that this is not a tenable hypothesis. The Catholic French speakers established their mission at Fort Vancouver early in 1839 [Notices of the Quebec Mission, 1956:13ff.]. Hale speaks of the Jargon at Fort Vancouver, which he visited between 1837 and 1842. Parker first saw Fort Vancouver on 16 October 1835 [1842:146-7] and left the region in June, 1836 [1845:357], so he must have collected his 'Vocabulary of the Chenook Language [actually Chinook Jargon] as Spoken about Fort Vancouver' during that period. Ross arrived on the Northwest Coast in 1811, but the Preface to his book is dated 1846, and by that time he had settled permanently in the region. All these people were thus talking to the same groups of Indians in the same places at about the same time -- in some cases literally the same Indians, because the Catholic missionaries (like Demers et al.) and the Protestant missionaries (like Parker) were engaged in an acrimonious tug-of-war for the very same souls. What the French speakers heard, then, the English speakers must also have heard. Of course it is very likely that the English speakers did not achieve as good a command of the language as Demers and his fellows did, and maybe later anglo CJ speakers diverged more, and more systematically, from the Indian pronunciation. But the evidence from the English writings shows that some non-English features were recognized as appropriate for the Jargon, and the evidence of the Quebec Mission source shows that some of the more exotic distinctions too were part of the target phonology.

The question remains as to whether English speakers recognized, and perhaps learned, a target CJ phonology that included such features as glottalized stops and dorsal fricatives. Here the indirect evidence, which consists of commentary on CJ, becomes crucial. On the one hand we have Hale's statement, quoted above, that the Jargon could not contain any sound not easily pronounced by English, French, and Chinook speakers; but we have already seen that, at least as far as syllable structure constraints are concerned, Hale's own CJ material contradicts his assertion. All the other commentary I've seen on this point suggests the opposite -- that Europeans were aware of the complex CJ phonology but could not, or would not, represent all the distinctions orthographically. The clearest statement I've found comes, again, from the Quebec Mission, in Father Bolduc's 1845 report on his experiences in the Northwest:

The Chinook jargon is derived in large part from the language of the true Chinooks who live near Fort George [Astoria]. This language is very poor and insufficient. In two weeks one can easily learn it. It is absolutely useless to make a grammar or a dictionary of it; besides one could not reproduce the pronunciation; one must absolutely hear it pronounced, and then one has trouble catching on to it. In the report of 1842 there are many names of men and tribes which you would not be able to recognize on hearing them pronounced correctly.

-- 1956:150; emphasis mine.
This note is significant because, while Father Bolduc is obviously aware of the difference between CJ and Chinook proper, and of the pidgin-like nature of the Jargon ('poor and insufficient'), he is quite definite about the difficulty of pronouncing the Jargon correctly -- a difficulty that could not have existed if, as Silverstein claims, each speaker simply pronounced CJ with a reduced version of his own native phonology. At a slightly later period, Winthrop seems to be expressing basically the same sentiment about CJ pronunciation when he warns his reader, at the beginning of his 'Partial Vocabulary of the Chinook Jargon', that 'all words in Chinook [i.e. Chinook Jargon] are very much aspirated, gutturalized, sputtered, and swallowed' [1863:299]. Later still, Gill again makes the same comment, with the added information that it was the Indians who pronounced the Jargon properly:

The pronunciation of these words can only be thoroughly learned by conversation with the Indians, whose deep gutturals and long-drawn vowels are beyond the power of our alphabet to represent.

-- 1862:4; cited by Hymes, Forthcoming, (as p. 285).

Here we have the same assessment of CJ phonology expressed independently by three different European writers over a period of nearly forty years -- a period which saw the greatest expansion of the Jargon. It doesn't look as if English speakers settled quickly into pronunciation habits that approximated English and seemed quite adequate for speaking the Jargon; it looks, instead, very much as if English speakers knew all along (Hale notwithstanding) that achieving good CJ pronunciation required time and effort, and the acquisition of new and unfamiliar sounds. This is not to say that most or even many English speakers reached this goal. Indeed, the total absence of systematic attempts by English writers to represent features like glottalization, non-initial /'/, and the velar: uvular opposition suggests that relatively few English speakers tried to acquire good pronunciation in the Jargon. As Indian speakers became accustomed to English speakers' systematic distortions, no difficulty in communication would result from the English speakers' failure to make some of the distinctions. Nevertheless, the indirect evidence of the commentaries provides a strong argument for the existence of a complex CJ target phonology, one that at least some Europeans recognized and tried to learn.11

The search for non-English features in CJ syntax as used by English speakers offers some difficulties of interpretation, but here too there are some unambiguous examples that Silverstein's model will not predict. The basic word order of CJ, as mentioned above, is SVO, so in this respect Silverstein is on solid ground. Even here, though, there is an occasional variant word order VS, which occurs not only in texts elicited from Indians but also (though less frequently) in English speakers' sample sentences.12 Hale 1846 contains 9 VS sentences and 20 SV ones;13 Gill 1902 has 6 VS and 15 SV sentences. In both sources, most sentences have only a pronoun subject. Indian speakers, to judge by Jacobs' and Boas' texts, were more likely to produce VS sentences when the
subject was a full noun rather than a pronoun. In such sentences Jacobs' Santiam Kalapuya informant, for example, produced 66 SV sentences and 12 VS sentences, though eight of the latter group had a subject pronoun preceding the verb in addition to the subject noun following it. Now, some of the VS sentences I'm counting in these sources are questions, and in questions VS word order is possible, to a limited degree, in English. It should be noted, however, that all experts agree on the absence of any regular word-order shift in CJ question formation. And the occurrence of VS word order in declarative sentences, even though it is occasional rather than regular, is a feature that cannot plausibly be claimed as a simplification of English. A typical example from Hale is Hāias olo tsok naika 'I am very thirsty' [1846:645], literally 'much hungry water I'.

A more problematic syntactic feature is the quite regular (though not exclusive) pattern in which a pleonastic subject pronoun is used in addition to a subject noun. This feature surely comes from the completely analogous pattern in Chinook (where the usual order is S_\text{pro} V S_\text{noun}) and in other Indian languages of the region, and it appears in the writings of English-speaking authors as well as in the Indian texts. Silverstein discusses a typical example, originally from Hale 1890 [33]: Jesus yaka kumtuks kanawey tilikums 'Jesus knew all nations' (literally 'Jesus he know all peoples') [II:612]. According to Silverstein, this sentence type 'should be compared with that English style which states a subject, then comments about it with a full sentence, a particular "folksy" literary style' [II:612]; and, indeed, it is possible to find analogous sentences in nineteenth-century American literature of the West, e.g. in Mark Twain's Roughing It: 'n' Tom Quartz he begin to wonder.... [1872:328]. But Silverstein's assumption that such constructions might appear spontaneously as simplifications in all English speakers' CJ is surely unjustified. Even granting that all English speakers may know of such a style, only those speakers who actually use it regularly could reasonably be expected to produce it -- in the absence of a conventional CJ norm -- in the process of simplifying their native syntax in order to communicate with other CJ speakers. Most of Tlain's characters and many or most English-speaking trappers, traders, servants, and soldiers in the region at that time might well fall into this group. But Horatio Hale the Harvard graduate, the various English-speaking missionaries who used CJ, and other people educated enough to write about CJ are unlikely to have been regular speakers of what is, after all, a socially stigmatized speech style. 14

A comparable construction is the regular possessive formation in which the possessor noun is followed by a pronoun referring to it, and the pronoun in turn by the possessed noun: Jesus yaka wawa 'Jesus' words/speech' (literally 'Jesus his words/speech') [II:613, from Hale 1890]. This parallels the Chinook possessive construction, and similar patterns are found in other Indian languages of the region. Silverstein considers this construction, too, to be a plausible simplification of English; in fact, he suggests that it might constitute 'interlingual evidence for the underlying verbal nature of possession' [II:613], and then he goes on to give a possible transformational derivation of it in those terms. His argument here is not convincing. First, it suffers from the same liability as his argument for SVO word order from a Chinook speaker: he can account for it only under the assumption that the speaker had a particular target -- a grammatical norm -- in mind, because otherwise anyone would expect an English speaker to simplify his syntactic possessive construction to Jesus speech instead of
activating a complex set of transformational rules to produce a relexified analogue of Jesus his speech. (Constructions like Jesus speech actually do occur very frequently in English-based pidgins and creoles around the world, usually when at least some of the pidgin speakers have native languages with analogous possessives.) Second, it is ultimately a great deal simpler to assume that CJ speakers learned a CJ grammar than to argue for an otherwise unheard-of (or at least undemonstrated) surfacing of a deeper syntactic level. The difficulty with Silverstein's claim here is that he is basing it on a theory of syntax so powerful that virtually any construction in a pidgin could be explained as a simplification of any language's syntactic deep structure. Consider, for instance, the argument in the literature to the effect that English is a VSO language [McCawley 1970], which could be used to account for English speakers' simplifying to VSO order in speaking some pidgin (and then why didn't they do so in speaking CJ to speakers of VSO languages?!). Given the extreme power (and lack of constraints on possible deep structures) of transformational-generative syntax, an argument that a particular construction is a simplification of some deeper structure must, if it is to be convincing, have some plausible source in the directly observable surface structures of the language. Aside from a possible reference to the stilted style of bookplates (‘John, his book’), one has no such recourse here.15 The Jesus his words pattern is surely a direct calque on Chinook and analogous constructions in other Indian languages.

Another non-English feature in CJ syntax is the question particle na, which is used optionally in yes/no questions. In Kaufman's 'Tales in Chinook Jargon' (Boas and Jacobs texts) and his 'Short sentences in Chinook Jargon' (Hale 1846, Winthrop, Gill) [1966a,b], I count 17 yes/no questions in all, 6 with the particle na and 11 without it. The English writers have as many instances of na as the texts elicited directly from Indians have. The catechism in Demers et al. contains many more yes/no questions, and there the use of na is much more regular than in the English and Indian sources.

Finally, CJ negative constructions differ in their word order from English, and from anything one might reasonably expect as a simplification of English. In the same sources I used for the na count I found 24 negative sentences with the order NEG S V and only 7 with the order S NEG V; or the latter type occur in Indian texts, three in English speakers' texts. This pattern (as we will see below) is predictable from Chinook sentences with pronominal subject affixes and from analogous patterns in other Indian languages of the region, but it doesn't fit Silverstein's picture of CJ as English-derived for English speakers. It also contrasts sharply with negative sentence patterns in most English-based pidgins and creoles, where the (original) native languages of non-English speakers share the English word order S NEG V. The only pidgin I know of with a negative word order pattern like that of CJ is the 17th-century Delaware-based Traders' Jargon of the northeastern U.S.; in that pidgin too the pattern can be explained on the basis of patterns found in the relevant Indian languages (see Thomason 1980 for a detailed discussion of this point).
To sum up, then, the CJ attested in the writings of English speakers contains several sounds and sound sequences and several syntactic features that are difficult or impossible to characterize as plausible simplifications of English phonological and syntactic structures. These are the presence of initial /ts/, of /x/ and/or /r/, and of non-English consonant clusters in the phonology, and, in the syntax, occasional VS word order beside the regular SV order; a regular pattern S noun S pro V; a regular possessive construction Poss noun Poss pro N; a regular word order pattern NEG S V in negative sentences; and a fairly common question particle na. In addition to this direct evidence, there are comments by Bolduc, Winthrop, and Gill about the non-English nature of CJ target phonology, and Hymes cites a similar comment about the syntax made by the missionary Eells [Forthcoming, ms.25]. The contrary assertion by Hale about the phonology is not borne out by his own CJ data. All this points unmistakably to the existence of a grammatical norm for CJ independent of English structures. And, as we will see below, texts elicited directly from Indian speakers of CJ by linguists point in the same direction -- toward a CJ grammar independent of (though not as divergent from) native-language structures.

3.2. CJ vs. Chinook

The only CJ texts that directly reflect CJ as spoken by a native speaker of Chinook are those dictated to Melville Jacobs by Mrs. Victoria Howard, a Clackamas speaker. These provide most of the CJ data that Silverstein analyzes from a Chinookan viewpoint, but there is evidence that Mrs. Howard's CJ was atypical. Silverstein quotes Boas' comment on this point, that Mrs. Howard's CJ was 'certainly not the Chinook Jargon that has been used for years all along the coast, but seems to be a Jargon affected by the Clackamas, a dialect of Chinook proper' (Silverstein 1:378, from Boas 1933:208-9). Silverstein goes on to say that "a jargon affected by the Clackamas" is what is expected from a native speaker of Clackamas, just as a jargon affected by the English is to be expected from a native speaker of English (1:379). But although he grants Boas' point, Silverstein does not take seriously enough Boas' further comments along the same lines, specifically the assertion that he heard 'the same Chinook that has often been recorded' (i.e. a CJ unlike Mrs. Howard's) from other speakers of Chinookan dialects, including Clackamas, Kathlamet, and Clatsop; two of these, he says, 'had spoken Chinook proper as their native language' (Boas 1933:209), and Chinook proper is the Chinookan dialect on which CJ is (partly) lexically based. So, although Silverstein may be right in saying that Mrs. Howard's deviant CJ was 'within the tolerance of the Jargon speech community' (1:379)16, and Jacobs may be right in his belief that Mrs. Howard's CJ represented a better and more elegant Jargon in the eyes of other Indians (1932:27-8), the crucial point here is that Mrs. Howard's CJ was deviant. Since Silverstein is arguing for the non-existence of an independent CJ grammar, a counterargument must show only that a grammatical norm for CJ existed. The question of whether or not everyone who spoke CJ conformed to that norm is another matter, and so are the social values attached to particular deviations from the norm. The attitude toward Mrs. Howard's version of CJ that Jacobs refers to sheds some interesting light on the prestige of Chinook itself, and of its speakers -- a prestige that is attested to in many writings on the region -- but Boas' assessment is much more important to an investigation of the nature of the Jargon as a linguistic system.

In any case, it is likely that both Mrs. Howard's CJ and the unattested normal Chinook speaker CJ that Boas refers to can for the most part easily
be analyzed, as in Silverstein, as systematic simplifications of Chinookan. This is predictable from the fact that the Jargon's limited stock of syntactic structures, with the sole exception of the SVO word order, constitutes a reasonable cross-language compromise between Chinook and neighboring Indian languages: pronoun subject markers in addition to full-noun subjects, pronominal possessors in addition to full-noun possessors, negative particles preceding subject as well as verb, the presence of a yes/no question particle, occasional (at least) VS word order, and other structures mentioned above. The SVO word order does pose a problem for Silverstein's analysis, as I pointed out in §2, though it cannot be claimed as a markedly non-Chinookan pattern. It is noteworthy, however, that even Mrs. Howard shows signs of conforming partially to a CJ norm in this feature. Her sentences are about equally split between SV order (48) and VS order (46), and this would be a surprising ratio if she were simplifying spontaneously from her VS-dominant native Chinookan. (But see below, §3, for a possible independent explanation for her order).

The only CJ phoneme which would emphatically not be expected in a spontaneous simplification from Chinookan is /r/. This phoneme occurs only in CJ words of English and French origin; /r/ is unknown not only in Chinookan but in almost every other Indian language in the region as well. Its appearance in texts elicited from Indians is sporadic, but when it does appear it offers striking evidence for a target CJ phonology. In Mrs. Howard's texts one CJ word with /r/, kuri 'run, go' occurs frequently, and Jacobs always transcribes it with an r and with initial voicing of the stop: gu'ri (1936: 2,4,5, and elsewhere).

Aside from the too-frequent SVO word order and the /r/, Mrs. Howard's CJ contains no systematic features that, as far as I know, cannot easily be analyzed in Silverstein's way.

There is one lexical feature, however, that might pose a problem for Silverstein's analysis of the Jargon as a simplification of Chinookan. This is the fact that some CJ words of Chinook origin are morphologically complex, while other comparable words are not: that is, the hypothesized simplification process sometimes removes all grammatical morphemes, but other times it apparently does not. Of course Silverstein's analysis does posit a conventional CJ vocabulary; nevertheless, if certain grammatical morphemes are supposedly eliminated in some words by a process of independent simplification from Chinookan deep structures, then it is hard to explain why they are retained in other words of the same type. (This feature of the CJ lexicon was pointed out to me by Terrence Kaufman, p.c. 1981. I have not yet searched the vocabulary systematically for examples).

3.3 CJ vs. Other Indian Languages

Let us review briefly the evidence presented so far in support of the hypothesis that CJ possessed a consistent, systematic grammar of its own. English speakers' CJ syntax differs in a number of ways from English and from any expected simplification of English deep structures; these syntactic patterns recur consistently in all Indians' CJ, including Mrs. Howard's, though Mrs. Howard's texts show a much greater proportion of VS sentences than do any other speakers' CJ. I have found no regular features of English speakers' CJ syntax that differ from other speakers' CJ, with the exception of Mrs. Howard's,
which has a number of features that are rare or nonexistent in all other speakers' versions of the Jargon (see Boas 1933:209 for other examples). In other words, aside from Mrs. Howard, there is no evidence of any systematic differences in syntax between English, French, and Indian speakers of CJ: the syntactic patterns are quite uniform from speaker group to speaker group.

The phonological situation is more complicated. The undoubted existence of some phonetic correspondence rules, e.g. English /k/ vs. Indians' /tʃ/ in word-initial position, points unmistakably to a certain degree of systematic variation in pronunciation between white and Indian speakers. The question is, how extensive was this variation? Given the inadequacies of both English- and French-based orthographies, we will probably never know; but both direct and indirect evidence strongly indicate that CJ had a target phonology as well as a syntax and lexicon.

When we turn to a comparison of CJ utterances produced by different Indians, we find a striking correspondence from speaker to speaker, not only in syntax but also in phonology. Moreover, the phonological picture that emerges from this comparison shows clearly that, even if whites did provide the initial stimulus for the development of the pidgin, Indians cannot have learned CJ from whites. Regular, consistent CJ sounds (in Indians' pronunciation, that is) include some that most whites did not produce, notably the voiceless laterals (a glottalized affricate and a fricative), the nonlateral glottalized stops, and the phonemically distinct velar and uvular series. These facts point to the existence of a systematic phonemic structure for CJ, a structure which surely permitted both individual and group variation (as the various Indian texts show, e.g. in the common allophonic voicing of voiceless stops) but which constituted a definite target phonology for all Indian speakers. English and French speakers, at least the later ones, deviated significantly from this norm, but even those deviations were generally patterned rather than random or idiosyncratic.

Anyone familiar with northwestern Amerindian languages will recognize the set of phonemes presented in §3.0 as a quite typical one for the whole region, with the exceptions of the voiced stops /b d g/, which are relatively rare as separate phonemes, and of /r/, which is very rare indeed. In addition, some of the languages, especially Athabaskan, Tlingit, and Haida, have a much less complete labial series. Nevertheless, some of the other phonemes also fail to occur, often even as nondistinctive phones, in various languages in the area, and it is to these differences that we must look for evidence to support the hypothesis of an independent CJ phonology.

Several factors interfere with this comparative study, and some of them introduce unavoidable indeterminacy into the results. First, we must disregard utterances of any Indian whose native language cannot be identified, no matter how sophisticated the transcription; this means that all of Boas' 'Chinook songs' must be eliminated, except for one which he identifies as a Nootka sailor's song (1888:222). Second, I have not tried to make use of utterances recorded by non-linguists. Winthrop, for instance, has a number of sentences that are supposed to have been spoken by a Clallam Indian, but his English-based orthography and other naive features of his recording make the data unsuitable for present purposes. Third, some of the native languages of recorded CJ speakers are now moribund or extinct, and the existing evidence as to their phonological structure is fragmentary. This is true, for instance,
of Kalapuya and of Upper Coquille Athabaskan, where we have a good idea of the phonemic inventories but only a few bits of information about subphonemic variation and morphophonemic alternations, which might be crucial for the interpretation of some CJ forms. For this reason I have relied heavily on data from speakers of relatively well-described languages, especially Twana, for which I have both Elmendorf's extensive list of CJ words and phrases and Drachman's admirably thorough and detailed phonological description (1969).

Excluding Mrs. Howard's CJ, I have eight sets of texts and/or word lists elicited directly by linguists from Indians whose native language is specified: Twana (Coast Salish; Elmendorf 1939); Snoqualmie (s. Lushootseed, Coast Salish; Jacobs 1936); Saanich (Coast Salish; Jacobs 1936); Nootka (Wakashan; Boas 1888); Tsimshian (Penutian?; Boas 1933); Upper Coquille Athabaskan (Jacobs 1936); Santiam Kalapuya (Penutian?; Jacobs 1936); and Chehalis (Harrington, n.d.).

Let's look first at the so-called nasalless languages in this group, Twana and Snoqualmie. In his very thorough investigation of Twana phonology, Drachman found twenty-eight words with nasal phones: eighteen with [m], nine with [n], and one with [ŋ]. He believes that all of these are loanwords, though for a few he can find no source. The word with [ŋ] is a Clallam loanword; four of the words with [m] and six of the words with [n] are from English; a few words are from French, possibly via Chinook Jargon; and, of the rest, six are affective words, including the word for 'small' (1969:198-99). In addition, two morphophonemic rules optionally derive [m] and [n] from [b] and [d] (which are themselves, in turn, reflexes of Proto-Salish *m* and *n*); one of these rules operates utterance-initially, the other at internal morpheme boundaries (64). Drachman, writing at a time when abstract phonology was more popular than it is now, analyzes [b] and [d] as derivatives of underlying /m/ and /n/ phonemes respectively. I do not find his arguments on this point completely convincing, but they are not at issue here: what is important in this context is the fact that nasal phones occur regularly in Twana only in a handful of words, out of a very large corpus; that these words are all demonstrably non-native and/or affective, in either case abnormal; and that otherwise [m] and [n] occur only as occasional variants of regular [b] and [d]. Twana is thus not totally nasalless, but nasal stops are not an ordinary part of its phonetic structure -- they are rare and, for the most part, foreign.

The situation is similar in Snoqualmie, at least to the extent that nasals are very rare. Two sources on Snoqualmie or very similar dialects of southern Lushootseed, Tweddell (1950) and Snyder (1968), list just one s. Lushootseed word with a nasal: this is the word for 'small', which also occurs in Twana with a nasal [m] (Tweddell:3, Snyder:10; Tweddell also gives the word *plank*, a recent English loanword). The phonological descriptions provided by these two sources are far less detailed than Drachman's, so Snoqualmie may well have other affective vocabulary with nasals and perhaps also some loanwords. But it is clear that Snoqualmie, like Twana, is in effect nasalless.

In the CJ utterances dictated to Elmendorf by Henry Allen, 105 words have the regular CJ nasals, while only eleven words have [b] or [d] where other CJ has a nasal stop. Two of these eleven words, 'handkerchief' and 'fathom', have a variant with a nasal, e.g. *he'katcam* ~ *he'katcam*. Of the others, most occur in Twana as well as in CJ -- that is, except for the word for
'whale', which is a native Salish word, all these words have apparently been borrowed into Twana from CJ. In the borrowing process, they have been nativized, and the CJ nasals have been replaced by normal Twana [b] and [d]. Examples are sta'kad 'stockings, socks', for normal CJ /stakin/ (originally from English); la'b 'rum', for normal CJ /lam/; ki'tkad 'kettle', for /kitl(an)/; and la'wid 'oats' for /la'win/ (originally from French l'avoine).

Allen even commented that sta'kad was 'not proper Jargon', indicating that he realized he was giving a Twana pronunciation for a CJ word. The interesting thing about this phonological situation is that Allen gave a Twana pronunciation only for those CJ words that also appear in Twana; he made no Twana-derived phoneme substitutions in other CJ words. In the same way, an American would be likely to pronounce a name like with a [Q] even when speaking a language like Serbocroatian, whose native speakers would pronounce it with [t]; but the same American, if fluent in Serbocroatian, would be unlikely to substitute an English affricate [tʃ] for the palatalized Serbocroatian affricate [tʃ] when speaking that language. As we will see, other CJ speakers also made a sharp distinction between the treatment of non-native sounds in loanwords, where foreign sounds were likely to be nativized, and their treatment in CJ, where foreign sounds tended to remain.

In Jacobs' texts from a Snoqualmie speaker (1936:24-25), I find 105 occurrences of nasal phones and no instances of a [b] or [d] substituted for an expected CJ nasal stop. The Twana and Snoqualmie materials thus provide overwhelming evidence that the speakers knew very well that in speaking CJ they were supposed to use [n] and [n]; there isn't the slightest tendency to substitute their native-language equivalents [b] and [d] for CJ nasals, except, with the Twana speaker, for words that he interpreted as Twana words, not CJ ones. It should be noted that Snoqualmie speakers also replaced CJ nasals with native, voiced oral stops in CJ words borrowed into Snoqualmie, e.g. /past̆/ for CJ /baston/ (Snyder 1968:67) and sta'kad for /stakin/ (Snyder 1968:40).

There are no other striking features in the CJ provided by these two speakers that would not be expected in their native languages. There is, however, one feature in which both Elmendorf's and Jacobs' informants followed their native-language phonologies rather than 'standard' CJ phonology: both speakers regularly substituted [l] for words with regular CJ [r]. Kaufman's vocabulary contains fifteen words with CJ /r/, thirteen of them originally from French and two from English; nine other words in his list, of French and English origin, have regular CJ /l/ but source-language /r/, e.g. /dlay/'dry'. The only /r/ word that appears in Jacobs' Snoqualmie-CJ text is /kuri/, 'run' and in the text it appears regularly as ku.'li. Elmendorf's Twana-CJ list contains four /r/ words, and his informant gave [l] for all of them: dle't for /dret/ 'straight', ku'l for /kuri/, lala'm for /laram/ 'oar', and skalapi'n for /karabin/ 'rifle'. (One or more of these, of course, could have been borrowed into Twana from CJ, so that the nativization of the CJ /r/ would be predictable).

For another Salishan language represented in the Indian texts, Saanich, I have no description. There is a good, though brief, description available of a closely related language, however: this is Clallam, another language of the Straits subgroup of Coast Salish (see Thompson and Thompson 1971). In addition, Demers (1974) gives a phonemic inventory for Lummi, a Straits language slightly less closely related to Saanich than Clallam is (see Thompson 1979 for a complete classification of Salishan languages). Jacobs' Saanich texts, like his Twana and Snoqualmie texts, have no /r/; the two CJ /r/ words that
It occurs are /dret/ and /kuri/, and these appear here as dili /k/ and ku /k/ in Lumi there is no /k/ (though there is a labialized phoneme /kW/); Clallam has a /k/, but it is said to be very rare and confined to loanwords (Thompson and Thompson 1971:253). The Saanich-CJ texts, however, show the usual CJ opposition between /k/ and /q/, e.g. kafmuks 'dog' vs. qa /k/ 'where'. In fact, /k/ is far more common in these texts than /q/, as it is in CJ in general. Another Clallam phoneme, /l/, is also said to be very rare in Clallam, occurring only in loanwords; I have no evidence that /l/ is rare in Lumi, so this trait may not be a general one in the Straits Salish languages. In any case, /l/ is certainly very common in the Saanich-CJ texts, both in words where one expects it and in words where one expects /r/.

A situation similar to that of Saanich with respect to the nonlabialized velar stops /k/ and /kW/ seems to obtain in the other Salishan language represented in my material, Chehalis. According to Kinkade [1963: ], Upper Chehalis has the phonemes /k/ and /kW/, but they are very rare and usually occur in loanwords from English and Chinook. (Some of these loanwords, of course, may have come into Chehalis via Chinook Jargon). Harrington's CJ material from a Chehalis speaker, however, shows the usual large number of words with /k/ and /kW/, and the usual smaller number of contrasting /q/ and /qW/ words.27 Other than this feature, I find no phonological features in Harrington's Chehalis-CJ word list that would be foreign to Chehalis itself. Like other Indian languages of the region, Chehalis lacks /r/; and Harrington's informant replaces the shaky CJ /r/ phonemes, e.g. in /kuri/ 'run, go', with /l/, as most other Indian CJ speakers do.

The Nootka sailor's song that Boas recorded (1888:222) is very short -- only three lines long, sixteen words in all -- but it has one very interesting phonetic feature. It contains three regular CJ words with /l/ and two English words which the informant pronounced with /l/: lele for CJ /li/ 'a (long) time'; elip for /ilip/ 'first', superlative formant; k'al for /q'al/ 'hard, difficult'; leave; and Entelplaize, for English Enterprise (the name of a sealing-schooner). The appearance of /l/ in several words in this song, including one in which English has /r/ 's', is interesting in light of the fact that Nootka itself has no voiced liquid /l/, though it has three voiceless lateral phonemes, /l/, /k/, and /x/ ( Sapir and Swadesh 1939). This feature of Nootka-CJ is especially striking when we compare it with loanwords in Nootka from Chinook Jargon and see that all of them have a nasal, usually [n], in place of CJ [l] (the page references for the following examples are to Sapir and Swadesh 1939): napnTt ~ occasional nilpnt 'priest, minister' (273) vs. CJ /lipret/, from French le prêtre; nano'pi 'ribbon' (274) vs. CJ /liluba/, from French le ruban; sapni-q ~ sapnin 'flour' (306) vs. CJ /lapli/, source unknown; niga'k (-1 'sack'(275) vs. /li'ak/, from French le sac; tänë(q-) 'dollar, money' (267) vs. CJ /dal/, from English; menatë(q-) 'sheep, wool' (263) vs. CJ /limu/, from French le mouton; and others. A similar comparison may be made between the song's one word with a [d], kada /kada/, and the CJ loanword tänë(q-) in Nootka, with [t] in place of CJ [d].28 Like the Twana treatment of CJ loanwords containing source-language nasals, Nootka nativizes loanwords containing the non-native sounds [l] and [d]; but when speaking CJ itself the Nootka speaker pronounces the CJ [l] and [d] as any other CJ speaker would.29

Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text (1933:211-13) has only one feature that would not be expected, as far as I know, if the pronunciation had been strongly influenced
by Tsimshian. This is the consistent and frequent occurrence of [tʃ], e.g. in tca.'ko 'come' and məsa'tči 'bad'; this is opposed to /ts/, as in la' matsin 'medicine'. Tsimshian itself has /c/ but no /tʃ/ phoneme, and I have not found any mention in the literature of allophonic rules that would derive a [tʃ] phone in the language. There are no instances in the text of a replacement of expected [tʃ] by [c]. The only other phonetic feature in the Tsimshian-CJ text that should be mentioned is the absence of [r]; the only two CJ /r/ words that occur always appear with [ɪ]: deq't, ku'ri.

Jacobs' texts from a speaker of Santiam Kalapuya contain several frequent sounds that are certainly not found in Kalapuya itself as separate phonemes and, as far as I can tell, not even as phones. The most striking of these is the [r]. The three CJ /r/ words that occur in the texts always have the expected /r/: gu'ri, ku'ri 'run', kri'yc'cry 'cry out', and drr't 'exact'. The texts also have the CJ phoneme /tʃ/, which does not occur in Kalapuya; examples are t'k'p 'find' and t3+u'nas 'uncertain, doubtful'. The phoneme /tʃ/ also occurs regularly, but it is not a Kalapuya phoneme. And finally, the texts show a phonemic distinction between CJ /s/ and /ʃ/, a distinction which does not exist in Kalapuya. There are some instances where expected CJ [ʃ] is replaced by [s], e.g. ma'ʃ beside ma'ʃ 'beat' and ku'ʃ beside ku'ʃ (= [muş]) 'good'. According to Jacobs' prefatory note, 'The [s] and [ʃ] series sounds (s, ss, tʃ, s, sc, tʃc) are probably one series to a Santiam when using his native language; the [s] series is articulated about a point between [s] and [ʃ] but closer to [s]; the [ʃ] series seems almost but not quite confused with the [s] series and is distinguished by the informants by employing a sound fairly close to [ʃ] (1936:vi). The texts show, however, that Jacobs' informant had a more consistent distinction than this comment suggests. There are over two hundred correct occurrences of ʃ and ts, and only nine s's (in four words) in place of expected /ʃ/. There are forty-four occurrences of expected ʃ and ʃ, and only one word, CJ /s/ps/ 'if', occurs often with ʃ instead of expected ʃ; otherwise, there are only three incorrect ʃ's. Twenty-one words in all have only the expected sibilants; only seven words show variation between the s and ʃ series.

The only feature in Jacobs' text from an Upper Coquille Athabaskan that was certainly foreign to the informant's native language is the r in dirr.t 'straight'. I have no description for the speaker's native language; descriptions of neighboring Athabaskan languages (or dialects) indicate a general (and typically Athabaskan) lack of labials, but two of them Chasta Costa (Tohoda) (Bright 1964) and Tututni (Golla 1976) -- have a /b/ and an /m/, a third, Galice, has /p/ and /m/ (Hsier, 1966), and a fourth, Hupa (Woodward 1964, cited in Ruhlen 1975:207), has /p/ and /m/. Sapir (1914) has /m/ in Chasta Costa, which he says is common, and a nondistinctive [b], which is occasional but does not occur in native words. Since I don't know which of these languages Upper Coquille resembled in this respect, I don't know whether or not the frequent occurrences of m (initially, medially, and finally), and b (initially and medially), and the single occurrence of p (finally), represent a noteworthy departure from native Upper Coquille phonology. Coquille surely differed from CJ in one important phonological feature: like other Athabaskan languages, the languages or dialects of Oregon lack a velar uvular opposition. Unfortunately, though there are many /k/w's, only one CJ word with /q/ appears in Jacobs' brief Coquille-CJ text. This is /xamwəʔ/ 'unable' which is transcribed as xa'pəʔ, i.e. with the stop apparently assimilated to the preceding fricative (perhaps, but by no means certainly, due to the speaker's attempt to preserve
the target CJ back articulation). Otherwise, only CJ fricatives /h/ and /x/ are distinguished; in initial position, CJ /h/ could certainly have been identified with the native Coquilles phoneme /h/, and CJ /x/ with native /x/. Only medial /x/ in the text might serve as evidence that the speaker was using the CJ /h/ /x/ distinction, and here the evidence is shaky. On the one hand we have mi’txwit (CJ /mothwit/ ‘stand’) and hi’lu ‘(it is) not’ vs. go’/xwit (CJ /xauqwa/ ‘unable’) and lyu (CJ /lxpul/ ‘shut’); but, on the other hand, we find words that appear consistently with the wrong fricative, e.g. di’lxem for CJ /talxem/ ‘person’ and baxani (which would reflect medial CJ /h/) for CJ /taxani/ ‘out(side)’.

A final note about Indian-CJ phonology concerns an item given by Boas in his 1933 paper. He recorded a CJ phrase from a Tillamook speaker living on the Siletz Reservation that contains the word kopa (for /kupa/), the all-purpose CJ preposition (1933:211). Now Tillamook, like the neighboring Athabaskan languages, is labial-poor; in fact, Thompson and Thompson remark that ‘Tillamook is meaningfully characterized as a language totally devoid of labial elements’ (1966:316). There is a [p] phone in the language, according to Edel (1939), but no phoneme /p/ or /b/; even [m] occurs only as a nondistinctive phone. The Thompsons’ account suggests that the labials are marginal even as phones. So, while no sweeping conclusions can be drawn from a single word, Boas’ informant’s kopa suggests that the speaker had a normal CJ phonology, with /p/.

In sum, then, all the Indian sources show one or more phonological features that would not be expected if the speakers were independently simplifying their respective native phonologies in speaking the Jargon. The informants for the nasalless Salishan languages, Twana and Snoqualmie, have regular CJ /m/ and /n/, in sharp contrast to the replacement of CJ /m/ and /n/ by native b and d in CJ words that have been borrowed into the languages.

Two other Salishan languages, Saanich and Chehalis, have only a marginal native opposition between the nonlabialized /k/ and /q/ series, but the Saanich and Chehalis speakers distinguished these series regularly in their CJ utterances. Boas’ informant for Nootka-CJ, whose native language has neither native /l/ nor /d/, produced one CJ /d/ and several /l/’s in all the expected positions, though CJ loanwords in Nootka have CJ /l/ replaced by a nasal stop and /d/ replaced by /t/. Boas’ CJ text from a Tsimshian speaker shows the usual /ts/ vs. /t/ distinction, though Tsimshian lacks it. Jacobs’ Santiam Kalapuya speaker usually kept CJ /ts/ /s/ and /t/ /t/ apart, though Kalapuya has no /k/ series, and he also had regular CJ /r/ (in three common words) and /t/ /t/, neither of which is present in Kalapuya. The Upper Coquille Athabaskan speaker used CJ /r/, which was foreign to him, and had a full complement of CJ labials, which may have been. And finally, one of the two CJ words which Boas heard from a Salishan Tillamook speaker has CJ /p/, which would not occur if the informant had been using his labial-less native language in speaking the Jargon.

These details in which Indian speakers of CJ deviate from their native-language phonologies support the hypothesis that CJ had an independent target phonology: the CJ phonemic inventory that Kaufman established from a comparison of all the sources was demonstrably used by all the Indians, even those whose native languages lacked one or more of the general CJ distinctions. The only exception, as mentioned above, is the /r/ /l/ opposition, which some Indians clearly lacked, though a few had it. /r/ is the only CJ phoneme that is foreign
to all the Indian languages of the region, and thus the only one that occurs only in words of European origin (though most European words with source-language /r/, like /dlay/ 'dry', always have an /l/ in everyone's version of CJ). It is significant that all the specific CJ sounds that are markedly non-European, namely glottalized stops, uvulars, lateral obstruents, and non-initial /-/o/ are shared by all, or almost all, the Indian languages in the area -- indeed, they constitute probably the best known evidence for the famous Northwest Sprachbund. These sounds would therefore be expected in a language that arose as a cross-language compromise among speakers of Northwest Amerindian languages, though some of them (notably the lateral obstruents and the phonemically distinct uvulars) are relatively uncommon, and thus highly marked, in universal terms.

When we turn to the syntax, we find at once a consistent feature in all the Indian sources that is hard to account for unless we assume the existence of a grammatical norm for CJ. This is the regular SVO sentential word order pattern, which, as was mentioned above, is not found as a statistically dominant word order in any Indian languages in the Northwest. Many of the languages, like Chinook, have SV word order as a stylistic possibility, but the dominant, basic word order in most of the languages is VSO. All the Salishan languages are verb-initial. Nootka and the other Wakashan languages all have VSO word order. Tsimshian has VS word order [Rigsby 1975:346]. I have no specific information about Kalapuyan word order, but other Penutian languages of Oregon, Takelma and Lower Umpqua (like Chinook itself), are verb-initial. A family that is not represented in the CJ sources, but whose speakers also spoke the Jargon (Boas 1892:37), is Chemakuan, and both of its members, Quileute and Chemakum, are apparently also verb-initial (e.g. the sample sentences in Powell 1971). Only one group in the region has a different basic word order pattern; this is Athabaskan, presumably including Coquille, which is SOV (Krauss 1965:183) and, in at least one of the Canadian languages, rigidly so (see Li 1946 on Chipewyan). In spite of the Athabaskan exception, then, the occasional VS sentences in all Indians' CJ are easy to explain as an areally determined feature, but the basic SVO order is not.

One caveat is in order here, however. As we will see below, all of the languages, including both verb-initial ones and Athabaskan, have pronominal subject prefixes or clitics that regularly or occasionally precede the main content verb. In a pidgin arising out of communication between speakers of such languages, it is reasonable to suppose that analytic subject pronouns would retain the preverbal position of native-language subject affixes or clitics, if the preverbal position predominates. A developmental process that fixed subject pronouns in this position could then be explained as an areally determined feature. In all CJ texts and collections of sentences, sentences with subject pronouns alone are far more common than sentences with full-noun subjects (38 to 16, for instance, in Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text), so one might argue that the general SV word order of CJ arose as an analogic extension of a regular S_proV order to sentences with full-noun subjects. The reason for such an extension, if it does not lie in the participation of speakers of SVO languages (i.e. English and French) in the developmental process, would have to be sought in the general improbability of an analytic syntax with one word order pattern for fully stressed pronoun subjects and a different pattern for noun subjects.

This point will be discussed in more detail below, in §4. What is important
in the present context is the fact that, even if the SV word order of CJ has its historical source in an areal s(-)V feature, the regular presence of full-noun subjects before the verb must surely be explained synchronically as a feature of an independent CJ target grammar. The reason is that, except for Athabaskan (with its S s-v order) and Chinook itself (with a regular s-VS order), all the languages of the area seem to have an order V-s S at least as often as s(-)VS. This means that speakers of these languages would not be likely, in the absence of a CJ grammatical target, to simplify their native languages spontaneously to a dominant SV pattern.

It is harder to compare some of the other syntactic features of CJ with the various Indian languages, largely because full syntactic descriptions are not available for most of the relevant languages. Moreover, the base for comparison is smaller for syntax than for phonology, because Boas’ brief Nootka sailor’s song offers very little evidence, and Harrington’s material contains only a handful of sentences and phrases. In this section I will concentrate on the syntactic features already discussed: pronoun subject markers in addition to full-noun subjects, pronominal possessors in addition to full-noun possessors, negative particles preceding subject as well as verb, and the presence of a yes/no question particle. All these features, as far as I can determine, are found in some form in all of the languages whose speakers provided CJ material, and in most of the other languages of the region as well. I am assuming here that the pleonastic subject and possessive pronouns of CJ may reasonably be viewed as analytic analogues of subject and possessive pronominal affixes; none of the relevant languages has pleonastic independent (stressed) pronouns as subjects or possessives, but all have sets of subject and possessive affixes and/or clitics. I am also assuming that a question particle may be interpreted as an analytic analogue of an interrogative affix.

I do not mean to suggest that the features I consider here exhaust the syntactic structures of CJ; they are merely the most salient ones, and the easiest to investigate areally. My approach in what follows is to exemplify each feature in the native languages of the Northwest in an effort to show that the features are, in fact, widespread. The results show that none of these features can be offered as conclusive evidence for the existence of an independent CJ grammar, since all are plausible as simplifications from the various languages of the region, except, in some cases, for the position they occupy in the CJ sentence. The ordering of the elements thus takes on crucial significance, just as, for English-speaking writers on CJ, the major systematic phonological features that could not be explained as a simplification of English were English sounds and sound sequences in non-English positions. Almost all the CJ examples given below are taken from Kaufman’s normalized ‘Tales in Chinook Jargon’ (1966), and page references are to this work unless otherwise specified. First, here are two examples of typical sentences with pleonastic subject pronouns from Jacobs’ Santiam Kalapuya informant:

1. t'alan’as pl lulu taska mbiayt iht iht taska haws ‘A coyote and a wolf lived (with) their houses side by side’ (30).
2. kaakwa yaka wawa t’alan’as kapa lulu ‘Thus the coyote spoke to the wolf’ (31).
The regular order of these elements in CJ in $\text{SN}_\text{pro} V$; the other order that occurs, $\text{S}_\text{pro} V \text{SN}$, is found only in Mrs. Howard's texts (33 times) and in the Kalapuya-CJ texts (8 times). The only Indian CJ text that does not show many more $\text{SN}_\text{pro} V$ sentences than simple $\text{SNV}$ sentences is Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text, which has eight of each:

(3) iht man yaka kuli kupa lamotiy
    One man went to the mountain (1).
(4) ukuk man tcaku
    That man came (2).

Compare the following constructions from Chinook, which has preverbal subject pronouns and postverbal full noun subjects:

(5) Chinook proper: wixt $\text{S}_\text{pro}$ t-i-u-u i-qisqis
    again he-went-on bluejay
    'Again the bluejay went on' (Silverstein 1:388, from Boas 1894:155)

(6) Kathlamet Chinook: ik-u-Xua-quitq t-ai-ci t-lxam
    the people arose. (Hymes 1955:303).

According to Silverstein, Chinookan 'has an almost entirely prefixing productive inflectional apparatus of very recent date' (1979:662). It is thus not surprising to find that neighboring Penutian languages of Oregon have a differently ordered set of pronominal affixes. Takelma and Siuslawan (Lower Umpqua), at least, have pronominal subject suffixes; but in these languages and in Coos, Alsea, Molale, and Kalapuya, the suffixal systems 'have been overlain by a system of pronominals that are either attested as, or easily reconstructible as, clitic elements the position of which in a sentence is determined. . .by the phrase position of the word to which they attach' (Silverstein 1979:661). In other words, of the Oregon Penutian languages only Chinookan itself has consistent preverbal subject (agent) pronouns. Kalapuya, in particular, does not, which means that the regular preverbal position of the pleonastic pronouns in Jacobs' Kalapuya-CJ text would not be expected as a simplification of the speaker's native language.

The interpretation of this feature cannot be certain, however, without more knowledge of the clitic elements that Silverstein mentions, with their variable position in the sentence. Beyond his statement, I have no information about the syntax of Oregon Penutian languages other than Chinookan. A look at comparable clitics in Coast Salishan languages, however, indicates that the problem of clitic placement -- and therefore of pronominal subject ordering -- is very complex indeed.

All Coast Salishan languages, together with Bella Coola and some of the Interior languages as well, have suffixed pronominals in a $V-o-s$ order. But in some of the languages, in at least some types of construction (e.g. independent clauses or with intransitive verbs), subject suffixes are attached to a formative $\kappa$ (or $\kappa$, both $\kappa$) instead of to a verb. The combined form then acts as a clitic word, and these clitics appear in various positions. An additional complication results from a major Salishan process of subordination in which a verb is nominalized by means of a prefix $s$- and its subject pronoun is expressed by a possessive affix. Two of these possessive affixes, in Proto-Salishan and in most of the modern languages, are prefixes (first singular and second singular), and the rest are suffixes. Still another complication is the use, in some of the languages, of an article or a demonstrative -- usually, apparently, in preverbal position -- as a third-person subject marker (in those constructions in which Salishan verb forms typically lack regular third person subject pronominals).

I do not have enough information about the syntax of relevant Coast Salishan
languages to be able to generalize about the position of pronominal subject markers relative to the verb. To make any useful generalizations I would have to know, among other things, the ratio of preverbal subject clitics to postverbal ones, and of nominalized verbs in texts to finite ones. By 'preverbal' I mean the position relative to the main verb, semantically speaking; there is ample evidence in pidgins form other parts of the world to show that the position of the semantically significant verb in source languages is the only one of syntactic relevance for predicting the position of the verb in a resulting pidgin. And evidence from verb-final Gastarbeiterdeutsch, at least, indicates that -- contrary to one's expectations about simplification from a source language -- the position of the verb in pidgin sentences may be determined by ordering in a common subordinate construction rather than by the order in independent clauses (see Clyne 1975:2-3). In any case, the examples and comments given below will serve to indicate the range of possibilities and the level of complexity in the systems. The most important examples in the present context are of course those from Chehalis, Tillamook, and Squamish, which show pleonastic third person pronominals or quasi-pronominals (actually articles or demonstratives), but I have included examples with first- and second-person subjects as well in order to show that all subject pronominals can occur in the preverbal position. It should be noted, though, that the third-person 'subject-markers' in Tillamook and Squamish always precede the verb.

In Skagit, a northern Lushootseed dialect closely related to the language of Jacobs' Snoqualmie speaker, subject markers in independent clauses are clitics, and these clitics 'appear postverbally only if the clause contains no adverb'

(Boas 1934:103)

The 3pl. of the days 'The days are short'

(12) Tillamook: du wäntu i c gatecelau
gatecelau went back

(Edel comments, in her description of Tillamook, that 'as in other Coast Salish dialects, there occur a number of proclitic particles which it has been customary to term articles. These articles are used with verb complexes as well as with nouns' (1939:44), and when used with verbs they refer to otherwise unexpressed third person subjects or objects:

(13) Tillamook: du wäntu i c gatecelau

'seemed to be very hungry'

Judging by some of the sample sentences in Thompson and Thompson (1971), the enclitic pronouns of Clallam (cf. Jacobs' Saanich-CJ) may also occur before a main verb if the sentence begins with an adverb:

(9) Clallam: me? cSn w? sas? bi? she&tone x'

'real'
In Squamish, there is unconditioned (stylistic) variation in the position of a clitic subject. According to Kuipers, if the predicate word is an intransitive verb and if the subject is first or second person, then 'reference is made by a subject suffix attached to the clitic /?f/. The clitic may precede or follow the predicate-word. If the subject is third person, there is no explicit reference to it, but the predicate is often "concretized" by the clitic /na/ "there, then". This clitic always precedes the predicate-word (1967:171):

(13) Squamish: na- ?fynaxwas ta swfqa ta m?gax 'The man (has) he- killed-it the man the bear killed the bear.'

(14) Squamish: /?f c?ic?ap/ n /c?ic?ap ?-n/ 'I work'. I work work I

And finally, here are two typical examples, from Upper Chehalis and from Clallam, in which a negative word (which is a verb) is followed by an enclitic subject pronoun and then by the nominalized 'main' verb:

(15) Upper Chehalis: ne?ta en ta s-y?tan 'I was not seen' NEG I the Nom-+being (Boas 1937:107).


In sum, the Coast Salishan languages have suffixed and enclitic subject pronounals, but they also have variant patterns in which a subject pronoun appears before the main content verb of a sentence. If we add the regular VS sentential word order to the (probably much more frequent) V(-0-)s order, we would expect an independent simplification from Coast Salishan languages like Saanich and Snoqualmie to result in regular postverbal first and second person pronouns, since in CJ these are all independent pronouns. We would also expect to find third person independent pronouns occurring postverbally, not preverbally as in Jacobs' texts. But the situation with the pleonastic third person subject indexicals different, because these seem to occur before the main verb as often as after it. This slim evidence would therefore support a hypothesis that independent simplification in Coast Salishan, if it resulted in pleonastic third person pronouns at all (which is somewhat doubtful), would quite possibly fix them in preverbal position, which is where they occur in CJ.

Tsimshian, like Coast Salishan, has only limited occurrence of pleonastic subject pronouns. As far as I can tell from Boas' texts (1914-22) and Rigby's discussion (1975), they occur in the form of plural markers and as a -t suffixed to a sentence-initial 'auxiliary' verb like the negative. Only the latter type seems to be obligatory, however; compare (17) and (18) below. The first three examples here are from the Nass dialect of Nass-Gitskan of the Tsimshian language group (see Rigby 1975:346, fn. 2).


(20) Tsimshian: a?/age+ s?esg?+c?g +t?k +c?g 'The great grizzly bear did not mind' (Boas 1914:421).

The more consistent of these, the -t suffixed to the 'auxiliary', thus occurs before the main verb in Tsimshian, so that we would expect to find a pleonastic
subject pronoun (if it occurred at all) in this position in an independently simplified Tsimshian. Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text has, in fact, only preverbal pleonastic pronouns.

Nootka and Kwakiutl have suffixed subject markers and, again, these are sometimes attached to a word preceding the main verb. Pleonastic third person subject suffixes occur only certain modes, e.g. the indicative:

(21) mamo.k + ma goʔasʔi 'The man is working' (Swadesh 1936:78).

work 3.sg. man

indic.

(22) heʔ wîk + eʔiʔic waʔ 'Oh, that is not what you were saying' (Sapir & Swadesh 1939:20).

oh NEG 2.sg. say

indic.

The Athabaskan languages, finally, have a uniform pattern of pronominal subject prefixes, but, like some of the other languages in the region, they have no regular third person pronominal subject markers. In Chasta Costa, according to Sapir, 'the third person, apart from possible deictic prefixes, is marked by the absence of any pronominal element' (1914:318); these deictic prefixes comprise 'a small number of quasi-pronominal elements of third personal reference which regularly come after adverbial prefixes' (305). These prefixes, which resemble the proclitic articles of Tillamook in function, occupy a different position in the verb complex from that of the regular pronominal subject markers. This feature of Chasta Costa is shared by Tututni (Golla 1976:221) and Hupa, and therefore probably by other Athabaskan languages of the region as well.

(22) Chasta Costa:

gijk+ n +1a at + tittni ' . . . said the dog owner' (Sapir 1914:337).

3rd say verb dog one who has

deictic suffix

(+ 1st modal?)

The Athabaskan languages with their SV word order and optional deictic prefixes as third person subject markers thus fit the \( S_N \pro V \) pattern of Chinook Jargon, and we might well expect to find such a pattern emerging as a result of independent simplification from Athabaskan (though the addition of the normal postverbal CJ object noun violates the OV pattern of Athabaskan).

All the Indian languages whose speakers provided CJ texts, then, have pleonastic subject pronominals at least to a limited extent, though the position of these markers does not always agree with their consistent preverbal position in CJ. In Kalapuya their position varies. In Coast Salishan they occur obligatorily in certain constructions, and their position depends on the construction, e.g. preverbal if the markers are demonstratives, suffixed if they are third person possessives. Tsimshian has an optional third plural suffix and an obligatory third person pronominal that precedes the main content verb because it is suffixed to a sentence-initial auxiliary verb. Nootka has the markers in some modes and, as in Salishan, in both positions. Athabaskan languages have optional deictic prefixes which function as quasi-pronominals. For all these languages, the question of whether we should expect pleonastic subject markers to appear at all in a native speaker's independent simplification of his own language must remain moot, and so must the question of their position relative to the main verb if they do appear. I doubt if we will ever know enough about spontaneous processes of simplification by native speakers of languages to make solid predictions in such complex cases; certainly we don't know enough now.
The existence and position of possessive pronominal affixes is easy to establish for all the languages of the area, but here again, as with the pleonastic subject pronominals, I have little information about their syntactic behavior. In CJ pleonastic possessive pronouns occur after the possessor noun and before the possessed noun:

(24) CJ: uk tanas-htfmen yaka tolham  'the young woman's relatives' that small woman 3.sg. people

Chinook has possessive prefixes, and the relative order of the two nouns is variable, but in most of the examples I have the possessed noun precedes the possessor noun (see especially Boas 1911a: 666-77):

(25) Chinook proper: u+ i+a+ t+ g+q+ su+ i+g+i*i+q+i+q+i+c+xam 'bluejay's elder sister' 3.m.sg. fem. elder bluejay 3.m.sg. poss. sister 1994:178.

(26) Kathlamet Chinook: t+axi t+La+q+L+pa i+a+xi +q+i+kk+i+xam that his house that singer-of-conjuror's song 'at the house of the singer of conjuror's songs' (Hymes 1955:301).

(27) Wishram Chinook: ya+g+da+i+ t+tc+ i+m+ya+g+da+i+q+i+q+i+q+i+xam 'that Merman's heart' (Boas 1911a:676, from Sapir's Wishram Texts).

I have no specific information about Kalapuya possessive constructions, but Takelma, one of the other Penutian languages of Oregon, has possessive suffixes, except for a prefixed first singular possessive used only with kinship terms. Of the other Penutian languages of Oregon, Lower Umpqua also has possessive suffixes (Frachtenberg 1922a), and Coos has loosely-bound prefixes (Frachtenberg 1922a).

All the Salishan languages of the area (and most other Salishan languages as well) have first and second person singular possessive prefixes, and third person and first and second person plural suffixes. In addition to constructions with the third person suffix as a pleonastic possessive pronominal, however, at least some of the languages have analytic possessive constructions that make use of demonstrative pronouns. One such language is a dialect of southern Lushootseed identical to that of Jacobs' Snoqualmie informant (or nearly so):

(28) s. Lushootseed: éfe+id a+tee+ stók+ 'the parents of that man' parents of that man

Compare the following constructions with the third possessive suffix +s:

(29) Chehalis: ca+ t yak' i+q+i+g+i+q+i+c+xam towards the house+3rd the ant's house (Boas 1934:103).

(30) Tillamook: di+ t s+i+u+q+i+q+i+n+d dit sisi'ns that Nom-shut+Nom-3rd that old 'that old woman's door' (Edel 1939:53); Edel points out that the -5 on sisi'ns is almost certainly an error.

Tsimshian has possessive pronominal suffixes, but with full-noun possessors the possessed noun precedes the possessor noun and takes a connective suffix instead of a pronominal possessor (Boas 1911c:392f). Nootka and Kwakiutl also have possessive suffixes, but here again I am not sure whether or not they occur as pleonastic suffixes when there is also a full noun possessor. The same is true of the Chemakuan languages, Chemakum and Quileute. Athabaskan languages, e.g. Hupa, Galice, and Chasta Costa, have possessive prefixes, and these do occur with full-noun possessors:
Hupa: tētky pa mit+t'sidtdaf 'the roof of the Sweat-house' (Goddard 1911:158).

It looks, then, as if Athabaskan languages are the only ones in the region whose possessive constructions clearly match the CJ Nposs Proposs N order. Chinookan has pronominal possessive prefixes, but the full-noun possessor usually follows the possessed noun; Salishan has a third person possessive suffix and, as in Chinook, the possessor noun follows the possessed noun. Coos is the only other language that might have a construction like that of CJ, because all the other languages have suffixed possessive pronominals. In other words, the CJ possessive construction, ordered as it is, would not be expected as an independent synchronic simplification from any of these languages, except Athabaskan, unless we assume a spontaneous simplification process so sophisticated that it adjusts all pronominal ordering relations to agree (i.e. Nposs Proposs N to match SNSpro V). This seems unlikely on the face of it, but, again, we do not know enough about processes of spontaneous simplification from morphologically complex languages to make any firm predictions.

The situation is much clearer in negative constructions. Here CJ has a variable word order, but the regular order is NEG S V in all sources. Here are examples of both the more common and the less common placement of the NEG particle:

(32) CJ: hilu mayka k' was 'Don't be afraid' (4j
NEG 2.sg. afraid
Tsimshian-CJ).

(33) CJ: wik aqi mai yka at'a mayka 'You won't (have to) wait for me' (29; Kalapuya-CJ).

(34) CJ: ukuk stik-sawef hilu iskam ukuk tanas-man 'The tree-ogre didn't get the small-man' (11; Sr:qualmi- CJ).

(35) CJ: pl 'aska hilu qa'g'alan 'but they would not obey' (18; Kalapuya-CJ).

In all the Indian languages of the region, the negative particle (which is often an intransitive verb) occurs regularly, or at least sometimes, outside the verb-subject complex; in fact, it rarely seems to occur between the verb and its subject. Most examples I've found, like the ones below, have a sentence-initial negative:

(36) Kathlamet Chinook: nft qa igikim ikauxu 'Owl did not speak nohow' (Silverstein 1974: S80).

(37) s. Lushootseed: x'ep k'e c-(s)-as-atx' kud 'I don't know where. . . . ' (Snyder 1968:71).

(38) (n.) Lushootseed: xw? t 'd la. xje flu 'I didn't come to eat' (Hess 1976:569).

(39) Upper Chehalis: mida t ?a xje 'you didn't see me' (Kinkade 1976:19).

(40) Clallam: ?o' na c x'ag'am 'I'm not hungry' (Thompson & Thompson 1971).

(41) Tillamook: qa c qa ncas.nu'k kant 'I didn't know my children' (Edel 1939:53).

(42) Squamish: haw q ren tiz a 'I didn't/don't work' (Kuipers 1967).
(43) Nootka: wik qabSX ha wikPis+Pi NEG die the young man+DIM
   'the little fellow did not die' (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:16).

(44) Nootka: he- wikte?IC wa-
   oh NEG+2.sg. say
   'Oh, that is not what you were saying' (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:20).

(45) Nass: needi + n ga'a+t
   NEG+1.sg. saw+3 sg.
   'I didn't see him' (Rigsby 1975:353).

(46) Tsimshian: a'gqet nesegp+toa meta megf+koa
gorgave mind connect great grizzly bear did not mind
   (Boas 1911c:421).

(47) Chasta Costa: dote nan xw+ ac+ L+
   NEG much adv 3.sg. 3rd +believe
   'I don't much believe it' (Sapir 1914:337).

Now, the very similar ordering in all these sentences hides some important formal differences among the various negative constructions. In particular, the negative word in the Salishan languages (Lushootseed, Chehalis, Clallam, Tillamook, and Squamish) is an intransitive verb, and the following predicate is a nominalized form; Nass has a similar construction, with the main content verb subordinated to the negative verb. In some of the other languages, for instance Chasta Costa, the negative marker is only a particle. Nevertheless, in spite of such differences, it is easy to believe that independent simplifications from any of these languages would result in a regular pattern of sentence-initial negatives, which is what we find in CJ; and variations in these patterns (aside from the SV vs. VS pattern here) would account for the occasional variant ordering in negative sentences in the various Indian CJ texts. At any rate, though the order of elements in CJ negative sentences is strong evidence for a CJ grammatical norm for English speakers, it provides no such evidence for the Indian CJ speakers. It should be noted, however, that the common NEG V-s (or NEG V S) order that appears in some of the sentences here appears only rarely in the Jargon.

The final syntactic feature that I want to consider in this section is equally widespread in the languages of the Northwest, if we allow (as I think we should when dealing with simplification in general and pidginization in particular) a formal connection between particles and affixes. This is the existence, in all the languages, of either a yes/no question particle or a yes/no question suffix attached to the verb. Yes/no questions are not common in the Indian-CJ texts, unfortunately, so to exemplify the na question particle of CJ we must turn to English and French writers on the Jargon. In all, somewhat less than a third of the yes/no questions I've found in the English writers' CJ material have the particle na; but I have not counted the occurrences of na in the Demers-Blanchet-St. Onge texts in which the particle occurs very frequently, so the English writers may be atypical in this respect. Here are a few sample questions, with and without the na:

(48) CJ: alta na paya ukuk lasup? 'Is the soup cooked now?' (27; Kalapuya-CJ).

(49) CJ: mayka na kantaks algi ynas? 'Do you know if it will rain?' (Kaufman 1966b; from Hale 1846).

(50) CJ: na ulu mayka? 'Are you hungry?' (Kaufman 1966b, from Gill 1902).

(51) CJ: mayka toki makmak? 'Do you want to eat?' (Kaufman 1966b; from Gill 1902).

(52) CJ: hilu mayka saman? 'Don't you have any salmon?' (Elmendorf 1939).
Of the relevant Indian languages, Chinook has question particles:

(53) Chinook proper: nPktNa tNe'tx1?q NEG Q I know it (Boas 1911a:650).

(54) Kathlamet/Chinook: i+qstx1Lau ci+Q+monster 'Is it a monster?' (Hymes 1955:304).

Salishan languages have particles and/or suffixes; their status varies and may be hard to determine. Edel calls the Tillamook question markers suffixes, for instance (1939:42), but she often writes them as particles. In any case, the question marker is not a verbal suffix in Salishan:

(55) s. Lushootseed: ok'h'xtxw lA+e+s+Q 2sg.+Q any Nom= eat 'Did you get any food?' (Snyder 1968:75).

(56) n. Lushootseed: ps+ q'q'lab lA+xw pu s+Q six? 'Are you tired again?' (Skagit 1976:308).


(58) Upper Chehalis: Q?el tal?l'm+Q s'samal'ax'Q would kind+ Q people 'Would it be kind to the people?' (Boas 1934:104).

(59) Tillamook: an:gi'+hi a+s+Q+tge'Q+ns? 2sg. Q 2sg+broke it 'Was it you who broke it?' (Edel 1939:42).

The Chemakuan languages apparently form interrogatives by means of a verbal suffix. Andrade mentions that Quileute (like Nootka) has 'the suffixes of... interrogative sentences. ... attached to special... interrogative stems' (1953:140); and Boas' examples of yes/no questions in Chemakum seem to show a similar pattern: ku'ts6'a6a1e? 'am I sick?' vs. ku'ts6a's'te6a 'I am sick' (1892:41).

Nootka has an interrogative suffix +ha:

(60) Nootka: wi+Q+so' Pa'nqQ qapsa'pmi+a ha? 'Do you not really want to kill me?' (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:17).

Tsimshian and Nass both use verbal suffixes, +a in Nass and +i or +u in Tsimshian:

(61) Nass: nQ me +s+Q hwa'+d+a? 'Didn't you find it?' (Boas 1911c:405).

(62) Tsimshian: me+deg'+la+Q 'Are you alive?' (Boas 1911c:405).

The Athabaskan languages of Oregon, finally, use a formative +ha which is variously analyzed as a verbal suffix (Sapir 1914) and an enclitic particle (Golla 1976):

(63) Chasta Costa: n3+ xw+ +f+1+ ye Q+ha? 'Are you playing?' (Sapir 1914:333).

(64) Tututni: sQ+i+Q s+aqW +ha? 'Did you hook a fish?' (Golla 1976:227).

In all these languages, the question marker is an enclitic or a suffix, so that the CJ sentences with sentence-initial na (all from English writers) look like improbable simplifications from the Indian languages themselves. Nevertheless, the question markers do take varying positions in the sentence, both in CJ and in the native languages, so again the complexity of the structures involved precludes the possibility of making easy predictions about the results of independent simplification. Since the question particle na was available for CJ, however, its absence in most of the yes/no questions in Indian-CJ texts is
rather surprising in view of the obligatory appearance of a question marker in the native languages. This may provide some evidence for a syntactic norm for CJ, but there are so few yes/no questions in all the Indian-CJ material that the evidence is not strong.

Let’s summarize the evidence from Indian-CJ syntax for a target CJ grammar. As we have seen, the only syntactic feature of CJ that looks at first glance like an impossible independent simplification from any of the Indian languages of the Northwest is the regular (though not exclusive) SVO word order pattern. Closer examination of the CJ material, however, suggested a possible internal-simplification explanation for the SV feature, for those languages that have a dominant s-V pattern: the s-V pattern, reanalyzed as an SproV pattern, may have constituted an analogic model for a general SV word order. But this explanation only works for Chinookan, and of course for Athabaskan, which has S s-V as a dominant order. All the other languages have a dominant, or at least frequent, V(-)s order, and we would therefore expect independent simplification from these languages to result in a consistent VS word order pattern. For Athabaskan speakers, including Jacobs’ Upper Coquille informant for CJ, we would also expect OV instead of the regular VO.

As for the pleonastic subject pronominals themselves, they occur in all the languages (though only to a limited extent in some, e.g. Tsimshian), but their ordering, as we have just seen, does not always match that of CJ: in Salishan, Tsimshian, Kalapuya, and Wakashan, they are primarily suffixes or enclitics. However, they often occur before the main content verb of a sentence in these languages as a result of syntactic transformations, and it is not clear from my sources which order predominates. We cannot predict with any certainty where they would occur in an independent simplification from any of these languages; and for Tsimshian, at least, we cannot even predict whether or not they would occur at all. The situation is similarly murky with the pleonastic possessive pronouns. Here only Athabaskan agrees with the CJ order, which is NposSproN.

Chinook has prefixed possessive pronouns, but the possessor noun follows the possessed noun; in Salishan two of the possessive affixes are prefixes and the rest are suffixes; in the other languages all possessive affixes are suffixes, but in Tsimshian, Wakashan, and Chemakuan there are apparently no pleonastic possessive pronouns at all. A claim of independent simplification in this feature for the Indian-CJ texts would therefore be hard to maintain for the last-mentioned group, but at least possible for the others.

The ordering of the negative particle (or verb) is clearer: none of the Indian languages of the region has a pattern in which the negative particle regularly separates a verb and its subject -- the regular patterns with pronoun subjects are NEG s(-)V or NEG V(-)s -- and the regular CJ pattern NEG S V would in fact be a reasonable prediction for independent simplification from any of the Indian languages. The question particle itself, finally, would be expected to appear as a result of simplification from any of the Indian languages; but its absence in some CJ yes/no questions is surprising, and its common sentence-initial position in CJ is also unlikely as an independent simplification from native languages of the region.

In spite of the difficulty of carrying out this comparative syntactic investigation, then, and in spite of the indeterminacy of some of the results, it seems clear that some regular CJ syntactic features would not be expected to arise through independent simplification of the various native-language grammars.
This evidence is by no means as striking as the evidence for a target CJ phonology, with consistent features like nasals for the so-called nasalless languages; but it is strong enough, as a total body of evidence, to make the claim that CJ had no target grammar untenable. The phonological and syntactic features of Indians' CJ are by no means invariable; individual CJ speakers certainly differed in their pronunciation of some words and in their syntactic structures as well, and no doubt groups of Indian speakers had habits of CJ usage that differed from their neighbors' habits. All the features discussed in this section, however, can be established as regular for all the Indians who provided CJ material. As we have already seen, English speakers certainly had a few institutionalized habits of pronunciation that differed from Indians' pronunciation, but some regular features of the Europeans' pronunciation were definitely non-European; and the syntax of Europeans' CJ matches the Indians' CJ syntax closely and deviates markedly from anything one could reasonably expect as a result of independent simplification from English (or French). In other words, all CJ speakers produced sounds, sound sequences, and syntactic constructions that were foreign to them. The only way to explain this fact is to assume that CJ speakers did, after all, have 'an essentially shared grammatical system' (Silverstein II:623); there was a Chinook Jargon language community, in Silverstein's sense, as well as a Chinook Jargon speech community.

4. The Origin of CJ: Before or After European Contact?

In this section I will consider the implications of the CJ grammatical features described in §3 for the old controversy about whether or not the Jargon existed as a means of communication among Indian tribes before the appearance of Europeans in the Pacific Northwest. I will not review the controversy 'self; the discussions are easy to find. I will also not attempt to analyze the pre-contact social setting of the Chinookan tribes and their neighbors in any detail, because Hymes' elegant and convincing reconstruction of this setting will soon appear (Hymes, Forthcoming). In his reconstruction Hymes argues that a stable pidgin was very likely to have emerged in the region before the Europeans arrived on the scene. I will argue below that the linguistic evidence supports this view. The attested structure of the Jargon is easiest to account for if CJ existed in stable form before the Europeans came: most of its phonological and syntactic features can readily be explained as the result of crystallization of a pidgin out of communication among the Indians of the region, but it is hard to explain them if the pidgin crystallized out of communication between Chinook speakers (and perhaps other Indians too) and whites. Before presenting this argument, however, I will describe briefly the nature of the earliest attestations of Chinook Jargon and the nature of intertribal relations at the time of contact with Europeans.

First of all, it should be noted that no one has presented direct evidence in the form of indigenous traditions attesting to pre-European usage of an intertribal Jargon in the Northwest. (If anyone had done so, there would presumably be no controversy on this point). Our first reports of the Jargon come from Europeans' travel journals; unfortunately, however, the earliest of these attestations are hard to interpret historically. For instance, the early explorers of the Pacific coast stopped first at Nootka on Vancouver Island in the late eighteenth century. In 1788, on the Columbia River, Captain John Meares recorded the following utterance of the chief Maquilla: 'cloosh, cloosh, good, good'
(Grant 1945:225). Now, cloosh would be the expected Europeans' rendering of the CJ word Քлк 'good'. But it would also be the expected European version of the Nootka word Քлк 'good', which is the ultimate source of CJ Քлк. So we cannot tell whether Chief Maquilla's cloosh indicates that CJ was already in existence as a trade language among (at least) Nootka and Chinook Indians before Europeans arrived on the scene, or whether it merely indicates that European sailors before Meares had brought the Nootka word with them from Nootka to the Columbia River, so that Chief Maquilla expected other Europeans to understand it too.

A similar problem arises with some of the words recorded by Lewis and Clark in 1805 along the Columbia River. Among these words were wik 'not' and kantaks 'know', both CJ words of Nootka origin and both used spontaneously by the Clatsop (Lower Chinook) chief Concomly. But these words, like cloosh, could have been brought to the Columbia River from Nootka by whites, so they cannot be taken as evidence that CJ itself was already spoken along the Columbia River when Lewis and Clark visited there. Other words collected by Lewis and Clark, however, may provide evidence for a pre-European origin for the Jargon. These are wapto 'root of sagittaria sagittifolia; potato' and sapli 'wheat, flour, meal', words attested only in CJ, with no established sources in the Indian languages of the region, in French, or in English.36

One way of trying to unravel the history of CJ through study of its lexicon would be to look at the form of the words. At least some CJ words of Nootka origin, for instance, show evidence of being transmitted to the Columbia by whites, not Indians; one of these is Քлк. The replacement of its initial Nootka Ք by ּ is not a problem, since most Indian languages in the area have a glottalized affricate /ק/ but no plain affricate /к/, and some of them have a phone /к/ as an allophone of the fricative /к/. But the replacement of the Nootka fricative ּ by ּ is hard to account for: the word had been transmitted to Indians by Indians; all the languages in the area have /к/ as a phoneme, and so does CJ itself, but no speakers ever pronounced CJ Քк with a lateral fricative, as far as one can tell. This distortion in this Nootka-derived CJ word, and analogous (though few) distortions in other CJ words of Nootka origin,37 suggest that these words were not in use in a putative pre-European Jargon. Of course, this does not mean that there was no pre-European pidgin; it only means that the pidgin, if it did exist, didn't contain (these) Nootka words.

The earliest attestations of Jargon words do not, therefore, point to any solution to the period-of-origin controversy. The same is true of what little indirect evidence there is in the travel journals. For instance, Johnson points out that Lewis and Clark needed interpreters in their dealings with Indians even after they had been living with a Chinook tribe for some time, and that they 'continued to use sign language to communicate with the Chinook and Clatsop, as they had all along the way with other Indians' (1978:24). He believes that this circumstance indicates that CJ could not have been already in existence in 1805, but this does not follow. First, the fact that the explorers lived with a Chinook tribe does not in itself mean that they would learn the language of that tribe. Second, there is no reason to suppose that Lewis and Clark would have noticed it if some of the Indians they met on the Columbia used a pidgin for intertribal communication. Chinook-Jargon in the mouths of Indians would have sounded to an outsider just like any other local Indian language, with its laterals, glottalized stops, and uvulars. There is evidence from the other side of North America that Europeans could easily mistake a pidgin for a regular Indian language: along the Delaware River Valley, people as sophisticated as William Penn and the Swedish
missionary Campanius mistook the Delaware-based Traders' Jargon for Delaware itself [Thomason 1980:182].

Pre-European intertribal relations between the Chinooks and their neighbors do provide strong, though indirect, evidence that the setting was favorable for the emergence of a pidgin before the Europeans arrived. There is no doubt that the Pacific Northwest was an area with very great multilingualism; institutions such as slavery and exogamy contributed to this feature of Indian life, and intertribal trade was carried on vigorously. The Lower Chinook, with their strategic location at the mouth of the Columbia River, occupied an important position in the trade picture; they were the powerful middlemen for trade both north and south along the coast and between the coast and the interior, up the river. One important item of trade was the Nootka canoe, which was exchanged for (among other things) slaves by the equally powerful Nootkas (Silverstein 1972:379). Although many of the Indians first encountered by white explorers were sophisticated multilinguals, it is unlikely that Indians could be fluent in all the languages of the tribes they dealt with. In this setting of intensive trade among linguistically diverse tribes, in an area with a relatively dense population, this question must arise: how did the people communicate with each other?

Before whites arrived in the area and established permanent trading centers which attracted Indians of various tribes, much of the trade between Indians may have been carried out by just two tribes at a time (but cf. Hymes, Forthcoming, on the trade center near the Dalles). It might therefore be argued that a pidgin could not have arisen in this situation, since, according to Whinnom's widely accepted model of tertiary hybridization, at least three groups -- one superstratum and two or more substratum groups -- are necessary before a stable pidgin can emerge (1971:104). But Whinnom's picture is too narrowly drawn, in my opinion. Ruling out the possibility that a pidgin may develop in a two-language situation ignores attitudinal factors that can be crucial. Tày Bô developed between speakers of French and Vietnamese under circumstances which did not encourage Vietnamese servants to learn their masters' language (Reinecke 1971:47); Halbdeutsch arose among native speakers of Estonian alone, when knowledge of German was highly advantageous for Estonians but was deliberately withheld by German speakers (Lehiste, p.c. 1975). Just as the Delawares kept outsiders at a distance by using pidgin rather than Delaware itself (Thomason 1980:182), and Choctaw and Koasati speakers used Mobilian Jargon for similar purposes (Drechsel 1977:9), the Lower Chinook may at first have used Chinook Jargon as a means of emphasizing their own superiority, linguistic and otherwise. (Hymes, Forthcoming, makes a similar point) The attitudes expressed by Indians toward Chinook itself (hard to learn) and toward a Chinook-tinged CJ (more elegant than other CJ) seem to me to support this view. Such an attitude would surely be most likely to manifest itself in conversation with slaves, but it may well have extended to trading situations as well.

As I have argued elsewhere (1980), an inference on sociohistorical grounds that a pidgin existed in a former contact situation about which we have no direct contemporaneous evidence must be supported, if it is to be convincing, by the linguistic evidence. In this case, there are two sorts of linguistic evidence that may be adduced in support of the hypothesis that Chinook Jargon predated the arrival of whites in the Northwest. First, as mentioned above, the phonological structure of CJ as spoken by Indians shows such a high degree of consistency in sounds that most whites did not produce at all that the Jargon had to have been transmitted to Indians by other Indians, not whites. The Appendix contains
examples of all the contrasts that are relevant in this context, each one ex-
emplified from at least two independent sources. Most of the sources are Indian
ones, but the Demers-Blanchet-St. Onge dictionary is just as consistent for some
distinctions, and occasionally another European-language source provides evidence
for a particular contrast. The only Indian source that shows signs of white
transmission is Boas' Tsimshian text,39 which has, for instance, /ap/ for
CJ/ti+ap/ 'find'. This word looks like a Tsimshian speaker's interpretation
of a white man's klap, and it contrasts with Chinook-CJ ti+ap, Twana-CJ ti+a’p,
Kalapuya-CJ ti+a’p, Saanich-CJ ti+a’p, Snoqualmie-CJ ti+a’p, Upper Coquille-CJ
ti+a’p, and Chehalis-CJ ti+a’p. But Tsimshian evidence is not very interesting
in a consideration of the origin of CJ, because it is far to the north of the
pre-white trade network that, according to the hypothesis, gave rise to CJ; the
Jargon was no doubt taken to the Tsimshian by whites, so we would expect to find
evidence of white transmission here (as well as in Tlingit and other northern
languages). In addition to the direct evidence from Indians' CJ, we also have
the indirect evidence provided by words borrowed into various Indian languages from
CJ. I have not collected such evidence systematically, but one example is Nootka
čiččik(M) ‘buggy, wagon’; CJ/ci’ik’čik/ ‘wheel, wagon’. The CJ word is said to
be onomatopoetic in origin, and Sapir and Swadesh identify the Nootka word as a
CJ borrowing (1939:305). This word could have been transmitted with a /s/ to
Nootka by whites (see examples of whites' pronunciation under /ts/ in the Ap-
pendix), but not with /s/.

Now, there are of course two possible ways of accounting for the consistent
appearance in the Indian CJ sources (and in the Indian languages themselves, in
loanwords from CJ) of non-European contrasts and clusters. One is the hypothesis
that, after Chinook Jargon arose early in the 19th century out of white-Indian
contact, it proved so useful to the various Indian tribes that they used the Jargon
among themselves, learned it from each other, and in this way spread the non-
European phonological features. But if the Europeans provided the initial stimu-
lus for the Jargon, then it is much more likely that most Indians, at least
those near the Columbia, encountered it for the first time when they came to the
Europeans' trading centers, and that they learned it from Europeans, not Indians.
If this is what happened, then the non-European contrasts ought not to be so
widespread, especially in languages like Kalapuya, Twara, Chehalis, and Snoqualmie.
Moreover, the commentary of various European writers indicates that the Jargon
was hard for whites to pronounce from the very beginning, and the Demers-Blanchet-
St. Onge materials show that most of the relevant distinctions were already
"standard" CJ in the first half of the 19th century. It is therefore easier
by far to account for the non-European phonological features of CJ under the
hypothesis that the Jargon was used first as a means of intertribal communication
and only later as a means of white-Indian communication.

The second type of linguistic evidence that supports the hypothesis of a
pre-European origin for CJ is indirect. The argument rests on a theory of the
development of pidgin grammars that I have discussed (and presented evidence for)
elsewhere (1980 and Forthcoming) and outlined briefly above, in §2.
According to this theory, the (original) speakers of a developing pidgin will
abandon their native-language grammatical structures only to the extent that they
are obliged to; and they will be obliged to do this to the extent that the marked
features of their native-language structures are not shared. Features that are
marked in universal terms are likely to appear in the pidgin only if they are shared
by all of its (original) speakers, though some one language may have a dis-
proportionate influence on the pidgin's grammar if its speakers are especially
numerous and/or prestigious. Unmarked features of the native-language
grammars will tend to remain whether they are shared by all speakers or not.

The number of marked features in the fully crystallized pidgin will of course
be greatest when the native languages are typologically similar. This theory
is based on the assumption that a universal principle of language learning
governs the peculiar kind of learning situation that obtains in the develop-
ment of a pidgin, as well as other kinds of language learning situations: in
learning a new language, people will learn what they have to and keep what
they can of the language(s) they already know. In the case of an emerging
pidgin, everyone (except speakers of language(s) that provide the vocabulary)
will have to learn a lexicon, but the grammar they use will in fact be a
cross-language compromise between the grammars of the native languages. After
the pidgin has crystallized, so that it is learned as a whole language by
all its speakers, its grammatical structures will reflect the original
compromise.40 This means that universally marked features that appear in any
given pidgin should be predictable as a cross-language compromise from the
native languages of the pidgin's originators.

If we look at Chinook Jargon from this viewpoint, we need to consider
whether its structures are more likely to have arisen out of white-Indian
contact or out of Indian-Indian contact. That is, which origin hypothesis
offers the more reasonable explanation of the Jargon's structures, especially
its marked structures? As we saw in §3.3, both the phonology and the syntax
of CJ are easy to explain as a typological norm for the Indian languages
of the Northwest, with the sole possible exception of the regular (though
not exclusive) SV word order pattern. And all those features that are
shared by the Indian languages are conspicuously absent from English and
French: glottalized stops and affricates, labialized dorsal obstruents,
lateral obstruents, uvular obstruents, /ts/, /ts/, and certain non-European consonant clusters; sentence-initial negative
particles, pleonastic subject and (in most of the languages) possessive
pronouns, and a yes/no question marker. Of these features, only the syn-
tactic ones occur consistently in the writings of English and French speakers,
though most of the phonological features are also attested directly in one
or more of those sources. The Indian sources contain all the phonological
and syntactic features, and both English and French writers refer to an
Indian-based phonological norm for CJ. Some of these features may not be
terms, marked in universal but probably none of them would occur on a current master
list of universally unmarked linguistic features. In any case, none of
them would be likely to emerge as a spontaneous simplification of English or
French, and few of these features occur in the better known pidgins and
creoles of the Caribbean, Africa, or the Pacific. (Tok Pisin has pleonastic
subject pronouns. Compare also the sentence-initial negative particle which
occurs regularly in the Delaware pidgin, where it can also be explained by
reference to local Indian languages; see Thomason 1980 for a discussion of
this point.

Even if English and/or French speakers would not be expected to develop
these features independently, might they not do so while developing a pidgin
through communication with Chinook and other Indians? Possibly, but then we
would have to explain the general lack of European influence on the grammar of the crystallized pidgin. The only promising sign of European influence on the grammar of the Jargon is the SV word order. Even this is dubious, because pronominal subjects are regularly preverbal in Chinook and sometimes preverbal in most of the other Indian languages. So if -- perhaps through the extra-strong influence of Chinook itself -- the pronoun took the regular preverbal position in CJ, we would expect noun subjects to be drawn analogically into that position too, given the much greater frequency of pronoun subjects in the Jargon relative to full noun subjects. Moreover, it would be peculiar if the only significant influence of English and French were the positioning of the subject before the verb; the grammatical influence of any contributing languages(s) should be distributed more or less evenly over the resulting pidgin's structures, surely, rather than focusing on just one syntactic feature. In any case, though the English and French users of CJ followed the regular syntactic rules faithfully, most of them clearly did not acquire the whole range of the otherwise regular CJ phonological features; and this is hard to explain if we assume that those features actually developed out of white-Indian communication.

If, on the other hand, we assume that Chinook Jargon arose out of Indian-Indian communication, there is nothing to explain in the phonology -- all the features of CJ are shared by all the relevant languages -- and the prediction of CJ syntax as a cross-language compromise among the Indians is also feasible, though more complicated. The linguistic features of CJ, then, are easier to account for if whites did not participate in the development of the language, and the fact that the Jargon must have been spread by Indians to Indians is also easier to explain on this hypothesis. The linguistic evidence thus offers strong support for the hypothesis that the pre-European contact situation in the Northwest favored the development of a contact language. The most reasonable conclusion is that Chinook Jargon was already in existence as a fully crystallized pidgin, used by the Lower Chinook and their neighbors, their slaves, and perhaps their more distant trading partners as well, before Europeans arrived in numbers in the Northwest.
FOOTNOTES

1 I do not mean to imply that Silverstein oversimplifies unwittingly; he does so to make his exposition clearer (see e.g. I:384, 386). I do believe, however, that this simplification necessarily omits crucial evidence about the Jargon’s status as a language.

2 This claim does not contradict my suggestion in §3.3 that CJ SV word order may possibly be explained after all as an internal simplification for speakers of an s-V S language; the reason is that I believe that explanation to be reasonable only for the development of an eventual grammatical norm, not for spontaneous independent simplification: in my view the SV order won out because most CJ sentences had only pronoun subjects, but the predominance of such sentences in CJ would not be a likely factor in an individual’s one-time simplification of his native language.

3 I concentrate here on syntax because the problems with phonology are somewhat different; Silverstein believes that each speaker uses his own native phonology in pronouncing Jargon words. See §3 for a detailed discussion of this point.

4 These points of CJ grammar are described more fully in Kaufman 1968.

5 Silverstein does argue for an important distinction between CJ and other pidgins, namely in the lack of a specific single language from which CJ syntactic structures can (and should) be derived. For CJ there is, he claims, no one model to be imitated, as opposed to, say, Pidgin English, ‘where clearly there was a model to be imitated’ (II:622). Here, I think he is confused about the nature of pidgins in general. The only sense in which a language like Tok Pisin (Neomelanesian) demonstrably had an English model to imitate was in its lexicon, which is mostly English. CJ is indeed, as Silverstein indicates, unusual among pidgins in this respect, since it draws its vocabulary from several sources, not almost entirely from one single source language. But neither Tok Pisin nor CJ had a single grammatical model to imitate: Tok Pisin grammar cannot possibly be viewed as a simplification of English grammar (see Thomason, To appear, for examples of non-English structures in Tok Pisin). This is a point commonly misunderstood by nonspecialists who place too much reliance on the now very controversial views of Hall (1966) and others who argue that pidgin and creole grammars are derived historically primarily from vocabulary-base language structures. The predominance of these views is understandable in a field that has concentrated, historically, on the Caribbean creoles, most of which have been converging toward a European vocabulary-base language target over the past two hundred years or so; but these languages are misleading as a guide to the grammatical nature of pidgins and creoles in general.
him two forms for 'water', *šoom* and *šuk*, and said that the former was spoken by Indians and the latter by whites. One interesting attestation is Sapir's report that the Indians of the Siletz Reservation in Oregon called the coast people 'Sol Chuck' ('salt water') Indians (1914:274).

11 Notice that there are two important differences between Gill's deference to the Indians' pronunciation of CJ and Jacobs' report that non-Chinook Indians viewed Mrs. Howard's Chinook-CJ as better and more elegant than their CJ (see below, §3.2). First, there is no hint that other Indians, even other Chinooks, tried to imitate Mrs. Howard's Chinook-tinged CJ. And second, Indians' respect for her Chinook-CJ was surely connected with their respect for the Chinooks and their difficult language, while Europeans in the Northwest were not in general noted for their respect for Indians or their languages.

12 The Indian texts I'm considering in this context are all those except Mrs. Howard's, since all authors agree that Mrs. Howard's CJ is heavily Chinook-tinged and thus (in Boas' opinion, and mine) atypical of CJ in general.

13 By 'V' I mean 'predicate'; in CJ many predicates consist merely of a predicate adjective or, more rarely, a predicate noun.

14 This construction is also quite regular in Demers et al. 1871, but I don't know if it is a stylistic possibility in French.

15 Terrance Kaufman has pointed out to me (p.c. 1981), however, that in some European languages such constructions have developed historically from possessive constructions similar to the modern English one with N's N. These languages include modern colloquial Dutch and nonstandard German, but, as far as I know, no such construction has emerged in English itself.

16 One piece of evidence that Silverstein is right about this is the occurrence, in two other sources, of features of Mrs. Howard's CJ that Boas identified as peculiar to her. John Hudson, Jacobs' Santiam Kalapuya informant, uses the shortened pronominal subject form *na* - (1st sg.) several times (Jacobs 1936:16-17); Johnson (1978:86), citing Richardson (1867), gives a form *ni-wo-wa* 'I say, my word', with a short 1st sg. pronominal form *ni* - instead of regular CJ /nayka/ (which Richardson would have spelled *nīka*). Moreover, though Boas says that Mrs. Howard's contracted form *munk* (instead of *manuk* 'make') was not used by other speakers (1933:209), John Hudson also used *munk* and the analogous form *mank* regularly (Jacobs 1936:15-18).

17 This figure includes both her V S N sentences (13, mostly in what would be subordinate clauses in a language with real subordination) and her S pro V S N sentences (33); the 48 SV sentences include 14 S N V sentences and 34 S N S pro V sentences.

18 A possible index of the level of expected NP fronting through stylistic topicalization without support in a CJ grammatical norm might be seen in the ratio of VO to OV constructions in her CJ texts: there are only 15 OV sentences, as opposed to a very large number of VO sentences.

19 The phones [b d g] occur often as allophones, though not as phonemes in most of the languages. The voiced oral stop phones are very frequent in some of the Indian-CJ texts, especially in Mrs. Howard's.
In studying the Jargon lexicon, I am searching the texts and word lists elicited directly from Indians for evidence that the Indians explicitly recognized the white-Indian correspondence rules. This study is still in a very preliminary stage, but a few CJ words of English and French origin do turn up in Indians' pronunciation with what look like hypercorrections. For instance, in the word list elicited by Elmendorf from Henry Allen, a Twana speaker, the English-origin word for 'kettle' is *ki't4ad* instead of regular Jargon *kitllan*). Here the final *n* is replaced by *d*, as often happens in Twana, which has no primary nasal phonemes; what's interesting in *ki't4ad* is rather the fact that the regular CJ medial *tl* cluster, which ought to be quite possible as a consonant sequence in Twana, is replaced by *tl*, as if Henry Allen automatically equated the *tl* he heard with the usual English speaker's replacement for a non-initial lateral affricate or fricative. (There are other possibilities, though, so this suggestion is very tentative. In particular, the *j* could simply be the normal pronunciation of Twana /j/ after a voiceless stop, so that this would merely be an assimilation according to Twana morphophonemic rules). Another instance is Henry Allen's pronunciation of the word for 'devil', whose source is the French phrase *le diable*: Elmendorf transcribes this word variously as *lidjo.b*, *lidjo.m* (compare regular CJ /lit%d/); the last variant looks like a hypercorrection, since loanwords from CJ into Twana with original CJ nasals are pronounced in Twana with *b* or *d*. (Twana *b* and *d* also correspond regularly to *m* and *n* in cognates from other Salish languages, so there may well have been a familiar set of correspondence rules for these sounds used by Twana speakers in communicating with their Salish-speaking neighbors in other languages besides CJ.) It is worth mentioning in this connection that Twana speakers, like other Indians of the region, were likely to be skilled multilinguals; Elmendorf says that Henry Allen spoke, in addition to his native Twana, fluent Clallam, Lushootseed, and English (p.c. 1980). Clallam, Lushootseed, and Twana are closely-related Coast Salish languages.

As far as I know, this was first pointed out by Kaufman (1971:275); but the data assembled in the Appendix to the present paper, drawn from all the Indian sources Kaufman used and from two additional ones that he did not have in 1971, constitute the first body of systematic evidence presented in support of this claim.

This structure is quite different from the one presented by Johnson (1978:180ff.), because Johnson erroneously assumes that in CJ 'the only phonemic distinctions that could be used were those shared by all of the contact languages' (180). For instance, in claiming that 'speakers of nasalless languages could substitute *b* for *m* and *d* for *n* (180), he did not notice that the only published text elicited by a linguist from a native speaker of such a language shows quite consistent *m* and *n* (Jacobs 1936:24-25, from a Lushootseed speaker). Like Silverstein, Johnson places too much reliance on Hale's assertion that all CJ sounds had to be easily pronounceable by (because native to) all CJ speakers (1846:640). As a result, Johnson gives a Silverstein-like analysis of CJ phonology by deriving CJ words from underlying sequences of native-language phonemes, via 'core rules'. Unfortunately, except for some of the systematic deviations in the English and French sources, his core rules do not reflect actual attested Jargon pronunciation.

There are various other references in the literature to CJ material elicited from Indian informants in recent years, especially in Johnson 1978, but I have not seen the data. I have also seen references to older material elicited by linguists from Indians, but as far as I know none of it is in print.
It should be mentioned in this context that Boas & Haeberlin give half a dozen Twana forms which have nasals alone or nasals alternating with b, d. These forms, which were apparently collected by Teit sometime between 1904 and 1909 (Boas & Haeberlin 1926:117; cf. Teit & Boas 1927-28:25), include the common lexical suffixes -lan - fad 'foot, leg', and -lN -m(w) 'people'. I don't know what to make of these forms, but they might indicate a relatively late spread to Twana of the areal feature of denasalization. This in turn might mean that nasals were not as abnormal to Elmendorf's, and perhaps also to Jacobs', informants in the 1930's as they were to Drachman's in the 1960's. Compare, in this connection, the comment by Hess that in Lushootseed, 'within the past one hundred years or so, /m/ was spoken where /b/ is used today' (1976:15).

All of these nasals are m and n except for lan 'tongue, language' (originally from French la langue). This may be the only CJ word with consistent /n/.

It might be argued that absence of nasals is a universally marked feature of a phonological system, and that the appearance of m and n in CJ as spoken by native speakers of 'nasalless' languages therefore merely represents a universally predictable simplification (marked — unmarked) of their native phonological system. One could also argue that, according to Drachman Twana, at least, has underlying /m/ and /n/, the m's and n's in Twana-CJ result from suppression of the Twana rule that converts most /m/ and /n/ into oral stops. This suppression could also be viewed as a simplification, and it could be linked to the argument based on markedness considerations. But neither of these arguments would be taking into account the fact that, for Twana speakers, the phones [m] and [n] are definitely non-normal: they are either foreign sounds or less preferred variants of b and d.

I make this comparison with some hesitation, because my copy of Harrington's field notes does not specify which type of Chehalis his informant spoke. According to Boas & Haeberlin (1926: ), one dialect of the language failed to undergo the usual Coast Salish sound change *k > s, and if Haeberlin's informant spoke this dialect, then his language would have had lots of /k/.' Outside of the Boas & Haeberlin article, however, I have not seen any discussion of the K-Chehalis dialect. According to Thompson (1979:703), the only Coast Salish language in which *k remains is Cowlitz, so it seems reasonably safe to assume that Harrington's informant spoke a dialect like the one Kinkade described.

The suggestion might be made that these words are not comparable, since the d in kada might reflect an intervocalic voicing process in Nootka. However, the CJ loanword nanqalpi(q-), with p instead of CJ b, indicates that CJ oral stops were devoiced even medially when the words were borrowed into Nootka. The same is true of English loanwords in general in Nootka, to judge by the Sapir & Swadesh material.

This sharp discrepancy between speakers' pronunciation of CJ loanwords in their native language and their pronunciation of CJ itself makes Johnson's assumption that the treatment of loanwords will match CJ pronunciation (1978:152) untenable. Johnson asserts that Tlingit speakers do in fact have the same replacement rules for loanwords and for CJ (1978:211), but he presents no data at all to support this claim, and, as the Twana and Nootka data presented here demonstrate, it is not a safe a priori assumption.
Boas actually transcribed the Lower Chinook source of this CJ word with two fricatives: *xa'oxaL* 'can not' (1911a:634). However, even Mrs. Howard has a stop [q] in the CJ word, so I assume a target /q/ for CJ. Nevertheless, it is possible that Jacobs' Coquille informant had [q] here in imitation of the Lower Chinook original.

The [t] is not a problem in this word. Many Northwest languages, including CJ and Athabaskan dialects closely related to Coquille, have /t/ and /tʃ/ as their only lateral obstruents. In some of these languages [tʃ] occurs as an allophone of /t/, and this was apparently also the case in at least some speakers' CJ, as here.

The one exception to this generalization that I've found is the apparent lack of pleonastic possessive pronouns in Tsimshian and Makashan.

Compare *gə'a+hl gə'+hl hanə* 'The man saw the woman' (Rigsby 1975:347).

Boas mentions another interrogative formation for Upper Chehalis, with a stem [i] followed by possessive forms. I have no examples of this formation, however. (See Boas 1934:109). *ʔə:a ʔə:iʔ i-a a-nə.

See, for instance, the references in Silverstein (I:379, fn.3) and the comments in Johnson (1978:24f.).

According to Shaw (1909:25), Chamberlain identifies *wapto* as a word of Algonquian origin, from Cree or Ojibway. I have not checked this suggestion, but if true it seems likely that the word was brought to the Columbia by French Canadian trappers.

At least two CJ words of Nootka origin have plain stops where Nootka has glottalized ones: CJ/tam's/ 'child' from Nootka *tane* 'child'; and CJ/tsun-/ /čək/ 'water' from Nootka *čəpak* 'river, stream (and maybe *čəpak* 'water')?. But cf. Twana-CJ *čəwəq1*, which, according to Elmendorf's notes, is not a proper Jargon word. One word, CJ/haykwa/ 'dentalia', has k where Nootka has a dorsal fricative: *hi-xma*(q-). If /tikmən/ 'metal, money' is from Nootka *čikmən*, as seems likely, rather than vice versa (as Sapir and Swadesh say (1939:303); but otherwise CJ/t/ is borrowed into Nootka as k, not c). The CJ [t] is likely to be a white man's distortion. Similarly, Nootka *icionala* 'woman, wife' would be expected to yield CJ *ts*, not *ts* as in /iutkəmən/ (but cf. Nootka *tə*- id.).

I do not mean to imply that a pre-European CJ setting involved a superstrate group and one or more substratum groups, in Whinnom's sense, because -- as Silverstein and others have pointed out -- there was no such social asymmetry in the CJ speech community. Nevertheless, some position of high esteem must have been held by the Lower Chinook, or their language would not have provided most of the Jargon's vocabulary.

This is not to say that no other sources have any words pronounced as whites (rather than other Indians) did; such words do occur occasionally in some Indian sources. Twana-CJ, for instance, has *tələham* 'people' rather than /tələham/, which appears in six other Indian sources. But Tsimshian-CJ is the only Indian source where white pronunciation (or, like *t*: *k*1, the application of regular correspondence rules) seems to be the norm. Besides *'find*', there are *ikt* 'one' for /iht/ and *ke'iləpə* for CJ /k'əlapə/.
Of course its grammar can and surely will change, as every language's grammar does; but there is no a priori reason to expect the grammar of a pidgin to change any faster than that of any other language, or to expect the changes to be different in type from ordinary changes in non-pidgin languages.

It might be argued that the pronominal prefixes of Chinook would not be expected to determine the position of fully stressed pronouns in a pidginized form. It's hard to be sure how grammatical simplification would turn out in the absence of extensive evidence from a variety of sources, but in one instance, at least, affix-verb order is directly reflected in a resulting pidgin's pronoun-verb order. This is Mobilian Jargon, with its regular OSV word order, from Choctaw's O s-V order (Drechsel 1977:6; see Thomason 1980:191, fn. 18, for discussion).

The ts = tצ variation in this word may be original and not due merely to anglicization: compare the Nootka source words צאה, צאהק 'water' (Sapir and Swadesh 280) and צארק, צארק 'river, creek, stream' (ibid. 304); a similar variation is apparently found in Chinookan forms: cf. Chinook proper Tltsuk vs. Clatsop Tl'chukw, cited by Shaw (4), but I have not found these words in linguistically sophisticated writings. A final point worth mentioning here is that Elmendorf's Twana informant commented that he had heard a pronunciation tצא'ק, but that he thought that form had been introduced into CJ as slang because of its similarity to the Puyallup word for 'rectum'.

Below are examples of some Chinook Jargon contrasts. The contrasts represented here are all those not found in English or French: plain : glottalized, velar : uvular, plain : labialized, /l/ : /ʔ/ : /tʔ/ and non-initial /ʔ/. In addition, non-European consonant clusters (including the CJ unit phoneme /ts/) are exemplified. The criterion for inclusion of a word in this list is attestation of the relevant non-European sequence or feature (glottalization, labialization, uvular position, lateral obstruent), vs. its absence, in at least two independent CJ sources. Most relevant sources are Indian ones and the Demers-Blanchet-St. Onge dictionary. For the non-European features and sequences, these lists are reasonably complete for my data; the major exceptions are /ʔ/, which is so common that I've included only a few representative examples, and /h/ : /x/, which are both also common. Other words with the less common non-European features are attested in only one CJ source. (Occurrence of a phoneme in a source language is of course irrelevant in this context, since my goal is to prove that CJ speakers used the sounds in speaking the Jargon itself.)

In the lists, Indian sources are identified by the speaker's native language: Chi. = Chinook proper (Mrs. Victoria Howard; Jacobs 1936); Tw. = Twana (Henry Allen; Elmendorf 1939); Cheh. = Chehalis (Harrington n.d.); Snoq. = Snouqualmie (Jack Stillman; Jacobs 1936); Saan. = Saanich (Thomas Paul; Jacobs 1936); Kalap. = Santiam Kalapuya (John Hudson; Jacobs 1936); Up. Coq. = Upper Coquille Athabaskan (Coquille Thompson; Jacobs 1936); Tsim. = Tsimshian (Boas 1933); Nt. = Nootka (Boas 1888). European sources are identified by the author's name: Hale = Hale (1846); St.O. = the Demers-Blanchet-St. Onge dictionary. Where a source has variant forms, only those variants relevant to the contrast in question are given here.
Forms enclosed in parentheses are ones that fail to show the feature that I specify as phonemic in a particular word. Note that some sources which have a velar instead of an expected uvular (or vice versa) nevertheless preserve the non-European feature of glottalization.

One general caveat is in order: the two major Salishan sources, Twana-CJ and Chehalis-CJ, sometimes seem to show shift or spread of glottalization from one consonant to another in the same word. This may be due to parallel but independent internal processes in these two languages, since such processes exist in Salishan. This means that, where these are the only two sources for a given word, the glottalization may not reflect CJ as spoken by other Indians.

1. /p'/: /p/

/p'/: /t'ala\p'as/ 'coyote': Cheh. t'\ap'a's : Kalap. t'\ap'a's; (Hale t\ap'a's, St.O, Talapos).

/s\p'\na/ 'jump': Chi. su'p'\na : Tw. so'\a\na : Cheh. s\ap'\na; (Kalap. su'p\na, St.O, Sopene, Hale s\ap\na).

/p'e\n\s/ 'baked in ashes': Chi. \ap\n\s : Boas 1933(Chi.) p'e\n\s : Cheh. p'\n\s : St.O, ppens.

/p/: /kup\'t/- /kap\'t/ 'stop; finished': Chi. ka'bit : Tw. kup\'t : Cheh. kup\'t : Tsim. kap\'t : Hale kwapet.

/k\i\ap\s/ 'return': -ap\(y\), sometimes with allophonic voicing, in Chi., Tw., Cheh., Kalap., Up.Cq., Tsim., Hale, St.O.; see /k'/ below for forms.

/pa\t\j/: 'give': Chi. -ba\t\j : Tw. pa\t\j : Saan. p\t\j : Cheh. pa\t\j : Up.Cq. ba\t\j : Tsim. p\t\j : Hale p\tlat\sh.

/pulakli/ 'dark; night': Tw. pu'\a\l\kli : Cheh. pu'\a\l\kli : Saan. pu'\a\l\kli : Kalap. bu'\a\l\kli : Hale p'\a\l\kli.

2. /t'/ : /t/

/t'/: /t'ala\p'as/ 'coyote': see /p'/ above for forms.

/k\i\mt'a/ 'following, after': Tw. ki\mt'a : Snoqu. ki\mt'a : Cheh. ki\mt'a - ki\mt'a; (Tsim. ki\mt'a, St.O. Kimpta, Hale k\mt'a, Kalap. ki\mt'a).

/t'am\e\lt\j/ 'tub, barrel': Tw. \e\l\t\j : Cheh. t'am\e\lt\j.

/t/: /tayi/ 'chief'; thus in all sources, with some variation in the first vowel (a - A).


/tai\j/ /t'q\ix/ 'want, like': Chi. t\q\i : Tw. t\q\i : Cheh. taq\i : Saan. dik\i : Snoqu. t\q\i : Kalap. t\q\i : Up.Cq. di'\q\i - t\q\i : Tsim. t\q\i : St.O, Tike - t\q\i : Hale t\q\i - t\q\i : Ross Tekeigh.

/tat\ojaw/ /t\aw\ja/ 'go': Chi. ta\d\a : Tw. ta\d\a - ta\d\a : Cheh.ta\t\aw : Saan. ta\d\a : Snoqu. ta\d\a : Kalap. ta\d\a : Up.Cq. ta\d\a : Hale k\a\t\aw : Parker clatu\w\a : Ross Thlat-away.

/an\t\j(\i)/ 'former, previous': Chi. a'n\g\a\j : Tw. a'n\k\o\j : Saan. ank\o\j - a'n\g\a\j : Cheh. a'n\g\a\j : Kalap. a'n\g\a\j : Tsim. a'n\q\a\j : Hale an\k\a\j : Parker aunacotta.
3. /ts/: /tsi'pi/ 'miss': Tw. ts'ipi : Cheh. ts'ipi'; (Boas 1933 (Ch.)
  ts'ipi, St.0. Tspe, Shaw Tsee'ipi).
  
  ts'am/ 'mark(ed), figured': Tw. ts'am : Cheh. ts'Am;
  (St.O. Tsom, Shaw Tsam = T'ss-zum = Tsam).

/ts'ikts'ik/ 'wheel; wagon': Cheh. ts'ikts'ik; cf. the Nootka
  word c'ikc'ik('w), which Sapir and Swadesh 1939 identify
  as an English loanword; (Tw. tsi'kts'ik, St.O. Tsiytsik, Shaw Tsi-
  Tch-, Hale T-).

/ts/ : /tsuq/ /tsuq/ 'water, stream': Chi. tsu'q : Kalap. tsu'q:
  tsuq (Indians) - tsak (whites) : St.O. tsok : Hale tsok -
  tsuk - tshok; (Tw. tsa'k, Saan. tsa'k, Sapir 1914 Chuck)."

/tse'pit/ 'button; star': Cheh. tse'pit : St.O. Tsomsil : Pal
  ier T-sit-still : Shaw Chil-chil - Tsil-ts'il; (Hale t'ilil
  - tshiltshil).

/tsulu/ 'lose one's way': Shaw Tso'-lo : Hale tso'lo.

/tś/ : /tʃak'/ 'come': Chi. tca'gu : Tw. tca'k : Cheh. tʃa'k:
  Snoqu. tca'ku : Saan. tca'gu : Kalap. tca'gu - tca'gu :
  Up.Ciq. tca'gu : Tsim. tca'k : Hale tshako : Parker chako :
  Ross chako.

/tʃ'h/i/ 'recent, new': Chi. tʃ)i' : Tw. tʃ'i : Cheh. tʃi':
  Saan. tʃi' : Kalap. tʃhi'.

/tʃikmen/ 'metal; money': Tw. tʃi'kmen : Cheh. tʃi'kmen.
/kətɛmen/ 'wife, woman; female': Chi. tu'tcmen : Tw. tu'tcmen:
Cheh. tɔtɔmin : Kalap. tu'tcmen; (St. O. Tluchå-men, Ross Tluchå-men, Hale kloţman).

/taska/ '3rd plural pronoun': Chi. səga = ṭas- : Tw. ta'ski:

/xauqwat/ 'unable, impossible': Chi. xa'ugat : Tw. xa'ugat:
Cheh. hɔ'wq'a't : Kalap. qa'ugwat : Up.Cq. xa'wew.

/aśqi/ 'later, future': Chi. aťgi : Tw. a'tki : Cheh. ṭa'tqux:
(St. O. Alke, Hale Aıkē).

/paštå/ 'give': Chi. -baš tac : Tw. paš tac : Cheh. paštå:
Saan. peš tac : Up.Cq. baš tac : Tsim. poš tac;
(St. O. Potlach, Hale pätlatsh).

/mesåy/ 'sit(down); stay; be (in a place); have': Chi. mištå:t:
Tw. mištå:t : Cheh. mištå:t : Snoqu. mištå:t : Saan. mištå:t:
(Hale mištå:t, Ross Meth-lite, Parker mištå:t, St. O. mištå:t).

/yuqat/ 'logg (dimension)': Chi. yu'qat : Tw. yu'qat:
Cheh. yu'kkat : Kalap. yu'qat; (St. O. Iutlkat, Hale lülkt).

/lam'sin/ 'medicine': Tw. l'amets'n : Cheh. lamets'in:
Tsim. lamets'in : St. O. Lametsin : Hale lameatlin.

/lam/ 'liquor': Tw. pašte'm 'drunk' [paš 'full'] : Cheh. lam:
Hale lam : St. O. Lam.

/la'miyi/ 'old woman': Chi. la'miya'i : Tw. la'miya'i:
Cheh. lamiyi : St. O. Lamat : Hale lawe - lawe.

/ili'i / - /lilah/ 'ground, earth': Chi. il'i : Tw. ilah:
Cheh. tlii? : Kalap. il'i : Up.Cq. il'i : - ilhi:
Tsim. eli:lihi : Hale ilēhi : Parker ililah : St. O. elēhi.

/saxali/ 'above, high': Chi. saxali : Tw. sa'xali:
Cheh. sahala : Snoqu. sa'xali : Saan. sa'xali : Tsim. sa'xali:
Hale sāhali : Parker saghalle : St. O. sāhali.

/xluíma/ 'other, different': Chi. xluíma : Tw. xluíma:
Cheh. xluíma : Snoqu. xluíma : Saan. xluíma : Tsim. xluíma:
Hale xluíma : St. O. Holoíma.

/alta/ 'now, at that time': Chi. a'lda- : Tw. a'lda:
Cheh. a'lda : Snoqu. a'lda : Saan. a'lda : Kalap. a'lda:
Up.Cq. a'lda : Parker alta : St. O. alta.

/či'el/ 'black, dark blue, green, brown': Tw. či'el:
Cheh. če'el : Up.Cq. či'el ; (St. O. Titli, Parker klaait);
Hale či'el.

/k'/ : /k'aw/ 'tie(d)': Chi. k'a'uk'au : Tw. k'au:
Cheh. k'aw : Saan. k'au : St. O. Kao; (Hale kāo).

/k'ilalay/ '(re)turn': Chi. k'ilalay : Tw. k'ilalay:
Cheh. k'ilalay : Kalap. k'ilalay : Up.Cq. k'ilalay :
St. O. Kilalay; (Bpas k'ilalay, Tsim. ke'ilalay, Hale k'ilalay).
/k'el/ 'hard, difficult' : Tw. k'el: Cheh. k'el : St.0. K'al.

/k'alax(an)/ 'fence, corral' : Tw. k'alax(an) [Elmendorf's informant thought this was a Twana word] : Cheh. k'alax(an) : [Harrington's informant identified this as a Chehalis word] : St.0. Kalah(en).

/tk'up/ 'white' : Tw. tk'o:p : Cheh. tk'o:p : Saan. tk'u:p : St.0. twop ; (Hale tk'op, Parker t'koop).

/tk'up/ 'broken; cut, chop' : Chi. tk'u:p : Cheh. tk'o:p : St.0. Tk'op ; (Shaw Tk'op).

/k'aynu/ 'tobacco' : Cheh. k'aynu [Harrington's informant identified this as a Chehalis word] : St.0. KaTyu.

/xa'xdu/ 'thorn; needle' : Cheh. xa'xdu : St.0. Kipuet; (Hale kIpot).

/k'ipwu/ 'tobacco' : Cheh. k'yipwu [Harrington's informant identified this as a Chehalis word] : St.0. KaTwy.

/sak'aluks/ 'trousers' : Tw. sak'aluks : Cheh. sak'aluks : (St.0. sakaluks, Hale sak'alucks).

/halgi/ 'curly; crooked' : Cheh. halgi : St.0. Hanlgi.

/k'ak'a/ 'crow' : Tw. k'ak'a : St.0. Kaka.

/kanawi/ 'all' : Chi. kanawi : Tw. ka'nawi : Cheh. kanawi : Kalap. kanawi : Tsim. kanawe : St.0. kanawé : Hale kanawé.

/iskam/ 'get' : Chi. iskam : Tw. iskam : Cheh. iskam : St.0. Iskom : Hale Iskam.

/t'aku/ 'come' : [see above, /t'ax/].

/taska/ '3rd plural pronoun' [see above, /t's/].

/pulak/ 'dark; night' [see above, /p/].


/q'/: /q'u/ 'reach, arrive' : Chi. qu' : Cheh. qu' : Kalap. qu' : St.0. Ku : (Tw. ku).

/uql/ 'snake' : Chi. u'ql : Cheh. u'ql : (St.0. Olok, Shaw u'ql).

/taki/ = /tq'il/ 'want, wish, love, like' : Chi. taki : Cheh. taki : St.0. Tike - Tekh ; (Tw. ti'ki, Snoqu. ti'ki, Saan. dik, Kalap. ti'gi, Up.Cq. tigi, Tsim. tiki, Hale tiké, Ross Tekeligh).

/tat'yak/ 'broad, wide' : Tw. tat'yak : Cheh. tat'yak : (St.0. Tat'yak).

/tq'ayax/ 'entrails' : Cheh. tq'ayax : St.0. KaBh.
/qada/ 'how, why': Chi. qa’da : Cheh. qa’dA : Saan. qa’da :
   Tsim. qa’dA; (Tw. ka’ba, Mt. kada, Hale kata).

/qa(x)/ 'where': Chi. qa’x - qa’ : Snoq. qa’ : Saan. qa’:
   Kalap. qa’; (Cheh. k’A’, St.0. Kah, Hale kah, Parker c’hn).

/qansi/ 'how many, how much; when': Chi. qa’ntci : Cheh. qansi:
   (Tw. ka’nsi, Hale k’ntske, St.0. Kansi).

/a’gi/ 'later, future': Chi. a’gi : Cheh. a’gI : Saan. a’gi:
   Kalap. a’gi : Up.Cq. a’gi; (Tw. a’gI, Tsim. a’gI, St.0. Aike, Hale a’gI).

/xauqwa/ 'unable, impossible' [see above, /x/].

/a’ngadi/ 'former, past': Chi. a’ngadi : Cheh. a’ngadi :
   Kalap. a’ngadi (- angadi) : Tsim. a’ngate; (Tw. a’ngadi,
   Saan. an’gadi, Hale a’ngadi. Parker anacottas, St.0. ankate -
   ankate).

/yutqat/ 'long (dimension)': [see above, /t/].

/(h)ayq/ 'fast, quick, easy': Chi. (h)ayq : Cheh. ayq:
   Kalap. a’yq; (Tw. ha’yak, Hale ha’ak, St.0. A’ak).

/tsug/ 'water; stream': [see above, /ts/].

/kw’a/ /kw’as/ 'afraid; tame': Chi. kw’a’s : Tw. kw’as : Cheh. kw’as :
   St.0. Kw’as : ?Saan. kw’as - kw’as; (Hale kw’as).

/yakw’atin/ - /kw’at’im/ 'belly; entrails': Chi. kwati’n :
   Tw. kw’at’im : St.0. Ikwat’im; ?Cheh. kwat’im.

/kwa’n/ 'glad; tamed': St.0. Kwa’n : Cheh. kw’a’n [no gloss given],
   kw’a’n 'glad'.

/kw’ukw’iu/ 'ring, circle': Cheh. k’wu’k’wu’ : St.0. Kw’ukw’iu; (Hale kw’ukw’iu).

/kw’asem/ 'always': Chi. gwa’nsem : Tw. kw’a’nsem : Cheh. kw’a’nsem : St.0. Kw’a’nsem.

/makwst/ 'two': Chi. ma’k’st [cf. Chinook x-mak’st, the source word] : Tw. ma’k’st : Cheh. ma’k’st - ma’k’s : Snoq. ma’k’s -
   Kalap. ma’k’st - ma’k’st : Hale makwst - mákst; (Saan. mak’st, Up.Cq. ma’k’sa’n ‘2 days’, Parker mokst, St.0. mokst).

/kikw’li/ 'lower, down': Chi. gi’k’li : Tw. ki’k’li - ki’k’li :
   Cheh. ki’k’li : Snoq. ki’k’li : ?Tsim. ke’k’li :

/teskwis/ 'woven mat made of cattail': Tw. ti’skwis :
   Cheh. ti’skwis : St.0. Kliskwis - Tliskwis : Hale kléskwis.
8. Non-European consonant clusters

/tia'wit/ 'leg, foot': Chi. tya'wít : Cheh. tryâwáwit;  
(Hale tíawit, St.O. TeIáwit).

/tulu/'earn, win': Chi. -du'lú': Cheh. tv'íq;  
(Tw. to'lo, St.O. tolo).

/txáw'yam/ 'poor, pitiful': Chi. ta'guuyám : Cheh.  
txáwyám [Indians] - txáhayám [whites];  
(Tw. txáguuyám, Hale kláshwám).

/t'k'up/ 'white': Tw. tk'úp : Cheh. tk'íp : Saan. tk'úp :  
St.O. tk'op : Parker t'k'op;  
(Hale tük'op).

/methwit/ 'stand(up)l': Chi. mi'txwit : Tw. mi'txwit :  
Cheh. mitxwit : Saan. mitxwit : Kalap. mi'txwit :  
Up.Coq. mi'txwit : St.O. mitwhit;  
(Hale mitkoi).

/dlay/ 'dry': Chi. dlay = tlay : St.O. Tlał;  
Hale tlał : Winthrop D'ley = De'ly;  
(Tw. dala'i).

/yut'/ 'glad, pleased, proud': Tw. yú't't : Cheh. yó'tt :  
(yót't); St.O. Itl.

/stuxtkin/ 'eight': Cheh. stótxkin : Ross stóghtkin :  
Hale stóhtkin;  
(Tw. tu'skin = tu'tskin. St.O. Stótkin = Softhkin).

See above for other non-European consonant sequences (in European sources) that correspond to unit phonemes in Indians' pronunciation of CJ: word-initial ts- and (especially in St.O.) ti-; preconsonantal n and x; and w /C_ C and /C_ #.

Finally, here is a complete list for Hale 1846 of English-origin CJ words with non-English pronunciations. In all these words Hale follows the CJ norm: klas 'glass'; kintshósh 'Englishman' (literally 'King George'); 10n 'rum'; Cluman 'old man, father'; tala 'dollar, silver';  
clai 'dry'; támél 'tomorrow' [1846:637].

And here is a partial list for the Demers-Blanchet-St.Onge dictionary of French-origin words with non-French pronunciations. Here again, the authors follow the CJ norm: Lapush 'mouth'; Lálam 'ear'; pulli 'rotten'; Lamial 'old woman'; Létal 'teeth'; Láwest 'vest'; Lálik 'tongue'; Lahash 'axe'; Laptop 'latam 'table'; Lawen 'oats'; Lámota'l 'mountain'; Lakom 'gum'; Lakalot 'carrot'; Lashanshel 'belt'; Láupa 'ribbon'; Lemo 'wild'.

Non-European consonant clusters

/tta/ '/recent, new': [see above. /h/].

/itsxut/ 'black bear': Tw. l'tcxwet : Cheh. itseuw :  
St.O. Itskut; Hale itshúht - itshút; (Hymes and Hymes kswat, 
Winthrop Ichfat).

/t'khep/ 'extinguished': Chi. tcxe"p : Boas 1933, tcxup" :  
Eells chhköp.

/t'k'up/ 'hole': Chi. t'kwa"p : St.O. tlwhop = Tlwop : Cheh. tw'íp :  
St.O. Tlwop : Shaw Tl'kope.

/tk'up/ 'broken; cut, chop': Chi. tk'úp : Cheh. tk'op :  
St.O. Tlkop : Shaw Tl'kope.
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