

## Uncovering the Chinookan roots of Chinuk Wawa: a new look at the linguistic and historical record<sup>1</sup>

Henry B. Zenk and Tony A. Johnson  
Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde, Oregon

This paper evaluates historical and linguistic evidence bearing on the attributes and development of Chinuk Wawa (or Chinook Jargon), with special attention to the earliest period of interethnic contact on the Lower Columbia. There has recently been new discussion of the old idea that Chinuk Wawa originated during the late-eighteenth century, when mainly English-speaking seafarers already partially familiar with Nootkan first visited the Lower Columbia and began attempting to acquire Chinookan. However, while an English-speakers' role in transmitting Nootkan-influenced lexemes into Chinuk Wawa may be considered well established, the large Chinookan contribution to Chinuk Wawa reveals no clear evidence of ever having been significantly filtered through English. Rather, this component of Chinuk Wawa appears to have originated with grammatical simplifications of Chinookan that only Chinookan speakers could have made. To that extent, Chinuk Wawa is clearly an indigenous linguistic variety, although the question of its pre-contact autonomy from Chinookan itself is more problematic.

The first extensive records of Chinuk Wawa (CW) were made on the Lower Columbia during the mid-nineteenth century, the two most comprehensive original sources being Gibbs (1863), cited here as CW<sub>GIBBS</sub>, and Demers, Blanchet, St. Onge (1871), cited here as CW<sub>DEMERS</sub>. These document a hybrid lexicon with the largest contribution from Chinookan, but with important contributions also from Nootkan, English, and French, and a remainder from a half dozen or so other languages or lacking known etymologies. A tabulation by Grant (1996:1192-1193) shows Gibbs's lexicon with 41% Chinookan, 5% Nootkan, 14% English, and 19% French contributions. Citing later compilations by Eells (for the Puget Sound region) and LeJeune (for British Columbia), Grant points out that these percentages shifted markedly in favor of English as CW spread north during the later nineteenth century: yielding figures of 15% Chinookan and 41% English in Eells, 31% Chinookan and 46% English in LeJeune. Relexification towards

---

<sup>1</sup>We are indebted to G. Tucker Childs and Tom Larsen for their helpful comments on drafts of this paper, to Dell Hymes for sharing his expertise on Chinookan languages with us, and to June Olson of the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Cultural Resources Department for her support of this project.

English was not the rule everywhere, however. Two Lower Columbia Indian CW varieties known primarily from records made between 1929 and the recent past, cited here as CW<sub>BAY C</sub> (for the CW of Willapa Bay, recorded mostly from Indians of Bay Center, Washington) and CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> (for the CW of the Grand Ronde community, Oregon), exhibit an etymological breakdown much closer to that of Gibbs's compilation.

CW<sub>GIBBS</sub>, CW<sub>DEMERS</sub>, CW<sub>BAY C</sub>, and CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> are the most comprehensive sources documenting CW on the Lower Columbia.<sup>2</sup> The four varieties represented share the same basic CW lexicon. While CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> is known for some grammatical innovations that other CW varieties either lack entirely, or attest in much attenuated form, these consist primarily of grammaticalizations, morphemic reductions, and cliticizations of forms that other varieties attest as free forms and unbound morphemes (Grant 1996a:231). The bulk of CW function words (pronouns, adverbs, particles, auxiliaries, numerals) are from Chinookan and Nootkan. There is however an important discontinuity contrasting the Chinookan and Nootkan contributions to CW. Chinookan-contributed CW items retain many features suggesting that the people who introduced them must have controlled

---

<sup>2</sup>CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> forms are from our own compilation and analysis (Zenk and Johnson 2003), which incorporates CW data from earlier sources (especially Jacobs 1928-36) with more recent field recordings by Hajda (1977-80), Zenk (1980-83), and Johnson (1998-2000). Harrington's (1942) phonetic transcriptions are the main source of CW<sub>BAY C</sub> forms; some alternate forms from Willapa Bay elders have been supplied by Johnson. The phonemic orthography used for CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> is that of the Handbook of North American Indians. Harrington's original phonetic spellings are preserved for CW<sub>BAY C</sub>, except that we have taken the liberty of transliterating his older IPA orthography to bring it more into line with HNAI usage: thus, Harrington's [α] appears here as [A], his [k] as [q], his [ʔ] as [ʔ], his [ʃ] as [ʃ], his [o] as [o] (we retain his [u] for the high back rounded lax vowel). We have had to omit some of Harrington's diacritics, missing from our available character sets.

CW<sub>GIBBS</sub> (Gibbs 1863), the "Ur" English-orthography CW dictionary (subsequently widely copied and pirated, as detailed in S. Johnson 1978:96-121), incorporates various earlier sources (especially Hale 1846:635-650) with Gibbs's own extensive mid-nineteenth century experience of CW in western Washington and northwestern Oregon (not just in Puget Sound, contrary to Grant's 1996:1190 impression). The question of whether the English-influenced pronunciations indicated by Hale and Gibbs constitute evidence of CW's ultimate origin as an English-speakers' variety will be addressed in section 1 (*Chinookan versus Chinuk Wawa*).

CW<sub>DEMERS</sub> (Demers, Blanchet, St. Onge 1871) includes a CW dictionary and Roman Catholic catechism, both supposed to have been composed by Demers in 1838 and 1839, plus CW Christian Prayers identical to Blanchet (1862) and some hymns of uncertain authorship. The final editor, St. Onge, was evidently responsible for systematizing this source's unique orthography, one of the earliest attempts to accurately represent the sounds of any Northwest indigenous language. We follow Blanchet (1862) in using the symbol *h* in place of St. Onge's "h" with its right leg missing, explained as "guttural, and similar to the German *ch* in *machen*." Our *κ* stands for St. Onge's *κ* (capitalized as "K" with the left upper point missing), "a guttural-explosive sound which practice alone can teach" (Demers, Blanchet, St. Onge 1871:10; see comparisons with modern recordings in Tables 1-3, also Thomason 1983:828-829).

Chinookan phonology and morphology. Such features, which as we take pains to establish in section 1 (*Chinookan versus Chinuk Wawa*) are not restricted to Indian CW varieties, are difficult to square with the notion that CW originated with imperfect foreigner approximations such as Trudgill (1996) observes usually give rise to pidginized varieties of lexifier languages. While Nootkan-contributed CW lexemes clearly *were* introduced by persons who did not control Nootkan phonology and morphology, even this portion of the CW lexicon reveals indications of Chinookan influence, as we will point out in section 2 (*Linguistic Evidence from Earliest Contact on the Lower Columbia*). Finally, we will conclude with an assessment of our findings in the light of previous contributions to the much-vexed question of CW's ultimate origin, whether before or after contact with the first visiting White traders (section 3, *Conclusion: Chinuk Wawa as a Chinookan Creation*).

## 1 Chinookan versus Chinuk Wawa

A Chinookan sentence consists normally of an inflected verb or noun.<sup>3</sup> Nouns take prefixes indicating their number and gender. A noun so marked can also stand alone as a nominal sentences:

- (1) a. UC *i-láitix*  
he-slave  
'He is a slave.'
- (2) b. UC *a-láitix*  
she-slave  
'She is a slave.'

The core of a Chinookan verbal sentence consists of an inflected verb. Often, this provides a remarkably compact representation of the sentence's grammatical relations. The constituent grammatical *and* lexical elements of Chinookan verbs typically consist of 1-3 phonemes, helping give rise to the

---

<sup>3</sup>We cite examples from all Chinookan languages, since the different Chinookan languages and dialects are phonologically, morphologically, and lexically sufficiently uniform to permit us to discuss CW for the most part with reference to Chinookan as a whole. Dialects and sources for Chinookan examples are keyed to the following abbreviations: UC (Kiksht Upper Chinook; examples are Wasco-Wishram dialect from Dyk 1933, Swadesh 1953, Moore 2003, and Clackamas dialect from Jacobs 1958:59); KC (Kathlamet Chinook; examples from Boas 1901 as analyzed in Hymes 1955); LC (Lower Chinook; examples are Chinook proper dialect from Boas 1894, 1911).

The same orthography used for CW<sub>GRONDE</sub> is also used to transliterate phonemically-spelled Chinookan forms from Dyk, Hymes, and Moore. Jacobs's (1958:5-7) phonetic simplifications and equivalences have provided guidance for simplifying and respelling Boas's earlier Chinookan recordings; the resulting respellings—which include all LC forms cited here—are not to be considered phonemically precise.

notoriously clustered combinations of consonants that have lent Chinookan languages a reputation for special difficulty among speakers of other local indigenous languages (e.g., Sapir 1909:x). Full nouns, adverbs, and independent pronouns permit semantic and expressive expansions upon the core schemata. The following excerpt, adapted from Moore's (2003) interpretation of one of the very few extant historical examples of a Chinookan missionary text (a Wasco UC hymn in Lee and Frost 1844:204-05), provides some illustrative material:

- (2) a. *kanawa id-nša-giutʷaχ kwanisim punank'au*  
 all it-our-pitifulness always blind  
 'We all are pitiful, always blind.'
- b. *maika, ga-m<sub>1</sub>-i<sub>2</sub>-nš-l-u-t* *i<sub>2</sub>-mi<sub>1</sub>-xan*  
 thou<sub>1</sub> [PST]-thou<sub>1</sub>-him<sub>2</sub>-us-to-[DIRECTIVE]-give he<sub>2</sub>-thy<sub>1</sub>-son  
 'Thou gave to us thy son.'
- c. *yaxka, a<sub>2</sub>-wawat ga-č<sub>1</sub>-a<sub>2</sub>-aw-i-t*  
 he<sub>1</sub> [FEM]<sub>2</sub>-word [PAST]-he<sub>1</sub>-it<sub>2</sub>-them[=people]-to-give  
 'He gave instruction [the "Word"?] to the people.'

In addition to an inflected noun (*-giutʷaχ* 'pitifulness') and two adverbs, *a* above features an uninflected form (*punank'au*) resembling a Chinookan inflected noun stem (cf. UC *a-k-p'uninkau* 'I am blind', KC *a-łá-p'unnikau* 'a blind one'). While we don't know Chinookan well enough to evaluate the composer's selection of an uninflected form over an available inflected noun here, what we can say with some certainty is that Chinookan number/gender and possessive noun prefixes are fully productive, and therefore, subject to speaker manipulation—including simplification.

Because full-noun and independent-pronoun constituents of Chinookan verbal sentences (lines *b* and *c* above) agree grammatically with the marking of grammatical relations within the verb core (as brought out here by subscripted numbers cross-referencing nouns and pronouns to their verbs), Chinookan word-

---

<sup>4</sup>Some idea of the special difficulty that Chinookan languages would have posed for missionary learners can be had by comparing Moore's analyzed transliterations with their 1844 original:

Kon-a-wa e-dinch-ah-gu-it quah / Quon-sim po-nan-a-kow  
 Mi-kah gum-inch-e-lute e-me-han  
 Yok-ah waw-wot gach-ow-eet

Obviously, a conventional English orthography is not well suited to representing either the sounds or the morphological structures of Chinookan. The "extreme difficulty" (Hale 1846:562) that Chinookan languages pose for European-language speakers has not always been sufficiently appreciated in discussions of the historical sources. Indeed, the language-name "Chinook," used historically with reference to any but the Chinookans themselves, almost always referred to Chinuk Wawa, not Chinookan. While potentially an ambiguous term, in historical usage it generally isn't—it simply means Chinuk Wawa.

order is generally speaking free. Although independent pronouns are also inflected forms, most function in the sentence as complete words. For example, in *b* the independent pronoun *maika* and the noun prefix *mi-* ('thy', modifying the noun stem *-xan* 'son') both agree with the verb prefix *m-* 'thou'. While *maika* is itself technically an inflected form (Hymes parses the KC as *m-ai-ka*), it functions in the sentence as a complete word and can be taken to agree both with noun and verb—potentially underscoring *both* of the meanings 'thy' and 'thou'. The strings of prefixed elements determining much of the grammar of Chinookan inflected verbs, by contrast, are fully productive: an ability to instantly decode and recode their manifold permutations is one of the requirements for understanding and speaking Chinookan with fluency.

More particularly to the point here, all of the independent pronouns and adverbs in (2): *a - c*, but none of the verb-core elements appearing there, find close analogues in regional CW.

Also of special interest for exploring the roots of CW is a large class of particles to which Boas attributed various degrees of sound symbolism or onomatopoeia. These range from more-or-less obvious imitations of physical sounds:

- (3) LC *tumm n-i<sub>1</sub>-x<sub>2</sub>-a-x kíkuli ku λ-čuy*  
 "Thump" he<sub>1</sub>-himself<sub>2</sub>-did below in the-water  
 'It went "thump" under the water.'

to specialized verb forms (termed "particle verbs" by Sapir), which constitute an important part of the language's lexicon:

- (4) UC *tq'úp ni-č<sub>1</sub>-i<sub>2</sub>-t-x-a*  
 slice he<sub>1</sub>-him<sub>2</sub>-to-did  
 'He cut it.'

In the UC example, the particle we have glossed 'slice', while it is perhaps about as onomatopoeic in Chinookan as "slice" (or "cut") is in English (that is, one may be able to see that the sound of the word suggests a sound—when one stops and thinks about it), also (and more importantly) constitutes the language's usual term for expressing the lexical meaning 'cut'. In this characteristic type of Chinookan construction, the semantic content of the verb is in effect extracted and brought to the front of the sentence by the particle, while the accompanying inflected form represents the sentence's grammatical relations in abstract form.

Chinookan adverbs, independent pronouns, onomatopoeic particles, particle verbs, and nouns are all well represented in the lexicon of Lower Columbia CW. Table 1: *pronouns and nouns* and Table 2: *particles* cite Chinookan forms with CW comparisons that will prove relevant for evaluating spellings from the various early historical sources cited in this paper.

Table 1: Selected LC pronouns and nouns with CW comparisons.

LC	CW <sub>GRONDE</sub>	CW <sub>RAYC</sub>	CW <sub>DEMERS</sub>	CW <sub>QIBBS</sub>
<i>i-ktā</i> '(some)thing'	<i>ikta</i>	[ʔi'ktā]	ikta, ekita	Ik'-tah
<i>úkuk</i> '[DEM]'	<i>úkuk</i>	[u'kuk]	okuk	O'-koke, O'-kook
<i>náika</i> '[1 SG]'	<i>náyka</i>	[nā'yka]	naika	Ni'-ka
<i>máika</i> '[2 SG]'	<i>máyka</i>	[mā'yka]	maika	Mi'-ka
<i>mšáika</i> '[2 PL]'	<i>msáyka, misáyka</i>	[massō'yka]	msaika	Me-si'-ka
<i>yáxka</i> '[MASC 3 SG]' (CW '[3 SG]')	<i>yáxka, yáka</i>	[yā-xka, ya'ka]	iaka	Yáh-ka, Yok'-ka
<i>áksta</i> 'who, someone'	<i>táksta</i>	[tā'ksta]	tlaksta	Klák-sta, Khuk'-sta
<i>i-k'áinu.á</i> 'tobacco'	<i>k'áynu.á</i>	[k'ō'y yinu.á]	kaínulh	Ki'-nootl, Ki'-noos
<i>i-líi</i> 'land, earth'	<i>ilíi, ilíhi</i>	[ʔilíʔi]	elehi	Il'-la-hie
<i>[i]-á'émínxut</i> 'lie'	<i>á'émínx'á</i>	[tā'Amí'naXwa]	tlemínwhit	Klim-in'-a-whit
<i>i-t'álapas</i> 'coyote'	<i>t'álapas</i>	[t'ō'lap'ō's]	talapos ('fox')	Tál-a-pus
<i>i-ñčxut</i> 'black bear'	<i>icxut</i>	[ʔi'ts.xut]	itshut	Its'-woot, Its'-hoot
<i>á-čúq</i> 'water'	<i>cəq'</i>	[tsoqʷ]	tsok	Chuck
<i>á-pášíši</i> 'blanket'	<i>pásisi</i>	[pasi'si]	pasisse	Pa'see-sie
<i>áá-xauyam</i> 'poor' (CW 1 'poor', 2 [salutation])	<i>táxayam, táxaw'lyám</i>	[tāō'xwaʔayam]	tlaHOWIAM	(1) Kla-hóW-yum, (2) Kla'-how-ya
<i>á-tá-xust</i> 'his eyes' (CW 'eye(s), face')	<i>siyáxus</i>	[siyō'hust]	siahost	Se-áh-host, Se-agh'-ost
<i>t-kamúsaq</i> 'beads' (diminutive form?: see note 9)	<i>kamúsaq</i>	[kamō'ssa'k]	kamusok	Ka-mo'-suk
<i>té-bx-am</i> 'people' (CW 'person, people')	<i>tilixam</i>	[tél'hām]	telikom	Til'-i-kum
<i>[u]-lali</i> 'salmonberry' (CW 'berry, berries')	<i>úlali</i>	[ʔu'lali]	olile ('wild fruit')	O'-lil-lie, O'-lal-lie
<i>ú-lu</i> 'hunger' (CW 'hungry')	<i>ulu</i>	[ʔu'lʊʔ]	olo	O'-lo

Table 2: Selected LC Particles with CW Comparisons.

LC	CW <sub>GRONDE</sub>	CW <sub>RAY C</sub>	CW <sub>DEMERS</sub>	CW <sub>OTARS</sub>
<i>c'ən</i> 'marked, spotted'	<i>c'ən</i>	[ts' ʌ'm]	tsom	tzum
<i>hihi</i> 'laugh'	<i>hihi</i>	[hi'hi]	hihi	hee'-hee
<i>k'au</i> 'tie'	<i>k'aw</i>	[k' ɑ'w]	kaō	kow
<i>k'as</i> 'afraid'	<i>k'as</i>	[k' w ɑ's]	kwas	kwass
<i>ʌq'up</i> 'cut'	<i>ʌq'up</i>	[ʌk' ɑ'p]	tlkop ('piece')	tl'ko'pe
<i>ʌx'ap</i> 'hole'	<i>ʌx'ap</i>	[ʌwɑ'p]	tlwop, tlhwop	kla'-wha'p
<i>ʌ'ap</i> 'find'	<i>ʌ'ap</i>	[tʰ ɑ'p]	tlap	klap
<i>ʌ'mə'n</i> 'mashed'	<i>ʌ'min</i>	[tʰ ʌmʌ'n]	tlamin	klim'-min
<i>ʌ'ə'x-ʌ'ə'x</i> 'tom'	<i>ʌ'ə'x-ʌ'ə'x</i>	[tʰ ʌ'x]	tlahlah	klugh
<i>pus</i> [CONDITIONAL] (UC <i>pu</i> )	<i>pus</i>		pus, spos*	spose*
<i>q'uʌ</i> 'tight'	<i>q'el</i>	[q' wʌ'tʰ]	kwotlk	kwutl
<i>ʃpəq</i> 'grey'	<i>sp'ú'huq</i>	[spo'ʔloqw]	spoak ('faded')	spo'-oh, spo'-eh ('faded')
<i>təmm, tumm</i> "thump" (onom. → CW <i>təm-təm</i> 'heart', <i>təm-wata</i> 'falls')	<i>tə'mtəm, təmwata</i>	[tʌ'mtʌ'm, tʌmtʌ'm], [tʌmwə'tʌ]	tomtom	tum'-tum, tum-wa'-ta
<i>tell, tel</i> 'tired'	<i>t'il</i>	[t'ell]	til	till, tull
<i>ʌq'i'x</i> 'like, want'	<i>t'q'i, tiki</i>	[tʌq'i]	tkēh, tike	tik-e'gh, tu-ke'gh
<i>ʌk'up</i> 'white'	<i>t'k'up</i>	[t'k' ʌ'p]	tkop	t'kope
UC, KC <i>wáwa</i> 'speech' (cf. KC <i>-wa</i> 'talk')	<i>wáwa</i>	[wɑ'wʌ]	wawa	wau'-wau
<i>yulʌ</i> 'proud'	<i>yulʌt</i>	[yʌ'ʔxtʰ]	iutl	youtl

\*English-speakers' "folk etymology" deriving the CW from English *suppose*. Note that CW<sub>DEMERS</sub> actually shows both forms, glossing *pus* as 'for, if, when, in order to, that', *versus* *spos* 'if, suppose' (Demers, Blanchet, St. Onge 1871:30-31).

\*\*The CW has also been attributed to Nootkan *wawaa* 'to say'.

An interesting feature of Chinookan-contributed nouns in the CW sources under consideration is that roughly half appear with Chinookan number/gender prefixes, half without. Since a numberless/genderless noun is incomplete in Chinookan terms, the presence of so many in CW bespeaks deliberate simplification by Chinookan speakers—the only CW speakers who could be expected to have known *how* to separate Chinookan nouns from their Chinookan prefixes. CW shows Chinookan speakers' "fingerprints" also in the frequent presence of CW *s, c* where corresponding Chinookan forms more normally show *š, č*. In Chinookan languages, shifting *š, č* to *s, c* is frequently a device for creating diminutive forms (Hymes 1996). The occurrence of so many matched CW:Chinookan pairs showing this contrast helps to sharpen the "line" between Chinookan and CW. But it is difficult to see how anyone but Chinookan speakers could have grasped a line so finely drawn—so closely linked, that is, to Chinookan expressive sensibilities.

Even more tellingly, inflected verbs, the beating grammatical "heart" of Chinookan languages, are largely absent from the Chinookan portion of the CW lexicon. Almost all of the dozen or so Chinookan verb stems that do come into CW fall into two categories: (a) CW adjectives that Boas observed are based on Chinookan verbal stems (Hymes classifies most of the KC forms for these as nouns); and (b) CW active verbs based on Chinookan simple imperatives, which are about as minimally inflected as Chinookan inflected verbs can be. Table 3: *verbs* collates examples of both kinds of Chinookan verb with CW comparisons; like Tables 1 and 2, these have been selected with an eye also to evaluating citations from historical sources.

Table 3: *Selected Chinookan verbs with CW comparisons.*

Chinookan	CW <small>GRONDE</small> [BAY c]	DEMERS	GIBBS	(CW meaning)
(a)				
LC <i>-u=cqat</i> 'short'	<i>yúcat</i> , [yú'tsk' At]	iutsekat	Yóut-skut	'short'
LC <i>-u=ʌqat</i> 'long'	<i>yúʌqat</i> , [yú'tʌkAt]	iutlkat	Yóutl-kut	'long'
LC <i>-xəʔ=uima</i> 'different'	<i>xúyima</i> , [xʌlu'yima]	holoima	Hul-ó-i-ma	'different'
KC <i>-x-l-aqʔ</i> 'to open'	<i>xálaqʔ</i> , [xʌ'laqʔ]	halah, halak (to open)	Háh-lakl	'open'
(b)				
LC <i>[i]~pšut</i> 'hide it!'	<i>ipsut</i> , [ʔi'psuʔt]	ipsut	Ip'-soot	'to hide'
LC <i>i-šgam</i> 'take it!'	<i>iskam</i> , [i'skam]	iskom	Is'-kum	'to take, get'
LC <i>məʔ-ʌa-it</i> 'thou sit!'	<i>mitʌyt</i> , [mʌ'tʌyt]	mitlaʔt	Mit'-lite	'to sit, stay'
LC <i>məʔ-txʷ-it</i> 'thou stand!'	<i>mitxʷit</i> , [mʌ'txʷi]	mitwhit	Mit'-whit	'to stand'

Again, only Chinookan speakers can be expected to have known which Chinookan forms are potentially subject to the most complex permutations (inflected verbs) and which are not (basically, all other Chinookan word



categories), and hence, how to have systematically excluded or reduced only the former as possible CW. This exclusion/reduction is plausibly explained if we assume that previous generations of Chinookan speakers were motivated to create a simplified, that is, a more foreigner-accessible Chinookan, much of which has been preserved in the Chinookan component of the CW lexicon. Note that "simplified" in this context means *grammatically simplified* from a Chinookan speaker's perspective.

Phonological evidence provides additional compelling evidence of the Chinookan origins of CW. The comparisons adduced in Tables 1-3 show that the Indian varieties of CW illustrated there reproduce all of the basic sounds of Chinookan. The same is not true for varieties of CW historically associated with many non-Indians, in which less "difficult" pronunciations of Chinookan-contributed CW words have been conventional (indeed, codified: in numerous English-orthography "Chinook" dictionaries, mostly based wholly or in part on CW<sub>GIBBS</sub>). Speakers of English typically find the following segmental phonemes of Chinookan difficult to produce: *t*, *ʔ*, *g*, *q*, *x*, *ʃ*, and the ejectives (*c'*, *ɕ'*, *k'*, *kʷ*, *ʔ'*, *p'*, *q'*, *qʷ*, *t'*). However, the places and manners of articulation implied by this list are all widely shared by Northwest Coast indigenous languages. Since somewhat over half of the complete lexicon of these varieties of CW is from Chinookan, it follows that their phonology is also to a considerable extent Chinookan.

Thomason (1981, 1983:836-844) has demonstrated that this basic Chinookan-congruent phonology characterized Indian varieties of CW throughout the Northwest, at least by the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth centuries when phonetically reasonably accurate records began appearing. Samarin (1986:27, 1996:332-334) has argued that any such phonology would have been a late development, following a formative stage characterized by chaotic variability rather than a uniform phonology. Evidence from the earliest systematic description of CW, that of Hale (1846:635-650), could be taken as support for Samarin's version of history, inasmuch as it documents the mid-nineteenth century existence of a phonetically *non-Chinookan* CW. Hale himself explained this feature of his CW recordings as follows:

As the Jargon [CW] is to be spoken by Chinooks, Englishmen, and Frenchmen, so as to be alike easy and intelligible to all, it must admit of no sound which cannot be readily produced by all three. (Hale 1846:640)

However, a close examination of matched items from Hale's Chinookan (1846:567-629, *family* 6) and CW (1846:636-639) word lists suggests another explanation. If we assume that Hale's Chinookan was heard from Indians, but that he recorded CW from an unidentified non-Indian source, then there is no phonetic variance between the two sets that cannot be explained with reference to the well-documented tendency of European-language (especially, English) speakers to avoid the "difficult" segments listed above. For example, the Chinookan and CW words for 'who' (Table 1: *ʔáksta*) appear in Hale's transcription as *tyláksta* and *kláksta*, respectively. Although Hale lacked the technical conventions to accurately represent the difficult sounds at issue, his transcription is systematic, and accurate

as far as it goes: "tʃl" obviously stands here for a voiceless lateral (*f* or *ʃ*), which equally obviously is missing from his transcription of the corresponding CW form. Other examples (Hale's CW with his translations are columns 1 and 2, his Chinookan column 3; italicized Chinookan forms are from Table 1, unless indicated otherwise):

iáhka	'he, she, it'	iáχka	(yáχka '3 SG')
ilehi	'earth, land'	eleē	(i-lí 'land, earth')
itsühüt	'black bear'	etsχot	(i-ñčχut 'black bear')
kainutl	'tobacco'	kainutχl, kainotχl	(i-k'áinuχ 'tobacco')
mitlait	'to sit, reside'	mú'tχlait	(mē-ša-it 'thou-sit!'; Tbl 3)
mūsaika	'we, our'	mūsaika, mčaika	(mšáika '2 PL')
siáhos	'eye'	siáχos	(s-iá-χust 'eyes')
tilikūm	'men, people'	tú'lexam, tileχam	(té-lx-am 'people')
tsok	'water'	tχltčókwa, tχltsókwa,	
		ltčóke, ltčóko	(š-čug' 'water')
túkéh	'to wish'	tqaeiχ, tkaieiχ	(tq'ix 'like, want'; Table 2)

No doubt, most English-speakers would find CW forms like Hale's above more "readily produced" than their indicated Chinookan source-forms. But are there any grounds for supposing that the CW of Lower Columbia Indians was *ever* characterized by similarly non-Chinookan phonetic forms?

In fact, Hale's own observations do not unambiguously support his claim of a "lowest common denominator" phonology for CW. Variations in the CW forms for some numerals, he remarks (1846:641), "proceed from the greater or less approximation attempted by the speaker to the original terms in Tshinuk . . ." And the CW word for 'good' (which he recognizes as Nootkan-derived, not Chinookan) appears as klōsh in his CW word-list, but elsewhere (1846:640) as the "Chinook" [-Indian] attributed form tχlōušh—a variance difficult to explain without granting the existence of a Chinookan-congruent norm for at least some Indian pronunciations of CW words.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>It cannot even be taken for granted that Hale's variety of CW would have been as phonetically unproblematic for "Chinooks" as it would have been for "Englishmen and Frenchmen" (for simplicity's sake, we will restrict the discussion to Chinooks and Englishmen). Although a form like Hale's klōsh would suggest a simple (CCVC) syllable to his "Englishmen's" ears (compare English "close," "clothes"), Dyk's (1933:7-9) analysis of Kiksht UC syllable structure suggests that an equivalent Chinookan form would be syllabically more complex (C+CVC or CV+VC, the latter with vocalic *l* as the first V). The "vocalic" (versus "consonantal") quality of Chinookan *l* (Dyk 1933:5) is particularly obvious in Boas's LC and KC transcriptions, in which the clusters *kl*, *gl*, *ql*, *k'l*, *q'l* are almost always written with an intervening epenthetic vowel (as [kəl], [gəl], [qəl], [k'əl], [q'əl], respectively). Quite possibly, the combination [k<sup>h</sup>], characterizing the initial sound of English speakers' pronunciations of words like klōsh, was not an altogether congenial or "natural" one in Chinookan. On the other hand, *f*, *ʃ*, *ʃ'* are perfectly natural syllable-initiating sounds in Chinookan.

Such a norm is hinted at even in CW<sub>GIBBS</sub>, whose CW spellings established an English-orthography standard followed by compilers of subsequent "Chinook" dictionaries (S. Johnson 1978:96-121), not to mention by Northwest language specialists down to the present day (most recent dictionaries of Northwest indigenous languages still cite English-orthography spellings for CW loans). But note that some of Gibbs's spellings collated in Tables 1-3 appear to stretch English orthography in the direction of non-English sounds and clusters: for example, Se-agh'-ost, Tzum, Tl'kópe, Tik-égh. Compare Thomason (1983:826-830), who cites various historical indications that many Whites *did* recognize an Indian "target phonology" for CW.

Such indications find additional support in the following rather confusingly worded excerpt from a report by the missionary priest Modeste Demers, dated Ft. Vancouver 1839—the same place and period represented by Hale's vocabularies:

The jargon [CW] is composed of words taken from different languages, disfigured in their orthography and pronunciation. It is all borrowed from different languages, which makes it easy to acquire. It possesses only from four hundred to five hundred words. . . . A good many of the Cascade Indians who understand this jargon, and some of the Klickatats [sic], attend the catechism and evening prayers. . . . I expect to learn the Klickatat language, which will be of real use in instructing this tribe and those of DesChutes [sic] and of the Cascades, who understand it well. The greatest difficulty in learning the language spoken on this side of the mountains, consists in the pronunciation which is such, that we are many times at a loss to find characters to represent it, as in *Sahaletaye*, God, *hihkt*, one. (Demers in Blanchet 1983:68-69)

Samarin (1986:27) reasons that if Demers found CW "easy to acquire" in 1839, he would not have encountered the "difficult" sounds later documented from Indian speakers and accepted by Thomason as evidence of the language's indigenous origin. However, Demers' "language spoken on this side of the mountains" (for which he was "many times at a loss to find characters") was apparently CW. While his example "hihkt" could be either Chinookan or CW (*txt* is 'one' in both), we have no evidence that Demers ever tried to learn Chinookan; he was, in fact, later known for his exceptionally fluent CW.<sup>6</sup> His other example is an unambiguously CW compound (CW *saxali-tayi* 'God', literally 'above-chief'), composed of one Chinookan-derived and one Nootkan-derived word. While words

---

<sup>6</sup>Nor is there any evidence that Demers' friend and fellow Northwest missionary priest, F. N. Blanchet, ever tried to learn Chinookan, notwithstanding the latter's claim (cited by Samarin 1986:28) to have produced a "full Chinook" translation of the Christian prayers. The only known Blanchet translation of the Christian prayers into any indigenous language is the CW translation in Blanchet (1862), later published in Demers, Blanchet, St. Onge (1871:33-38).

for the missionary-introduced concept of the Christian God in local tribal languages all appear to have originated as translations of this CW compound, they are generally recorded with Native, not CW words (for example, UC for 'God' is *šáɣdix ištamx*, literally 'above chief'). In the CW dictionary that Demers' colleagues St. Onge and Blanchet edited and published the year Demers himself died (Demers, Blanchet, St. Onge 1871), a number of specially-made characters appear, including some clearly meant to convey "difficult" phonetic features. For example, the item *ixt* appears there as *lht*, the word for 'God' as Sahali-Taï (allowing for the substitutions explained in Footnote 1; in Blanchet 1862 the latter word appears as Sahalé Tayé). While it is possible that Demers would have labelled such features—and any special characters devised to represent them—as "disfigured," it is also possible that he meant that characterization more specifically as a reference to the pronunciation and spelling of English and French contributed words in CW. Examples of the latter from Demers' dictionary, as published: Hankechem 'handkerchief', Kapech 'cabbage', Lapushet 'fork', Lesash 'angel'.

In the next section, we will try to ascertain what the very earliest sources, predating Hale and Demers, can tell us about CW and its Chinookan affinities.

## 2 Linguistic Evidence from Earliest Contact on the Lower Columbia

Natives of the greater Lower Columbia first encountered speakers of European languages in the late eighteenth century, when British and Euro-American seafarers began making frequent landfalls along the Northwest Coast of North America. The facility of these early visitors for rapidly acquiring enough of the local languages to permit communication for restricted purposes (primarily trade) should not be underestimated. The log of the American ship *Columbia*, which accomplished the first recorded penetration of the Lower Columbia in 1792, contains a Nootkan vocabulary from an earlier visit to Vancouver Island, introduced as follows:

Our constant converse with the Natives enabled us to gain a considerable knowledge of their Language Manours and customs I have here insurtd a vocabulary which enabled us to converse on allmost aney Subject with facillity (Howay 1969:58; spelling as in original).

Nootkan languages, like Chinookan languages, are phonologically and morphologically sufficiently exotic by comparison to the seafarers' European languages to have posed a learning task of "extreme difficulty" for them (quoting Hale's 1846:562 observation regarding foreigner reluctance to learn Chinookan). Not surprisingly, the early seafarers apparently only managed to acquire a grammatically rudimentary and phonetically reduced variety of Nootkan, the so-called Nootka Jargon (Samarin 1988) or Nootka Lingo (Lang 2000, following seafarer terminology). This Nootka Lingo is of considerable importance for understanding how CW developed into its later nineteenth-century forms, since it evidently is the source of a relatively small but semantically and grammatically central Nootkan component of the CW lexicon. Had this Nootkan component of

CW been introduced in the context of aboriginal trade involving direct contacts between Chinookans and Nootkans, as some have assumed (Swan 1857:307, Thomas 1935:12-14), one would expect Nootkan-contributed CW words to retain all the sounds shared by Chinookan and Nootkan. As Table 4 reveals, however, these CW words show a systematic replacement of Nootkan glottalized ejectives, uvular stops, and velar and uvular fricatives (albeit not all lateral fricatives, regarding which see note 5) by more European-language friendly counterparts, reproducing many of the same substitutions illustrated by Hale's CW word-list.

The earliest recorded hints that more-or-less effective communications had been established between the seafarers and Chinookans are to be found in the log of the British ship *Ruby* (Roe 1967), which over-wintered on the Lower Columbia in 1795, just three years after Robert Gray and the *Columbia* made the first recorded entry into the river. Effective communication is implied by impressively detailed accounts of Native trading and raiding activity, attributed to local Indians including one named Concomly (LC *qanqm li* [qʰʌnqʰəʔ mli]), later well-known as the principal Lower Chinook chief of the fur-trade era. Two words explicitly attributed to local Indians appear in the log: Peeshee (sic) ("it was 'Peeshee' that we should offend her [the moon]") and Wapato(e) ("the Wild Potatoe [sic] called by the Natives 'Wapatoe'") (Roe 1967:121, 128-129). It is very interesting that neither of these words appears to be Chinookan as known from the sources listed in footnote 3. The first suggests Nootkan-contributed CW *pʰišák* 'bad' (Table 4), the second CW<sub>GRONDE</sub> *wáptʰu*, CW<sub>BAY</sub> *c* [wʌʔptʰu, wʌʔpʰtu, wʌʔpatu] 'wapato (*Sagittaria latifolia*); potato', which for lack of a firmly demonstrated etymology must be considered unique to CW.<sup>7</sup>

The record of interethnic communication left by a later English-speaking over-wintering party, that of Lewis and Clark in 1805-06, is more copious, yet similarly incomplete. While it is clear that by the end of their winter's stay on the Lower Columbia, members of the Lewis and Clark expedition had acquired some ability to communicate verbally with their Clatsop Chinookan near neighbors, this

---

<sup>7</sup>The cited CW forms correspond to a term recorded by Lewis and Clark usually as *wapto*, but also as *wappatoo*, *pap-pa-too*, etc. As Lewis and Clark's careful observations of the plant and its Native use make clear, their name refers to the starchy tubers of *Sagittaria latifolia* (named *wapato* following their usage; also called arrowhead, Indian potato), a local indigenous staple. Two conflicting etymologies for this term have appeared in print: the Oxford English Dictionary (2nd ed.) cites Cree *wapato*wa 'white mushroom' as the source form; while Samarin (1988:233), pointing to the variant spellings with *p*-, suggests a Spanish or Portuguese source. However, two features point to a local origin: the element *wa*, which suggests the UC feminine singular prefix *wa*- (as in UC *wa-qat*, '*S. latifolia*, potato' in the Clackamas dialect); and the element *pto*, which suggests the Kalapuyan nominal stem '*S. latifolia*' (attested as Northern Kalapuya *mám-pdu*, Southern Kalapuya *gám-pdu*?, reconstructed as Proto-Kalapuyan *\*pdoʔ* by Berman 1990:54). Though not attested in modern recordings of Chinookan, a form *\*wa-pdu* is formally plausible as Upper Chinook, as well as historically plausible as an indication of ties between Upper Chinookans and neighboring Kalapuyans (David French, personal communication to Henry Zenk, 1976).

Table 4: CW items with presumed Nootkan (Nuuchahnulth) source-forms.

<i>CW<sub>GRONDE</sub></i> ; [ <i>CW<sub>BAYC</sub></i> ]	Nootkan ( <i>Powell 1991</i> ; <i>Sapir and Swadesh 1939</i> )
<i>čáku</i> ; [tšó'ku] 1 'come, approach', 2 'become'	čok"o- 'come!'
<i>háyk"á</i> ; [hó-ykwa] 'dentalium shells'	hiix"á 'dentalium shell'
<i>hayú</i> ; [hó-yu:] 'many, much'	hayu '10' (cf. <i>žaya</i> 'many')
<i>kákšat</i> ; [kó'kšat] 'beat, whip'	qaxši.š, qahši.š 'to die'
<i>kə'miəks</i> ; [kə'miaks] 'know, understand'	kamat + -o-ŋ 'known' + '[IRREALIS]'
<i>kát(u)wá</i> ; [tátuwa] 'go, proceed'	katw"aa 'to paddle'
<i>šičmər</i> ; [tú'tšamín] 'woman'	šuučma 'woman'
<i>šuš</i> ; [tú's] 'good'	šut 'good, pretty'
<i>mákuk</i> ; [mó'kuk] 'to buy'	maakuk 'to buy'
<i>mámuk, munk</i> ; [mó'muk] 'do, make'	momo-k 'working'
<i>máwič</i> ; [mó-witš] 'deer'	muwač 'deer'
<i>nánič</i> ; [nó'nitš] 'see, look'	n'an'aan'ič, n'an'aač 'looking (at)'
<i>pálač, páfač</i> ; [pá'fatš] 'give; a gift'	p'očil- 'potlatch to'
<i>p'išák, pišášk</i> 'brushy, rough (place)' ( <i>CW<sub>DEMERS</sub></i> pishak 'bad')	p'išaq 'bad, wicked, ugly'
<i>sayá</i> ; [sayó:] 'far away'	sayaa 'distant, far off'
<i>tayi</i> ; [tayi:] 'chief, boss'	taayii 'oldest son'; 'older brother, senior'
1. <i>tanás</i> 'child' 2. <i>tunús, tənəs</i> ; [tanó's] 'little, small' ( <i>CW<sub>DEMERS</sub></i> tanas 1 'child', 2 'small, young')	t'an'a 'child'; t'an'eñs, t'an'añs 'young child'
<i>wik</i> ; [wek] 'no, not'	wik 'no!'
( <i>CW<sub>OMBS</sub></i> win'-a-pie 'presently')	wiinapi 'to stay (somewhere), stop'

---

\*This etymology is from Silverstein (1996:128).

is documented by very little in the way of actual linguistic examples. The following entries recorded at the Cascades of the Columbia (in the country of the *waʔála* Chinookans), after the expedition had begun its homeward journey, document the acquisition by some expedition members of what they took to be "some of" the "Clatsop language."

one of the Squaws told us in the Clatsop tongue that She had Slept with the white traders & c. (Ordway in Thwaites 1904-05,4:340)

one other fellow attempted to steal Capt. Lewis's dog, and had decoyed him nearly half a mile \_\_\_\_ we were informed of it by a man who Spoke the Clatsop language . . . (Clark in Moulton 1990,7:109)

three of this tribe of villains the Wah-clel-lars [for UC *waʔála*] Stole my dog this evening, and took him toward their village; I was shortly afterwards informed of this transaction by an Indian who spoke the Clatsop language, [NB: *some of which we had learnt from them during the winter*] (Lewis in Moulton 1990,7:105)

NB identifies notations in the original journals made by Nicholas Biddle, first editor of the expedition journals, during consultations with Clark after the return of the expedition. Another Biddle note from his conversations with Clark clarifies what Lewis and Clark were learning as "Clatsop."

Clatsop lang. more resembling ours in pron. & more easy to learn than that of any other lang. They not accentuate the last syllable as most Indians, but rather the first. (Jackson 1962:489)

However, not only do the indigenous languages of the greater lower Columbia share a number of sounds that native English speakers find quite exotic, but *Chinookan* languages in particular feature such sounds in conjunction with consonant clusters that even speakers of other local languages find daunting. It is also notable that usual first-syllable stress accurately characterizes CW, but not *Chinookan*.

The journals preserve precisely one example of a clause-level "Clatsop" utterance:

. . . every [Clatsop] man Came around examined the Duck looked at the gun the Size of the ball which was 100 to the pound and Said in their own language *Clouch Musket*, [NB: *English word Musket*] *wake, com ma-tax Musket* which is, a good Musket do not under stand this kind of Musket &c. (Clark in Moulton 1990,6:121)

This utterance breaks down into four lexemes, all of which match words later recorded as Lower Columbia CW—three Nootka-Lingo derived (Table 4):

Clouch	CW <i>tuš</i> 'good',
wake	CW <i>wik</i> 'no, not',
com ma-tax	CW <i>kə'mtəks</i> 'know, understand';

and one English-derived:

Musket	CW <sub>G RONDE</sub> <i>mə'skʰit</i> 'musket',
	CW <sub>BAY C</sub> [mɑ'skɪt] '(any) gun'.

In addition to these four examples, the journals contain 19-plus other Indian-attributed lexemes from the Lower Columbia, excluding proper names of persons, places, and groups. At least 12 of these resemble words later recorded as CW—two Nootka-Lingo derived (Table 4 and below):

pe shack "bad"	CW <i>pʰiśák</i> 'bad',
tiá "chief"	CW <i>tayí</i> 'chief, boss';

at least eight Chinookan-identifiable, including the following four keying to Tables 2 and 3:

Commashuck "beads"	CW <i>kamúsaq</i> 'beads',
pah-shish-e-ooks "cloth men" [=Whites]	CW <i>pasísi</i> 'blanket' (+Chin <i>-ukš</i> '[PLURAL]'),
timmm [a falls]	CW <i>təm(wata)</i> 'falls', <i>təm(təm)</i> 'heart',
Spuck [infant otter]	CW <i>spʰuʔuq</i> 'grey, faded';

and two unique (as far as is known) to CW: wapto (see note 7), and shapallel, chapallel [a native-processed meal made into cakes] (cf. CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> *saplél* 'grain, wheat, flour, bread', CW<sub>BAY C</sub> [tsApAlɪ:l] 'bread')<sup>8</sup>.

The fact that two items from the foregoing list appear in a compound (ti-á co-mo-shack "chief beads") is of note: compounds are unusual in Chinookan, but

---

<sup>8</sup>Also CW<sub>DEMERS</sub> *sapilil* 'bread, flour, wheat', CW<sub>GIBBS</sub> *sap'-o-lilil* 'wheat, flour, meal'. Gibbs (1863:22) derives the term from Chinookan *tša pelil* (compare the CW<sub>BAY C</sub> form above), noting that the word appears to have been shared by various Columbia River languages. Silverstein and Moore (in Moulton 1990:5:39, 1990:7:93) give the Chinookan as *a-sáblal* 'bread', noting that the term's etymology is obscure. The term is also in Upper Chehalis Salishan as *saplíl* 'bread, flour', where Kinkade (1990:340) derives it "from French *la farine*, via Algonkian and Chinook Jargon *sap-o-lill* flour, meal." While we don't know either French or Algonkian well enough to comment on the linguistic plausibility of the latter proposal, we must consider it historically improbable. Eastern Amerindians and French Canadians are not reported on the Lower Columbia until the commencement of the land-based fur trade, which post-dates Lewis and Clark's visit by several years. Clearly, though, Lewis and Clark were recording a term used by local Indians for an indigenous product.



characteristic of CW.<sup>9</sup>

Some five years after Lewis and Clark's sojourn among the Clatsop Chinookans, the American-owned Pacific Fur Company established Astoria on lands of these same Native people. Also in that year, David Thompson, an employee of the rival Canadian Northwest Company, led an expedition from the interior down to the mouth of the Columbia River. Near the Cascades of the Columbia River, he made the following short notation in his journal:

July 13 [1811], Saturday. A fine day, the people on the right side, or north side are called Wan-Thlus-lar, on the south side Woe-yark-Eek. Thloos, good, Kummertacks - I understand or know it, Knick-me-week-no-se-ye, far off. Pesheek, bad. After much delay we were obliged to set off. (Elliot 1914:61-62)

Following the local names Wan-Thlus-lar (sic) (*waʔála*) and Woe-yark-Eek (*wáyaxix*) there occurs a somewhat garbled list of linguistic items, which sort out as follows:

Thloos ,	good ,	CW <i>tuš</i> (Table 4)
Kummertacks -	I understand or know it ,	CW <i>kə'mtəks</i> (Table 4)
Knick -	me -	CW <i>náyka</i> (Table 1)
Week -	no -	CW <i>wik</i> (Table 4)
se-ye ,	far off.	CW <i>sayá</i> (Table 4)
Pesheek ,	bad.	CW <i>pʰisák</i> (Table 4)

These six linguistic items, which as noted all correspond to CW words, also provide the first direct indication of a Chinookan pronoun apparently occurring in association with Nootka-Lingo derived items.

The available accounts of Franchere and Ross, two of the traders at Astoria in 1811, are disappointingly sketchy with respect to minutiae of daily interaction and communication with local Indians.<sup>10</sup> In early passages, Franchere

---

<sup>9</sup>An alternate parsing of this Lewis and Clark item appears in Moulton (1990, 6:82; Moulton's Chinookan consultants were Michael Silverstein and Robert E. Moore): *tiaq'mušaks*, evidently for Chinookan *t-ia-q'muš-aks* '[PLURAL]-his-bead-s'. However, *Tiá* appears elsewhere in the journals (1990,6:163, 198) with the meaning "chief," and contrary to the editor's note (1990,6:164) no Chinookan noun like *tia* (sic) 'chief' is on record. Hymes (personal communication) comments that the latter form doesn't look at all plausible as a Chinookan noun. Silverstein (1990:541) elsewhere gives the Chinookan words for 'chief' as LC *iʔkánaʔ*, UC *iʔkáʔmana*, *iʔstámʔ*.

<sup>10</sup>Unfortunately, Franchere's and Ross's original journals have not survived. What we have instead are, for Franchere, an author's manuscript (published in the French original, with an English translation by W. T. Lamb, as Franchere 1969), subsequently reorganized and rewritten by an editor (M. Bibaud) to appear as a contemporary popular narrative (French original: Franchere 1820; English translations: Huntington 1854, Hoyt Franchere

(1969:73) refers to communication by "sign language," while in later passages he is communicating with Indians "in their own languages" (Franchere 1969:106, 133). Concerning overtures made to him by the Northwest Co. after its takeover of Astoria in 1813, Franchere (1969:182, note 1) states:

I perceived by the reception given to myself in particular, that thanks to the Chinook dialect of which I was sufficiently master, they would not have asked better than to give me employment, on advantageous terms.

Both Franchere and Ross comment upon the difficulty of "Chinook":

The language spoken by these people is guttural, very difficult for a foreigner to learn, and equally hard to pronounce. To speak the Chinook dialect, you must be a Chinook. (Ross 1849:101)

It remains for me to say something about the Chinook language [original: la langue Chinouque, ou *Tchinouke*], which is spoken by all the native tribes from the river's mouth to the rapids [the Cascades of the Columbia River]. It is a hard language and difficult for strangers to pronounce, filled as it is with gutturals like those of the Scottish Highlanders. The Chinooks have no consonants "f," "v," and so forth. They do not even have our "r," but a strongly articulated guttural that is somewhat like this letter pronounced as a uvular, as in "Kreluit" [original: *Chreluit*, evidently corresponding to Chinookan (*i*) *ʔxáit* 'they are strange, different' (Silverstein 1990:545)], or perhaps better, "Hreluit." The combinations "tʰl" or "tʰ" and "lt" are as frequent in Chinook as they are in Mexican . . . (Franchere 1820:203-204, as translated in Hoyt Franchere 1967:121-122)

This quotation from Franchere prefaces a "Chinook" vocabulary of 56 entries, which (along with the quotation) appears only in the 1820 French edition (it is reproduced in Hoyt Franchere 1967, but was omitted from Huntington 1854 and the latter's reprints).<sup>11</sup> It is through this vocabulary, subsequently reprinted by Gallatin (1836:379), that Chinookan languages first came to the attention of linguists.

---

1967). For Ross, we have Ross (1849, reprinted as Ross 1986), covering his Astorian years, and Ross (1956), covering his subsequent career as an employee of the Northwest and Hudson Bay Companies. While the latter is at least an author's manuscript, for the Astorian period we have only an edited narrative meant (like Franchere 1820) to appeal to the popular tastes of the time.

<sup>11</sup> A check of the handwritten original of Franchere (1969), which is preserved at the Metropolitan Toronto Reference Library, confirms that it was not included in the author's manuscript (personal communication by Christine Mosser to Dell Hymes, 1987). Evidently, it was added by or at the insistence of M. Bibaud, editor of the 1820 edition.

Ross's (1849:342-349) much longer vocabulary is subdivided into a "Chinook vocabulary" of 236 entries, and 30 appended additional entries introduced as follows:

Besides the foregoing [Chinook] language, there is another lingo, or rather mixed dialect, spoken by the Chinook and other neighbouring tribes; which is generally used in their intercourse with the whites. It is much more easily learned, and the pronunciation more agreeable to the ear than the other, . . .

Lacking any known earlier or manuscript version of Ross's vocabularies, we are forced to speculate on the exact date of their compilation. All that we can know with certainty is that Ross left the Pacific Northwest for the Red River Settlement, Saskatchewan, in 1825, and that his vocabularies appear to be independent of any other known earlier source.<sup>12</sup> We find no compelling reason not to accept them as what they purport to be—a record reflecting language contact during the Astorian period.<sup>13</sup> Since they share many peculiarities with Franchère's much shorter list, the two sources will be considered together here.

---

<sup>12</sup>S. Johnson (1978:34-35) observes that some of Ross's Nootkan-identifiable "mixed dialect" items lack matches in later CW sources, but do resemble spellings of items in the Nootkan vocabularies of Jewett (published 1815) and Mozino (published in Spanish in 1792). But S. Johnson's claim that "many [?—only the two below fall into this category] of these look as though they may have come directly from either Mozino or Jewett" must be weighed against the fact that the spellings in question are not identical, and could just reflect shared spelling conventions. It must also be remembered that Ross at Astoria would have been hearing Nootka Lingo, not Nootkan. With reference to the examples as cited by S. Johnson:

'canoe': Ross Chippots : Jewett Chap-atz : Mozino Cha-patz (cf. Nootkan *č'apač*, *č'aapač*, *č'apac* 'canoe')

'sea otter': Ross Quatluck : Jewett Quart-lak : Mozino Coa-tlac, Quotlac (the meaning in Mozino is actually 'sea otter fur', the word for 'sea otter' appearing there as Co-cotl: cf. Nootkan *k'ak'ak'* 'sea otter')

<sup>13</sup>Ross's (1986:155) account of his activities upon first arriving at Ft. Okanagon in the interior (present-day northeastern Washington State) provides an important clue for evaluating his Lower Columbia vocabularies: "... I set to in earnest to learn the Indian language, and wrote vocabulary after vocabulary." It is known that Ross kept journals (later unfortunately lost) of his years as a fur-company employee, and that he drew upon these to construct his two published autobiographical narratives (Rhonda in Ross 1986:7-9). If the Lower Columbia vocabularies document a similar attempt to learn to communicate with Indians in the vicinity of Ft. Astoria, they probably date to the earliest period of Ross's Pacific Northwest sojourn (1811-12), his only extended period of residence on the Lower Columbia. Ross's entire subsequent career as a fur-company employee, save for some brief trips to the coast, was spent in the interior, where he lived among (and ultimately married himself into) the local Interior-Salish speaking population. After leaving the Pacific Northwest in 1825, Ross and his Indian wife founded one of the leading families of the Red River Métis community.

Taken at face value, Ross's 30 "mixed dialect" entries (with 35 lexemes total) provide unambiguous proof that CW in its historically recognizable form was established by the Astorian period. 14 of the lexemes match Nootka-Lingo derived CW items, 11 match Chinookan-derived CW items, one (Shippo "ship") appears to be English-derived (cf. CW<sub>GRONDE</sub> *šip* 'ship', *šip-man* 'sailor'), two (Hias, Hi-ass "big or large," and Snass "rain") correspond to common CW lexemes of uncertain derivation (CW *hayás* 'big', *snas* 'rain'). Notably, nothing in the list matches anything in the large French-derived lexicon of CW.<sup>14</sup> It is clear from his spellings that Ross recognized voiceless laterals (*t*, *ʃ*, *ʃ*: his "thl," "tl") and velar/uvular fricatives (*x*, *χ*: his "ch" or "gh," conventions probably reflecting his Scottish Highland background). Indeed, his "mixed dialect" entries show them exactly where an Indian CW variety would lead one to expect them, regardless of the items' ultimate Nootkan or Chinookan provenance:

Thluchè-men "woman"	CW <i>túčmən</i> 'woman' (Table 4)
Tlòsh "good"	CW <i>túš</i> 'good' (Table 4)
Thla choea "how are you?"	CW <i>táχayam</i> '[SALUTATION]' (Table 1)
Thlat-away "go away"	CW <i>tát(u)wa</i> 'go' (Table 4)
Meth-lite "come in"	CW <i>míʔayt</i> 'sit, stay' (Table 3)
Tekeigh "I love you"	CW <sub>DEMERS</sub> <i>tkēh</i> 'like, want' (Table 2)

Two clause-level utterances are given. Both are lexically and grammatically "perfect" as CW sentences, given where the Chinookan grammars would lead us to expect the presence of inflected verbs. Both also exemplify the hybrid, predominantly Chinookan-Nootka Lingo lexicon suggested by the provenances of the remaining "mixed dialect" items (we supply interlinear transliterations and translations; compare Tables 1 and 4):

- (5) a. Ick-etta mika mackouk CW *ikta mayka makuk*  
 "what are you going to trade?" what-? thou trade
- b. Winnippie nica chico CW *winapi nayka čaku*  
 "By-and-bye [sic] I'll come again" presently I come

If Franchère was aware of the existence of a contact medium existing alongside the regular language of the Chinookans, he betrays no hint of it in either version of his narrative. His "Chinook" vocabulary is actually a mixed bag. Three items (plus one additional from the text of the narrative) match Nootka-Lingo

---

<sup>14</sup>Nor are there any such matches in Ross's much longer "Chinook" vocabulary, although the latter does show a Nootka Lingo admixture. Compare, for example, the CW compounds for numerals from 11 to 19, which all incorporate the French-derived lexeme CW *pi* 'and' (as in CW<sub>GRONDE</sub> *tá flam pi ixt* 'eleven', literally, 'ten and one'), with Ross's "Chinook" numerals, which all incorporate Chinookan *ikun* 'one more' instead (as in his Eattathlelam equin ight 'eleven').

derived CW lexemes (Table 4):

Tanasse "enfant"	CW <i>tanás</i> 'child'
Patlatch "un présent"	CW <i>pátač</i> 'give; gift'
Ouinapi "bientôt"	CW <sub>GIBBS</sub> Win'-a-pie 'bye-and-bye, presently'
haiqua [dentalium shells]	CW <i>háyk'a</i> 'dentalium shells'

Ross's "Chinook" (vs "mixed dialect") vocabulary also has some Nootka-Lingo derived items (at least eight, including Tye-yea "chief," Sciah "far off," Nananitch "to look"; Table 4: CW *tayi* 'chief, boss', *sayá* 'far away', *nánič* 'to look, see'). None of the foregoing Franchere and Ross "Chinook"-identified (but actually Nootka-Lingo derived) items appear as Chinookan in the later nineteenth-century record, where the indicated meanings are expressed by indigenous items.

Although Franchere's list was evidently badly mangled somewhere in the editing and typesetting process, the following examples of Chinookan and CW matches show that, like Ross, he recognized voiceless laterals and velar/uvular fricatives:

Icht "un, une"	CW, Chinookan <i>ixt</i>
Thloun "trois"	CW, Chinookan <i>łun, łun</i>
Thlipaigt "corde"	LC [ <i>łə</i> ]- <i>pait</i> (with reference to LC <i>tə'-pait</i> 'rope', CW <sub>DEMERS</sub> <i>tlipait</i> 'string')
Tlaoltk "du sang"	LC <i>ł-łáwilqt</i> 'blood'
Ste kech "je t'aime"	CW <sub>DEMERS</sub> <i>kəh</i> 'like, want' (Table 2)

Additionally, at least two of Franchere's sentences look more like CW than Chinookan. Indeed, the following exemplifies the same ordinary interrogative construction illustrated by the first Ross example. Again, "good" Chinookan would use an inflected verb to express the same meaning, as suggested by the accompanying Chinookan examples. Unlike the Ross examples, it lacks any Nootka-Lingo derived lexeme (the verb is a common CW lexeme of unknown origin: CW<sub>GRONDE</sub> *mə k'hmak*, CW<sub>BAY C</sub> [*mə k'amak*] 'food; to eat').

- (6) Ikta mika makoumak? CW *ikta mayka makəmak*  
 "Que veux-tu manger?" what-? thou eat
- UC *dan i-m-ł-łm-am*  
 what-? [TENSE]-thou-it-eat-[PURPOSIVE]  
 'What did you eat?'
- KC *tanxə al-i-łm-ú-łm-m-a*  
 what-? [TENSE]-he-eat-[DIR]-  
 -do-[ASPECT]-[TENSE]  
 'What does he want to eat?'

Other examples show that Franchere and Ross were indeed exposed to

Chinookan, though it may be questioned to what extent either had mastered its complex verbal morphology.<sup>15</sup> For example (Franchere):

(8)

- |    |   |   |
|----|---|---|
| a. | Kakhpah émoreya?<br>"où vas-tu?"          | Chinookan/CW <i>qa(x)</i> , UC <i>q'áx-ba</i> 'where?'<br>Chinookan <i>m-</i> 'thou', <i>u-</i> '[DIRECTIVE]', <i>-ya</i><br>'go'<br>cf. UC <i>qánǎx a-m-u-ya</i> 'When will you go?' |
| b. | Kanchik euskoya?<br>"quand reviendras-tu" | Chinookan/CW <i>qánǎ(x)</i> 'when'<br>LC <i>-gu-ya</i> 'return'<br>cf. UC <i>qánǎx alma a-tx-u-ya</i> 'When shall we go?'   |
| c. | Nixt nothlitkal<br>"tu ne comprends pas"  | Chinookan <i>nikšt</i> 'no'<br>LC, KC <i>ǎ-</i> 'them, it', <i>-kal</i> 'know'<br>["no" translating <i>nikšt</i> ?]   |

Some of Ross's "Chinook" nouns show a meticulous attention to phonetic detail, albeit with translations calling into question his grasp of the morphology:

Eneck-kats-ach "back"	LC <i>i-[mə]-k'ǎ</i> 'thy back' <sup>16</sup>
Eats-wanē "belly"	LC <i>i-[ǎ]-wan</i> 'my belly'
Thlam-eck-took "head"	LC <i>ǎ-[m]-iq̣tq</i> 'thy head'
Etsuck-out "eyes"	LC <i>[i]-[ǎ]-q't</i> 'my eye'
Ots-ats-ach "teeth"	LC <i>[u]-[ǎ]-aǎ</i> 'my tooth'
Ecskaun "chest, wood"	LC <i>i-škan</i> 'plank' (stem <i>-škan</i> 'wood')
Useun [sic] "kettle"	LC <i>u-škan</i> 'bucket' (stem <i>-škan</i> 'wood')

Note Ross's tendency to write *c* and *s* where the sources show *ǎ* and *š*, suggesting that he was hearing Chinookan diminutive forms.

An interesting case is Ross's "Chinook" section example:

Nica oh-low "I am hungry"

While Nica clearly corresponds to the Chinookan first-person singular independent pronoun *naika*, oh-low to the feminine singular noun LC *u-lu* (KC, UC *wa-lu*)

---

<sup>15</sup>Nor have we mastered the "complex verbal morphology" of Chinookan. Our analyses of the subsequent Franchere/Ross examples must therefore be taken as suggestive, not definitive.

<sup>16</sup>As per the preceding note, brackets mark our own reconstructions based on our reading of the grammars. That is, they are not quoted from the Chinookan text corpus.

'hunger', parallel examples from the Chinookan text corpus suggest that simply juxtaposing the two items to yield the indicated meaning does not make "good" Chinookan. Compare:

- (9) LC  $u_1-lu$   $g_1-n_2-a-x_3-t$   
 UC  $wa_1-lu$   $g_1-n_2-u-x_3-t$   
 the<sub>1</sub>-hunger she<sub>1</sub>-me<sub>2</sub>-[DIRECTIVE]-does<sub>3</sub>-[TENSE]  
 'I am hungry.'

However, Nica also corresponds to the CW pronoun *náyka* 'I, me, my', oh-low to the CW adjective *úlu* 'hungry', and the phrase

- (10) *nayka ulu*  
 I hungry  
 'I am hungry.'

is perfectly intelligible as a CW predicate adjective construction. The question remains open, however, whether this example is better construed as "good" CW, or as "broken" Chinookan.

The same ambiguity is posed by two compounds appearing in the Astorian-era sources. Although Ross's Kaltash wa-wa "idle talk," entered as "Chinook," corresponds to a common CW idiom (CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> *kʰəltəs-wáwa* (1) 'to talk nonsense, blather', (2) 'slander'), it conceivably could have been intended as Chinookan (UC, CW *wáwa*: Table 2; LC *káltas* 'in vain', corresponding to CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> *kʰəltəs*, CW<sub>BAYC</sub> [kə-ltəs]). Conversely, the item Uth-lath-Gla-gla "an immense bird, inhabiting the Sun," appearing in the journal of one of Franchere's and Ross's Astorian contemporaries (Stuart 1953:33), while it appears at first glance to be Chinookan, on closer examination reveals features more suggestive of CW: Uth-lath appears to match Hale's CW form for sun, *ōlah*, as opposed to (numbered/gendered) LC *u-ñi-lax* (ó'otylax in Hale's Chinookan spelling); and Gla-gla, while no doubt Chinookan in origin (compare LC *k-t-gə-ka-l* 'birds', literally, 'the fliers', UC *i-k-lak-la* 'goose'), also suggests CW<sub>G RONDE</sub> *kála-kala*, CW<sub>BAYC</sub> [kə-lə-kə-lə] 'bird'.

Similar considerations apply to the Franchere examples:

Thlounasse olilé	"peut être des fruits"
Nix, quatiassé moulak thlousk	"Non, donne-moi de la viande"
Mitlaight o kok	"assieds-toi-là"

In the original, the first example follows "Ikta mika makounak?," either as a continuation of the latter question (as Hoyt Franchere translates: 'What do you want to eat? Perhaps some fruits?'), or (with the second example) as an alternate answer ('What do you want to eat? -Perhaps some fruits / -No, give me some meat') (Hoyt Franchere has supplied the second question mark, lacking in the 1820 original). While the question, as we point out above, is best construed as CW, the first answer (or continuation) contains two lexemes identifiable either as

Chinookan or CW (LC *áunas*, CW<sub>GRONDE</sub> *á'únas* 'maybe'; CW *úlali* 'berries': Table 1), and could be considered either CW or Chinookan. Similarly, Mitlaight in the third example corresponds both to CW and Chinookan verbs (Table 3), while *o kok* corresponds to Chinookan and CW *úkuk*, a demonstrative pronoun (Table 1). While the adverbial use of *úkuk* illustrated is unusual for CW as we know it, this example is probably fairly considered either CW or (attempted) Chinookan. By contrast, the second example (putative second answer to "what do you want to eat?") looks more like Chinookan, with Chinookan *nikšt* 'no', a verb perhaps with *q*- 'someone' as subject and *-i(x)* 'give' as stem, plus a noun that is either Chinookan *i-múlak* or CW *múlak* (both meaning 'elk').

As illustrated above, it is not always possible to draw a definite line between CW and Chinookan in sources from this early period. Further illustrations are given by approximately 40 Chinookan-identifiable/ CW-matching nouns appearing in Franchere and Ross (counting only relatively unproblematic cases). Like Chinookan-contributed nouns in CW, these exhibit a rough 50/50 split between forms retaining Chinookan number/gender prefixes, and forms lacking such prefixes. Most of the examples agree with their CW matches on this point (eight CW-congruent prefixed nouns vs. five unprefixed in Franchere, 11 prefixed vs. 10 unprefixed in Ross), although there are some mismatches: two examples in Franchere and four in Ross showing prefixes where the corresponding CW forms lack them. Following are the six nouns in Franchere matching entries in Table 1:

Etalapass "Dieu, ou l'Etre Suprême"	LC <i>i-t'álapas</i> 'coyote'
Tilikum "les hommes"	LC <i>té-tx-am</i> , CW <i>tilixam</i>
Passisché "drap"	CW <i>pásisi</i>
Ilekai "la terre"	LC <i>i-ili</i> , CW <i>ili ũ</i> , <i>ilihi</i>
Olo "la faim"	LC <i>ú-lu</i> , CW <i>úlu</i>
Kaienoulk "tabac"	CW <i>k'áynu†</i>

While these examples (with the remaining like instances in Franchere and Ross) can be taken as further evidence that CW was established by the Astorian period, the possibility remains that some unprefixed forms in these sources represent either Chinookan speakers' *ad hoc* simplifications, or words elicited from them in isolation (a context in which Chinookan speakers may be more prone to give unmarked forms).

To sum up our overview of the linguistic record from the Astorian period: alongside examples best characterized as either CW or Chinookan, respectively, this record also includes examples whose classification appears to be ambiguous. While the most complete source, Ross, is informed by an explicit recognition of CW as a "lingo" distinct from Chinookan, both Ross and his fellow Pacific Fur Company clerk, Franchere, show more-or-less clearly Chinookan examples appearing in association with Chinuk-Wawa identifiable examples either not identifiable as Chinookan at all (that is, not in terms of the later authoritative Chinookan sources), or identifiable only as imperfect Chinookan (lacking appropriately Chinookan inflections).



The foregoing section has summarized the linguistic record of Chinookan and CW on the Lower Columbia from first contact through the Astorian period. We have seen that alongside examples best characterized as Chinookan or CW (counting Nootka Lingo as CW), this record also includes examples whose classification is ambiguous. Apparently, the foreign explorers and traders who visited the Lower Columbia before 1814 did not learn Chinookan well enough to clearly distinguish it from the Nootka Lingo and simplified Chinookan that their own materials partially document. Nor do their spellings of Nootka Lingo/CW identifiable items suggest the non-Chinookan pronunciations recorded by Hale and later associated especially with English-speaking users of CW. While Lewis and Clark used *cl*, suggestive of Hale's *kl*, to represent the voiceless lateral in CW *tuś* (table 4), they used the same convention to write voiceless laterals in Chinookan place and group names (for example, their Clatsop, Clotsop, for LC *łac'əp*, their Wah-clai-lars for UC *wa tala*). And David Thompson's spelling Thloos points definitely to the early-historical presence of a voiceless lateral fricative or affricative in Indian pronunciations of this word, notwithstanding its Nootka Lingo provenance. As we have pointed out (note 5), voiceless laterals in Chinookan pronunciations of this and other Nootka Lingo words may just reflect normative or more natural Chinookan, as opposed to English speakers' usual *kl*- in these words. In any case, it is difficult to see how this feature alone constitutes convincing counter-evidence to the many other indications that these words were introduced by English speakers. Its documentation as early as 1811, however, does point to the early recognition by foreigners of a Chinookan norm for pronouncing these words, and therefore constitutes counter-evidence to claims that CW's Chinookan-congruent phonology was a later development.

We infer that Chinookan participants in the early trade with visiting seafarers combined elements of the Nootka Lingo with grammatically simplified Chinookan in very short order, creating the grammatical and lexical core of CW as recorded in later nineteenth century sources. It may be surmised that part if not all of the English portion of the later nineteenth-century CW lexicon dates to these early encounters, although the earliest sources include little note of it.<sup>17</sup> The fourth major source

---

<sup>17</sup>Lewis and Clark do comment on Lower Columbia Indians' acquisition of some English as a result of their contacts with the early seafarers; for example:

The persons who usually visit the entrance of this river for the purpose of traffic or hunting, I believe is either English or Americans; the Indians inform us that they Speak the Same language with our Selves, and gave as proofs of their varacity by repeating maney words of English, Sun of a pitch & c. [NB: *heave the lead & maney blackguard phrases*] (Moulton 1990,6:204-205; spelling as in original)

As Thomason (1983:827, note 11) points out, many English and French contributed CW lexemes are phonetically distorted from the point of view of their English and French sources. While the word "pitch" quoted above is not recorded as CW, it does exemplify one of the phonetic distortions of English-contributed lexemes in CW: the replacement of many English voiced segments by unvoiced or indigenous-voiced (= less voiced)

language contributing to the CW of later record, French, is conspicuous by its utter absence from the earliest sources.

While the Nootka Lingo/simplified Chinookan with which Chinookans met early English-speaking visitors was surely much more easily acquired by foreigners than Chinookan, the early historical evidence considered here suggests that just like the CW of later record, its pronunciation entailed certain features more "readily produced" by Northwest Coast Indians. This finding provides further support for Thomason's (1983:859-867) case-based largely on phonetically accurate, but historically recent recordings of Northwest Indian CW varieties (collated in Thomason 1981)—that the origin of CW's complex phonetics is to be sought in the origin of CW itself. This is in contrast to Samarin's (1996:332-334) insistence that phonetic complexity characterizing some (he questions whether all) CW varieties points to later "nativization" of an originally unstable seafarers' "prepidgin."

Our section 1 (*Chinookan versus CW*) also lends added substance to Thomason's (1983:865) observation that "the evidence of CJ [=CW] structure strongly suggests . . . that Europeans [that is, European-language speakers] did not participate significantly in its development." We noted there a number of features pointing to *deliberate grammatical simplification* of a degree and kind implying the agency of Chinookan speakers: (a) the unprefixing of Chinookan forms accounting for about half of all Chinookan-derived CW nouns, (b) the frequent shift of Chinookan *š*, *č* to CW ("little Chinookan") *s*, *c*, and (most importantly) (c) the almost wholesale avoidance/reduction of Chinookan verbal morphology revealed by CW verb phrases.

To our argument there we must add the proviso that simplification is to be understood in relation to relevant degrees of pre-existing complexity. Grant (1996:1189) also notes the presence of Chinookan inflected nouns and verbs in CW, but reaches a conclusion exactly the reverse of ours: to wit, that such forms are indicative of Chinookan words being "taken out of one utterance and generalized," something that is most likely to have been done by "people who did not control the morphology of the donor language." But it is easy to imagine the kinds of Chinookan inflected forms cited by Grant—prefixed nouns and simple imperative verbs—becoming established through linguistic "negotiation" in the context of cross-language contact involving Chinookans and foreign-speaking (note, not necessarily White) outsiders. In Chinookan terms, these are minimally-inflected categories of form, ones which Chinookan speakers could well have supplied either as part of simplified Chinookan, or as corrections of foreign-speaking interlocutors' attempted Chinookan. Simple imperatives like LC *mə'-łax-it* 'thou sit!' would lend themselves especially well to linguistic negotiation with outsiders perceived to be foreign or strange, whether visitors from afar or newly captured slaves. The Chinookan nominal and verbal affixes at issue reveal little if any distortion of form in their CW counterparts—only, their Chinookan grammatical functions have been disconnected, as it were. Thus, LC *i-láitix* '(a male) slave' becomes CW *iláy'tx* '(any) slave', LC *té-tx-am* 'people' becomes CW *tilixam* 'person, people', and LC *mə'-łax-it* 'thou sit!' becomes CW *mí'tayt* 1) 'sit! cease!', 2) 'to sit, stay, reside'. While Chinookan prefixed nouns are gendered

---

counterparts.

and numbered, the CW forms derived from them therefore not, this seems to us a minimal loss of complexity compared to CW's wholesale avoidance/reduction of Chinookan verbal morphology. And just as prefixed Chinookan nouns coexist in CW with an equal number of unprefixed Chinookan nouns, so do the relatively few CW verbs based on Chinookan inflected forms coexist with many more Chinookan uninflected particle verbs. Often, the latter occur paired with the Nootka-Lingo derived CW auxiliaries *mamuk*- (more usually *munk*- in CW<sub>GRONDE</sub>) 'make, do, cause to be' and *čaku*- 'become, get to be', paralleling the pairing of particle verbs with the inflected auxiliary verb *-x* 'make, do' in Chinookan. Examples:

(11)

- a. 'He cut it':  
 UC *tq'úp ga-č-i-u-x*  
     cut [TENSE]-he-him[=it]-[DIRECTIVE]-do  
 CW *yaka mamuk-tq'úp úkuk*  
     he make-cut that one
- b. 'He got cut':  
 UC *tq'úp gal-i-x-u-x*  
     cut [TENSE]-him-[REFLEXIVE]-[DIRECTIVE]-do  
 CW *yaka čaku-tq'úp*  
     he become-cut
- c. 'They dig the ground':  
 LC *łx'áp a-ł-k-ái,-a-x* *i,-lii*  
     dig [TENSE]-they-to-him,-[DIRECTIVE]-do the,-ground  
 CW *łaska mamuk-łx'áp iliñ*  
     they make-hole ground

Had CW originated as a chaotic prepidgin combining the seafarers' Nootka Lingo with their predictably very imperfect attempts to acquire Chinookan, the Chinookan contribution to CW should reveal evidence of extreme structural distortion. While it is possible that this could have been corrected to some extent in the course of subsequent nativization of Indian varieties, it should still be traceable from linguistic evidence in early historical sources as well as in the mid-nineteenth century CW corpus. However, rather than convincing evidence of distortion, what we have found instead are many indications of a reverse process: of CW forms and constructions being tailored by Chinookans themselves to avoid the complexities of Chinookan morphology.

An instructive example of what can happen when Chinookan is attempted by a non-speaker, even one fluent in another local indigenous language, is provided by Harrington's principal speaker of CW<sub>BAY C</sub>, Mrs. Emma Millet Luscier. Mrs. Luscier was a local-Chinookan/local-Salish descended resident of Willapa Bay, Washington, who, like most other Willapa Bay Chinookan descendants of her generation, spoke only local Salishan (both Lower Chehalis and Lower Cowlitz, in her case), CW, and

English. When Harrington (1942, frames 0061-0208) tried to check Curtis's (1911) LC and KC word-lists by re-eliciting many of Curtis's Chinookan forms from her, she often added an initial *i-* to them, resulting in some morphologically complete Chinookan forms with an anomalous added *i-*: e.g., [ʔiʔδ-lhʌ~yʊ], for LC *ú-lxayu* 'seal'; [ʔiʔlɫ-ytx], for LC *i-láitix* 'a (male) slave'. Apparently, Mrs. Luscier knew that *i-* yields complete Chinookan forms like *i-t'álapas* and *i-k'áinuʔ* (she had grown up around older family members who did know Chinookan), but she overgeneralized that knowledge, forming an idiosyncratic rule for marking nouns as Chinookan. By contrast, all four of the Lower Columbia Chinuk Wawa varieties cited here show Chinookan-contributed forms free of any comparable indications of morphological distortion (as Tables 1-3 illustrate).

This brings us, finally, to Thomason's proposal that the indigenous phonetics and structures described for the CW of historical record are best explained on an hypothesis that they derive from like features of an aboriginal (and therefore necessarily undocumented) Lower Columbia pidgin.

Johnson finds this a sensible position, especially considering that Chinookan trade and travel connections took in a wide geographical region crossing many language boundaries extending all directions from the immediate Lower Columbia.

Zenk is inclined to be more cautious, citing Hajda's (1983) ethnohistorical reconstructions of indigenous political and economic relations in the greater Lower Columbia region at the time of first contact. On the evidence of her sources, indigenous intergroup relations on the Lower Columbia were accommodated within a well-developed system of intermarriages and associated multilingualism. Not only is direct evidence of an indigenous Lower Columbia lingua franca lacking, but a careful reading of the early sources casts doubt on whether one would have served much useful purpose there.

Granting Hajda's point, Zenk still feels that the linguistic evidence we have cited makes a convincing case for attributing many elements of CW to an indigenous simplified Chinookan. But that evidence, while certainly consistent with a putative Lower Columbia Chinookan-based pidgin, is equally consistent with some sort of a *register*, or specialized style of speaking Chinookan tailored to certain interlocutors in certain contexts. All languages presumably have a "foreigner-talk" register, or set of stylized simplifications adopted for the assumed benefit of foreign-speaking outsiders. The ethnographic and historical sources for the Lower Columbia, while they may not directly document the existence of an aboriginal lingua franca, certainly do document the participation of Chinookans in economic and other contacts involving a wide array of foreign groups from the surrounding region. While participants' multilingual repertoires presumably sufficed more often than not to sustain such contacts, it is plausible to assume that a simplified Chinookan of some sort could also have been useful, especially when contacts involved participants from distant groups. Trade and slavery pose two overlapping spheres in which such contacts occurred with some frequency. Hymes (1980) has already commented on slavery as a context favoring "less than perfect Chinookan." While we are aware of no direct evidence backing his claim that Chinookans used less than perfect Chinookan to talk down to slaves, there is abundant historical evidence (although all post-contact, Hajda personal communication 2004 points out) that some Chinookan-held slaves originated as adults captured from

distant groups. Such individuals presumably would have arrived on the Lower Columbia with no previous knowledge of Chinookan. The necessity to establish communications with them would have favored the development of some form of simplified Chinookan: minimally, a slave register or slave jargon.

While Zenk therefore questions how linguistically autonomous from Chinookan a pre-contact simplified Chinookan would have been, there can be no doubt regarding the linguistically autonomous status of CW upon its integration of Nootka Lingó, English, and French elements to yield the lexically and grammatically more-or-less stable CW recorded during the mid-nineteenth century by Hale, Demers, and Gibbs. Lang (1997, 2000; compare Samarin 1996:330-331) has been working out a detailed sociolinguistic history of Lower Columbia ethnically-mixed fur-company communities, especially Astoria and Fort Vancouver, where this integration process appears to have been situated. It was during this period that CW became established as the lingua franca of the entire Pacific Northwest, a development tied intimately to the growth of a significant and influential Métis population around the fur companies' centers and associated settlements.

For Johnson, CW's Chinookan roots are also a matter of the heart. As a Lower Columbia Indian who, like his father and grandfather before him, was born on Willapa Bay, Johnson can attest personally to the long survival of CW there. One of the Johnsons' family friends was the late Antone Luscier, a son of Harrington's principle CW<sub>BAY C</sub> source, Mrs. Emma Millet Luscier. While teaching Johnson aspects of community history, including its languages, Mr. Luscier would often say something first in Lower Chehalis Salishan, then repeat himself in a second language which he referred to as *Old Chinook*. This "Old Chinook" clearly exhibited the "difficult" sounds discussed in our section 1, and was clearly felt by Mr. Luscier to be among his "Indian languages." In fact, the language was CW, although to Johnson this would have been incomprehensible, since his perception of CW was then limited to the old English-orthography dictionaries that shape most contemporary Pacific Northwesterners' perceptions of it. He had always assumed that the CW he was exposed to in early life was *Chinookan*. And indeed, as we have attempted to demonstrate in this paper, he was hearing a linguistic variety that is based primarily upon Chinookan. For him, CW is a tangible link to his Native heritage: "Chinuk Wawa is the only place where the language of my lower river ancestors lives today. The language as I have learned it is an unbroken chain, mouth-to-ears, from our old people."

## References

- Berman, Howard. 1990. An outline of Kalapuya historical phonology. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 56(1):27-59.
- Blanchet, Rev. Francis Norbert. 1862. "Prières<sup>x</sup>tiennes en Jargon Tchinois Corrigies par Mgr. Demers." (Pp. 120-122 in *Book II of Letters from 1853 to 1869 ...*, ms in Archdiocese of Portland in Oregon Historical Archives, Portland, Oregon.)
- Blanchet, Rev. Francis Norbert. 1883. *Historical Sketches of the Catholic Church in Oregon*. Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press. [Original: Portland, 1878.]

- Boas, Franz. 1894. Chinook texts. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 20. Washington.
- Boas, Franz. 1901. Kathlamet texts. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 26. Washington.
- Boas, Franz. 1911. Chinook. Pp. 559-677 in Vol. 1 of "Handbook of American Indian Languages," F. Boas, ed. *Bureau of American Ethnology Bulletin* 40. Washington.
- Curtis, Edward S. 1911. *The North American Indian*, Vol. 8. Norwood, Mass.: Plimpton Press.
- Demers, M., F. N. Blanchet, and L. N. St. Onge. 1871. *Chinook Dictionary, Catechism, Prayers and Hymns. Composed in 1838 & 1839 by Rt. Rev. Modeste Demers, Revised, Corrected, and Completed, in 1867 by Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet, with Modifications and Additions by Rev. L. N. St. Onge Missionary among the Yakamas and Other Indian Tribes*. Montreal.
- Dyk, Walter. 1933. A grammar of Wishram. Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University.
- Elliott, T. C., ed. 1914. Journal of David Thompson. *Oregon Historical Quarterly* 15: 39-63.
- Franchère, Gabriel. 1820. *Relation d'un voyage à la côte du Nord-ouest de l'Amérique Septentrionale, dans les années 1810, 11, 12, 13, et 14*. Montréal: C. B. Pasteur.
- Franchère, Hoyt C., ed. and trans. 1967. *Adventure at Astoria, 1810-1814*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press. [English translation of Franchère 1820.]
- Franchère, Gabriel. 1969. *Journal of a Voyage on the North West Coast of North America During the Years 1811, 1812, 1813 and 1814*. W. Kaye Lamb, ed., Wessie Tipping Lamb, trans. Toronto: The Champlain Society.
- Gallatin, Albert. 1836. A synopsis of the Indian tribes within the United States east of the Rocky Mountains, and in the British and Russian possessions in North America. Pp. 1-422 in *Archaeologia Americana: Transactions and Collections of the American Antiquarian Society* 2. Cambridge, Mass.
- Gibbs, George. 1863. *A Dictionary of the Chinook Jargon, or Trade Language of Oregon*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution.
- Grant, Anthony P. 1996. Chinook Jargon and its distribution in the Pacific Northwest and Beyond. Pp. 1185-1208 in *Atlas of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas*. Stephen A. Wurm, Peter Mühlhäusler, and Darrel T. Tryon, eds. Mouton DeGruyter.
- Grant, Anthony P. 1996a. The evolution of functional categories in Grand Ronde Chinook Jargon: ethnolinguistic and grammatical considerations. Pp. 225-242 in "Changing meanings, changing functions: papers relating to grammaticalization in contact languages." *Westminster Creolistics Series* 2. London: University of Westminster Press.
- Hajda, Yvonne P. 1977-80. [Chinuk Wawa data from members of the Grand Ronde Community, Oregon: tapes and tape transcripts.] (Originals in possession of author, duplicates in the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde language archives.)
- Hajda, Yvonne P. 1983. Regional social organization in the greater Lower Columbia, 1792-1830. Ph.D. dissertation in Anthropology, University of Washington,

Seattle.

- Hale, Horatio. 1846. *Ethnology and philology*. Vol. 6 of *U. S. Exploring Expedition During the Years 1838, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842*. Philadelphia: C. Sherman.
- Harrington, John P. 1942. [J. P. Harrington papers microfilm, vol. 1, reel 18.] National Anthropological Archives, Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- Howay, Frederick W. 1943. *Voyages of the "Columbia" to the Northwest Coast, 1787-1790 and 1790-1793*. New York: Da Capo Press.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1955. The language of the Kathlamet Chinook. Ph.D. dissertation in Linguistics, Indiana University.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1980. Commentary. Pp. 389-423 in *Theoretical Orientations in Creole Studies*. Albert Valdman and Arnold Highfield, eds. New York: Academic Press.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1996. Consonant symbolism in Kathlamet and Shoalwater Chinook. Pp. 163-171 in "Chin Hills to Chiloquin: papers honoring the versatile career of Theodore Stern," Don E. Dumond, ed. *University of Oregon Anthropological Papers* No. 52. Eugene.
- Huntington, J. V., trans. and ed. 1854. *Narrative of a Voyage to the Northwest Coast of America, in the Years 1811, 1812, 1813, and 1814, or, the First American Settlement on the Pacific*. New York: Redfield. [English translation of Franchère 1820.]
- Jackson, Donald, ed. 1962. *Letters of the Lewis and Clark Expedition with Related Documents 1783-1854*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Jacobs, Melville. 1928-36. [Chinuk Wawa and other linguistic data from members of the Grand Ronde Community, Oregon.] (Field notebooks and linguistic slip files in the Melville Jacobs Collection, University of Washington Archives, Seattle.)
- Jacobs, Melville. 1958-59. Clackamas Chinook texts. *Indiana University Research Center in Anthropology, Folklore, and Linguistics* 8, 11. Bloomington.
- Johnson, Samuel. 1978. Chinook Jargon: a computer assisted analysis of variation in an American Indian pidgin. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Johnson, Tony A. 1998-2000. [Chinuk Wawa data from members of the Grand Ronde Community, Oregon: tapes and tape transcripts.] (Originals in possession of author, duplicates in the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde language archives.)
- Kinkade, Dale. 1990. Upper Chehalis dictionary. *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* No. 7. Missoula.
- Lang, George. 1997. *Gender & Jargon: Voyageur Wives & the "Founding" of Chinook Jargon*. (Working text for oral presentation at the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics annual meeting, January 3-4, 1997, Chicago.)
- Lang, George. 2000. *Making Wawa: the Founding of Chinook Jargon*. (Book manuscript in possession of author.)
- Lee, D., and Frost, J. H. 1844. *Ten Years in Oregon*. New York: J. Collord.
- Moore, Robert E. 2003. [Interpretation of a Wasco Chinookan hymn in Lee and Frost 1844:205.] (Posting to CHINOOK@LISTSERV.LINGUISTLIST.ORG, April 21, 2003.)

- Moulton, Gary E., ed. 1990. *The Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition*, Vol. 6. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Powell, Jay, ed. 1991. Our world – our ways: T'aa' aqsaapa cultural dictionary. *Learning T'aa' aqsaapa Series*. Nuuchahnulth Tribal Council.
- Roe, Michael, ed. 1967. *Journal and Letters of Capt. Charles Bishop on the Northwest Coast of America 1794-1799*. Cambridge: Hakluyt Society.
- Ross, Alexander. 1849. *Adventures of the First Settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River*. London: Smith, Elder.
- Ross, Alexander. 1956. *The Fur Hunters of the Far West*. Kenneth A. Spaulding, ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Ross, Alexander. 1986. *Adventures of the First Settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River*. (Partial reprint of Ross 1849, with an introduction by James P. Ronda.) Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Samarin, William J. 1986. Chinook Jargon and pidgin historiography. *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 5(1):23-34.
- Samarin, William J. 1988. Jargonization before Chinook Jargon. *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes* 22(2):219-238.
- Samarin, William J. 1996. Arctic origin and domestic development of Chinook Jargon. Pp. 321-339 in *Language Contact in the Arctic: Northern Pidgins and Contact Languages*, E. H. Jahr and I. Broch, eds. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Sapir, Edward. 1909. Wishram texts. *Publications of the American Ethnological Society*, No. 2. Leiden.
- Sapir, Edward, and Morris Swadesh. 1939. *Nootka Texts: Tales and Ethnological Narratives, with Grammatical Notes and Lexical Material*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, Linguistic Society of America.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1990. Chinookans of the Lower Columbia. Pp. 533-546 in "Northwest Coast," vol. 7 of the *Handbook of North American Indians*, Wayne Suttles, vol. ed., William C. Sturtevant, general ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- Silverstein, Michael. 1996. Chinook Jargon. Pp. 127-130 in "Languages," vol. 17 of the *Handbook of North American Indians*, Ives Goddard, vol. ed., William C. Sturtevant, general ed. Smithsonian Institution, Washington.
- Stuart, Robert. 1953. *On the Oregon Trail*, Kenneth A. Spaulding, ed. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Swadesh, Morris. 1953. [Tape recording of Wishram/Wasco (Kiksht) Upper Chinook words and phrases.] (In Archives of Traditional Music, Indiana University, Bloomington.)
- Swan, James G. 1857. *The Northwest Coast; or, Three Years' Residence in Washington Territory*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Thomas, Edward Harper. 1935. *Chinook: a History and Dictionary*. Portland, Oregon: Binford & Mort.
- Thomason, Sarah G. 1981. [Collated Chinuk Wawa phonetic forms, pp. 378-392 in draft version of Thomason 1983.] Working Papers of the XVI International Conference of Salish and Neighboring Languages, *University of Montana Occasional Papers in Linguistics* 2.



- Thomason, Sarah G. 1983. Chinook Jargon in Areal and Historical Context. *Language* 59(4):820-870.
- Thwaites, Reuben Gold. 1904-1905. *Original Journals of the Lewis and Clark Expedition 1804-1806*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co.
- Trudgill, Peter. 1996. Dual-source pidgins and reverse creoloids: northern perspectives on language contact. Pp. 5-14 in *Language Contact in the Arctic: Northern Pidgins and Contact Languages*, E. H. Jahr and I. Broch, eds. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Zenk, Henry B. 1980-1983. [Chinuk Wawa data from members of the Grand Ronde Community, Oregon: tapes and tape transcripts.] (Originals in possession of author, duplicates in the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde language archives.)
- Zenk, Henry B., and Tony A. Johnson. 2003. *Chinuk Wawa kakwa ntsayka ulman tilixam taska munk-kəmtəks ntsayka / Chinuk Wawa as our elders teach us to speak it*. (Draft Chinuk Wawa dictionary, © the Confederated Tribes of the Community of Grand Ronde.)

Henry Zenk  
hzenk@pdx.edu

Tony Johnson  
tony.johnson@grandronde.org

