

CHINOOK JARGON IN AREAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Sarah Grey Thomason
University of Pittsburgh

ABSTRACT

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

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

Author's note: This paper is a first draft, and I have no illusions about my chances of having avoided factual errors completely in the sections that involve analyses of Indian languages. Corrections will therefore be most welcome, as will any/all comments about the details or general arguments.

CHINOOK JARGON IN AREAL AND HISTORICAL CONTEXT *

1. Introduction

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

The origin of CJ is unclear; in fact, it has been a source of controversy since the nineteenth century. The controversy revolves around the question of whether CJ existed as a means of communication among Indian tribes before the appearance of Europeans in the region, or whether it arose only after the Europeans arrived to provide a stimulus for the emergence of a contact medium. More recently, a new controversy has arisen about the linguistic status of CJ. In his well-known 1972 article Silverstein argues that the grammatical structure of the Jargon 'is defined only in relation to a particular component first language of its speakers' [I:378], so that Chinook Jargon itself actually consists only of a lexicon; it has no grammar of its own and is therefore not a language if, pace Silverstein [II:622-3], we insist on the usual criterion that speakers of the same language have a shared grammar. In producing

CJ utterances, says Silverstein, each speaker starts with his own primary language and reduces it drastically in ways that are predictable by universal principles, until it converges with the analogously reduced primary language of his interlocutor into a mutually intelligible surface structure onto which CJ lexical items are mapped. Starting from a careful contrastive analysis of Chinook and English, Silverstein claims that 'it is possible...to modify either grammar to produce' CJ [II:618] and that, in fact, 'it is just the systematic non-appearance in Jargon of anything not relatable to both Chinook and English which seems to me to render this goal of independent grammatical analysis of Jargon unattainable' [II:616].

In the present paper I will argue that Chinook Jargon is a true pidgin and not a jargon in Silverstein's sense of a structurally targetless speech form created anew by each speaker, or rather by each pair of speakers, as an independent individual compromise. My argument falls into two parts. First, though Silverstein's notion of cross-language compromise in the formation of a contact medium makes excellent sense diachronically, it seems weak to me synchronically, as a scenario for day-to-day communication among individual speakers. Second, Silverstein's belief that the attested Jargon contains no features that are not relatable to English is not justified by the facts. Moreover, and more importantly, when we abandon Silverstein's socially and linguistically simplified picture of CJ as an exclusively English-Chinook compromise,¹ we find ample evidence in both the phonology and the syntax to support the view that CJ is a real language, with grammar as well as lexicon. That is, there is clear evidence that CJ, though functionally and linguistically restricted in typical pidgin fashion, possessed a grammatical norm that all its speakers aimed at -- and achieved. This evidence is presented below in the context of a comparison of CJ materials provided by Indians (Twana, Upper Chehalis, Tsimshian, Nootka, Upper Coquille Athabaskan, Snoqualmie, Saanich, and Santiam Kalapuya) with structural features of their native languages.

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

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

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

syntactically similar or identical sentences -- that is, to take just one example, that the regular CJ word order pattern SVO is the cross-language compromise to be expected from English and Chinook speakers.

But if we have well-defined expectations about the particular common-denominator structures that speakers will produce in a given contact situation, and if those expectations do not match the results of a hypothetical simplification of either language in isolation, then we must ask how a speaker knows which route to follow in simplifying his native-language syntax. This problem is compounded if we assume further -- as is in fact the case with CJ -- that native speakers of typologically diverse languages arrive at the same cross-language compromise. For instance, Silverstein argues convincingly that SVO word order is just what we would expect from an English-Chinook compromise, since English does not admit a verb-initial structure in declarative sentences, while Chinook, a verb-initial language, does freely admit SVO order through topicalization of the subject noun phrase [II:612]. Surely, though, a spontaneous simplification of Chinook without reference to English (or to some other SVO language) would result in verb-initial sentences.² The only way I can see of accounting for the SVO order of Chinook speakers' CJ, on Silverstein's model, is to conclude that CJ speakers had a target to aim at in producing CJ sentences. This target must have been, in effect, a grammatical norm for CJ.

The question then arises as to the usefulness of Silverstein's model. In order to communicate in CJ, English and Chinook speakers would have to have learned both the CJ lexical items and the appropriate structural outcomes (e.g. SVO word order) of their independent syntactic simplifications.³ But if they have learned both lexicon and grammar in order to speak CJ, then what reason is there to believe that they produce CJ utterances derived from their native-language syntactic deep structures rather than directly from

independent CJ syntactic deep structures? Silverstein presents one major structural argument that is applicable here. Jargon is, he claims, in every way much simpler than either English or Chinook [I:386], and it is therefore possible to derive Jargon sentences from either language's deep structures. Since it is possible to do this, we should do it. Even if we grant his premise for the moment (though it is false), his conclusion does not follow from it. Chinook Jargon, it is true, is a typical pidgin in that it is extremely shallow derivationally in the transformational sense. As Silverstein observes, there are no syntactic embeddings; clauses are conjoined rather than subjoined. Bound morphemes occur very rarely. There are few function words (these include prepositions, negative particles, and the occasional interrogative particle). The category of auxiliary verb is rather well developed, providing for most of the complexity in the verb phrase.⁴ But any argument to the effect that a relatively simple grammatical structure is not susceptible of independent grammatical analysis would have to rest on some standard measure of minimum acceptable complexity, and no such standard exists. CJ is not unusual among pidgins in its simplicity, and grammatical descriptions of other pidgins abound in the literature.⁵

Although I do not see the force of Silverstein's argument against the existence of an independent CJ grammar, his notion of a cross-language compromise has a very important application to the general problem of the origin and development of a pidgin language. He expresses this notion synchronically in the following way: 'If each speaker retains in his grammar for Jargon sentence production essentially these more basic and expectable features of his primary language, then of course we expect the surface forms to merge as the result of universal tendencies' [II:620]. Restating the idea diachronically, we would expect that each speaker of a developing pidgin would retain those features of his native language that are most likely to be understood by his interlocutors. These would not always be the most basic features of the language;

6 This approach to the study of the origins of pidgin grammar is not new, but it was unfashionable for some time and has only recently been explored vigorously again. A major stimulus for current elaborations of this view is recent work on language universals and markedness theory -- the same theories Silverstein appeals to in his synchronic analysis of Chinook Jargon. For presentations of the diachronic approach, see Kay & Sankoff 1974, Thomason 1980, and Thomason & Kaufman, Forthcoming.

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

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

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

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

if all speakers have typologically similar native languages, then features that are highly marked in universal terms might well turn up in the pidgin. Moreover, VSO word order is more basic than SVO order in Chinook, and neither pattern has a clear edge universally. The SVO norm of CJ may therefore indicate that, for at least some speakers of the developing pidgin, verb-medial sentences were easier to understand than verb-initial sentences. In any case, only those marked features that are shared by all or most of the native languages would be expected to appear in the resulting pidgin, and thus we expect (and indeed find) relatively few universally marked features in pidgins in general. On this view, the grammatical structure of a fully crystallized pidgin language is a function of the structures of the native languages of its developers and original speakers.⁶ I will return to this point, with its implications for a theory of CJ origin, in §4.

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

3.0. In this section I will address the specific questions Silverstein raises about the attested Chinook Jargon: do CJ structures represent a lowest common denominator, phonologically and syntactically, of the structures of speakers' native languages? Do speakers retain their own native inventory when pronouncing Jargon words [I:384]. and is Jargon syntax 'basically a drastically reduced form of each speaker's primary language' [I:386]? Is CJ 'in all respects greatly simplified in relation to both Chinook proper and English' [I:386]? Silverstein answers all these questions in the affirmative; my answer to all of them is no. In testing his claims I will concentrate on showing that, as far as we can

tell from the attestations of CJ, all its speakers had a specific target to aim at -- a grammatical norm -- and some of the target grammatical features of CJ differed markedly from structures in their native languages. That is, if Silverstein is right, then we ought not to find any systematically occurring nonlexical features in any one person's CJ that do not occur in that person's native language. But in fact, as we will see below, such features occur in almost all of the sources.

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

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

collected so far on the non-European oppositions and distributions: plain : glottalized, velar : uvular, plain : labialized, the three laterals, the dorsal fricatives, non-initial glottal stop, and certain consonant clusters.

p	t	ts	tš	k	kw	q	qw	'
p'	t'	tš'	ts' (tš')	k'	kw'	q'	qw'	
b	d			g				
		ɬ	s	š	h	hw	x	xw
m	n			(ŋ)				
	r	l						
w				y				
								i u
								e ɐ o
								a

Notes: /h/ = [h] /#__, [x] elsewhere;

/x/ = [x] everywhere.

/'/ = [ʔ], but ' after a consonant symbol is the usual glottalization sign.

Table I

Chinook Jargon Phonemes

3.1. Chinook Jargon vs. English

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

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

Nevertheless, enough evidence exists to refute Hale's early claim (and Silverstein's, following him) that 'as the Jargon is to be spoken by Chinooks, Englishmen, and Frenchmen, so as to be alike easy and intelligible to all, it must admit no sound which cannot be readily pronounced by all three' [1846:640]. The most common non-English feature in the English speakers' texts is the presence of postvocalic h, which represents both CJ /h/ and /x/

(since velars and uvulars are not distinguished by Europeans). Some authors use the spelling gh for this purpose, e.g. Ross's Tekeigh and Shaw's Tik-egh ~ Tiky 'want; like' for /tq'ix/ (alternating with /təki/, which is more common and presumably due to anglicization); Shaw's Tsugh 'split', Lagh 'lean (over)', and Pe-chugh 'green' for /ts'əx/, /laxw/, and /ptšəh/; Ross's stoghtkin 'eight' for /stuxtkin/; and Parker's eght 'one' for /iht/. Other authors, notably Hale himself, use h: Hale tūkēh ~ takēh 'want, like', stōhtkin ~ stūhtkin 'eight', and even iāhka ~ yāhka 'he, she' for /ya(x)ka/ (the variant /yaka/ is more common); Parker also has yahkah, alternating with yākkā; and Palmer has iht 'one'.⁹ There is even a small amount of evidence indicating that at least one English speaker recognized, and kept in intersyllable position, the distinction between CJ /h/ and /x/. Parker transcribes the word for 'high', for instance, as saghalle (CJ /saxali/); compare his spelling illaha 'earth' for CJ /ili'i/ ~ /ilahi/ (the latter no doubt represents an anglicization; it is used by all whites and some Indians).

The lateral nature of word-initial /ɬ/ is indicated by at least two English-speaking writers. Ross uses tl for word-initial /ɬ/: tlutchē-men for /ɬutšmən/ 'woman' and tlōsh for /ɬuš/ 'good'; Shaw usually follows the normal kl practice, but in one word he uses initial tl: tl'kope for /ɬk'up/ 'chop' (presumably the odd cluster accounts for his deviation here).

Other non-English features in English speakers' writings come under the general heading of syllable-initial clusters, like Shaw's tl'kope, that are not possible in English. A borderline case is the initial ts sequence that occurs in most of the sources I've seen. This is an affricate in CJ as spoken by Indians, but it may well have been a consonant cluster in whites' CJ. In either case, of course, the ts sequence is non-English. Examples are

- 10 Hale's tsōk ~ tsok ~ tsūk ~ tshōk for /tsuq/ 'water';¹⁰ Palmer's T-sit-still and Shaw's chillchil ~ tsiltsil for /tseltse/ 'button, star'; Shaw's Tsugh for /ts'ex/ 'split', Tsee'pie for /tsipi/ 'miss', and Tsik'-tsik ~ Tchik tchik for /ts'ikts'ik/ 'wheel; wagon'.

The word for 'white', /tk'up/, turns up in three of the sources I have with the initial cluster intact: Parker t'koop, Shaw T'kope, and Winthrop Tee-coop ~ t'kope (cope); compare Hale's tūkōp.

Finally, the word /dlay/ 'dry', which is of English origin but which appears in all sources, English as well as Indian, with CJ /l/, turns up in several writers' lists with the non-English dl (or tl) cluster: Hale tlai, Winthrop Die, Shaw D'ly ~ De-ly. This word is particularly interesting because it provides a striking bit of counterevidence to Silverstein's claim that 'all speakers clearly simplify to a certain extent the phonetic realization of words derived from their own languages and yet pronounce them with their sound structures more intact than do non-native speakers' [I:384]. It is difficult to imagine an English speaker simplifying his /r/ to /l/, even with an epenthetic vowel inserted between the word-initial stop and the following resonant; it is even harder to imagine him simplifying an ordinary /dr/ cluster to a cluster that violates English syllable structure constraints. The completely consistent presence of /l/ in this CJ word can only be accounted for if we assume that English speakers learned it as a CJ word rather than rephonologizing the native English word dry as they spoke the Jargon.

The direct linguistic evidence of the English writers thus strongly indicates the existence of a consistent CJ phonological norm containing certain distributional features and perhaps one phonemic distinction, /h/ vs. /x/, that cannot be claimed as simplifications of English phonology. English writers cannot be shown to distinguish glottalized from nonglottalized sounds, though

Shaw's spelling T'ss-zum (~ Tzum, Tsum) for /ts'am/ 'mark' may represent an effort to indicate glottalization. They do not distinguish /t/ from /tʰ/ nor velar stops from uvular stops, and they do not indicate non-initial /'/. Labialized dorsals are treated as Cw clusters in syllable-initial position; elsewhere labialization is usually not indicated, though Hale's v_ariant mākust (~ mākst) for /makwst/ 'two' probably reflects a labialized velar.

Before turning to the indirect evidence for an independent CJ phonology, let us look at the most important direct evidence from French-speaking writers. Of all the European-language writings on CJ, the one that is closest by far to the pronunciation of the Indian sources is the little book from the Quebec Mission, containing brief grammatical notes, a dictionary, catechism, prayers, and hymns. This book was composed in the first years of the Mission (1838-1839) by Father Modeste Demers, who, according to his colleague Father Blanchet, 'possessed [the Jargon] sufficiently well [after three months' residence in the region] to be able to explain the catechism and give instruction to the catechumens without having to force himself to write what he had to tell them' [Notices of the Quebec Mission, 1956:19]. Blanchet revised, corrected, and completed the book in 1867, and Father St. Onge modified it, made additions, and published it in Montreal in 1871. The result is a remarkable work, and it shows beyond any doubt that these Europeans, at least, heard most of the CJ distinctions presented above and tried to reproduce some of them orthographically. Dorsal fricatives are represented by a truncated letter h (in contrast to ordinary h); CJ /h/ and /x/ are thus consistently distinguished in syllable-initial position, e.g. helo '(it is) not' vs. holoīma 'different' (CJ /hilu/, /xluīma/) and elehi 'earth' vs. sahali 'high'. Plain and glottalized dorsal stops are also distinguished regularly. The glottalized stops are written with a truncated k (or lower-case k), as opposed to nonglottalized K and k.

The lateral fricative is always written tl; the lateral affricate /tʃ/ is usually written tl, but one word, /tʃ'ep/ 'deep' is written variously as Tlep, Tlip, or Klip -- the last showing glottalization of the stop by the only orthographic means available. Similarly, the spelling ppens for /p'e'nəs/ 'baked in ashes' may represent an attempt to indicate glottalization of the initial stop. Besides these distinctions, Demers et al. regularly show initial ts and the non-English clusters, which are also non-French: Tl~~g~~op 'chop', tsok 'water', Tlaɪ 'dry', and others. A glance at the Appendix will show how closely the transcriptions in this work agree with later transcriptions of CJ elicited from Indians by linguists. Now, it might be argued that the French Canadian missionaries and the English-speaking travelers and missionaries could have heard different versions of the Jargon, and that this circumstance, rather than mere orthographic (or auditory) difficulties, made the English speakers' CJ look so very different from Demers', Blanchet's, and St. Onge's. But a look at the relevant dates and places shows that this is not a tenable hypothesis. The Catholic French speakers established their mission at Fort Vancouver early in 1839 [Notices of the Quebec Mission, 1956:13ff.]. Hale speaks of the Jargon at Fort Vancouver, which he visited between 1837 and 1842. Parker first saw Fort Vancouver on 16 October 1835 [1842:146-7] and left the region in June, 1836 [1842:357], so he must have collected his 'Vocabulary of the Chenook Language [actually Chinook Jargon] as Spoken about Fort Vancouver' during that period. Ross arrived on the Northwest Coast in 1811, but the Preface to his book is dated 1846, and by that time he had settled permanently in the region. All these people were thus talking to the same groups of Indians in the same places at about the same time -- in some cases literally the same Indians, because the Catholic missionaries (like Demers et al.) and the Protestant missionaries (like Parker) were engaged in an acrimonious tug-of-war for the very same souls. What the French

speakers heard, then, the English speakers must also have heard. Of course it is very likely that the English speakers did not achieve as good a command of the language as Demers and his fellows did, and maybe later anglo CJ speakers diverged more, and more systematically, from the Indian pronunciation. But the evidence from the English writings shows that some non-English features were recognized as appropriate for the Jargon, and the evidence of the Quebec Mission source shows that some of the more exotic distinctions too were part of the target phonology.

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

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

-- 1956:150; emphasis mine.

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

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

-- 1882:4; cited by Hymes,
Forthcoming, (ms.p.) 25.
1980:407.

Here we have the same assessment of CJ phonology expressed independently by three different European writers over a period of nearly forty years -- a period which saw the greatest expansion of the Jargon. It doesn't look as if English speakers settled quickly into pronunciation habits that approximated English and seemed quite adequate for speaking the Jargon; it

looks, instead, very much as if English speakers knew all along (Hale notwithstanding) that achieving good CJ pronunciation required time and effort, and the acquisition of new and unfamiliar sounds. This is not to say that most or even many English speakers reached this goal. Indeed, the total absence of systematic attempts by English writers to represent features like glottalization, non-initial /'/, and the velar : uvular opposition suggests that relatively few English speakers tried to acquire good pronunciation in the Jargon. As Indian speakers became accustomed to English speakers' systematic distortions, no difficulty in communication would result from the English speakers' failure to make some of the distinctions. Nevertheless, the indirect evidence of the commentaries provides a strong argument for the existence of a complex CJ target phonology, one that at least some Europeans recognized and tried to learn.¹¹

The search for non-English features in CJ syntax as used by English speakers offers some difficulties of interpretation, but here too there are some unambiguous examples that Silverstein's model will not predict. The basic word order of CJ, as mentioned above, is SVO, so in this respect Silverstein is on solid ground. Even here, though, there is an occasional variant word order VS, which occurs not only in texts elicited from Indians but also (though less frequently) in English speakers' sample sentences.¹²
Hale 1846 contains 9 VS sentences and 20 SV ones;¹³ Gill 1902 has 6 VS and 15 SV sentences. In both sources, most sentences have only a pronoun subject. Indian speakers, to judge by Jacobs' and Boas' texts, were more likely to produce VS sentences when the

subject was a full noun rather than a pronoun. In such sentences Jacobs' Santiam Kalapuya informant, for example, produced 66 SV sentences and 12 VS sentences, though eight of the latter group had a subject pronoun preceding the verb in addition to the subject noun following it. Now, some of the VS sentences I'm counting in these sources are questions, and in questions VS word order is possible, to a limited degree, in English. It should be noted, however, that all experts agree on the absence of any regular word-order shift in CJ question formation. And the occurrence of VS word order in declarative sentences, even though it is occasional rather than regular, is a feature that cannot plausibly be claimed as a simplification of English. A typical example from Hale is Haias olo tsok naika 'I am very thirsty' [1846:645], literally 'much hungry water I'.

A more problematic syntactic feature is the quite regular (though not exclusive) pattern in which a pleonastic subject pronoun is used in addition to a subject noun. This feature surely comes from the completely analogous pattern in Chinook (where the usual order is $s_{pro} + V S_{noun}$) and in other Indian languages of the region, and it appears in the writings of English-speaking authors as well as in the Indian texts. Silverstein discusses a typical example, originally from Hale 1890 [33]:

Jesus yaka kumtuks kanaway tilikums 'Jesus knew all nations' (literally 'Jesus he know all peoples')[II:612]. According to Silverstein, this sentence type 'should be compared with that English style which states a subject, then comments about it with a full sentence, a particular "folksy" literary style' [II:612]; and, indeed, it is possible to find analogous sentences in nineteenth-century American literature of the West, e.g. in Mark Twain's Roughing It: 'n' Tom Quartz he begin to wonder...' [1872:328]. But Silverstein's assumption that such constructions

might appear spontaneously as simplifications in all English speakers' CJ is surely unjustified. Even granting that all English speakers may know of such a style, only those speakers who actually use it regularly could reasonably be expected to produce it -- in the absence of a conventional CJ norm -- in the process of simplifying their native syntax in order to communicate with other CJ speakers. Most of Twain's characters and many or most English-speaking trappers, traders, servants, and soldiers in the region at that time might well fall into this group. But Horatio Hale the Harvard graduate, the various English-speaking missionaries who used CJ, and other people educated enough to write about CJ are unlikely to have been regular speakers of what is, after all, a socially stigmatized speech style.¹⁴

14

A comparable construction is the regular possessive formation in which the possessor noun is followed by a pronoun referring to it, and the pronoun in turn by the possessed noun: Jesus yaka wawa 'Jesus' words/speech' (literally 'Jesus his words/speech') [II:613, from Hale 1890]. This parallels the Chinook possessive construction, and similar patterns are found in other Indian languages of the region. Silverstein considers this construction, too, to be a plausible simplification of English; in fact, he suggests that it might constitute 'interlingual evidence for the underlying verbal nature of possession' [II:613], and then he goes on to give a possible transformational derivation of it in those terms. His argument here is not convincing. First, it suffers from the same liability as his argument for SVO word order from a Chinook speaker: he can account for it only under the assumption that the speaker had a particular target -- a grammatical norm -- in mind, because otherwise anyone would expect an English speaker to simplify his syntactic possessive construction to Jesus speech instead of

activating a complex set of transformational rules to produce a relexified analogue of Jesus his speech. (Constructions like Jesus speech actually do occur very frequently in English-based pidgins and creoles around the world, usually when at least some of the pidgin speakers have native languages with analogous possessives.) Second, it is ultimately a great deal simpler to assume that CJ speakers learned a CJ grammar than to argue for an otherwise unheard-of (or at least undemonstrated) surfacing of a deeper syntactic level. The difficulty with Silverstein's claim here is that he is basing it on a theory of syntax so powerful that virtually any construction in a pidgin could be explained as a simplification of any language's syntactic deep structure. Consider, for instance, the argument in the literature to the effect that English is a VSO language [McCawley 1970], which could be used to account for English speakers' simplifying to VSO order in speaking some pidgin (and then why didn't they do so in speaking CJ to speakers of VSO languages?!). Given the extreme power (and lack of constraints on possible deep structures) of transformational-generative syntax, an argument that a particular construction is a simplification of some deeper structure must, if it is to be convincing, have some plausible source in the directly observable surface structures of the language. Aside from a possible reference to the stilted style of bookplates

15 ('John, his book'), one has no such recourse here.¹⁵ The Jesus his words pattern is surely a direct calque on Chinook and analogous constructions in other Indian languages.

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

Finally, CJ negative constructions differ in their word order from English, and from anything one might reasonably expect as a simplification of English. In the same sources I used for the na count I found 24 negative sentences with the order NEG S V and only 7 with the order S NEG V; four of the latter type occur in Indian texts, three in English speakers' texts. This pattern (as we will see below) is predictable from Chinook sentences with pronominal subject affixes and from analogous patterns in other Indian languages of the region, but it doesn't fit Silverstein's picture of CJ as English-derived for English speakers. It also contrasts sharply with negative sentence patterns in most English-based pidgins and creoles, where the (original) native languages of non-English speakers share the English word order S NEG V. The only pidgin I know of with a negative word order pattern like that of CJ is the 17th-century Delaware-based Traders' Jargon of the northeastern U.S.; in that pidgin too the pattern can be explained on the basis of patterns found in the relevant Indian languages (see Thomason 1980 for a detailed discussion of this point).

To sum up, then, the CJ attested in the writings of English speakers contains several sounds and sound sequences and several syntactic features that are difficult or impossible to characterize as plausible simplifications of English phonological and syntactic structures. These are the presence of initial /ts/, of /x/ and/or ^{preconsonantal}/h/, and of non-English consonant clusters in the phonology, and, in the syntax, occasional VS word order beside the regular SV order; a regular pattern S_{noun} S_{pro} V; a regular possessive construction Poss_{noun} Poss_{pro} N; a regular word order pattern NEG S V in negative sentences; and a fairly common question particle na. In addition to this direct evidence, there are comments by Bolduc, Winthrop, and Gill about the non-English nature of CJ target phonology, and Hymes cites a similar comment about the syntax made by the missionary Eells [Forthcoming, ms.25]. The contrary assertion by Hale about the phonology is not borne out by his own CJ data. All this points unmistakably to the existence of a grammatical norm for CJ independent of English structures. And, as we will see below, texts elicited directly from Indian speakers of CJ by linguists point in the same direction -- toward a CJ grammar independent of (though not as divergent from) native-language structures.

3.2. CJ vs. Chinook

The only CJ texts that directly reflect CJ as spoken by a native speaker of Chinook are those dictated to Melville Jacobs by Mrs. Victoria Howard, a Clackamas speaker. These provide most of the CJ data that Silverstein analyzes from a Chinookan viewpoint, but there is evidence that Mrs. Howard's CJ was atypical. Silverstein quotes Boas' comment on this point, that Mrs. Howard's CJ was 'certainly not the Chinook Jargon that has been used for years all along the coast, but seems to be a jargon affected by

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

In any case, it is likely that both Mrs. Howard's CJ and the unattested normal Chinook speakers' CJ that Boas refers to can for the most part easily

be analyzed, à la Silverstein, as systematic simplifications of Chinookan. This is predictable from the fact that the Jargon's limited stock of syntactic structures, with the sole exception of the SVO word order, constitutes a reasonable cross-language compromise between Chinook and neighboring Indian languages: pronoun subject markers in addition to full-noun subjects, pronominal possessors in addition to full-noun possessors, negative particles preceding subject as well as verb, the presence of a yes/no question particle, occasional (at least) VS word order, and other structures not mentioned above. The SVO word order does pose a problem for Silverstein's analysis, as I pointed out in §2, though it cannot be claimed as a markedly non-Chinookan pattern. It is noteworthy, however, that even Mrs. Howard shows signs of conforming partially to a CJ norm in this feature. Her sentences are about equally split between SV order (48) and VS order (46),¹⁷ and this would be a surprising ratio if she were simplifying spontaneously from her VS-dominant native Chinookan.¹⁸ (But see below, §3, for a possible independent ^{simplification} explanation for her ^{SV} order).

The only CJ phoneme which would emphatically not be expected in a spontaneous simplification from Chinookan is /r/.¹⁹ This phoneme occurs only in CJ words of English and French origin; /r/ is unknown not only in Chinookan but in almost every other Indian language in the region as well. Its appearance in texts elicited from Indians is sporadic, but when it does appear it offers striking evidence for a target CJ phonology. In Mrs. Howard's texts one CJ word with /r/, *kuri* 'run, go' occurs frequently, and Jacobs always transcribes it with an *r* and with initial voicing of the stop: *gu'ri* (1936: 2,4,5, and elsewhere).

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

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

3.3 CJ vs. Other Indian Languages

Let us review briefly the evidence presented so far in support of the hypothesis that CJ possessed a consistent, systematic grammar of its own. English speakers' CJ syntax differs in a number of ways from English and from any expected simplification of English deep structures; these syntactic patterns recur consistently in all Indians' CJ, including Mrs. Howard's, though Mrs. Howard's texts show a much greater proportion of VS sentences than do any other speakers' CJ. I have found no regular features of English speakers' CJ syntax that differ from other speakers' CJ, with the exception of Mrs. Howard's,

which has a number of features that are rare or nonexistent in all other speakers' versions of the Jargon (see Boas 1933:209 for other examples). In other words, aside from Mrs. Howard, there is no evidence of any systematic differences in syntax between English, French, and Indian speakers of CJ: the syntactic patterns are quite uniform from speaker group to speaker group.

The phonological situation is more complicated. The undoubted existence of some phonetic correspondence rules, e.g. English kl vs. Indians' /tʃ'/, /ʃ/ in word-initial position, points unmistakably to a certain degree of systematic variation in pronunciation between white and Indian speakers.²⁰ The question is, how extensive was this variation? Given the inadequacies of both English- and French-based orthographies, we will probably never know; but both direct and indirect evidence strongly indicate that CJ had a target phonology as well as a syntax and lexicon.

When we turn to a comparison of CJ utterances produced by different Indians, we find a striking correspondence from speaker to speaker, not only in syntax but also in phonology. Moreover, the phonological picture that emerges from this comparison shows clearly that, even if whites did provide the initial stimulus for the development of the pidgin, Indians cannot have learned CJ from whites.²¹ Regular, consistent CJ sounds (in Indians' pronunciation, that is) include some that most whites did not produce, notably the voiceless laterals (a glottalized affricate and a fricative), the nonlateral glottalized stops, and the phonemically distinct velar and uvular series. These facts point to the existence of a systematic phonemic structure for CJ, a structure which surely permitted both individual and group variation (as the various Indian texts show, e.g. in the common allophonic voicing of

voiceless stops) but which constituted a definite target phonology for all Indian speakers.²² English and French speakers, at least the later ones, deviated significantly from this norm, but even those deviations were generally patterned rather than random or idiosyncratic.

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

Several factors interfere with this comparative study, and some of them introduce unavoidable indeterminacy into the results. First, we must disregard utterances of any Indian whose native language cannot be identified, no matter how sophisticated the transcription; this means that all of Boas' 'Chinook songs' must be eliminated, except for one which he identifies as a Nootka sailor's song (1888:222). Second, I have not tried to make use of utterances recorded by non-linguists. Winthrop, for instance, has a number of sentences that are supposed to have been spoken by a Clallam Indian, but his English-based orthography and other naive features of his recording make the data unsuitable for present purposes. Third, some of the native languages of recorded CJ speakers are now moribund or extinct, and the existing evidence as to their phonological structure is fragmentary. This is true, for instance,

of Kalapuya and of Upper Coquille Athabaskan, where we have a good idea of the phonemic inventories but only a few bits of information about subphonemic variation and morphophonemic alternations, which might be crucial for the interpretation of some CJ forms. For this reason I have relied heavily on data from speakers of relatively well-described languages, especially Twana, for which I have both Elmendorf's extensive list of CJ words and phrases and Drachman's admirably thorough and detailed phonological description (1969).

Excluding Mrs. Howard's CJ, I have eight sets of texts and/or word lists elicited directly by linguists from Indians whose native language is specified: Twana (Coast Salish; Elmendorf 1939); Snoqualmie (s. Lushootseed, Coast Salish; Jacobs 1936); Saanich (Coast Salish; Jacobs 1936); Nootka (Wakashan; Boas 1888); Tsimshian (Penutian?; Boas 1933); Upper Coquille Athabaskan (Jacobs 1936); Santiam Kalapuya (Penutian?; Jacobs 1936); and Chehalis (Harrington, n.d.).²³

Let's look first at the so-called nasalless languages in this group, Twana and Snoqualmie. In his very thorough investigation of Twana phonology, Drachman found twenty-eight words with nasal phones: eighteen with [m], nine with [n], and one with [ŋ]. He believes that all of these are loanwords, though for a few he can find no source. The word with [ŋ] is a Clallam loanword; four of the words with [m] and six of the words with [n] are from English; a few words are from French, possibly via Chinook Jargon; and, of the rest, six are affective words, including the word for 'small' (1969:198-99). In addition, two morphophonemic rules optionally derive [m] and [n] from b and d (which are themselves, in turn, reflexes of Proto-Salish *m and *n);

one of these rules operates utterance-initially, the other at internal morpheme boundaries (64). Drachman, writing at a time when abstract phonology was more popular than it is now, analyzes b and d as derivatives of underlying /m/ and /n/ phonemes respectively. I do not find his arguments on this point completely convincing, but they are not at issue here: what is important in this context is the fact that nasal phones occur regularly in Twana only in a handful of words, out of a very large corpus; that these words are all demonstrably non-native and/or affective, in either case abnormal; and that otherwise [m] and [n] occur only as occasional variants of regular b and d. Twana is thus not totally nasalless, but nasal stops are not an ordinary part of its phonetic structure -- they are rare and, for the most part, foreign.²⁴ The situation is similar in Snoqualmie, at least to the extent that nasals are very rare. Two sources on Snoqualmie or very similar dialects of southern Lushootseed, Tweddell (1950) and Snyder (1968), list just one s. Lushootseed word with a nasal: this is the word for 'small', which also occurs in Twana with a nasal [m] (Tweddell:3, Snyder:10; Tweddell also gives the word plank, a recent English loanword). The phonological descriptions provided by these two sources are far less detailed than Drachman's, so Snoqualmie may well have other affective vocabulary with nasals and perhaps also some loanwords. But it is clear that Snoqualmie, like Twana, is in effect nasalless.

In the CJ utterances dictated to Elmendorf by Henry Allen, 105 words have the regular CJ nasals,²⁵ while only eleven words have [b] or [d] where other CJ has a nasal stop. Two of these eleven words, 'handkerchief' and 'fathom', have a variant with a nasal, e.g. he'kətcəm ~ he'kətcab. Of the others, most occur in Twana as well as in CJ -- that is, except for the word for

'whale', which is a native Salish word, all these words have apparently been borrowed into Twana from CJ. In the borrowing process, they have been nativized, and the CJ nasals have been replaced by normal Twana [b] and [d]. Examples are sta'kad 'stockings, socks', for normal CJ /stakin/ (originally from English); la'b 'rum', for normal CJ /lam/; ki'tʔəd 'kettle', for /kitl(ə)n/; and lawid 'oats' for /la'win/ (originally from French l'avoine). Allen even commented that sta'kad was 'not proper Jargon', indicating that he realized he was giving a Twana pronunciation for a CJ word. The interesting thing about this phonological situation is that Allen gave a Twana pronunciation only for those CJ words that also appear in Twana; he made no Twana-derived phoneme substitutions in other CJ words. In the same way, an American would be likely to pronounce a name like Ruth with a [θ] even when speaking a language like Serbocroatian, whose native speakers would pronounce it with [t]; but the same American, if fluent in Serbocroatian, would be unlikely to substitute an English affricate [tʃ] for the palatalized Serbocroatian affricate [č] when speaking that language. As we will see, other CJ speakers also made a sharp distinction between the treatment of non-native sounds in loanwords, where foreign sounds were likely to be nativized, and their treatment in CJ, where foreign sounds tended to remain.

In Jacobs' texts from a Snoqualmie speaker (1936:24-25), I find 105 occurrences of nasal phones and no instances of a [b] or [d] substituted for an expected CJ nasal stop. The Twana and Snoqualmie materials thus provide overwhelming evidence that the speakers knew very well that in speaking CJ they were supposed to use [m] and [n]; there isn't the slightest tendency to substitute their native-language equivalents [b] and [d] for CJ nasals, except,

with the Twana speaker, for words that he interpreted as Twana words, not CJ ones.²⁶

It should be noted that Snoqualmie speakers also replaced CJ nasals with native, voiced oral stops in CJ words borrowed into Snoqualmie, e.g. /pastɬ/ for CJ /bastən/ (Snyder 1968:67) and stakad for /stakin/ (Snyder 1968:40).

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

For another Salishan language represented in the Indian texts, Saanich, I have no description. There is a good, though brief, description available of a closely related language, however: this is Clallam, another language of the Straits subgroup of Coast Salish (see Thompson and Thompson 1971). In addition, Demers (1974) gives a phonemic inventory for Lummi, a Straits language slightly less closely related to Saanich than Clallam is (see Thompson 1979 for a complete classification of Salishan languages). Jacobs' Saanich texts, like his Twana and Snoqualmie texts, have no /r/: the two CJ /r/ words that

occur are /dret/ and /kuri/, and these appear here as dili't and ku'li. In Lummi there is no /k/ (though there is a labialized phoneme /kʷ/); Clallam has a /k/, but it is said to be very rare and confined to loanwords (Thompson and Thompson 1971:253). The Saanich-CJ texts, however, show the usual CJ opposition between /k/ and /q/, e.g. ka'muks 'dog' vs. qa 'where'. In fact, /k/ is far more common in these texts than /q/, as it is in CJ in general. Another Clallam phoneme, /l/, is also said to be very rare in Clallam, occurring only in loanwords; I have no evidence that /l/ is rare in Lummi, so this trait may not be a general one in the Straits Salish languages. In any case, /l/ is certainly very common in the Saanich-CJ texts, both in words where one expects it and in words where one expects /r/.

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

The Nootka sailor's song that Boas recorded (1888:222) is very short -- only three lines long, sixteen words in all -- but it has one very interesting

phonetic feature. It contains three regular CJ words with /l/ and two English words which the informant pronounced with /l/: lele for CJ /lili/ 'a (long) time'; elip for /iləp/ 'first', superlative formant; k'al for /q'əl/ 'hard, difficult'; leave; and Entelplaize, for English Enterprise (the name of a sealing-schooner). The appearance of /l/ in several words in this song, including one in which English has /r/'s, is interesting in light of the fact that Nootka itself has no voiced liquid /l/, though it has three voiceless lateral phonemes, /l/, /ɬ/, and /ɬ'/. (Sapir and Swadesh 1939). This feature of Nootka-CJ is especially striking when we compare it with loanwords in Nootka from Chinook Jargon and see that all of them have a nasal, usually [n], in place of CJ [l] (the page references for the following examples are to Sapir and Swadesh 1939): napnīt ~ occasional nipnīt 'priest, minister' (273) vs. CJ /liprét/, from French le prêtre; nano'pi(q-) 'ribbon' (274) vs. CJ /lilubá/, from French le ruban; sapni-q- ~ sapnin 'flour' (306) vs. CJ /saplil/, source unknown; nīšā'k (w-) 'sack' (275) vs. /lis'ák/, from French le sac; tānā(q-) 'dollar, money' (267) vs. CJ /dala/, from English; mamatō(q-) 'sheep, wool' (263) vs. CJ /limutō/, from French le mouton; and others. A similar comparison may be made between the song's one word with a [d], kada 'how', vs. CJ /qada/, and the CJ loanword tānā(q-) in Nootka, with [t] in place of CJ [d].²⁸ Like the Twana treatment of CJ loanwords containing source-language nasals, Nootka nativizes loanwords containing the non-native sounds [l] and [d]; but when speaking CJ itself the Nootka speaker pronounces the CJ [l] and [d] as any other CJ speaker would.²⁹

Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text (1933:211-13) has only one feature that would not be expected, as far as I know, if the pronunciation had been strongly influenced

by Tsimshian. This is the consistent and frequent occurrence of [č], e.g. in tca·'ko 'come' and mosa'tci 'bad'; this is opposed to /ts/, as in la'mətsin 'medicine'. Tsimshian itself has /c/ but no /č/ phoneme, and I have not found any mention in the literature of allophonic rules that would derive a [č] phone in the language. There are no instances in the text of a replacement of expected [č] by [c]. The only other phonetic feature in the Tsimshian-CJ text that should be mentioned is the absence of [r]; the only two CJ /r/ words that occur always appear with [l]: dole·'t, ku·'li.

Jacobs' texts from a speaker of Santiam Kalapuya contain several frequent sounds that are certainly not found in Kalapuya itself as separate phonemes and, as far as I can tell, not even as phones. The most striking of these is the [r]. The three CJ /r/ words that occur in the texts always have the expected /r/: gu·'ri, ku·'ri 'run', kri·'ye 'cry out', and dre·'t 'exact'. The texts also have the CJ phoneme /tʃ/, which does not occur in Kalapuya; examples are t·'a·p 'find' and t·'u·nas 'uncertain, doubtful'. The phoneme /tʃ/ also occurs regularly, but it is not a Kalapuya phoneme. And finally, the texts show a phonemic distinction between CJ /s/ and /ʃ/, a distinction which does not exist in Kalapuya. There are some instances where expected CJ [ʃ] is replaced by [s], e.g. ma·'s beside ma·'s 'beat' and tu·'s beside tu·'c (= [tʃ]) 'good'. According to Jacobs' prefatory note, 'The s and c series sounds (s, ts, t's, c, tc, t'c) are are probably one series to a Santiam when using his native language; the s series is articulated about a point between s and c but closer to s; the c series seems almost but not quite confused with the s series and is distinguished by the informants by employing a sound fairly close to c' (1936:vi). The texts show, however, that Jacobs' informant had a more consistent distinction than

this comment suggests. There are over two hundred correct occurrences of s and ts, and only nine s's (in four words) in place of expected /ʃ/. There are forty-four occurrences of expected ʃ and tʃ, and only one word, CJ /(s)pus/ 'if', occurs often with ʃ instead of expected s; otherwise, there are only three incorrect ʃ's. Twenty-one words in all have only the expected sibilants; only seven words show variation between the s and ʃ series.

The only feature in Jacobs' text from an Upper Coquille Athabaskan that was certainly foreign to the informant's native language is the r in dire·t 'straight'. I have no description for the speaker's native language; descriptions of neighboring Athabaskan languages (or dialects) indicate a general (and typically Athabaskan) lack of labials, but two of them, Chasta Costa (Tolowa) (Bright 1964) and Tututni (Golla 1976) -- have a /b/ and an /m/, a third, Galice, has /p/ and /m/ (Hoijer, 1966), and a fourth, Hupa (Woodward 1964, cited in Ruhlen 1975:207), has [p] and /m/. Sapir (1914) has /m/ in Chasta Costa, which he says is common, and a nondistinctive [b], which is occasional but does not occur in native words. Since I don't know which of these languages Upper Coquille resembled in this respect, I don't know whether or not the frequent occurrences of m (initially, medially, and finally), and b (initially and medially), and the single occurrence of p (finally), represent a noteworthy departure from native Upper Coquille phonology. Coquille surely differed from CJ in one important phonological feature: like other Athabaskan languages, the languages or dialects of Oregon lack a velar: uvular opposition. Unfortunately, though there are many /k/'s, only one CJ word with /q/ appears in Jacobs' brief Coquille-CJ text. This is /xauqwaʔ/, 'unable'³⁰ which is transcribed as xa·'xwaʔ, i.e. with the stop apparently assimilated to the preceding fricative (perhaps, but by no means certainly, due to the speaker's attempt to preserve

the target CJ back articulation). Otherwise, only CJ fricatives /h/ and /x/ are distinguished; in initial position, CJ /h/ could certainly have been identified with the native Coquilles phoneme /h/, and CJ /x/ with native /x/. Only medial x and h in the text might serve as evidence that the speaker was using the CJ /h/ : /x/ distinction, and here the evidence is shaky. On the one hand we have mi'txwit (CJ /m^hthwit/ 'stand') and hi'lu '(it is) not' vs. xa'xwot (CJ /xauqwa / 'unable') and ixpu (CJ /ixpui/ 'shut'); but, on the other hand, we find words that appear consistently with the wrong fricative, e.g. di'lxom for CJ /tal^hem/ 'person' and taxani (which would reflect medial CJ /h/) for CJ /taxani/ 'out(side)'. 31

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

In sum, then, all the Indian sources show one or more phonological features that would not be expected if the speakers were independently simplifying their respective native phonologies in speaking the Jargon. The informants for the nasalless Salishan languages, Twana and Snoqualmie, have regular CJ /m/ and

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

These details in which Indian speakers of CJ deviate from their native-language phonologies support the hypothesis that CJ had an independent target phonology: the CJ phonemic inventory that Kaufman established from a comparison of all the sources was demonstrably used by all the Indians, even those whose native languages lacked one or more of the general CJ distinctions. The only exception, as mentioned above, is the /r/ : /l/ opposition, which some Indians clearly lacked, though a few had it. /r/ is the only CJ phoneme that is foreign

to all the Indian languages of the region, and thus the only one that occurs only in words of European origin (though most European words with source-language /r/, like /dlay/ 'dry', always have an l in everyone's version of CJ). It is significant that all the specific CJ sounds that are markedly non-European, namely glottalized stops, uvulars, lateral obstruents, and non-initial /ʔ/, are shared by all, or almost all, the Indian languages in the area -- indeed, they constitute probably the best known evidence for the famous Northwest Sprachbund. These sounds would therefore be expected in a language that arose as a cross-language compromise among speakers of Northwest Amerindian languages, though some of them (notably the lateral obstruents and the phonemically distinct uvulars) are relatively uncommon, and thus highly marked, in universal terms.

When we turn to the syntax, we find at once a consistent feature in all the Indian sources that is hard to account for unless we assume the existence of a grammatical norm for CJ. This is the regular SVO sentential word order pattern, which, as was mentioned above, is not found as a statistically dominant word order in any Indian languages in the Northwest. Many of the languages, like Chinook, have SV word order as a stylistic possibility, but the dominant, basic word order in most of the languages is VSO. All the Salishan languages are verb-initial. Nootka and the other Wakashan languages all have VSO word order. Tsimshian has VS word order [Rigsby 1975:346]. I have no specific information about Kalapuya word order, but other Penutian languages of Oregon, Takelma and Lower Umpqua (like Chinook itself), are verb-initial. A family that is not represented in the CJ sources, but whose speakers also spoke the Jargon (Boas 1892:37), is Chemakuan, and both of its members, Quileute and Chemakum, are

apparently also verb-initial (e.g. the sample sentences in Powell 1971). Only one group in the region has a different basic word order pattern; this is Athabaskan, presumably including Coquille, which is SOV (Krauss 1965:183) and, in at least one of the Canadian languages, rigidly so (see Li 1946 on Chipewyan). In spite of the Athabaskan exception, then, the occasional VS sentences in all Indians' CJ are easy to explain as an areally determined feature, but the basic SVO order is not.

One caveat is in order here, however. As we will see below, all of the languages, including both verb-initial ones and Athabaskan, have pronominal subject prefixes or clitics that regularly or occasionally precede the main content verb. In a pidgin arising out of communication between speakers of such languages, it is reasonable to suppose that analytic subject pronouns would retain the preverbal position of native-language subject affixes or clitics, if the preverbal position predominates. A developmental process that fixed subject pronouns in this position could then be explained as an areally determined feature. In all CJ texts and collections of sentences, sentences with subject pronouns alone are far more common than sentences with full-noun subjects (38 to 16, for instance, in Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text), so one might argue that the general SV word order of CJ arose as an analogic extension of a regular $S_{pro}V$ order to sentences with full-noun subjects. The reason for such an extension, if it does not lie in the participation of speakers of SVO languages (i.e. English and French) in the developmental process, would have to be sought in the general improbability of an analytic syntax with one word order pattern for fully stressed pronoun subjects and a different pattern for noun subjects. This point will be discussed in more detail below, in §4. What is important

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

It is harder to compare some of the other syntactic features of CJ with the various Indian languages, largely because full syntactic descriptions are not available for most of the relevant languages. Moreover, the base for comparison is smaller for syntax than for phonology, because Boas' brief Nootka sailor's song offers very little evidence, and Harrington's material contains only a handful of sentences and phrases. In this section I will concentrate on the syntactic features already discussed: pronoun subject markers in addition to full-noun subjects, pronominal possessors in addition to full-noun possessors, negative particles preceding subject as well as verb, and the presence of a yes/no question particle. All these features, as far as I can determine, are found in some form in all of the languages whose speakers provided CJ material, and in most of the other languages of the region as well.³² I am assuming here that the pleonastic subject and possessive pronouns of CJ may reasonably be viewed as analytic analogues of subject and possessive pronominal affixes; none of the relevant languages has pleonastic independent (stressed) pronouns as subjects or possessives, but all have sets of subject and possessive affixes and/or clitics. I am also assuming that a question particle may be interpreted as an analytic analogue of an interrogative affix.

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

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------|
| (1) <u>t'alap'as pi lilu' laska molayt iht-iht laska haws</u> | 'A coyote and a |
| coyote and wolf they live one-one they house | wolf lived (with) |
| | their houses side |
| | by side' (30). |
| (2) <u>kakwa yaka wawa t'alap'as kapa lilu'</u> | 'Thus the coyote |
| so he speak to | spoke to the wolf' |
| | (31). |

The regular order of these elements in CJ in $S_N S_{pro}^V$; the other order that occurs, $S_{pro}^V S_N$, is found only in Mrs. Howard's texts (33 times) and in the Kalapuya-CJ texts (8 times). The only Indian CJ text that does not show many more $S_N S_{pro}^V$ sentences than simple $S_N V$ sentences is Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text, which has eight of each:

- (3) iht man yaka kuli kupa lamotáy 'One man went to
one man 3.sg. go to mountain the mountain' (1).
(4) ukuk man tcaku 'That man came' (2).
that man come

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

- (5) Chinook proper: wixt á-i-u-u i-qísqis 'Again the bluejay
again he-went-on bluejay went on' (Silverstein I:388, from Boas 1894:155)
(6) Kathlamet Chinook: ik-u-Xua-quitq t-ai-ci t-lXam 'The people
they- arose those people arose.' (Hymes 1955:303).

According to Silverstein, Chinookan 'has an almost entirely prefixing productive inflectional apparatus of very recent date' (1979:662). It is thus not surprising to find that neighboring Penutian languages of Oregon have a differently ordered set of pronominal affixes. Takelma and Siuslawan (Lower Umpqua), at least, have pronominal subject suffixes; but in these languages and in Coos, Alsea, Molale, and Kalapuya, the suffixal systems 'have been overlain by a system of pronominals that are either attested as, or easily reconstructible as, clitic elements the position of which in a sentence is determined. . . by the phrase position of the word to which ^{they} attach' (Silverstein 1979:661). In other words, of the Oregon Penutian languages only Chinookan itself has consistent

preverbal subject (agent) pronominals. Kalapuya, in particular, does not, which means that the regular preverbal position of the pleonastic pronouns in Jacobs' Kalapuya-CJ text would not be expected as a simplification of the speaker's native language.

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

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

I do not have enough information about the syntax of relevant Coast Salishan

languages to be able to generalize about the position of pronominal subject markers relative to the verb. To make any useful generalizations I would have to know, among other things, the ratio of preverbal subject clitics to postverbal ones, and of nominalized verbs in texts to finite ones. By 'preverbal' I mean the position relative to the main verb, semantically speaking; there is ample evidence in pidgins from other parts of the world to show that the position of the semantically significant verb in source languages is the only one of syntactic relevance for predicting the position of the verb in a resulting pidgin. And evidence from verb-final Gastarbeiterdeutsch, at least, indicates that -- contrary to one's expectations about simplification from a source language -- the position of the verb in pidgin sentences may be determined by ordering in a common subordinate construction rather than by the order in independent clauses (see Clyne 1975:2-3). In any case, the examples and comments given below will serve to indicate the range of possibilities and the level of complexity in the systems. The most important examples in the present context are of course those from Chehalis, Tillamook, and Squamish, which show pleonastic third person pronominals or quasi-pronominals (actually articles or demonstratives), but I have included examples with first- and second-person subjects as well in order to show that all subject pronominals can occur in the preverbal position. It should be noted, though, that the third-person 'subject-markers' in Tillamook and Squamish always precede the verb.

In Skagit, a northern Lushootseed dialect closely related to the language of Jacobs' Snoqualmie speaker, subject markers in independent clauses are clitics, and these clitics 'appear postverbally only if the clause contains no adverb' (Hukari 1976:307):

- (7) Skagit: pas- tag^wax^w cad 'I am hungry'
static-hungry I
- (8) Skagit: laPb cad pas- tag^wax^w 'I am very hungry'
very I static-hungry

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

- (9) Clallam: men[?] cx^w u[?] x^wen, Pa[?] t[?]ane x^w 'you walk too fast'
very you contempo- fast as walk you (1971:269)
raneous

Boas' Chehalis text shows typical Salishan suffixed pleonastic third person subject markers, both on finite and on nominalized main verbs:

- (10) to[?]m + a^{te} t s^qe[?]tatci 'The days are short'
short 3.pl. the days (Boas 1934:103).
continulative
- (11) we[?] t[?]la s+ts+itc+[?]s s+q[?]ul+na[?]/mts 'Ripe fruits will disappear' (103).
it is future nom-disappear nom-ripe+body
izer +3rd poss -izer
ripe fruits

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

- (12) Tillamook: du w[?]usni[?]c gatc[?]au 'Gatcelau went back'
sg. art. went back G. (52). The u in du, in place of expected a, is presumably due to the following w.

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

(13) Squamish: na- q'úynəx was ta swípa ta m'íxa 'The man (has)
he- killed-it the man the bear killed the bear.'

(14) Squamish: /č-n c'ic'a'p' / ~ /c'ic'a'p' č-n/ 'I work'.
I work work I

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

(15) Upper Chehalis: me'tta en ta s-š'xtam 'I was not seen'
NEG I the Nom-+being (Boas 1937:107).
poss. izer seen

(16) Clallam: ʔəwa cən c x'wə'em 'I'm not hungry.'
NEG I DEM hungry (Thompson and Thompson 1971:).
pres. 2ndary

In sum, the Coast Salishan languages have suffixed and enclitic subject pronominals, but they also have variant patterns in which a subject pronominal appears before the main content verb of a sentence. If we add the regular VS sentential word order to the (probably much more frequent) V(-o-)s order, we would expect an independent simplification from Coast Salishan languages like Saanich and Snoqualmie to result in regular postverbal first and second person pronouns, since in CJ these are all independent pronouns. We would also expect to find

third person independent pronouns occurring postverbally, not preverbally as in Jacobs' texts. But the situation with the pleonastic third person subject indexicals is different, because these seem to occur before the main verb as often as after it. This slim evidence would therefore support a hypothesis that independent simplification in Coast Salishan, if it resulted in pleonastic third person pronouns at all (which is somewhat doubtful), would quite possibly fix them in preverbal position, which is where they occur in CJ.

Tsimshian, like Coast Salishan, has only limited occurrence of pleonastic subject pronominals. As far as I can tell from Boas' texts (1911:414-22) and Rigsby's discussion (1975), they occur in the form of plural markers and as a -t suffixed to a sentence-initial 'auxiliary' verb like the negative. Only the latter type seems to be obligatory, however; compare (17) and (18) below. The first three examples here are from the Nass dialect of Nass-Gitskan of the Tsimshian language group (see Rigsby 1975:346, fn. 2).

(17) Nass: N+L hwʔl g'itsʔel + qā /ō+dēL RōpE+tk.ʔē'Lkʷ 'That is the
then where in go 3.pl small children (plu.)
(plu. stem) connective +L. (plu.)
place where the children went in' (Boas 1911:414).

(18) Nass: K'ʔē k'si+Lō'ō+L k'opE+tk.ʔēLkʷ 'The boys went out'
then out go (plu.) connective small children(plu.)
(plu.) (Boas 1911:417).

(19) Nass: neediit ga'a+h1 gat+h1 haanaK' 'The man didn't see
NEG + 3.sg. saw connective man connective woman
(ref. to 3sg) 33 (Rigsby 1975:363).

(20) Tsimshian: a'Age+t nešegā'+tga wT+medī'okga 'The great grizzly bear
NEG + 3.sg. mind connective great + grizzly bear
did not mind' (Boas 1911:421).

The more consistent of these, the -t suffixed to the 'auxiliary', thus occurs before the main verb in Tsimshian, so that we would expect to find a pleonastic

from an English
point of view.

subject pronoun (if it occurred at all) in this position in an independently simplified Tsimshian. Boas' Tsimshian-CJ text has, in fact, only preverbal pleonastic pronouns.

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

- (21) mamo·k + ma qo·?as?i 'The man is working'
 work 3.sg. man (Swadesh 1936:78).
 indic.
- (22) he· wik + e·?ic wa· 'Oh, that is not what you were
 oh NEG 2. sg. say saying' (Sapir & Swadesh 1939:20).
 indic.

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

- (22) Chasta Costa:
djA+ n +la ɬi + t!i+ni '...said the dog owner'
 3rd say verb dog one who has (Sapir 1914:337).
 deictic suffix
 (+ 1st modal?)

- (23) Hupa: Me·dildin dedin tcit te+ +L +tcwen 'Medildin grew
 poor 3.sg. distrib. 3rd. grow,
 (ref. to modal do poor' (Goddard
 adult Hupa) 1911:117).

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

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

The existence and position of possessive pronominal affixes is easy to establish for all the languages of the area, but here again, as with the pleonastic subject pronominals, I have little information about their syntactic behavior. In CJ pleonastic possessive pronouns occur after the possessor noun and before the possessed noun:

- (24) CJ: uk tanas-tutsmen yaka tolham 'the young woman's relatives'
that small woman 3.sg. people (18).

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

- (25) Chinook proper: u+ iá+ xk+un i+qisqis 'bluejay's elder sister' (Silverstein 1:391, from Boas 1894:178).
fem. m.sg. elder m.sg.+ bluejay
sg. poss. sister

- (26) Kathlamet Chinook: t+aXi t+La+qL+pa i+aXi i+qi+kcxam
that his+house+at that singer-of-conjuror's song

'at the house of the singer of conjuror's songs' (Hymes 1955:301).

- (27) Wishram Chinook: ya-xdau itc!e'xyan ya-go'meni+ 'that Merman's heart' (Boas 1911a:676, from Sapir's Wishram Texts).
that Merman m.sg.+ heart
(near 2nd person poss.)

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

All the Salishan languages of the area (and most other Salishan languages as well) have first and second person singular possessive prefixes, and third

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

- (28) s. Lushootseed: éhešd a+tee+ stóbš 'the parents of that man' (Snyder 1968:44).
parents of+that man

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

- (29) Chehalis: ca+ t xad-c tít sts'ka'eq 'towards the ant's house' (Boas 1934:103).
towards the house+3rd poss. the ant

- (30) Tillamook: dzi s+ t+uq+i'n +s dit sisi'ns 'that old woman's door' (Ede1 1939:53); Ede1 points out that the -s on sisi'ns is almost certainly an error.
that Nom-izer shut+Nom-izer 3rd poss. that old woman

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

- (31) Hupa: taikyūw mit+tsidtda^ε 'the roof of the Sweat-house'
 Sweat-house 3rd roof
 poss.

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

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

- (32) CJ: hilu mayka k^awas 'Don't be afraid' (4;
 NEG 2.sg. afraid Tsimshian-CJ).
- (33) CJ: wik a^qi msayka atá nayka 'You won't (have to)
 NEG future 2.pl. wait for 1. sg. wait for me' (29; Kalapuya-CJ).
- (34) CJ: ukuk stik-sawá^s hilu iskam ukuk tónas-man 'The tree-ogre
 that tree-ogre NEG get that small-man didn't get the boy' (11; Snoqualmi-CJ).

- (35) CJ: pi taska hilu qw^alan 'but they would not obey'
 but 3.pl. NEG hear (18; Kalapuya-CJ).

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

- (36) Kathlamet Chinook: níšt qa i+gíkim i+kauxau 'Owl did not
 NEG indef. he+spoke Owl speak nohow'
 particle (Silverstein 1974: S80).
- (37) s. Lushootseed: xw^é? kwe c-(s)-as-áy-txw^w čád 'I don't know
 NEG some 1.sg.+knowing where
 poss. (Snyder 1968:71).
- (38) (n.) Lushootseed: xw^í? čod 1a. ?ə́tə dílu^z 'I didn't come to
 NEG 1.sg. come to eat eat' (Hess 1976:569).
- (39) Upper Chehalis: mi^áta t ?a+s^{ax}+čc 'you didn't see me'
 NEG indef. 1.sg. see + 1.sg. (Kinkade 1976:19).
- (40) Clallam: čəwə con c xw^ə?əm 'I'm not hungry'
 NEG 1.sg. dem. hungry (Thompson & Thompson 1971).
- (41) Tillamook: qa.c qa ncAs.nū/x^w+i undzU .ne +qáha^z 'I didn't know
 NEG NEG knew them+1.sg. myself 1.sg.+children
 subj. poss. my children' (Ede1 1939:53).
- (42) Squamish: háv q ?an čičá^p 'I didn't/don't work'
 NEG irreal 1 sg. work
 poss. (Kuipers 1967).

- (43) Nootka: wik qahsiX ha-wiX+Pis+Pi 'the little fellow did
NEG die the young man+DIM not die' (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:16).
- (44) Nootka: he-wik+e-Pic wa 'Oh, that is not what
oh NEG+2.sg. say you were saying'
indic. (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:20).
- (45) Nass: needi + n ga'a+t 'I didn't see him'
NEG+1.sg. saw+3.sg. (Rigsby 1975:353).
- (46) Tsimshian: a'tg+tt neSega' +tga wi+medi'o kga 'The great grizzly
NEG+3.sg. mind conn- great+grizzly bear did not mind'
active bear (Boas 1911c:421).
- (47) Chasta Costa: do+lan xw+ ac+ L+ T 'I don't much believe
NEG+much adv.+1.sg.+3rd +believe it' (Sapir 1914:337).
(adv) (subj) modal

Now, the very similar ordering in all these sentences hides some important formal differences among the various negative constructions. In particular, the negative word in the Salishan languages (Lushootseed, Chehalis, Clallam, Tillamook, and Squamish) is an intransitive verb, and the following predicate is a nominalized form; Nass has a similar construction, with the main content verb subordinated to the negative verb. In some of the other languages, for instance Chasta Costa, the negative marker is only a particle. Nevertheless, in spite of such differences, it is easy to believe that independent simplifications from any of these languages would result in a regular pattern of sentence-initial negatives, which is what we find in CJ; and variations in these patterns (aside from the SV vs. VS pattern here) would account for the occasional variant ordering in negative sentences in the various Indian CJ texts. At any rate, though the order of elements in CJ negative sentences is strong evidence for a CJ grammatical norm for English

speakers, it provides no such evidence for the Indian CJ speakers. It should be noted, however, that the common NEG V-s (or NEG V S) order that appears in some of the sentences here appears only rarely in the Jargon.

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

- (48) CJ: alta na paya ukuk lasup? 'Is the soup cooked now?'
now Q fire, DEM soup (27; Kalapuya-CJ).
cooked
- (49) CJ: mayka na kamtaks atqi snas? 'Do you know if it will
2.sg. Q know future rain rain?' (Kaufman 1966b; from
Hale 1846).
- (50) CJ: na ulu mayka? 'Are you hungry?' (Kaufman 1966b,
Q hungry 2.sg. from Gill 1902).
- (51) CJ: mayka teki makmak? 'Do you want to eat?'
2.sg. want eat (Kaufman 1966b, from Gill 1902).
- (52) CJ: hilu mayka samon? 'Don't you have any salmon?'
NEG 2.sg. salmon (Elmendorf 1939).

Of the relevant Indian languages, Chinook has question particles:

- (53) Chinook proper: nēkct na tnē'txix? 'Do I not know it?'
NEG Q I know it (Boas 1911a:650).
- (54) Kathlamet/Chinook: i+qstxiLau ci? 'Is it a monster?'
a+monster Q (Hymes 1955:304).

Salishan languages have particles and/or suffixes; their status varies and may be hard to determine. Edl calls the Tillamook question markers suffixes, for instance [1939:42], but she often writes them as particles. In any case, the question marker is not a verbal suffix in Salishan:³⁴

- (55) s. Lushootseed: ok^w/dtx^w ʔex^w+o k^we s+ ʔā+d? 'Did you get any food?' (Snyder 1968:75).
got 2sg.+Q any Nom+ eat
- (56) n. Lushootseed: ʔas+ q^watəb ʔax^w ʔu six^w? 'Are you tired again?' (Hukari 1976:308).
static+tired 2.sg. Q again
- (57) Clallam: ʔé?iən? u cx^w? 'Are you eating?'
eating Q 2.sg. (Thompson and Thompson 1971:262).
- (58) Upper Chehalis: q^aat talil-na sšam^aalax^w 'Would it be kind to the people?'
would kind+ Q people (Boas 1934:104).
- (59) Tillamook: an.gi' hi a+s+tg+a/ns? 'Was it you who broke it?' (Edl 1939:42).
2.sg. Q 2sg.+broke it indep.

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

Nootka has an interrogative suffix +ha:

- (60) Nootka: wik+ha'+so' ʔa'naqh qahsa'pmihsa? 'Do you not really want to kill me?'
NEG+ Q +2.sg. really want to cause (me) to die (Sapir and Swadesh 1939:17).

Tsimshian and Nass both use verbal suffixes, +a in Nass and +ī or +ū in

Tsimshian:

- (61) Nass: nē mē sem hwa'+d +a? 'Didn't you find it?'
NEG 2. pl. find+it+Q (Boas 1911c:405).
interrog.
- (62) Tsimshian: mē dedū'olsen+i? 'Are you alive?'
2.sg. alive +Q (Boas 1911c:405).

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

- (63) Chasta Costa: nā+ xw+ í+ l+ ye +ha? 'Are you playing?'
adv. +adv.+2.sg.+3rd+play+Q (Sapir 1914:333).
modal (classifier)
- (64) Tututni: s+ i+ ɬ+ s'eg^w +ha? 'Did you hook a fish?' (Golla 1976:227).
pfctv+2sg. +class+hook a fish +Q
aspectifier

In all these languages, the question marker is an enclitic or a suffix, so that the CJ sentences with sentence-initial na (all from English writers) look like improbable simplifications from the Indian languages themselves. Nevertheless, the question markers do take varying positions in the sentence, both in CJ and in the native languages, so again the complexity of the structures involved precludes the possibility of making easy predictions about the results of independent simplification. Since the question particle na was available for CJ, however, its absence in most of the yes/no questions in Indian-CJ texts is

rather surprising in view of the obligatory appearance of a question marker in the native languages. This may provide some evidence for a syntactic norm for CJ, but there are so few yes/no questions in all the Indian-CJ material that the evidence is not strong.

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

As for the pleonastic subject pronominals themselves, they occur in all the languages (though only to a limited extent in some, e.g. Tsimshian), but their ordering, as we have just seen, does not always match that of CJ: in Salishan, Tsimshian, Kalapuya, and Wakashan, they are primarily suffixes or enclitics. However, they often occur before the main content verb of a sentence in these languages as a result of syntactic transformations, and it is not clear from my sources which order predominates. We cannot predict with any certainty

where they would occur in an independent simplification from any of these languages; and for Tsimshian, at least, we cannot even predict whether or not they would occur at all. The situation is similarly murky with the pleonastic possessive pronominals. Here only Athabaskan agrees with the CJ order, which is $N_{poss}Pro_{poss}N$.

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

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

In spite of the difficulty of carrying out this comparative syntactic investigation, then, and in spite of the indeterminacy of some of the results, it seems clear that some regular CJ syntactic features would not be expected to arise through independent simplification of the various native-language grammars.

This evidence is by no means as striking as the evidence for a target CJ phonology, with consistent features like nasals for the so-called nasalless languages; but it is strong enough, as a total body of evidence, to make the claim that CJ had no target grammar untenable. The phonological and syntactic features of Indians' CJ are by no means invariable: individual CJ speakers certainly differed in their pronunciation of some words and in their syntactic structures as well, and no doubt groups of Indian speakers had habits of CJ usage that differed from their neighbors' habits. All the features discussed in this section, however, can be established as regular for all the Indians who provided CJ material. As we have already seen, English speakers certainly had a few institutionalized habits of pronunciation that differed from Indians' pronunciation, but some regular features of the Europeans' pronunciation were definitely non-European; and the syntax of Europeans' CJ matches the Indians' CJ syntax closely and deviates markedly from anything one could reasonably expect as a result of independent simplification from English (or French). In other words, all CJ speakers produced sounds, sound sequences, and syntactic constructions that were foreign to them. The only way to explain this fact is to assume that CJ speakers did, after all, have 'an essentially shared grammatical system' (Silverstein II:623); there was a Chinook Jargon language community, in Silverstein's sense, as well as a Chinook Jargon speech community.

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

In this section I will consider the implications of the CJ grammatical features described in §3 for the old controversy about whether or not the Jargon existed as a means of communication among Indian tribes before the

appearance of Europeans in the Pacific Northwest. I will not review the controversy itself; the discussions are easy to find.³⁵ I will also not attempt to analyze the pre-contact social setting of the Chinookan tribes and their neighbors in any detail, because Hymes' elegant and convincing reconstruction of this setting will soon appear (Hymes, ¹⁹⁸⁰ ~~Forthcoming~~). In his reconstruction Hymes argues that a stable pidgin was very likely to have emerged in the region before the Europeans arrived on the scene. I will argue below that the linguistic evidence supports this view. The attested structure of the Jargon is easiest to account for if CJ existed in stable form before the Europeans came: most of its phonological and syntactic features can readily be explained as the result of crystallization of a pidgin out of communication among the Indians of the region, but it is hard to explain them if the pidgin crystallized out of communication between Chinook speakers (and perhaps other Indians too) and whites. Before presenting this argument, however, I will describe briefly the nature of the earliest attestations of Chinook Jargon and the nature of intertribal relations at the time of contact with Europeans.

First of all, it should be noted that no one has presented direct evidence in the form of indigenous traditions attesting to pre-European usage of an intertribal Jargon in the Northwest. (If anyone had done so, there would presumably be no controversy on this point). Our first reports of the Jargon come from Europeans' travel journals; unfortunately, however, the earliest of these attestations are hard to interpret historically. For instance, the early explorers of the Pacific coast stopped first at Nootka on Vancouver Island in the late eighteenth century. In 1788, on the Columbia River, Captain John Meares recorded the following utterance of the chief Maquilla: 'cloosh, cloosh, good, good'

(Grant 1945:225). Now, cloosh would be the expected Europeans' rendering of the CJ word ʔuʃ 'good'. But it would also be the expected European version of the Nootka word ʔuʃ 'good', which is the ultimate source of CJ ʔuʃ. So we cannot tell whether Chief Maquilla's cloosh indicates that CJ was already in existence as a trade language among (at least) Nootka and Chinook Indians before Europeans arrived on the scene, or whether it merely indicates that European sailors before Meares had brought the Nootka word with them from Nootka to the Columbia River, so that Chief Maquilla expected other Europeans to understand it too.

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

One way of trying to unravel the history of CJ through study of its lexicon would be to look at the form of the words. At least some CJ words of Nootka origin, for instance, show evidence of being transmitted to the Columbia by whites, not Indians; one of these is ʔuʃ. The replacement of its initial Nootka ʔ by ʔ is not a problem, since most Indian languages in the area have a glottalized affricate /ʔ/ but no plain affricate /ʔ/, and some of them have a phone [ʔ] as an allophone of the fricative /ʔ/ . But the replacement of the Nootka fricative ʔ by ʃ is hard

to account for if the word had been transmitted to Indians by Indians; all the languages in the area have /ʔ/ as a phoneme, and so does CJ itself, but no speakers ever pronounced CJ ʔuʃ with a lateral fricative, as far as one can tell. This distortion in this Nootka-derived CJ word, and analogous (though few) distortions in other CJ words of Nootka origin,³⁷ suggest that these words were not in use in a putative pre-European Jargon. Of course, this does not mean that there was no pre-European pidgin; it only means that the pidgin, if it did exist, didn't contain (these) Nootka words.

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

missionary Campanius mistook the Delaware-based Traders' Jargon for Delaware itself [Thomason 1980:182].

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

Before whites arrived in the area and established permanent trading centers which attracted Indians of various tribes, much of the trade between Indians may have been carried out by just two tribes at a time (but cf. Hymes, ¹⁹⁸⁰ ~~Forthcoming~~, on the trade center near the Dalles). It might therefore be argued that a pidgin could not have arisen in this situation, since, according to Whinnom's widely accepted model of tertiary hybridization, at least three groups -- one superstratum and two or more substratum groups -- are necessary before a stable pidgin can emerge (1971:104). But Whinnom's picture is too narrowly drawn, in my

opinion. Ruling out the possibility that a pidgin may develop in a two-language situation ignores attitudinal factors that can be crucial. Tây Bồi developed between speakers of French and Vietnamese under circumstances which did not encourage Vietnamese servants to learn their masters' language (Reinecke 1971:47); Halbdeutsch arose among native speakers of Estonian alone, when knowledge of German was highly advantageous for Estonians but was deliberately withheld by German speakers (Lehiste, p.c. 1975). Just as the Delawares kept outsiders at a distance by using pidgin rather than Delaware itself (Thomason 1980:182), and Choctaw and Koasati speakers used Mobilian Jargon for similar purposes (Drechsel 1977:9), the Lower Chinook may at first have used Chinook Jargon as a means of emphasizing their own superiority, linguistic and otherwise. (Hymes, *Forthcoming*, makes a similar point.) The attitudes expressed by Indians toward Chinook itself (hard to learn) and toward a Chinook-tinged CJ (more elegant than other CJ) seem to me to support this view. Such an attitude would surely be most likely to manifest itself in conversation with slaves, but it may well have extended to trading situations as well.³⁸

As I have argued elsewhere (1980), an inference on sociohistorical grounds that a pidgin existed in a former contact situation about which we have no direct contemporaneous evidence must be supported, if it is to be convincing, by the linguistic evidence. In this case, there are two sorts of linguistic evidence that may be adduced in support of the hypothesis that Chinook Jargon predated the arrival of whites in the Northwest. First, as mentioned above, the phonological structure of CJ as spoken by Indians shows such a high degree of consistency in sounds that most whites did not produce at all that the Jargon had to have been transmitted to Indians by other Indians, not whites. The Appendix contains

examples of all the contrasts that are relevant in this context, each one exemplified from at least two independent sources. Most of the sources are Indian ones, but the Demers-Blanchet-St. Onge dictionary is just as consistent for some distinctions, and occasionally another European-language source provides evidence for a particular contrast. The only Indian source that shows signs of white transmission is Boas' Tsimshian text,³⁹ which has, for instance, ɬap for CJ/ɬap/ 'find'. This word looks like a Tsimshian speaker's interpretation of a white man's klap, and it contrasts with Chinook-CJ ɬap, Twana-CJ ɬap, Kalapuya-CJ ɬap, Saanich-CJ ɬap, Snoqualmie-CJ ɬap, Upper Coquille-CJ ɬap, and Chehalis-CJ ɬap. But Tsimshian evidence is not very interesting in a consideration of the origin of CJ, because it is far to the north of the pre-white trade network that, according to the hypothesis, gave rise to CJ; the Jargon was no doubt taken to the Tsimshian by whites, so we would expect to find evidence of white transmission here (as well as in Tlingit and other northern languages). In addition to the direct evidence from Indians' CJ, we also have the indirect evidence provided by words borrowed into various Indian languages from CJ. I have not collected such evidence systematically, but one example is Nootka čikčik(w-) 'buggy, wagon' ; CJ /c'ikc'ik/ 'wheel, wagon'. The CJ word is said to be onomatopoeitic in origin, and Sapir and Swadesh identify the Nootka word as a CJ borrowing (1939:305). This word could have been transmitted with a ts to Nootka by whites (see examples of whites' pronunciation under /ts'/ in the Appendix), but not with ts'.

Now, there are of course two possible ways of accounting for the consistent appearance in the Indian CJ sources (and in the Indian languages themselves, in loanwords from CJ) of non-European contrasts and clusters. One is the hypothesis

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

The second type of linguistic evidence that supports the hypothesis of a pre-European origin for CJ is indirect. The argument rests on a theory of the development of pidgin grammars that I have discussed (and presented evidence for) elsewhere (1980 and Forthcoming) and outlined briefly above, in §2. According to this theory, the (original) speakers of a developing pidgin will abandon their native-language grammatical structures only to the extent that they are obliged to; and they will be obliged to do this to the extent that the marked features of their native-language structures are not shared. Features that are marked in universal terms are likely to appear in the pidgin only if they are shared

by all of its (original) speakers, though some one language may have a disproportionate influence on the pidgin's grammar if its speakers are especially numerous and/or prestigious. Unmarked features of the native-language grammars will tend to remain whether they are shared by all speakers or not. The number of marked features in the fully crystallized pidgin will of course be greatest when the native languages are typologically similar. This theory is based on the assumption that a universal principle of language learning governs the peculiar kind of learning situation that obtains in the development of a pidgin, as well as other kinds of language learning situations: in learning a new language, people will learn what they have to and keep what they can of the language(s) they already know. In the case of an emerging pidgin, everyone (except speakers of languages(s) that provide the vocabulary) will have to learn a lexicon, but the grammar they use will in fact be a cross-language compromise between the grammars of the native languages. After the pidgin has crystallized, so that it is learned as a whole language by all its speakers, its grammatical structures will reflect the original compromise.⁴⁰ This means that universally marked features that appear in any given pidgin should be predictable as a cross-language compromise from the native languages of the pidgin's originators.

If we look at Chinook Jargon from this viewpoint, we need to consider whether its structures are more likely to have arisen out of white-Indian contact or out of Indian-Indian contact. That is, which origin hypothesis offers the more reasonable explanation of the Jargon's structures, especially its marked structures? As we saw in §3.3, both the phonology and the syntax of CJ are easy to explain as a typological norm for the Indian languages

of the Northwest, with the sole possible exception of the regular (though not exclusive) SV word order pattern. And all those features that are shared by the Indian languages are conspicuously absent from English and French: glottalized stops and affricates, labialized dorsal obstruents, lateral obstruents, uvular obstruents, /ts/, /ts'/, the non-initial glottal stop, and certain non-European consonant clusters; sentence-initial negative particles, pleonastic subject and (in most of the languages) possessive pronominals, and a yes/no question marker. Of these features, only the syntactic ones occur consistently in the writings of English and French speakers, though most of the phonological features are also attested directly in one or more of those sources. The Indian sources contain all the phonological and syntactic features, and both English and French writers refer to an Indian-based phonological norm for CJ. Some of these features may not be marked in universal^{terms,} but probably none of them would occur on a current master list of universally unmarked linguistic features. In any case, none of them would be likely to emerge as a spontaneous simplification of English or French, and few of these features occur in the better known pidgins and creoles of the Caribbean, Africa, or the Pacific. (Tok Pisin has pleonastic subject pronouns. Compare also the sentence-initial negative particle which occurs regularly in the Delaware pidgin, where it can also be explained by reference to local Indian languages; see Thomason 1980 for a discussion of this point.

Even if English and/or French speakers would not be expected to develop these features independently, might they not do so while developing a pidgin through communication with Chinook and other Indians? Possibly, but then we

would have to explain the general lack of European influence on the grammar of the crystallized pidgin. The only promising sign of European influence on the grammar of the Jargon is the SV word order. Even this is dubious, because pronominal subjects are regularly preverbal in Chinook and sometimes preverbal in most of the other Indian languages. So if -- perhaps through the extra-strong influence of Chinook itself -- the pronoun took the regular preverbal position in CJ,⁴¹ we would expect noun subjects to be drawn analogically into that position too, given the much greater frequency of pronoun subjects in the Jargon relative to full noun subjects. Moreover, it would be peculiar if the only significant influence of English and French were the positioning of the subject before the verb; the grammatical influence of any contributing languages(s) should be distributed more or less evenly over the resulting pidgin's structures, surely, rather than focusing on just one syntactic feature. In any case, though the English and French users of CJ followed the regular syntactic rules faithfully, most of them clearly did not acquire the whole range of the otherwise regular CJ phonological features; and this is hard to explain if we assume that those features actually developed out of white-Indian communication.

If, on the other hand, we assume that Chinook Jargon arose out of Indian-Indian communication, there is nothing to explain in the phonology -- all the features of CJ are shared by all the relevant languages -- and the prediction of CJ syntax as a cross-language compromise among the Indians is also feasible, though more complicated. The linguistic features of CJ, then, are easier to account for if whites did not participate in the development of the language, and the fact that the Jargon must have been spread by

Indians to Indians is also easier to explain on this hypothesis. The linguistic evidence thus offers strong support for the hypothesis that the pre-European contact situation in the Northwest favored the development of a contact language. The most reasonable conclusion is that Chinook Jargon was already in existence as a fully crystallized pidgin, used by the Lower Chinook and their neighbors, their slaves, and perhaps their more distant trading partners as well, before Europeans arrived in numbers in the Northwest.

FOOTNOTES

* I am most grateful to Terrence Kaufman for helpful suggestions on this paper and for copies of his unpublished Chinook Jargon materials, without which my task of analyzing the CJ sources would have been infinitely more difficult. I am also deeply indebted to William Elmendorf for a copy of his 1939 CJ materials elicited from a Twana speaker, and for his useful comments on the Jargon in two 1980 letters; and to Terrence Kaufman for a copy of J.P. Harrington's field notes on CJ from a Chehalis speaker.

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

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

3 I concentrate here on syntax because the problems with phonology are somewhat different; Silverstein believes that each speaker uses his own native

phonology in pronouncing Jargon words. See §3 for a detailed discussion of this point.

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

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

him two forms for 'water', tsogw and tsak, and said that the former was spoken by Indians and the latter by whites. One interesting attestation is Sapir's report that the Indians of the Siletz Reservation in Oregon called the coast people "Sol Chuck" ('salt water') Indians (1914:274).

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

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

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

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

15 Terrence Kaufman has pointed out to me (p.c. 1981), however, that in some European languages such constructions have developed historically from possessive constructions similar to the modern English one with N's N. These languages

include modern colloquial Dutch and nonstandard German, but, as far as I know, no such construction has emerged in English itself.

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

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

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

19 The phones [b d g] occur often as allophones, though not as phonemes in most of the languages. The voiced oral stop phones are very frequent in some of the Indian-CJ texts, especially in Mrs. Howard's.

20 In studying the Jargon lexicon, I am searching the texts and word lists elicited directly from Indians for evidence that the Indians explicitly recognized the white-Indian correspondence rules. This study is still in a very preliminary stage, but a few CJ words of English and French origin do turn up in Indians' pronunciation with what look like hypercorrections. For instance, in the word list elicited by Elmendorf from Henry Allen, a Twana speaker, the English-origin word for 'kettle' is ki'tl~~əd~~ instead of regular Jargon ki:tl(ən). Here the final n is replaced by d, as often happens in Twana, which has no primary nasal phonemes; what's interesting in ki'tl~~əd~~ is rather the fact that the regular CJ medial tl cluster, which ought to be quite possible as a consonant sequence in Twana, is replaced by tl̥, as if Henry Allen automatically equated the tl he heard with the usual English speaker's replacement for a non-initial lateral affricate or fricative. (There are other possibilities, though, so this suggestion is very tentative. In particular, the l̥ could simply be the normal pronunciation of Twana /l/ after a voiceless stop, so that this would merely be an assimilation according to Twana morphophonemic rules). Another instance is Henry Allen's pronunciation of the word for 'devil', whose source is the French phrase le diable: Elmendorf transcribes this word variously as li'dj~~ab~~, li'dj~~ə~~b, and li'djo'm (compare regular CJ /litʃáb/); the last variant looks like a hypercorrection, since loanwords from CJ into Twana with original CJ nasals are pronounced in Twana with b or d. (Twana b and d also correspond regularly to m and n in cognates from other Salish languages, so there may well have been a familiar set of correspondence rules for these sounds used by Twana speakers in communicating with their Salish-speaking neighbors in other languages besides CJ.) It is worth mentioning in this connection that Twana speakers, like other Indians of the region, were likely to be skilled multilinguals; Elmendorf says that Henry Allen spoke, in addition to his native Twana, fluent Clallam, Lushootseed, and English (p.c. 1980). Clallam, Lushootseed, and Twana are closely-

related Coast Salish languages.

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

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

23 There are various other references in the literature to CJ material elicited from Indian informants in recent years, especially in Johnson 1978, but I have not seen the data. I have also seen references to older material elicited by linguists from Indians, but as far as I know none of it is in print.

24 It should be mentioned in this context that Boas & Haeberlin give half a dozen Twana forms which have nasals alone or nasals alternating with b, d. These forms, which were apparently collected by Teit sometime between 1904 and 1909 (Boas & Haeberlin 1926:117; cf. Teit & Boas 1927-28:25), include the common lexical suffixes -sen ~ -sed 'foot, leg' and -mš ~ -mx(w) 'people'. I don't know what to make of these forms, but they might indicate a relatively late spread to Twana of the areal feature of denasalization. This in turn might mean that nasals were not as abnormal to Elmendorf's, and perhaps also to Jacobs', informants in the 1930's as they were to Drachman's in the 1960's. Compare, in this connection, the comment by Hess that in Lushootseed, 'within the past one hundred years or so, /m/ was spoken where /b/ is used today' (1976:15).

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

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

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

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

29 This sharp discrepancy between speakers' pronunciation of CJ loanwords in their native language and their pronunciation of CJ itself makes Johnson's assumption that the treatment of loanwords will match CJ pronunciation (1978:152) untenable. Johnson asserts that Tlingit speakers do in fact have the same replacement rules for loanwords and for CJ (1978:211), but he presents no data at all to support this claim, and, as the Twana and Nootka data presented here demonstrate, it is not a safe a priori assumption.

30 Boas actually transcribed the Lower Chinook source of this CJ word with two fricatives: xa'oxaL 'can not' (1911a:634). However, even Mrs. Howard has a stop [g] in the CJ word, so I assume a target /q/ for CJ. Nevertheless, it is possible that Jacobs' Coquille informant had [x] here in imitation of the Lower Chinook original.

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

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

33 Compare ga'a+hl gat'+hl hana^k 'The man saw the woman' (Rigsby 1975:347).

34 Boas mentions another interrogative formation for Upper Chehalis, with a stem i[?] followed by possessive forms. I have no examples of this formation, however. (See Boas 1934:109). *pačč' pukma ana*

35 See, for instance, the references in Silverstein (1:379, fn.3) and the comments in Johnson (1978:24f.).

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

37 At least two CJ words of Nootka origin have plain stops where Nootka has glottalized ones: CJ/tands/'child' from Nootka tana 'child'; and CJ/tsuq~/~čok/ 'water' from Nootka čaʔak 'river, stream' (and maybe čaʔak 'water'?). But cf. Twana-CJ ts'aq^w, which, according to Elmendorf's notes, is not a proper Jargon word. One word, CJ/haykwa/ 'dentalia', has k where Nootka has a dorsal fricative: hi·x^wa·(q-). If /tšikmən/ 'metal, money' is from Nootka cikimin, as seems likely, rather than vice versa (as Sapir and Swadesh say (1939:303); but otherwise CJ/tš/ is borrowed into Nootka as č, not c), the CJ tš is likely to be a white man's distortion. Similarly, Nootka lo·csma 'woman, wife' would be expected to yield CJ ts, not tš as in /ɬutšmən/ (but cf. Nootka loč- id.).

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

39 This is not to say that no other sources have any words pronounced as whites (rather than other Indians) did; such words do occur occasionally in some Indian sources. Twana-CJ, for instance, has tu'ləkam 'people' rather than /talham/, which appears in six other Indian sources. But Tsimshian-CJ is the only Indian source where white pronunciation (or, like ɬ : kl, the application of regular correspondence rules) seems to be the norm. Besides 'find', there are ikt 'one' for /iht/ and ke·'lapai for CJ /k'ilapay/.

40 Of course its grammar can and surely will change, as every language's grammar does; but there is no a priori reason to expect the grammar of a pidgin to change any faster than that of any other language, or to expect the changes to be different in type from ordinary changes in non-pidgin languages.

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

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

APPENDIX

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

In the lists, Indian sources are identified by the speaker's native language: Chi. = Chinook proper (Mrs. Victoria Howard; Jacobs 1936); Tw. = Twana (Henry Allen; Elmendorf 1939); Cheh. = Chehalis (Harrington n.d.); Snoqu. = Snoqualmie (Jack Stillman; Jacobs 1936); Saan. = Saanich (Thomas Paul; Jacobs 1936); Kalap. = Santiam Kalapuya (John Hudson; Jacobs 1936); Up.Coq. = Upper Coquille Athabaskan (Coquille Thompson; Jacobs 1936); Tsim. = Tsimshian (Boas 1933); Nt. = Nootka (Boas 1888). European sources are identified by the author's name. Hale = Hale (1846); St.O. = the Demers-Blanchet-St. Onge dictionary. Where a source has variant forms, only those variants relevant to the contrast in question are given here.

Forms enclosed in parentheses are ones that fail to show the feature that I specify as phonemic in a particular word. Note that some sources which have a velar instead of an expected uvular (or vice versa) nevertheless preserve the non-European feature of glottalization.

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

1. /p'/ : /p/

/p'/: /t'alap'as/ 'coyote': Cheh. t'á'lap'á's : Kalap. t'a'lap'a's;
(Hale ta'lapas, St.O. Talapos).

/sup'na/ 'jump': Chi. su'p'na : Tw. so'p'na : Cheh. sú'p'na;
(Kalap. su'pna, St.O. Sopene, Hale sūpina).

/p'ə'nes/ 'baked in ashes': Chi. pi'nes : Boas 1933(Chi.) p'ə'nis
: Cheh. p'āns : St.O. ppens.

/p/: /kupét/ ~ /kapét/ 'stop; finished': Chi. ka'bit : Tw. kupit :
Cheh. kup'it : Tsim. kup'it : Hale kwapet.

/k'ilapay/ 'return': -apa(y), sometimes with allophonic voicing, in Chi., Tw., Cheh., Kalap., Up.Coq., Tsim., Hale, St.O.; see /k'/ below for forms.

/pa'tatš/ 'give': Chi. -ba'tatc : Tw. pa'tatc : Saan. pe'tatc :
Cheh. pa'tatš : Up.Coq. ba'tatc : Tsim. po'tatc : Hale pātlatsh.

/pulakli/ 'dark; night': Tw. pu'lakli : Cheh. pú'lakli :
Saan. pu'lakli : Kalap. bu'lakli; Hale pōlakli.

2. /t'/ : /t/

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

/k'imt'a/ 'following, after': Tw. ki'mt'a : Snoqu. ki'mt'a :
Cheh. k'imt'a ~ k'it'mt'a; (Tsim. ki'mta, St.O. Kimpta,
Hale kimta, Kalap. ki'mda).

/t'amúletš/ 'tub, barrel': Tw. tamo'lit.c : Cheh. t'Amúvlatš.

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

/təlhəm/ 'person': Chi. di'lxam : Tw. ti'lekəm : Saan. ti'lxəm :
Cheh. tél'ham : Kalap. di'lxam : Up.Coq. di'lxəm :
Tsim. té'lxəm : Hale tílikūm : Parker tilecum : St.O. Telikom.

/təki/ ~ /tq'ix/ 'want; like': Chi. tqi : Tw. ti'ki : Cheh. taq'í :
Saan. diki : Snoqu. ti'ki : Kalap. ti'gi : Up.Coq. di'gi ~
tigi : Tsim. tiki : St.O. Tike ~ tkeh : Hale tūkéh ~ takēh :
Ross Tekeigh.

/tatwa/ 'go': Chi. ta'dwa : Tw. ta'tewa ~ ta'dewa : Cheh. tá'tawa :
Saan. te'dwa : Snoqu. te'dwa : Kalap. ta'dwa : Up.Coq. ta'dwa ; (Hale klátawa : Parker clatu(w)a : Ross Thlat-away).

/anqati/ 'former, previous': Chi. a'ngadi : Tw. a'nkati :
Saan. ankadi ~ a'ngadi : Cheh. ʔá'ngati : Kalap. a'ngadi :
Tsim. a'ngate : Hale ānākati : Parker aunacotta.

3. /ts'/ : /ts/ : /tʃ/

/ts'/: /ts'ipi/ 'miss': Tw. tʃi'pi : Cheh. ts'i'pí'; (Boas 1933 (Chi.) tse'pe, St.O. Tsepe, Shaw Tsee'pie).

/ts'am/ 'mark(ed), figured': Tw. tʃá'm : Cheh. ts'ám;
(St.O. Tsom, Shaw Tzum ~ T'ss-zum ~ Tsum).

/ts'ikts'ik/ 'wheel; wagon': Cheh. ts'íkts'ík; cf. the Nootka word c'ikc'ik^(W-), which Sapir and Swadesh 1939 identify as asCJ loanword; (Tw. tcl'ktcl, St.O. Tsiktsik, Shaw Ts- ~ Tch-, Hale č-).

/ts/: /tsuq/ ~ /tʃek/ 'water, stream': Chi. tsu'q : Kalap. tsu'q : tsoqu (Indians) ~ tʃak (whites) : St.O. tsok : Hale tʃok ~ tsük ~ tshök; (Tw. tca'k, Saan. tce'k, Sapir 1914 Chuck).⁷²

/tseltʃel/ 'button; star': Cheh. tsiltʃil : St.O. Tsiltʃil : Palmer T-sit-still : Shaw Chil-chil ~ Tsil-tsil; (Hale tíltil ~ tshíltshil).

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

/tʃ/: /tʃaku/ 'come': Chi. tcaqu : Tw. tca'ku : Cheh. tʃá'kv : Snoqu. tca'ku : Saan. tca'gu : Kalap. tsagu ~ tca'gu : Up.Coq. tca'gu : Tsim. tca'ku : Hale tshako : Parker chawko : Ross chicko.

/tʃ(h)i/ 'recent, new': Chi. tcxi' : Tw. tcxi : Cheh. tʃxí' : Saan. tci' : Kalap. tchi'.

/tʃikmən/ 'metal; money': Tw. tcl'kəmɪn : Cheh. tʃikAmɪn.

4. /tʃ'/: /tʃ/ : /l/

/tʃ'/: /tʃ'unas/ 'uncertain, doubtful': Chi. tʃ'u'nas : Cheh. tʃ'u'nás : Saan. tʃunə's : Kalap. tʃ'u'nas : Up.Coq. tʃ'u'nas; (Tw. tʃu'nás, St.O. Tlonas, Hale klunás, Parker clunas).

/tʃ'ap/ 'find': Chi. tʃ'ap : Tw. tʃ'a'p : Cheh. tʃ'á'p : Snoqu. tʃ'a'p : Saan. tʃ'ə'p : Kalap. tʃ'a'p : Up.Coq. tʃ'a'p; (Tsim. ʃap, St.O. tlap).

/tʃ'əp/ 'deep, sunken': Tw. tʃ'ə'p; tʃ'ipsan 'sundown' [san 'sun'] : St.O. Tlep; Klipsan ~ Tlipsan 'sunset'; (Hale tilfp).

/tʃ'mən/ 'soft, fine, ground up': Chi. tʃ'mən : Tw. tʃ'əmɪ'n : Cheh. tʃ'Amɪn; (St.O. tlemɪn).

/tʃ'minhwət/ 'tell a lie': Tw. tʃ'əmɪ'nəxwət : Cheh. tʃ'Amɪ'nəxwət; (Hale kliminēkwit, Shaw Kliminawhit, St.O. Tleminwhit).

/yutʃ'/: 'glad, pleased, proud': Tw. yut'ʃ'ʃ : Cheh. yú'tʃ' ~ yú'ʃ'ʃ; (St.O. Iutl).

/itʃ'wəl(i)/ 'meat, flesh, body': Chi. i'ʃ'wəl : Cheh. ʔi'ʃ'vɪɪ; (Tw. i'ʃ'wəli, St.O. itluil).

/tatʃ'i/ 'thus': Chi. da't'ʃi : Kalap. dat'ʃi.

/tʃ/: /tʃuʃ/ 'good': Chi. ʃu'c : Tw. ʃo'c : Cheh. ʃu'ʃ : Snoqu. ʃu'c : Saan. ʃu'c : Kalap. ʃu's ~ ʃu'c : Up.Coq. ʃu'c : Tsim. ʃo'c; (St.O. Tlush, Ross Tlōsh, Hale klōsh, Parker close).

/tutšmən/ 'wife, woman; female': Chi. tutšmən : Tw. tutšmən :
Cheh. tutšmən : Kalap. tutšmən; (St.O. tluchmen,
Ross tlutché-men, Hale klōtshman).

/taska/ '3rd plural pronoun': Chi. tasga ~ tas- : Tw. tasga :
Cheh. tasga : Saan. tasga : Kalap. tasga : Up.Coq. tasga :
Tsim. tasga; (St.O. tlaska, Hale klaska, Parker klaska).

/xauqwa/ 'unable, impossible': Chi. xauqwa : Tw. xauqwa :
Cheh. hāwq^ha : Kalap. qa'ugwa : Up.Coq. xa'xwə.

/a'qi/ 'later, future': Chi. a'qi : Tw. a'qi : Cheh. a'q^hi :
Saan. a'qi : Kalap. a'qi : Up.Coq. a'qi : Tsim. a'qi;
(St.O. Alke, Hale álkē).

/pa'tatš/ 'give': Chi. -ba'tatc : Tw. pa'tatc : Cheh. pā'tatš :
Saan. pe'tatc : Up.Coq. ba'tatc : Tsim. po'tatc;
(St.O. Potlach, Hale pātlatsh).

/mə'tayt/ 'sit(down); stay; be (in a place); have': Chi. mi'tait :
Tw. mi'tait : Cheh. mā'tait : Snoqu. mi'tait : Saan. mē'tait :
Kalap. mi'tait : Up.Coq. mi'tait : Tsim. mi'tait;
(Hale mitlait, Ross Meth-lite, Parker mitlit, St.O. mitlait).

/yu'tqat/ 'long (dimension)': Chi. yu'tqat : Tw. yu'tqat :
Cheh. yū'tkāt : Kalap. yu'tqat; (St.O. Iutikat, Hale iūlkot).

/l/: /lamet'sin/ 'medicine': Tw. lāmets n : Cheh. lāmetsin :
Tsim. lāmetsin : St.O. Lametsin : Hale lamestin.

/lam/ 'liquor': Tw. pa'tiam 'drunk' [pa't 'full'] : Cheh. lām :
Hale lām : St.O. Lam.

/lamiéy/ 'old woman': Chi. lamiya'i : Tw. lamiya'i :
Cheh. lamiy^f : St.O. Lamiaf : Hale lawie = lavie.

/ili'i/ ~ /ilahi/ 'ground, earth': Chi. i'li : Tw. i'lahi :
Cheh. i'li'i : Kalap. i'li'i : Up.Coq. i'li'i ~ i'lihi :
Tsim. e'lehi : Hale ilēhi : Parker illaha : St.O. elehi.

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

/xluima/ 'other, different': Chi. xlu'wima : Tw. xalo'ima :
Cheh. xlú'yima : Snoqu. xlu'wima : Saan. xlu'wimen :
Tsim. xalo'yim : Hale halōima : St.O. Holoima.

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

/ti'el/ 'black, dark blue, green, brown': Tw. te'e'l :
Cheh. ti'el : Up.Coq. ti'il; (St.O. Tlitli, Parker klaait);
Hale klāfil.

5. /k'/ : /k/ : /q'/ : /q/ : /kw'/ : /kw/ : /qw'/ : /qw/

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

/k'ilapay/ '(re)turn': Chi. k'i'labai : Tw. k'i'lapai :
Cheh. k'i'lapay : Kalap. k'i'labai : Up.Coq. k'i'labai :
St.O. Kilapaf; (Boas ke'lapai, Tsim. ke'lapai, Hale kilapai).
¹⁴³³(Chi.)

/k'el/ 'hard, difficult': Tw. k'á'l : Cheh. k'Al : Nt. k'al :
St.O. Kal.

/k'aláx(an)/ 'fence, corral': Tw. k'al'a'xad [Elmendorf's
informant thought this was a Twana word] : Cheh. k'Alá'X -
q'Alá'X [Harrington's informant identified this as a Chehalis
word] : St.O. Kalah(en).

/tk'up/ 'white': Tw. tk'o'p : Cheh. t'k'u'p : Saan. tk'u'p :
St.O. t'wop; (Hale t'ukōp, Parker t'koop).

/t'k'up/ 'broken; cut, chop': Chi. t'k'u'p : Cheh. t'k'o'p :
St.O. tl'kop; (Shaw tl'kope).

/k'aynu/ 'tobacco': Cheh. k'á'y'yinu [Harrington's informant
identified this as a Chehalis word] : St.O. Kainulh.

/k'ipwut/ 'thorn; needle': Cheh. k'ipwat : St.O. Kipuet;
(Hale k'lapōt).

/sak'áluks/ 'trousers': Tw. sak'a'lvks : Cheh. sak'áluks;
(St.O. sakaluks, Hale sakáluks).

/halk'ix/ 'curly; crooked': Cheh. hánk'í - hánq'í : St.O. Hanl'weh

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

/k/: /kanawi/ 'all': Chi. ka'nawi : Tw. ka'newi : Cheh. ká'ná'wí :
Kalap. ka'nawi : Tsim. ka'nawe : St.O. kanewe : Hale kanawē.

/iskam/ 'get': Chi. i'sgam : Tw. i'skəm : Cheh. í'skam :
St.O. Iskom : Hale iskam.

/tšaku/ 'come': [see above, /tš/].

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

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

/ya(x)ka/ '3rd singular pronoun': Chi. ya'xga - ya- : Tw. yaka :
Cheh. yáká - yá'xka : Snoqu. ya'ka : Saan. ya'ka - yaqka
(= [yaxka]) : Kalap. ya'ga : Up.Coq. ya'ga : Tsim. ya'ka :
St.O. Iaka : Parker yahkah : Hale iáhka.

/q'/: /q'u'/ 'reach, arrive': Chi. qu' : Cheh. q'ó'? : Kalap. qu' :
St.O. Ko; (Tw. k'w'o').

/ulq'/ 'snake': Chi. u'1q' : Cheh. u'1'laq'; (St.O. Olok,
Shaw o-luk).

/təki/ ~ /tq'ix/ 'want, wish, love, like': Chi. tqi :
Cheh. taq'í : St.O. Tike - tkeh; (Tw. ti'ki, Snoqu. ti'ki,
Saan. diki, Kalap. ti'gi, Up.Coq. tigi, Tsim. tiki,
Hale túkéh, Ross Tekeigh).

(?)/taq'á/ 'broad, wide': Tw. tá'k'at : Cheh. táqq'at; (St.O.
tlakalh).

(?)/q'ayax/ 'entrails': Cheh. q'á'y'yaX : St.O. Kaiah.

/q/: /qada/ 'how, why': Chi. qa'da : Cheh. q'á'ta : Saan. qa'da : Tsim. qa'da; (Tw. ka'da, Nt. kada, Hale kata).

/qa(x)/ 'where': Chi. qa'x ~ qa' : Snoqu. qa' : Saan. qa' : Kalap. qa'; (Cheh. k'á', St.O. Kah, Hale kah, Parker câh).

/qansi/ 'how many, how much; when': Chi. qa'ntci : Cheh. qansí; (Tw. ka'nsi, Hale kántsek, St.O. Kansi).

/a'qi/ 'later, future': Chi. a'igi : Cheh. á'iqi : Saan. a'igi : Kalap. a'igi : Up.Coq. a'igi; (Tw. a'iki, Tsim. a'iki, St.O. Alke, Hale álkē).

/xauqwa/ 'unable, impossible' [see above, /t/].

/anqati/ 'former, past': Chi. a'ngadi : Cheh. á'ngati : Kalap. a'ngadi (~ angadi) : Tsim. a'ngate; (Tw. a'nkati, Saan. ankadi, Hale ānkati, Parker aunacotta, St.O. ankate ~ anhate).

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

/(h)ayáq/ 'fast, quick, easy': Chi. (?)a'yaq : Cheh. á'yaq : Kalap. a'yaq; (Tw. ha'yak, Hale hafak, St.O. Aiak).

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

/kw/: /kw'as/ 'afraid; tame': Chi. k'wa's : Tw. k'wa's : Cheh. k'wá's : St.O. Kwas : ?Saan. kwá's ~ kwás; (Hale kwás).

/yakw'atin/ ~ /kw'atfn/ 'belly; entrails': Chi. k'wati'n : Tw. k'wa'tin : St.O. Iakwatin; ?Cheh. q'wattin.

/kw'an/ 'glad; tamed': St.O. Kwan : Cheh. k'wá'n [no gloss given], kwá'n 'glad'.

/kw'iu'kw'iu/ 'ring, circle': Cheh. k'w'yu'k'w'yu' : St.O. Kwiukwiu; (Hale kwiokwio).

/kw/: /kwansəm/ 'always': Chi. gwa'nisim : Tw. kwa'nəsəm : Cheh. kwá'nisim : Kalap. gwa'nsum : Hale kwánisim : St.O. kwanesom.

/makwst/ 'two': Chi. ma'k^wst [cf. Chinook š-mak^wst, the source word] : Tw. ma'k^wst : Cheh. má'k^wst ~ má'kwst : Snoqu. ma'k^ws- : Kalap. ma'k^wst ~ ma'k^ws- : Hale mákust ~ mākst; (Saan. ma'kst, Up.Coq. ma'k-sa'n '2 days', Parker moxst, St.O. mokst).

/kikwli/ 'lower, down': Chi. gi'kwli : Tw. ki'kwli ~ kwi'kwli : Cheh. k'kwali : Snoqu. kwi'kwli : ?Tsim. ke'kule : Hale kikwili ~ kikwili : St.O. Kikwile : ?Parker kekulle.

/teskwis/ 'woven mat made of cattail': Tw. tl'skwis : Cheh. tl'skwis : St.O. Kliskwis ~ Tliskwis : Hale kléskwes.

/qʷʰ/: /qʷʰəlán/ 'hear; ear': Cheh. qʷallá'n : Kalap. qʷela'n;
Tw. kʷel'a'n : St.O. Kwolan = kolan; (Hale kwalán).

/qʷʰe/: 'hit': Chi. qʷa' : Cheh. qʷa; St.O. Kwotl.

/qʷ/: /qʷenem/ 'five': Chi. qʷe'nem : Cheh. qʷwánam : Kalap. qʷe'num;
(Tw. kwé'nem, Up.Coq. kwenem, St.O. Kwanom, Parker quinum).

6. /x/ [x] : /h/ [h,x]

/x/: /xluima/ 'other, different': Chi. xluíma : Cheh. Xlú'yima :
[x] Snoqu. xlu'wima : Saan. xlu'wimən : Tsim. xalo'yim;
(Tw. xalo'ima, St.O. Holoíma, Hale halōima).

/saxali/ 'above, high': Chi. sa'xli : Tw. sa'xali : Cheh.
sá'XALI - sá'hali : Snoqu. sa'xali : Saan. sa'xali :
Tsim. sa'xali; St.O. sahali, Parker saghale, Hale sáhali -
sákali.

/taxani/ 'out(side), without': Chi. ta'xni : Tw. ta'xeni :
Cheh. tá'XANI : Saan. ta'xani : Tsim. ta'xani : ?Kalap. ta'x
: St.O. Tlahane; (Up.Coq. ta'xani).

/ixpú:/ 'shut, close(d)': Chi. i'xbui : Tw. i'xpu - i'xpui :
Cheh. i'xpuv : Saan. a'xpuwi : Up.Coq. ixpu : St.O. Ixpui.

/taxáw'yam/ 'poor, pitiful': Chi. ta'xau'yám : Tw. taxá'uyem :
Cheh. tá'XAWYAM [Indians] - tá'hAYAM [whites];
(Hale klahāwēam).

/laxw/ 'leaning; bent over': Chi. la'xw-sa'n 'afternoon'
(san 'day, sun') : Cheh. lá'XW : St.O. Lah.

/h/: /hayás/ 'big': Tw. ha'yas : Cheh. hayá' : Hymes & Hymes há'os;
[h,x] Hale hafas : Parker hias : St.O. afas.

/iht/ 'one': Chi. i'xt : Tw. i'xt : Cheh. i'xt : Snoqu. i'xt :
Saan. i'xt : Kalap. i'xt : St.O. iht : Hale iht - ikt :
Parker egt; (Tsim. ikt).

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

/tšhi/ 'recent, new': Chi. tcxi' : Tw. tcxi : Cheh. tšxi' :
Kalap. tchi' ; (Saan. tci' , St.O. Chi).

/hilu/ 'absent, lacking, without': Tw. he'lo : Cheh. hé'lu :
St.O. helo.

/ulhayu/ 'seal': Cheh. ulhayu : St.O. Olehaño : Hale walhwafu.

7. Non-initial /'/

/q'u'/ 'reach, arrive': Chi. qu' : Cheh. q'ó' : Kalap. q'w' ;
(Tw. k'wó' , St.O. Kó).

/ya'yem/ 'tell a story': Tw. ya'yem : Cheh. ya'yayam :
Kalap. ya'yem; (St.O. Iafim).

/ili'i/ = /ilahi/ 'ground, earth': Chi. i'li' : Cheh. i'li' :
Kalap. i'li'i : Up.Coq. i'li'i - i'lihi; (Tw. i'lahi,
Tsim. e'lehi, Hale ilēhi, Parker illaha, St.O. elehi).

/ti'el/ 'black': Tw. te'e'l : Cheh. ti'el : Up.Coq. ti'il;
(St.O. Tlitli, Parker klaait, Hale kláil).

/tia'wit/ 'leg, foot': Chi. tya'wit : Cheh. tyá'wí; (Hale tiáwit, St.O. TeIawit).

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

/taxáw'yam/ 'poor, pitiful': Chi. *a'xau'yám : Cheh. tá'xau'yám [Indians] ~ tá'hayám [whites]; (Tw. *axa'uyem, Hale klahāwēam).

/p'ə'nəs/ 'roasted, baked in ashes': Chi. pi'nəs : Cheh. p'āns ; (Boas 1933 p'énis, St.O. ppens).

(?)/qw'əlán/ 'hear, ear': Tw. kwel'a'n : Cheh. q'wallán?; (Kalap. q'wela'n, St.O. Kwolan, Hale kwálán).

8. Non-European consonant clusters

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

/itsxut/ 'black bear': Tw. l'tcxwat : Cheh. ʔitsxut : St.O. Itshut; Hale itshūhūt ~ itsūhūt; (Hymes and Hymes šwit, Winthrop Ichfat).

(Chi.)
/tshəp/ 'extinguished': Chi. tcxə'p : Boas 1933, tcxup' : Bells chh'p.

/xwap/ 'hole': Chi. *xwa'p : St.O. tlwhop ~ Tlwop : Cheh. *wá'p.

/k'up/ 'broken; cut, chop': Chi. *k'u'p : Cheh. *k'op : St.O. Tl'kop : Shaw Tl'kope.

/tk'up/ 'white': Tw. tk'o'p : Cheh. t'k'ú'p : Saan. tk'u'p : St.O. t'kop : Parker t'koop; (Hale túköp).

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

/dlay/ 'dry': Chi. dlai : Cheh. tláy ~ t'áláy : St.O. Tlaí : Hale tlai : Winthrop Dlie : Shaw D'ly ~ De'ly; (Tw. dela'i).

/yut'/'glad, pleased, proud': Tw. yu't'íí : Cheh. yú'íí ~ yú'tíí; St.O. Iutl.

/stuxtkin/ 'eight': Cheh. stúxtkin : Ross stoghtkin : Hale stóhtkin; (Tw. tu'skin ~ tu'tskin, St.O. Stotkin ~ Sotkin).

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

Finally, here is a complete list for Hale 1846 of English-origin CJ words with ^{finite} non-English pronunciations. In all these words Hale follows the CJ norm: klas 'glass'; kintshótsh 'English(man)' (literally 'King George'); lūm 'rum'; ōluman 'old man, father'; tala 'dollar, silver'; tlai 'dry'; tūmōla 'tomorrow' [1846:637].

And here is a partial list for the Demers-Blanchet-St.Onge dictionary of French-origin words with non-French pronunciations. Here again, the authors follow the CJ norm: Lapush 'mouth'; Lalam 'oar'; puli 'rotten'; Lamiaí 'old woman'; Letaí 'teeth'; Lawest 'vest'; Lalak 'tongue'; Lahash 'axe'; Latap ~ latam 'table'; Lawen 'oats'; Lamotai 'mountain'; Lakom 'gum'; Lakalot 'carrot'; Lashanshel 'belt'; Lalupa 'ribbon'; Lemolo 'wild'.

- Andrade, Manuel J. 1953. Notes on the relations between Chemakum and Quileute. IJAL 19.212-15.
- Boas, Franz. 1888. Chinook songs. Journal of American Folk-Lore 1.220-6.
- . 1892. Notes on the Chemakum language. Am.Anth. 5.37-44.
- . 1911a. Chinook. HAIL I: BAE-B40, part 1, 559-667. Washington, D.C.
- . 1911b. Kwakiutl. HAIL I: BAE-B40, part 1: 423-557.
- . 1911c. Tsimshian. HAIL I: BAE-B40, part 1, 283-422.
- . 1933. Note on the Chinook Jargon. Lg. 9.208-13.
- . 1934. A Chehalis text. IJAL 8.103-10.
- Boas, Franz, & Herman Haeblerlin. 1926. Sound shifts in Salishan dialects. IJAL 4.117-36.
- Bright, Jane. 1964. The phonology of Smith River Athapaskan (Tolowa). IJAL 30.101-7.
- Clyne, Michael G. 1975. German and English working pidgins. Paper presented at the International Conference on Pidgins & Creoles, Honolulu.
- Demers, Modeste (1838, 1839), F. N. Blanchet (1867), & L. N. St. Onge. 1871. Chinook Dictionary, Catechism, Prayers, and Hymns. Montreal.
- Demers, Richard A. 1974. Alternating roots in Lummi. IJAL 40.15-21.
- Drachman, Gaberell. 1969. Twana phonology. OSU WPL, #5.
- Drechsel, Emanuel J. 1977. Mobilian Jargon: some linguistic and sociocultural aspects of an American Indian lingua franca. Paper presented at the 16th Conference on American Indian languages: the Southeast, AAA, Houston.
- Edel, May Mandelbaum. 1939. The Tillamook language. IJAL 10.1-57.
- Elmendorf, William. 1939ms. Field notes on Chinook Jargon from a Twana Indian.
- Frachtenberg, Leo J. 1922a. Coos. HAIL II: BAE-B40, part 2: 297-429. Washington, D.C.
- . 1922b. Siuslawan (Lower Umpqua). HAIL II: BAE-B40, part 2: 431-629. Washington, D.C.
- Gill, John K. 1891 (1878). Dictionary of the Chinook Jargon with examples of use in Conversation. 9th ed. Portland: J.K. Gill, publisher; Himes the printer.
- Goddard, Pliny Earle. Athapaskan (Hupa). HAIL I: BAE-B40, part 1, 85-158.
- Golla, Victor. 1976. Tututni (Oregon Athapaskan). IJAL 42.217-27.

- Grant, Rena V. 1945. Chinook Jargon. IJAL II. 225-33.
- Hale, Horatio. 1846. United States Exploring Expedition during the years 1838-1842: Ethnography and Philology. Lea & Blanchard. (1968 reprint: Ridgewood, N.J.: The Gregg Press.)
- Harrington, J.P. ms. n.d. (1930's?). Chinook Jargon words from a Chehalis speaker.
- Hess, Thom. 1976. Dictionary of Puget Salish. Seattle: University of Washington Press.
- Hoijer, Harry. 1966. Galice Athapaskan: a grammatical sketch. IJAL 32.320-7.
- Hukari, Thomas E. 1976. Person in a Coast Salish language. IJAL 42.305-18.
- Hymes, Dell H. 1955. The language of the Kathlamet Chinook. Indiana University Ph.D. dissertation. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.
- . 1980. Commentary. In Albert Valdman and Arnold Highfield, eds., Theoretical orientations in creole studies (N.Y.: Academic Press), 389-423.
- & Virginia Hymes. 1972. Chinook Jargon as 'mother's tongue'. IJAL 38.207.
- Jacobs, Melville. 1932. Notes on the structure of Chinook Jargon. Lg. 8.27-50.
- . 1936. Texts in Chinook Jargon. University of Washington Pub'ns in Anthro., vol. 7, 1: 1-27. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Johnson, Samuel V. 1975. Chinook Jargon variation: Towards the complete Chinooker. Paper presented at the International Conference on Pidgins & Creoles, Honolulu.
- . 1978. Chinook Jargon: A computer assisted analysis of variation in an American Indian pidgin. University of Kansas Ph.D. dissertation, Ann Arbor: University Microfilms International.
- Kaufman, Terrence, ed. ms. 1966a. Tales in Chinook Jargon.
- . 1966b. Short sentences in Chinook Jargon.
- . 1968. Chinook Jargon vocabulary with grammatical notes.
- . 1971. A report on Chinook Jargon. In Dell Hymes, ed., Pidginization and creolization of languages (Cambridge: University Press), 275-8.
- Kinkade, M. Dale. 1963. Phonology and morphology in Upper Chehalis. IJAL 29.181-95.
- . 1976. The copula and negatives in inland Olympic Salish. IJAL 42.17-23.
- Krauss, Michael E. 1965. Eyak: a preliminary report. CJL 10.2, 3:167-87.
- Kuipers, Aert H. 1967. The Squamish language. I.
- Li, Fang-Kuei. 1946. Chipewyan. LSNA 398-423.
- McCawley, James D. 1970. English as a VSO language. Lg. 46:286-99.

Notices & Voyages of the famed Quebec Mission to the Pacific Northwest. Being the correspondence, notices, etc., of Fathers Blanchet and Demers, together with those of Fathers Bolduc and Langlois ... mission to the engages of the Hudson's Bay Company and the pagan natives, 1838 to 1847. 1956. Portland: Oregon Historical Society.

Palmer, Joel. 1847. Journal of travels over the Rocky Mountains, to the mouth of the Columbia River; made during the years 1845 and 1846: containing minute descriptions of the valleys of the Willamette, Umpqua, and Clamet; ... Cincinnati: J.A. & U.P. James. Facsimile Series. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Incorporated.

Parker, Samuel (Rev., A.M.). 1842. Journal of an exploring tour beyond the Rocky Mountains, under the direction of the A.B.C.F.M., in the years 1835, '36, and '37 ... 3rd edition. Ithaca, N.Y.

Powell, J.V. 1971. Quileute deixis -- a study of grammatical markedness. In James Hoard & Thom Hess, eds., Studies in Northwest Indian Languages (Sacramento: Sacramento Anthropological Society, Paper #11, 91-109.)

Rigsby, Bruce. 1975. Nass-Gitskan: an analytic ergative syntax. IJAL 41.346-54.

Ross, Alexander. 1849. Adventures of the first settlers on the Oregon or Columbia River: Being a narrative of the expedition fitted out by John Jacob Astor, to establish the "Pacific Fur Company"; with an account of some Indian tribes on the coast of the Pacific. London: Smith, Elder & Co. March of America Facsimile Series, #58: Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, Incorporated.

Ruby, Robert H., & John A. Brown. 1976. The Chinook Indians: traders of the lower Columbia River. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

Ruhlen, Merritt. 1975. A guide to the languages of the world. Stanford University: Language Universals Project.

Sapir, Edward. 1914. Notes on Chasta Costa phonology and morphology. University of Pennsylvania: The University Museum Anthropological Publications, vol. II: 2.

Sapir, Edward, & Morris Swadesh. 1939. Nootka texts: Tales and ethnological narratives, with grammatical notes and lexical materials. Philadelphia: LSA: University of Pennsylvania. William Dwight Whitney Linguistic Series.

Shaw, George C. 1909. The Chinook Jargon and how to use it. A complete and exhaustive lexicon of the oldest trade language of the American continent. Seattle: Rainier Printing Company.

Silverstein, Michael. 1972. Chinook Jargon: language contact and the problem of multi-level generative systems. I: Lg. 48.378-406; II: Lg. 48.596-625.

----. 1974. Dialectal developments in Chinookan tense-aspect systems: an areal-historical analysis. IJAL 40.4.2: S45-S99. Memoir 29.

----. 1979. Penutian: an assessment. In Lyle Campbell & Marianne Mithun, eds., The languages of native America: historical and comparative assessment (Austin: University of Texas Press), 650-91.

Reinecke, J.E. 1971. Tây Bồi: Notes on the Pidgin French of Vietnam. In D. Hymes, ed., Pidginization and creolization of languages (Cambridge: University Press), 47-56.

Snyder, Warren A. 1968. Southern Puget Sound Salish: Phonology and morphology. Sacramento Anthropological Society Paper #8.

Swadesh, Morris. 1936. Nootka internal syntax. IJAL 9:77-102.

Teit, James A., & Franz Boas. 1927-28. The Salishan tribes of the western Plateaus. BAE Report #45.

Thomason, Sarah G. 1980. On interpreting "The Indian Interpreter". Language in Society 9.167-93.

----. To appear. Review of K. Hill, ed., The genesis of language. To appear in SSL.

Thomason, Sarah G., and Terrence Kaufman. In preparation. Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics. (revision and expansion of a paper entitled "Toward a more adequate definition of creolization", presented at the 1975 International Conference on Pidgins and Creoles, Honolulu.

Thompson, Laurence C. 1979. Salishan and the Northwest. In Lyle Campbell & Marianne Mithun, eds., The languages of native America: historical and comparative assessment (Austin: University of Texas Press), 692-765.

Thompson, Laurence C., and M. Terry Thompson. 1966. A fresh look at Tillamook phonology. IJAL 32.313-19.

----. 1971. Clallam: a preview. UCPL 65. 251-94.

Twain, Mark. 1872(1962) Roughing It. New York: Signet.

Tweddell, Colin Ellidge. 1950. The Snoqualmie-Duwamish dialects of Puget Sound Coast Salish. An outline of phonemics and morphology. University of Washington Publications in Anthropology, vol. 12: iii-v, 1-78. Seattle: University of Washington.

Whinnom, Keith. 1971. Linguistic hybridization and the 'special case' of pidgins and creoles. In Dell Hymes, ed., Pidginization and creolization of languages (Cambridge: University Press), 91-117.

Winthrop, Theodore. 1863. The canoe and the saddle: adventures among the northwestern rivers and forests. Boston: Ticknor & Fields.

Woodward, Mary. 1964. Hupa phonemics. In William Bright, ed., Studies in California Linguistics (UCPL 34), 199-216.