

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 (à la Silverstein's psycholinguistic model) of how Chinookan and English structures may be idiosyncratically converged via 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 Wachenno, a brother of Mr. Bobb's stepfather John Wachenno. 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),

he has no memory at all of Mrs. Howard speaking Clackamas. Not only that, but he firmly rejected my assertion that Mrs. Howard even was, 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: aspectival hayu; (b) these speakers' distinctive and regular usage of short clitic versus long independent separate sets of pronouns; and (c), their resort to formal reduplication to convey plural and

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 variation, will be considered: (d), the speakers' rather different 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 elicitation, that is, as Mr. Bobb's Jargon translations of English model sentences proffered 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.

(a) Aspectival hayu. Mrs. Howard frequently preposes the particle hayu (haya, hai) to verbs. Jacobs (1932:33, 49) identifies it, naturally enough, with the adverbial hayu, hayú '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, hayu 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 kiléi uk-dənes-lučməŋ

'The little girl cried out loud.' (hayaš 'greatly, loud'; note Spro Adv V S order.)

alda-yašú:š gamdaks

'She listened carefully.' (šú:š 'good, carefully'; gamdaks 'know, perceive')

alda-yašú:š-dimdim uk-yačšč

'Her grandmother was in fine humor now.' (šú:š 'good, well'; dimdim '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 hayu or hai, alongside four of external hayu, hayú. Jacobs' suggested interpretation (1932:49) of the word: 'lots, very, much, rather, sort of, somehow', is usually

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 hayú, 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 hayu 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 mAkmAk hayú I do-that eat lots	'I'm eating lots.'
maksdi iAs wawA daniki twice they talk yesterday	'Twice they talked yesterday.'
tumáA iAs wawA ixsdi tomorrow they talk once	'Tomorrow they'll talk once.'
qAnči li:li iAs hayu wawA such time they do-that talk	'They've been talking such a long time!'
li:li wek iAs wawA long-time not they talk	'A long time its been since they talked.'
li:li iAs hayu wawA long-time they do-that talk	'A long time they're talking.'

wik na:nIč uguk not look that	'Don't look at that!'
wik hayu na:nIč khaNáwi IktA not do-that look all thing	'Don't be looking at everything!'
iAs hayu na nIč pus uk danús danás they do-that look for that little child child.'	'They're looking for the little child.'

kAldAs ya wawA wawA, ya λ'amín xwet λ'amín xwet just he talk talk he lie lie	'He just talks and talks, he constantly lies.'
dret ya kAmdAks λ'amín xwet straight he know lie	'He's a regular liar.'

(From a conversation:)

If iAs iuš wawA, wA kAmdAks iAs hai λ'amí:nxwet kaba maI .. 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 kwan(i)sam 'always' renders its specification superfluous, preposed hayu is optional.

na čhagu hayáš hayu wawA šawáš wawA I become big do-that talk Indian talk	
na čha.u hayáš wawA šawáš wawA I become big talk Indian talk	

'I grew 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 self-expression of being a native speaker of Jargon.)

qha ya hayu ku:rikuri khánAwíqhá
still she do-that run-all-around everywhere

qha ya ku:rikuri khánAwíqhá
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 mamúrk alda? 'What are you doing now?'
what you-do now

WB na hayu maš cōqw kAbA uk 'I'm (now) putting water on
I do-that throw water on that this (grass).'

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

aláxdí lAs hayu wawA, wek naI kAmDAks 'Perhaps they're talking
perhaps they do-that talk not I know now, I don't know.'

Some instances of preposed aspectival hayu 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).

yaga-hai-marḅ-íu:s-uk-paya 'He made a good fire.'

(Literal translation uncertain. Presumably, the subject worked some to build up the fire.)

"wik-aiḅi nsáiga adá:-naiga, ga:gwuk mēsáiga-hayu-marḅ

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

yagái-munḅ-líplíp uguk-lasu:p 'He made the soup boil.'

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

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

"It must be this old man who has been eating the soup."
(yagayu evidently contracted for yaga hayu; 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 aiḅi (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 aiḅi 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 hayú, patently the source of aspectival hayu, 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>	(<u>nai</u>)	<u>naiga</u>
2 p.s.	<u>ma</u>	(<u>mai</u>)	<u>maiga</u>
3 p.s.	<u>ya</u>	(<u>ya</u>)	<u>yaga, yaxka</u>
1 p.pl.	<u>ncá,</u> (<u>ca, sa</u>)	(<u>cai, sai</u>)	<u>ncáiga,</u> (<u>caiga</u>)
2 p.pl.	<u>mcá,</u> (<u>mesá</u>)	(<u>mesái</u>)	<u>mcáiga,</u> (<u>mesáiga</u>)
3 p.pl.	<u>fas</u>	<u>fas</u>	<u>taska</u>
Dem.	<u>uk</u>	<u>uk</u>	<u>uguk</u>

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>I</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: yaga (marked, as opposed to unmarked ya), yaxka (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 fas '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-1 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) Formal reduplication. 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

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) tixtix '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:m̄xum '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 λ'Áx uk pipA he-make tear that paper	'He tears the paper (e.g., one to a few pieces).'
yamunk λ'Á:xA'Ax uk pipA he-make tear-repeatedly that paper	'He tears up all the paper (a lot of it).'
na c'i bi I miss	'I missed (shot once and missed).'
na c'i:bi'ibi I miss-repeatedly	'I missed (several to many times).'

ya š ox he slip	'He slipped.'
ya hayu š o:xš ox he do-that slip-repeatedly	'He's slipping all over.'
(With <u>munk</u> , the form š o:xš ox takes on a special meaning: 'give hell to, a good talking to'.)	
na hayAš wawA ya, namunk š o:xš ox ya I big talk him I-'give-hell-to' him	'I gave him a big talking to, I really gave him hell.'
na č'AkAn 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 unnecessary, and hence optional, to use a reduplicated verb-form (cf. hayu above). Such a form may however serve to convey extra emphasis.

khanAwi aigi λ'Imen Iləhi all later soft earth	'Its going to get all muddy.'
pus uk sna:s čha:go, khanAwi uk Iləhi čhagu λ'Imenλ'Imen if that rain come all that earth become all-soft	'If it rains, its going to get all muddy.'
namunk šuk khanAwi IktA I-make break all thing	'I broke it all up.'
namunk šukšuk khanAwi IktA I-make break-repeatedly all thing	'I broke it all up.'

- linguistics). Anthropological linguistics 23(3):93-112.
- ajda, Yvonne
1976-80 [Fieldnotes in author's possession.]
- Hymes, 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.
- Jacobs, 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.
- Kaufman, Terence
1971 A report on Chinook Jargon. In Hymes, ed.,
Pidginization and creolization of languages.
- Tomason, Sarah
1983 Chinook Jargon in areal and historical context.
Language 59(4):820-870.
- Silverstein, Michael
1972 Chinook Jargon: language contact and the problem of
multi-level generative systems. Language 48(2):378-406,
48(3):596-625.
- Wenk, Henry
1984 Chinook Jargon and Native cultural persistence in the
Grand Ronde Indian Community, 1856-1907. [Unpublished Ph.d.
dissertation. University of Oregon, Eugene.]