Some Evidence of Elaboration in Chinook Jargon¹

Henry Zenk University of Oregon

The recent literature on Chinook Jargon reveals a notable lack of consensus on the most basic questions of classification, not to mention equally basic questions surrounding the language's origin and later development. The controversy over classification reduces to two radically different characterizations of the Jargon which came into wide regional use during the nineteenth century: one, that it was a stable pidgin language (Kaufman 1971, Thomason 1983); the other, that it exemplified an early, structurally uncrystallized phase of the pidginization process (a "pre-pidgin" perhaps) (Drechsel 1981, with reference to Silverstein 1972). At the crux of this controversy has been the issue of structural autonomy/ homogeneity versus variability, an opposition which has been posed especially with reference to the Jargon of one speaker: Melville Jacobs' Clackamas Chinookan speaking consultant Victoria Howard (Jargon texts dictated in 1930, published in Jacobs 1936:1-13). The Jargon of this speaker looks quite unusual by comparison to that of other speakers, as Boas (1933) pointed out by way of criticizing Jacobs' Notes on the Structure of Chinook Jargon (Jacobs 1932; based primarily upon the Howard texts). In Boas' assessment, Mrs. Howard's Jargon looked to be "a jargon affected by the Clackamas, a dialect of Chinook proper", a suggestion since enormously expanded upon by Silverstein (1972). This imputation of a Chinookan structural basis to Mrs. Howard's Jargon has been taken to imply (a), that her form of Jargon was a highly personalized and idiosyncratic one; and (b), that similarly personalized improvisations upon native-language structural patterns also characterized the Jargon of all speakers. Presumption (b) has been systematically countered by Thomason (1983), who has marshalled a large array of evidence to the contrary: that the Jargon in historical regional currency in fact exhibited a high degree of structural homogeneity and autonomy, with respect both to syntax and phonology. As for presumption (a), concerning Mrs. Howard's indisputably variant form of the language, compare the following comments offered by Jacobs (1936:v) in response to Boas' original assessment.

No doubt the Howard texts, coming as they do from a native speaker of a Chinookan language, reveal a form of Jargon already too stylized and far too rich with purely Chinookan content to have been given currency in such garb far beyond the Columbia. The Howard texts are linguistically none the less instructive in revealing the extent to which a jargon may elaborate. Dr. Franz Boas has pointed out that Mrs. Howard's Jargon was exceptional, not typical Jargon. While a form of Jargon much cruder and simpler than hers held sway over most of the region in which Jargon was spoken, her texts are of interest and importance if the attempt be made to observe the variant local Jargon developments. (Underlining added)

Here, I present some fresh data which seem to me to lend weight to Jacobs' as opposed to Boas' original assessment of Victoria Howard's Jargon. That is, I would like to suggest that Mrs. Howard's Jargon indeed should be taken as an example of "the extent to which a jargon may elaborate"; as opposed to an example (<u>a la Silverstein's psycholinguistic model</u>) of how Chinookan and English structures may be idiosyncratically converged <u>via</u> Jargon lexicon.

These data come in the Jargon of an elderly former member of the same community in which Mrs. Howard herself spent the greater part of her life, the Grand Ronde Indian Community (formerly, Grand Ronde Reservation) of western Oregon. This elder. Mr. Wilson Bobb. age 93 at this writing, speaks a Jargon exhibiting many of the same features which makes Mrs. Howard's Jargon seem so unusual. Since the two speakers knew one another well, this would hardly be surprising-- but for the extreme artificiality which has resulted from considering Mrs. Howard as if she were a case in isolation. Of course, Mrs. Howard in real life was no such case-- her daily life at Grand Ronde (where she was born, grew up, and spent most of her adult years) was spent in the constant company of relatives. friends, and acquaintances. It was these people, fellow family and community members not outsiders, with whom she learned and used Jargon. Jacobs' fieldnotes (1929) from Mrs. Howard herself have this to say about Jargon in her earlier life: "Mrs. Howard's mother talked mostly Jargon to her, [although she] knew Molale and Clackamas just like Mrs. Howard". Later on, during a good portion of her mature years, Mrs. Howard was married to Dan Wacheno, a brother of Mr. Bobb's stepfather John Wacheno. The two brothers were also close neighbors, and extended-family alignments remained strong in this as in other Grand Ronde Reservation families. Consequently,. Mr. Bobb was for a number of years rather closely associated with Mrs. Howard. The languages they shared, according to him: Jargon and English (Mrs. Howard, note, was fluent in English, like most Grand Ronde Reservation Natives of her generation). It is interesting, furthermore, that while Mr. Bobb can remember Mrs. Howard speaking Jargon, and his stepfather. step-uncles, and step-grandmother speaking Clackamas (regarding which he retains a distinct impression of that language's acoustic harshness, although he himself has never spoken or understood it),

340

distributive meanings. In addition to these, another syntactic feature, which in posing a significant point of contrast between the two speakers also raises some interesting issues concerning speakers' versus our own analytic perspectives on linguistic

word order patterns. It should be noted at the outset that Mr. Bobb has had little occasion to use Jargon for a good many years, a circumstance which does have bearing on the data gleaned from him. Most of these came in the form of sentence elicitations, that is, as Mr. Bobb's Jargon translations of English model sentences proferred by myself. Towards the end of the fieldwork period, however, I was able to use my own rudimentary Jargon competence to engage Mr. Bobb in some Jargon conversation. Since Mr. Bobb no longer feels comfortable giving Jargon text dictations, these constitute our only samples of Jargon discourse from him.

variation, will be considered: (d), the speakers' rather different

(a) <u>Aspectival hayu</u>. Mrs. Howard frequently preposes the particle <u>hayu</u> (<u>haya</u>, <u>haf</u>) to verbs. Jacobs (1932:33, 49) ident-ifies it, naturally enough, with the adverbial <u>hayu</u>, <u>hayi</u> 'many, much'. Such an interpretation is suggested by the patterning of other adverbials, which usually occur externally to (preceding or following) the pronoun-verb-(object) complex, but may also appear directly preposed to the verb (often, with change in meaning). However, <u>hayu</u> behaves curiously in Mrs. Howard's texts. In my scan of the texts I spotted just three instances of other preposed adverbs (Jacobs 1936:7,8; Jacobs' orthography transliterated and somewhat simplified).

alda ya-hayáš kilái uk-dənəs-łučmən

'The little girl cried out loud." (<u>hayaš</u> 'greatly, loud'; note Spro Adv V S order.) alda-yałú;š gamdaks 'She listened carefully." (<u>łu:š</u> 'good, carefully'; <u>gamdaks</u> 'know,perceive')

alda-yałú:š-dimdim uk-yačáč

'Her grandmother was in fine humor now.' (<u>lu:s</u> 'good, well'; <u>dimdim</u> 'think, feel'; Spro Adv V S order).

In each of these cases, the translation more-or-less clearly reflects the meaning lent by the preposed adverbs. By contrast, I spotted 25 instances of preposed <u>hayu</u> or <u>hai</u>, alongside four of external <u>hayu</u>, <u>hayú</u>. Jacobs' suggested interpretation (1932:49) of the word: 'lots, very, much, rather, sort of, somehow', is usually

he has no memory at all of Mrs. Howard speaking Clackamas. Not only that, but he firmly rejected my assertion that Mrs. Howard even <u>was</u>, originally, "a Clackamas" (that is, by natal "tribal" affiliation). The "tribes" (aboriginal cultural-linguistic groups) at Grand Ronde were by that time all quite small, and in Mr. Bobb's perception (quite genuinely Native on this point) a Clackamas-Clackamas marriage (as between Dan Wacheno and Victoria Howard) would have been tantamount to a marriage between relatives. (In fact, Mrs. Howard's father, who died when she was a child, was Tualatin Kalapuyan, while her part-Clackamas mother was an offspring of one of the reservation's prominent Molala families. Jacobs 1929.)

The intricately intertwined histories and circumstances of individuals and families on Grand Ronde Reservation will concern us no more here (refer to Zenk 1984 for more detail on the Wachenos and other Grand Ronde families in which Jargon was used). What I wish to call attention to is the comparability of Mr. Bobb's Jargon with Mrs. Howard's. This is most immediately obvious with regard to certain features of syntax, which are quite unusual in regional terms. Some of these indeed do strongly suggest a Chinookan structural basis or origin. But, insofar as they characterize Mr. Bobb's Jargon as well as Mrs. Howard's, we must reject Silverstein's claim that they necessarily betray the workings of a Chinookan speaker's grammatical competence. Mr. Bobb, to repeat, has never had the least such competence, passive or active (nor, for that matter, has he ever had any competence in any indigenous language, other than Jargon). His mother was Tualatin-Klickitat, his natural father, who died when he was 4-5 years old, was Tillamook, and his stepfather was Clackamas; Jargon was probably the only language shared by his mother and natural father, while both Jargon and English were used in the home by his mother and stepfather. Of course, the presence of patently Chinookan traits in these speakers' Jargon does require explanation. In short, there seems to have been at Grand Ronde a peculiarly Chinookanized dialectal variety of Jargon, just as intimated above by Jacobs. At the same time, there are also indications that the formal peculiarities of this "variant local Jargon development" cannot be accounted wholly to Chinookan source-language models. Rather, the Jargon of these speakers, and beyond that, the Jargon of the Grand Ronde Community generally, appears worthy of consideration as a developing linguistic system in its own right. Some of these indications will receive consideration here.

The present discussion will be limited to just a few points of syntax: (a) the presence of a special aspect marker in these speakers', as well as in some other Grand Ronde speakers' Jargon: <u>aspectival hayu;</u> (b) these speakers' distinctive and regular usage of short clitic versus long independent <u>separate sets of pronouns;</u> and (c), their resort to <u>formal reduplication</u> to convey plural and

not obvious in his actual translations. In most cases, we are driven to the context for any suggestion of augmentation; lacking that, very few contexts definitely exclude the alternate interpretations 'rather, sort of, somehow'!

The data from Mr. Bobb bring some new light to this confusing picture. Mr. Bobb frequently uses preposed hayu (minimally or not at all stressed; occasionally reduced to hayA or haI). For him, it is most definitely not the same word as adverb/adjective havu, which he consistently stresses on the second syllable: thus demarcating a minimal pair. (By the way, the failure of Jacobs' transcription to show the same distinction more than sporadically is not necessarily decisive: stress falls lightly in this form of Jargon, and consistency here is much helped by the realization, or at any rate the suspicion, that there are indeed two words at issue. Jacobs had no inkling of this.) Preposed havu serves. rather, to highlight action in its aspect of continuing or repeating performance (I am indebted to Professor Wayne Suttles for originally suggesting that an aspectual distinction might be at issue here). A literal gloss, suggested by Mr. Bobb's own introspection, would be 'do(ing)-that'.

| hayú na mAkmAk; na mAkmAk hayú lots I eat I eat lots | 'I eat lots.' |
|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| na hayu mAkmAk I do-that eat | 'I'm eating.' |
| na hayu mAknAk hayú I do-that eat lots | 'I'm eating lots.' |
| maksdi łAs wawA danłki twice they talk yesterday | 'Twice they talked yesterday.' |
| tumál A łAs wawA ixsdi tomorrow they talk once | 'Tomorrow they'll talk once.' |
| qAnči li:li łAs hayu waw A such time they do-that talk | 'They've been talking such a long time!' |
| li:li wek las wawA long-time not they talk | 'A long time its been since they talked." |
| li:li lAs hayu wawA long-time they do-that talk | 'A long time they're talking.' |

wik ne:nIč uguk not look that 'Don't look at that!'

wik hayu na:nIč khanAwi IktA 'Don't be looking at everything!' not do-that look all thing

±As hayu na nIč pus uk dənús dənás 'They're looking for the little they do-that look for that little child child.'

kAldAs ya wawA wawA, ya l'aminxwət l'aminxwət just he talk talk he lie lie

'He just talks and talks, he constantly lies.'

drat ya kAmdAks & `emin xwet 'He's a regular liar.' straight he know lie

(From a conversation:)

If they good talk you know they do-that lie to you

'If they speak finely, you know they're lying to you.'

Where context alone clearly indicates continuous or repeated action, or, alternatively, where an adverbial such as <u>kwan(i)sam</u> 'always' renders its specification superfluous, preposed <u>hayu</u> is optional.

na čhagu hayáš hayu wawA šawAš wawA I become big do-that talk Indian talk

na čha.u hayáš wawA šawAš wawA I become big talk Indian talk

> 'I grow up speaking the Indian language (Jargon).' (The second sentence was given upon my request for a repetition of the first, which came during a conversation-- as Mr. Bobb's quite spontaneous selfexpression of being a native speaker of Jargon.)

cha ya hayu ku:rikuri khanAwiqhá still she do-that run-all-around everywhere

qha ya ku:rikuri khánAwiqhá still she run-all-around everywhere

'She's still running around all over.'

A secondary implication, of action continuing and, therefore, happening in present time, is sometimes evident.

- HZ IktA mamúŋk aldA? what you-do now WB na hayu maš côqw kAbA uk 'I'm (now) putting water on
 - I do-that throw water on that this (grass).

dənəs hayáš ya hayu wawA little big he do-that talk 'He's talking a little louder

aláxdi 1As hayu wawA, wek naI kAmdAks 'Perha perhaps they do-that talk not I know now, I

'Perhaps they're talking now, I don't know.'

Some instances of preposed aspectival <u>hayu</u> occur also in samples from two other Grand Ronde speakers: Jacobs' Santiam Kalapuyan speaking consultant John Hudson (Jacobs 1936:14-19); and, Yvonne Hajda's consultant Elmer Tom (Hajda 1976-80). So far as I know it is documented nowhere else. None of the younger speakers is familiar with the usage at all. The following are the four instances which I find in Mr. Hudson's texts (all are from text no. 2). yaza-hai-mank-lu:s-uk-paya

'He made a good fire.'

(Literal translation uncertain. Presumably, the subject worked some to build up the fire.) "wik-algi nsáiga adá:-naiga, ga:gwuk məsáiga-hayu-mank

> "But we will not have to wait for me, such as you have had to do so often." (<u>ga:gwuk</u> contracted for <u>kagwa uk;</u> meaning of <u>havu</u> clearly indicated by translation here.)

yagái-muŋk-liplip uguk-lasu:p 'He made the soup boil.'

(yagai evidently contracted for yaga hai; again, we can only presume that some time and effort were given to the soup.)

"dak'i-ya:ga-uk-ulman yagayu-makmak uk-lasú:p"

"It must be this old man who has been eating the soup." (<u>yagayu</u> evidently contracted for <u>yaga havu</u>; again, a clear translation.)

The above considerations permit the following conclusions: Pre-verb hayu patterns quite differently from the adverbials serving more usually in Jargon to convey time reference (Thomason 1984, p.c.). Compare especially the relative-tense indicators alda (marking a point in time: 'now'), and are (marking time following a given point in time: 'later'). While adverbials of manner are often found directly preposed to verbs (except: only rarely in Mrs. Howard's texts), alda and arqi almost invariably (at least, in all the older Grand Ronde speakers' Jargon) fall clause-externally. Aspectival hayu, on the other hand, is invariably directly preposed to verbs, in effect creating verb forms specially marked for continuative-repetitive aspect. As a productive device complicating the expression of verbal ideas in this language, it must be accounted a trait of elaboration. Moreover, it does not seem directly traceable to Chinookan structure. In fact, the adverbial have, patently the source of aspectival have, belongs to the Nootkan rather than the Chinookan component of Jargon lexicon.

(b) Separate sets of pronouns. The pronoun usages of the two speakers are closely comparable, but not identical. In the following tabulation, forms used by both speakers are shown unparenthesized, while those used by Mr. Bobb alone are parenthesized.

| Prepositioned clitic short forms | Independent or clitic short forms | Independent full forms |
|----------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| 1 p.s. <u>na</u> 2 p.s. <u>ma</u> 3 p.s. <u>ya</u> | (<u>nai</u>) (<u>mai</u>) (ya) | <u>naiga</u> <u>maiga</u> yaga, yaxka |
| 1 p.pl. <u>ncá</u> , (ca, sa) | (<u>cai, sai</u>) | ncáiga, (caiga) |
| 2 p.pl. <u>mcá</u> , (mesá) | (<u>məsái</u>) | <u>mcáiga</u> , (məsáiga) |
| 3 p.pl. <u>tas</u> | tas | taska |
| Dem. <u>uk</u> | uk | uguk |

The familiar regional Jargon has but one set of pronouns: identical with the above full-form set (column 3). In these two speakers' usage, however, the full forms are functionally specialized, serving: (1) as accusative forms; (2) as the usual subject forms in attributive and equational constructions; and (3) as special emphatic (marked) subject forms alternating with short clitic (unmarked) forms in transitive/intransitive and possessive constructions (cf. Jacobs 1932:42). The latter unmarked:marked significance is uniquely attested in the Jargon of these speakers. Some other Grand Ronde speakers also frequently use short clitic forms (from both sets: columns one and two) in alternation with full forms, but so variably that no marking significance is obvious with respect to one or the other set. It should be pointed out that the data from Mr. Bobb reveal this significance even more clearly than do Mrs. Howard's texts, which include examples of (judging from the translations) apparently unmotivated preposed full forms (one text in particular, no. 2, Jacobs 1936:4-6, is riddled with such examples). Mr. Bobb is very deliberate in reserving full-form pronouns for emphatic effect. Three different degrees of markedness are apparent in the following examples from him:

| na kAmdAks | 'I understand' |
|------------------|---------------------------------------|
| naIgA kAmdAks | ' <u>1</u> understand' |
| naIgA na kAmdAks | ' <u>I'm</u> the one who understands' |

3 p.s. can be given an extra degree of marking, since not one but two full forms are available: <u>yaga</u> (marked, as opposed to unmarked <u>ya</u>), <u>yagka</u> (very infrequently used by Mr. Bobb, therefore highly marked for him).

Chinookan source-language patterning is quite clearly revealed in the first and third sets of pronoun forms. Both correspond one-for-one to Chinookan originals: Chinookan pronominal prefixes on the one hand, Chinookan independent pronouns on the other (Jacobs 1932:41-42). Furthermore, the patterning of the Jargon sets is paralleled in Chinookan, wherein pronominal prefixes are obligatory, while independent pronouns are optional and hence available for expressive effect (Silverstein 1972:400-401, 404). However, there seems to be no Chinookan precedent for three distinct sets of forms. Yet, the third set (column 2) is indeed functionally distinguishable (although, to be sure, fully so only from Mr. Bobb): these forms may be used like full forms, accusatively (note, here, Mrs. Howard's occasional usage of short <u>tas</u> '3 p.pl.' as an accusative form), or to indicate the subject in attributive and equational constructions; but they may also be used like column-l short forms, to indicate the unemphasized subject in transitive/intransitive/possessive constructions.

So even here, where Chinookan origins are transparent, we find an indication of independent development: a complete extra set of pronouns. The Chinookan-paralleled distinction between independent-emphatic and short-unemphatic subject forms remains fundamental, but speakers now also have the option of using one set of pronouns accusatively, or to indicate, without emphasizing, all categories of subjects and possessors.

There are furthermore certain other grounds for considering the existence of different sets of pronouns in Grand Ronde Jargon an elaboration, if not in the narrowly syntactic sense under consideration here. For the foregoing two speakers, the short:long pronoun alternation serves what Hymes (1968:115-124) terms "expressive" function. While this cannot be identified in the case of other attested Grand Ronde speakers who used both sets of forms. there is however evidence that the "mixed" usages, too, should be viewed in functional terms (Zenk 1984). In brief: back when Jargon was still in regular daily use in this community, many speakers seem to have used short forms, not just pronouns but a whole plethora of truncations and contractions as well, especially when communicating with close familiars under highly casual circumstances (as, for example, when at home-- Jargon having been a medium of daily general communication in many Grand Ronde households). In Hymes' terminology, these speakers' pronoun usages therefore exhibited variation with respect to "contextual" or "situational" function. As a significant indicator of register differentiation within the Jargon spoken in this community, such variation would indeed seem to constitute positive evidence of elaboration.

(c) <u>Formal reduplication</u>. As Thomason has pointed out (1982, p.c.), repetition (for emphasis, etc.) is probably universal in the world's languages, and duplication for emphatic effect should not be surprising in anyone's Jargon. Examples of simple repetition of words-- usually duplication or triplication-- are available from

347

all the Grand Ronde speakers. However, the regular usage of some of the speakers (but most especially, Mrs. Howard and Mr. Bobb), in which formally reduplicated forms convey specific distributive or plural meanings, appears to be distinctive. The description of the reduplication process which Jacobs gives in his structural notes (1932:32-33), however, requires some correction. There, it is indicated that the first syllable of a reduplicated monosyllabic root is regularly lengthened (except where the vowel is a), likewise the second syllable (if closed) of a disyllabic root. However, Jacobs' texts from Mrs. Howard include two examples of reduplicated forms which do not show the expected lengthening: (mun)kw'itkw'it 'break off plural objects'; (munk) łixłix 'tickle all over' (but more literally, 'make repeatedly silly') (these verbs are both attested in simplex form from other Grand Ronde speakers, including Mr. Bobb who uses both the reduplicated and simplex forms). Apparently, it is stress, not length as such which really marks the reduplication. This is suggested by the general high frequency of stressed long syllables in the texts, as well as, more specifically, by many evidently purely phonological reduplicants: xu:mxum 'brains', hi:hi 'laugh', lu:lu 'carry', li:li 'awhile', and others. In fact, I was uncertain whether to indicate length in a number of the reduplicated forms cited below from Mr. Bobb. Often, the indicated lengthening reflects syllable prominence more than quantity-- as could be graphically shown by an orthography which permitted the first syllable to be printed in larger letters than the second.

Examples from Mr. Bobb:

yamunk & Ax uk pipA he-make tear that paper

'He tears the paper (e.g., one to a few pieces).'

of it)."

yamunk h'A:3h'Az uk pipA he-make tear-repeatedly that paper

na c'ibi I miss

na c'i:bic'ibi

I miss-repeatedly

'I missed (shot once and missed).'

'He tears up all the paper (a lot

'I missed (several to many times).'

ya šox he slip

ya hayu šo:xšox he do-that slip-repeatedly 'He's slipping all over.'

'He slipped.'

(With <u>munk</u>, the form <u>š):xš)x</u> takes on a special meaning: 'give hell to, a good talking to'.) na hayAš wawA ya, namunk š):xš)x ya I big talk him I-'give-hell-to' him

' 'I gave him a big talking to, I really gave him hell.'

na č⁷AkAn ya I kick him 'I kicked him.'

na č'AkAnč'AkAn ya upuč, ya hayAš kəláI I kick-repeatedly his ass he big cry

'I really kicked his ass, he sure cried.'

Where distributive or plural meaning is otherwise obvious, it may be unecessary, and hence optional, to use a reduplicated verb-form (cf. <u>hayu</u> above). Such a form may however serve to convey extra emphasis.

khanAwi algi k'Imen Ilehi all later soft earth

'Its going to get all muddy.'

pus uk sna:s čha:go, khanAwi uk Ilehi čhagu k'Imenk'Imen if that rain come all that earth become all-soft

'If it rains, its going to get all muddy.'

namunik luk khenAwi IktA I-make break all thing

'I broke it all up.'

namunk lukluk khanAwi IktA I-make break-repeatedly all thing 'I broke it all up.'

350

'I tie it all up."

khanAwi IktA namuŋk k'a:U all thing I-make tie

•

namunk lu:š k'a:Uk'aU lAs I-make good tie-repeatedly them

'I tie them together really well.'

By contrast with Mrs. Howard, Mr. Bobb seems disinclined to reduplicate adjectival forms. For example, when I posed Mrs. Howard's <u>dunúsdunus</u> to him (cf. her <u>kas-mun-k'a:uk'au dunúsdunus</u> <u>ka:nawi ikda</u>, 'they wrapped up a little of everything'; one of the examples used by Silverstein, 1972:606), he could not recall ever hearing the form. But, he was able to tell me quite specifically, and without prompting, what it <u>should</u> mean, and to furnish a supporting example.

kAldAs dunú:sdunus ya pAlAč just little-by-little he give 'He just gives out a little at a time.'

The following is one of the few spontaneously given examples of a reduplicated adjectival form we have from him.

q'aIwAq'aIwA uk maI siyaxwəs all-crooked that your eye 'Your eyes are every which way.' (Something that might be said to a man "sying" a woman, or a woman "sying" a man.)

This feature may serve to underscore a point already intimated in the discussion of feature (b): elaboration may or may not entail independent development. Formal reduplication must indeed be accounted a trait of elaboration: as in (a) and (b) above, we have here a productive formal device evidently absent in the regionally more usual Jargon. Nor is reduplication in Grand Ronde Jargon an exclusively Chinookan-connected speakers' usage: other speakers also show such forms, if much less frequently than Mr. Bobb and Mrs. Howard. At the same time, this looks to be a Chinookan device, pure and simple (cf. Boas 1904:118-124). That is, the samples from these speakers, as far as I can see anyway, suggest no Jargoninternal processes of formal or functional differentiation in regard to this feature.

Finally, along with the foregoing points of close comparison, I consider a point of variance between the two speakers. (d) <u>Word-order patterns</u>. Grand Ronde Jargon shows regular SV0 word order with verbs used transitively; usual SV order, as well as occasional (stylistically optional) VS order, with verbs used intransitively; and variable S-Pred/Pred-S order in attributive and equational constructions (Thomason, 1983, treats predicate adjectives and predicate nouns as intransitive verbs, hence equating S Pred = SV, Pred S = VS).

The most notable exception to the foregoing picture comes in the Jargon of one speaker -- Victoria Howard, Mrs. Howard, by contrast to all other speakers everywhere (that is, those represented by data!), employs VS order with quite high frequency-by Thomason's count, yielding in her texts a VS / SV ratio of 46/94. In view of its seeming anomalousness, this feature indeed suggests Mrs. Howard's spontaneous (idiosyncratic) simplification of her VS-dominant Clackamas Chinookan word-order patterns. While I must acknowledge that Mrs. Howard's Clackamas competence may indeed be a factor to be reckoned with here, I would also like to point out some important qualifications concerning this feature. In my own rapid scan of the Howard texts, I found that VS order (including S-pronounV S and S-pronoun) is almost always restricted to verbs used intransitively. Most of the verbs in question, furthermore, are ones which are intransitive in normal meaning. The main exception to this rule was the verb wawa, 'say, tell' (8 VS instances), which has about an equal likelihood of turning up transitive or intransitive. In 5 of the 8 wawa instances, context clearly indicates intransitive meaning; in two, context clearly indicates transitive meaning-- both showing S-pronounV OS order. The one remaining case (Jacobs 1936:5: alda yawawa uk-ya-čəč, translated 'and she said to her grandmother') I believe to be a mistranslated example of VS order, with intransitive wawa (the all-important context-- the relationship between the two actors. and the preceding pattern of turns of talk involving them--suggests that it is grandmother who is speaking here).

It therefore appears that Mrs. Howard rather consistently, if not invariably, conforms her VS preference to the limitations of normal Jargon syntactic order. That is to say, that she by and large conforms to Jargon syntactic norms where it most makes a difference-- in transitive verb constructions. But, as already pointed out, VS order in intransitive constructions is stylistically optional for other Grand Ronde speakers. Furthermore, were we to count the latter speakers' rather frequent examples of Pred S order as examples of VS, we would find VS not so unusual after all in Grand Ronde Jargon. So, Mrs. Howard's VS usage, while indeed unusual, does exhibit definite points of comparison with other Grand Ronde speakers' usages.

Mr. Bobb is one of the speakers who frequently employs Pred S order. On the other hand, he is also one of the speakers who hardly ever employs VS order with verbs properly so-called. One of

354

the few such examples we have from him, however, serves ideally for introducing a new consideration to the discussion.

lAs tendem uk ba:sden laskauk/hayAš tIlIxAm/ they think the Whites they that big people

> 'The Whites think they're the superior people (race).' ("/" for speech peuses)

This example is especially suggestive for two reasons: it shows VS order in a transitive construction, therefore violating seemingly the most cardinal rule of Jargon syntax; and, it came spontaneously, in conversation, rather than in the set-piece frame of prompted sentence elicitations. It is easy enough to see why variant word order brings no confusion in meaning here: simply, it is unlikely (that is, in the particular terms of the particular conversation in which the example came) that anyone <u>but</u> Whites would think this. What is much more to the point though: Mr. Bobb did not seem to find this example (on review) to be in the least awkward. To him, it seems perfectly "good Jargon".

I would like to use this example to pose the following question: on what basis is Mrs. Howard's VS preference to be considered idiosyncratic or "anomalous" ? We have no indications whatsoever that other competent speakers of the Grand Ronde community would have perceived it as such. Moreover, if they did not, this probably would not have been for lack of competentspeaker's criteria for differentiating "good" from "poor", "natural" from "awkward" Jargon. Mr. Bobb, for one, holds quite exacting criteria in this regard, particularly with respect to traits of phonology (on which basis he adjudges the Jargon of most other contemporary Grand Ronde speakers to be quite "poor"). Indeed, for all we can now know, Mrs. Howard's VS preference (say, by virtue of imparting a more "Chinooky" stamp to her Jargon) was stylistically motivated, not a matter of spontaneous simplification at all. For want of additional evidence, this possibility must remain in the realm of speculation -- but then perhaps, so should the evaluation of "anomalousness".

<u>Conclusion</u>. In one regard, this paper may be viewed as an expansion of Thomason's (1983) case for Jargon structural autonomy. Thomason argues that the pidgin Jargon formerly in wide regional distribution exhibited distinct norms with respect both to phonology and syntax. These are revealed in the typically "non-simplificatory ways" in which Jargon turns out to differ from its speakers' other languages. Here, I have argued that the same sort of considerations apply to the variant form of the language heretofore known only from Jacobs' Clackamas Chinookan speaking consultant Victoria Howard. It very much appears that, other views to the contrary, Jacobs' original assessment of Mrs. Howard's Jargon was correct after all. That is, her Jargon is best seen, not as one speakers' idiosyncratic improvisation upon Chinookan structural patterns, but as exemplifying: (a) "the extent to which a jargon may elaborate", and (b), a particular dialectal "variant local Jargon development". The focus here has been upon point (a). Specifically, certain syntactic peculiarities of Mrs. Howard's Jargon turn out to find close parallels in data recently gleaned from a fellow former member of her home community. While these peculiarities to some extent do reveal Chinookan source-language patterning, their presence in the Jargon of this speaker, who has never known a Chinookan language, suggests that they represent something more than spontaneous simplifications of Chinookan. Furthermore, not all of these peculiarities turn out to trace to Chinookan structural models. Some, rather, suggest processes of internal development characterizing these speakers' Jargon as a linguistic system in its own right. Nor can these two speakers' form of Jargon be considered simply in isolation -- it turns out to exhibit many points of comparison with the language as we know it from other Grand Ronde speakers.

NOTES

¹ My profound debt to Wilson Bobb will be obvious here. I also owe much to Eula Petite, for her frequent assistance to me over my past several years' research on Jargon. Travel and other expenses incurred during that period were partially defrayed by the Melville and Elizabeth Jacobs Research Fund.

This paper grew directly out of discussions with Judy Phillips, and so owes a great deal to her. Her suggestions have been informed by her own considerable background in pidgin-creole linguistics. I have also benefitted from earlier suggestions by others, most especially Wayne Suttles, Yvonne Hajda, and Sarah Thomason. Of course, I alone must be held responsible for any errors.

The orthography used is conditioned by the available typewriter keyboard: \underline{I} stands for "lota", \underline{A} for "caret". Stress is marked when it falls on other than first syllables, or on first syllables when doubled for emphasis.

REFERENCES

Boas, Franz

1933 Note on the Chinook Jargon. Language 9(2):208-13. Drechsel, Emanuel

1981 A preliminary sociolinguistic comparison of four indigenous pidgin languages of North America (with notes towards a sociolinguistic typology in American Indian 355

linguistics). Anthropological linguistics 23(3):93-112. ajda, Yvonne 1976-80 [Fieldnotes in author's possession.] ymes, Dell 1968 The ethnography of speaking. In Joshua A Fishman, ed., Readings in the sociology of language. 1971 [Introduction to Part III.] In Dell Hymes, ed., Pidginization and creolization of languages. acobs, Melville 1929 [Field notebook no. 53. Melville Jacobs Collection, University of Washington Archives, Seattle.] 1932 Notes on the structure of Chinook Jargon. Language 8(1):27-50 1936 Texts in Chinook Jargon. University of Washington publications in anthropology 7(1):1-27. aufman, Terence 1971 A report on Chinook Jargon. In Hymes, ed., Pidginization and creolization of languages. homason, Sarah 1983 Chinook Jargon in areal and historical context. Language 59(4):820-870. ilverstein, Michael 1972 Chinook Jargon: language contact and the problem of multi-level generative systems. Language 48(2):378-406, 48(3):596-625.

enk, Henry

1984 Chinook Jargon and Native cultural persistence in the Grand Ronde Indian Community, 1856-1907. [Unpublished Ph.d. dissertation. University of Oregon, Eugene.]