UC Berkeley

Survey Reports, Survey of California and Other Indian Languages

Title

Blue Munk: Towards an Analysis of Causatives and the Like in Chinuk Wawa

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/39d9792n

Author

Larsen, Thomas W

Publication Date

2002

BLUE MUNK: TOWARDS AN ANALYSIS OF CAUSATIVES AND THE LIKE IN CHINUK WAWA

Thomas W. Larsen

Branford Price Millar Library
Portland State University

Chinook Jargon is a pidgin which was formerly used widely in Northwestern North America as a lingua franca among native peoples of different linguistic backgrounds as well as between native peoples and whites. The primary lexical source language was Lower Chinook, but there was also vocabulary from other native languages as well as, in later times at least, significant French and English components. One important non-Chinookan source of vocabulary was Nuu-chah-nulth (Nootka). This Nootkan element, though small, includes some of the important grammatical words. Because the Nootkan words in Chinook Jargon often show a degree of phonological distortion not found in words from other native sources, it is believed that these Nootkan words were introduced by whites from a Nootka Jargon used for trade at Vancouver Island before the Columbia River was discovered in the late 18th century. But the question of whether or not Chinook Jargon existed in some form or another before contact with whites is still controversial. (See Thomason 1983, Zenk 1984:26-31, Thomason and Kaufman 1988:256-263, Silverstein 1996:127-130, and the references cited therein for further discussion.)

When the Grand Ronde Reservation was established in Oregon in 1856, people from 15 small tribes speaking more than 9 different languages were moved onto this reservation. Zenk (1984, 1988) has shown that since the population of the community was always small, and since no one of these groups was large enough to become dominant, Chinook Jargon became the general language of the community. During the period from the late 1800s to the early 1900s, many children grew up in households where Jargon was the only or main language spoken, though probably none of them grew to maturity without also learning English. Thus, Zenk argues that Chinook Jargon was in the process of creolization at Grand Ronde until it was later supplanted by English. Zenk and Johnson worked extensively in the 1980s and 90s with the remaining elders of the community who retained a knowledge of Chinook Jargon (which they now prefer to call Chinuk Wawa); and the data used here primarily comes from their work as well as from materials collected by Melville Jacobs from two Grand Ronde community members in the 1920s and 30s (Jacobs 1936:1-19).[1]

Vrzić (1999), in the course of making a case for the role of universals in Pidgin/Creole development, presents a formal analysis of certain structures in a different variety of Chinook Jargon. This variety is one that appeared in a mimeographed newspaper called *Kamloops Wawa*, which was published between 1891 and 1904 by a Father LeJeune of Kamloops, B.C. This newspaper contained articles in Chinook Jargon written in a unique orthography based on Duployan shorthand, and it can be interesting to try to compare some of the structures Vrzić has analyzed in the presumably more pidgin-like variety of Jargon in *Kamloops Wawa* with what has

---

been found in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa. With that in mind, I would here like to consider how causative and other similar constructions are formed in Chinuk Wawa.

We can start by looking at some basic facts about the language. The pronouns are shown in Table 1.[2] Many varieties of Chinook Jargon only have the "Long Forms" shown in the first column of the table. However, in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa, many speakers use the other forms at least some of the time. Note that the "Focus Forms" are, aside from heavier stress, identical to the "Long Forms" except in the third person singular, where the special focus form *yáxka* is often used.

	LONG FORMS	SHORT FORMS	CLITIC FORMS	FOCUS FORMS
	(a) Pre-verbal Subjects and Noun Possessors; typically unstressed (b) Objects and Post-verbal Subjects; typically stressed	(Same patterns as Long Forms)	Preverbal subjects and noun Possessors only; typically unstressed	(Heavily Stressed)
1 SG	náyka	náy	na	náyka
2 SG	máyka	máy	ma	máyka
3 SG	yáka	yá	ya	yáxka
1 PL	ntsáyka	tsáy	ntsa	ntsáyka
2 PL	msáyka	misáy	msa	msáyka
3 PL	łáska	łás	łas	łáska

TABLE 1. Pronouns

Transitive sentences generally appear in SVO order, as seen in (1-3).

(1) *ya(ka)*   *nánich*   *yáka*   'S/he sees him/her.'
     s/he   see   s/he

(2) *? uk*   *mán*   *nánich*   *uk*   *łúchmən*   'The man saw the woman.'
     that   man   see   that   woman

(3) *uk*   *mán*   *ya(ka)* *nánich*   *uk*   *łúchmən*   'The man saw the woman.'
    that   man   he   see   that   woman

---

[2] The Chinuk Wawa forms cited here have been provided by a number of different Grand Ronde community members. There is a certain amount of phonological variation exhibited in the speech of different speakers. Thus for the sake of consistency, all Chinuk Wawa forms cited in this paper will be cited according the spellings of the lead entries in Zenk and Johnson's (2001) dictionary.

When the subject is a full non-pronominal NP, it is possible to have a so-called "pleonastic" third person pronoun before the verb, as in (3). In most varieties of Chinook Jargon this pronoun, though possible, is most often not present, as seen in (2). However, in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa, sentences like (2) are relatively rare (at least in main clauses; hence the question mark in example 2), and transitive sentences most often have the form seen in (3).

Vrzić (1999:241-246) argues from the perspective of Chomsky's Principles and Parameters theory that the normal position of subjects (both nominal and pronominal) in Chinook Jargon is outside the VP; that is to say, Chinook Jargon subjects are not raised out of the VP into the AgrSP (subject agreement phrase). She proposes that the normal position of the subject is directly in AgrSP in a clause structure like that illustrated in (4).

(4) [ForceP TopP FocP TopP FinP   [[SUBJECT] [   ]]]
     CP   IP   AgrSP   VP

She further argues that, when a nominal subject co-occurs with a "pleonastic" subject pronoun, the pronoun is the actual subject in AgrSP and the lexical NP is either in the focus phrase (FocP) or one of the two topic phrases (TopP). Since nothing in the present discussion seems to crucially depend on this, I will assume here for the sake of simplicity that this analysis is correct. However, I do not believe that such an analysis can be maintained in all cases for Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa given that co-occurring lexical subjects and "pleonastic" pronouns seem to be the norm in that variety. I am rather inclined to think that in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa the lexical NP (when there is one) is the actual subject and the "pleonastic" pronoun actually represents a verb agreement phenomenon. It is true, as mentioned previously, that lexical subjects do sometimes occur without a "pleonastic" pronoun (or rather, a pronominal agreement marker); but I believe that the presence or absence of these pronouns, as well as the position of the subject with respect to an intransitive predicate (see below), can be accounted for in terms of factors such as the animacy and volitionality of the subject and the semantics of the verb. The details of this, however, have yet to be worked out.

Sentences with intransitive verbs or non-verbal predicates can appear either in SV or VS order, as seen in (5-6). VS order is particularly common with non-verbal predicates, but is sometimes also found with intransitive verbs. Examples (5-6) also illustrate the auxiliary verb *chaku-*, a verb which is frequently used without the "pleonastic" pronoun. (See the discussion in the previous paragraph.)

(5) *líli   álta   chaku-chxə́p   uk pʰáya*   'After a while the fire went out.'
     a while then   (be)come-extinguished the fire

(6) *úk   tənəs-łúchmən   chaku-hayásh*   'The girl grew up.'
     the   little-woman   (be)come-big

Example (7) illustrates a possessive construction. Here the possessive relationship between the possessor NP *uk mán* and the possessed NP *kəním* is indicated by the pronoun appearing before that possessed NP.

(7) *uk   mán   ya(ka)   kəním*   'the man's canoe' (lit., 'the man his canoe')
     the   man   s/he   canoe

110

Examples (8-9) illustrate some of the uses of the "Focus Forms" of the pronouns. Here I have indicated heavy stress by using a stress mark (') before the stressed syllable in addition to the usual acute accent over the stressed vowel.

(8)　'yáx̣ka　　ya　　　nánich　　ḱapa　　looking glass
　　　S/HE　　　s/he　　see　　　PREP　　looking glass
　　　'She herself is the one she sees in the looking glass.'

(9)　ya　　q'wə́ɬ　'náyka　　álta　　na　　q'wə́ɬ　'yáx̣ka
　　　s/he　hit　　ME　　　　then　　I　　hit　　　HIM/HER
　　　'He hit ME, and then I hit HIM.'

Example (10) illustrates one of the ways of forming reflexives in Chinuk Wawa. Here the possessive construction *ya təmtəm* 'his/her heart' is used as a reflexive pronoun.

(10)　ya　　munk-hílu　　ya　　təmtəm　　'He kills himself.'
　　　s/he　make-nothing　s/he　heart

The particular constructions that I want to look at here are ones that Vrzić actually does not deal with in any great detail. These are constructions involving the word *munk* meaning, as a noun, 'work', and as a verb, 'to do, to make, to work, etc.' In most varieties of Chinook Jargon, this word has the form *mamuk*, which comes from the Nuu-chah-nulth word *mamuuk* 'work'. However, at Grand Ronde the fuller form *mamuk* has come to have certain sexual connotations such that most speakers prefer the shortened form *munk* in most ordinary contexts. An example of *munk* used as a transitive verb in a simple sentence is seen in (11).

(11)　yaka　múnk　dála　　'He makes money.'
　　　s/he　make　money

Example (12) illustrates (ignoring a few details to be discussed presently) another use of *munk*, namely, its use in forming causative constructions.

(12)　yaka　munk　miməlust　ɬaska　　'He killed them'
　　　s/he　make　die　　　they

Vrzić (1999:134) says that she found only a few causative constructions like (12) in *Kamloops Wawa*. They are, on the other hand, extremely common in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa. However, Vrzić apparently wants to analyze these as bi-clausal constructions where the subordinate clause is always intransitive with the subject obligatorily post-verbal. She notes (1999:134) that this obligatory VS order in "causative clauses" is a departure from the canonical SV(O) word order. Two of her examples are shown in (13-14). Below each of Vrzić's examples

111

from *Kamloops Wawa*, I show in parentheses the Grand Ronde ("G.R.") spellings of the words in the examples.[3]

(13) Kamloops Wawa: *yaka*   *mamuk* [*chako*   *tepso*]
                      s/he   make   come   grass
      (G.R.:   *yaka*   *munk*   *cháku*   *típsu*)
      'He makes the grass grow.'

(14) Kamloops Wawa: *S.T.*   *mamuk* [*klatawa*   *chok*   *kanawe*   *kanamokst*]
                      God   make   go   water   all   together
      (G.R.: *Sáxali Tayí* *munk*   *łátwa*   *tsáqw*   *kʰánawi*   *kʰanumákwst*)
      'God made the waters all run together.'

In addition to constructions like that seen in (12), one also finds in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa superficially similar constructions like the one seen in (15).

(15) *battery munk mimalust* 'The battery conked out.' (NOT: 'The battery killed (someone).')
      battery make   die

Although (12) and (15) might appear to be examples of the same construction, their meanings are quite different. Notice that (15) does not have causative meaning, but rather is interpreted, in this case at least, more like a "middle voice" construction.[4] In actual fact, though, (12) and (15) are not quite as similar as they may seem on a superficial level. In (12), *munk mimalust* is, in normal speech, usually pronounced as a single word with a single primary stress on the second element,

---

[3] This is not to say, however, that these sentences would necessarily have these exact syntactic forms in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa. Also note that the *Kamloops Wawa* examples have been transliterated by Vrzić from their original spellings in Duployan shorthand.

[4] There are languages in which the causative forms can sometimes also have a passive meaning. For example in Classical Manchu, the verbal suffix *-bu* forms a causative on some verbs and a passive on others, and on still others it can form either a causative or a passive. Some examples can be seen in (b) and (d) below.

(a) *hūlha*   *be*   *alcur*   *de*   *gida-ha*   '(They) defeated the rebels at Alcur.'
     rebel   ACC   Alcur   LOC   defeat-PERF.PARTICIPLE

(b) *hūlha*   *cooha*   *de*   *gida-bu-ha*   'The rebels were defeated by the soldiers.'
     rebel   soldier   LOC   defeat-PASS/CAUS-PERF.PARTICIPLE

(c) *si*   *inu*   *boo-de*   *tuwakiya-ci*   *aca-mbi*
     you   also   house-LOC   guard-CONDITIONAL.CONVERB   should-AORIST
     'You also should keep watch in the house.'

(d) *boigon*   *be*   *emu*   *tanggū cooha*   *be*   *tuwakiya-bu-fi* ...
     household   ACC   one   hundred soldier   ACC   guard-PASS/CAUS-PERF.CONVERB
     'Having ordered one hundred soldiers to guard the household, ...'

It should be noted, however, that the Chinuk Wawa construction illustrated in (15) does not have passive meaning. The non-passive nature of this construction should be even more evident in other examples to be seen presently.

112

as seen in (16). In examples like (15), on the other hand, both verbal elements are typically stressed in normal speech, as seen in (17).

(16) *yaka   munk-mímǝlust   łáska*   'He killed them'
      s/he   make die   they

(17) *battery   múnk   mímǝlust*   'The battery conked out'
      battery   make   die

Some additional examples of this "middle voice" construction can be seen in (18-19).

(18) *ya   tíki   múnk   háyash-man*   'He wants to make himself an important man.'
      s/he   want   make   big-man

(19) *yaka   múnk   hǝ́m*   'He stinks'
      s/he   make   stink

In (20) the *múnk* + VERB construction appears to be "transitive" rather than "intransitive" as in the previous examples. In this case, the meaning of the construction cannot be properly characterized as "middle voice" (nor as passive). Rather, this example seems to have an aspectual interpretation.

(20) *álta   yaka   múnk   t'áqʰwin   yaka   latít*
      now   s/he   make   lick   s/he   head
      'Now he (Coyote) commenced to lick his (Turkey Buzzard's) head'
      (NOT: 'Now he caused his head to lick.')

This same aspectual interpretation can also be seen in (17), which could perhaps be translated as something like 'the battery up and died'. This aspectual meaning may also be present in (18) and (19) although it is difficult to tell for sure out of context. It is also interesting to compare examples like (21-22). In (21) *múnk kǝ́mtǝks* is part of a "transitive" *múnk* + VERB construction, whereas in (22), *munk-kǝ́mtǝks* is part of a causative construction. The aspectual part of the meaning of (20) can perhaps also be seen in (21), where *múnk kǝ́mtǝks* 'to recognize' could be interpreted as something like 'commence to know'.

(21) *álta   yaka   múnk   kǝ́mtǝks   yáka*   'Then he recognized her.'
      then   s/he   make   know   s/he

(22) *munk kǝ́mtǝks   yáka!*   'Explain it to him!'
      make-know   s/he

The examples of causative constructions we have looked at so far, (16) and (17), have all been formed with intransitive verbs: *mímǝlust* 'to die' and *kǝ́mtǝks* 'to know'. One might then wonder if causatives can be formed from transitives. For instance, how would one say something

like 'I made John eat beans' in Chinuk Wawa? Such examples seem to be extremely rare in our database. Henry Zenk, a very fluent non-native speaker, suggests that perhaps one could say either (23) or (24).

(23)   *nayka* *múnk* *John* *məkʰmək*   *lipwá*   'I made John eat beans.'
           I   make John   eat   bean

(24)   *nayka* *múnk* *pus*   *John* *ya(ka)* *məkʰmək*   *lipwá* 'I made John eat beans.'
           I   make that   John s/he   eat   bean

Though there are no examples exactly like (24) in our Chinuk Wawa database, Vrzić (1999:243) cites example (25) from *Kamloops Wawa*, which appears to be an example of this same construction.

(25)   Kamloops Wawa: *ayu* *naika* *mamuk* *pus masachi*   *wek*   *tolo*   *naika*
                    a lot I   make   that sin   not   win   I
              (G.R.: *háyu*   *nayka* *múnk*   *pus* *masháchi*   *wik*   *túlu?* *náyka)*
                 'I try hard that sin does not win me over.'

In Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa one finds this type of construction used with certain main verbs other than *múnk*, as seen in (26-27).

(26)   *nayka*   *tíki*   *pus*   *yaka* *kʼilapay*   'I want him to come back.'
           I   want that   s/he   return

(27)   *ya*   *wáwa* *pus*   *ya*   *pálach*   *kʼilapay*   'He told him to give it back.'
           s/he say   that   s/he give   return

Example (28), a Grand Ronde sentence from Jacobs (1936:19), may actually be an example of this construction using the verb *múnk*; however, because of the ambiguity of the second occurrence of the complementizer *pus* 'that, when' in (28), this is not totally clear.

(28)   *pus*   *álta*   *ntsayka*   *múnk* *pus*   *tílxam* *míməlust,*
           what if   now   we   make that, when   people die

           łáska *chaku-kʼilapay*   *kʰapa*   *qwinəm*   *sán*
           they   come-return   PREP   five   sun

'Supposing we make it that when people die, they may come back on the fifth day.'

Turning now to example (23), there is an example similar to this one in our database, shown in (29).

(29)   *ya*   *múnk* *ya*   *pálach*   *kʼilapay*   'He made him give it back.'
           s/he make s/he give   return

It would be reasonable to assume that (23) and (29) are typical control constructions with a structure like that shown in (30).[5]

(30) [*nayka*   *múnk* *John* ᵢ [[PRO ᵢ   *mək^hmək*   *lipwá*]]]
      IP   CP IP

There is possibly one further example of this construction, from Jacobs (1936:5), shown in (31).

(31) *yá*   *lima* *yáxka*   *yaka*   *múnk*   *lalám*
      s/he   hand   it   s/he   make   paddle
      'It is his hand that he uses as a paddle.' (lit., 'His hand, IT he makes be a paddle.')

If the analysis in (30) is correct, then (31) should have a structure like that shown in (32).

(32) [[*yá lima*] ᵢ [*yáxka*] ᵢ   [*yaka múnk* t ᵢ   [[PRO ᵢ *lalám*]]]]
      CP TopP   FocP   IP   CP   IP

Note that if *John* in (30) and the trace in (32) were actually in subject position in the embedded clause rather than in object position in the main clause, we might expect there to be a "pleonastic" pronoun in the embedded clause (cf. the embedded clause in 24). Example (30) is admittedly a "made-up" example, but the lack of a "pleonastic" pronoun in (31) suggests that the analyses shown in (30) and (32) are indeed correct. The lack of a "pleonastic" pronoun here correlates with the fact that PRO must appear in a non-case-marked position. If a "pleonastic" pronoun could appear here, then this would have to be considered a case-marked position. Obviously there is no other way in Chinuk Wawa to distinguish between finite and non-finite clauses.

Even if examples (23-24) are legitimate, however, it can be seen that these constructions are quite different from the more common causative construction we have seen in (12) and (22). For one thing, *múnk* does not join with the second verb in (23-24) as it does in (12) and (22). Nevertheless, the analysis of (23) proposed in (30) does provide a clue to the structure of the *múnk* + VERB construction. Given what we have seen, it is reasonable to assume that (17) is also a control construction as shown in (33).

(33) *battery* ᵢ   *múnk* [PRO ᵢ   *mimɔlust*]   'The battery conked out'
      battery   make   die

Since the empty category PRO in the embedded clause is controlled by the main clause subject, this accounts for the fact that *battery* is interpreted as the subject of both *múnk* and *mimɔlust* in (17). Furthermore, the fact that *múnk* and *mimɔlust* are verbs in separate clauses accounts for the

---

[5] Example (29) is somewhat problematic in this respect, however. The fact that the second occurrence of the pronoun *ya* is unstressed might suggest that it could be the subject of *pálach*, not the object of *múnk*. Without further examples, it is not totally clear whether or not this apparent lack of stress should invalidate the analysis in (30). In any case, Henry Zenk (personal communication) points out that the speaker who produced (29) in an elicitation session said, upon further reflection, that he actually preferred the sentence shown in (27) to that shown in (29).

fact that they are both stressed. We can account for examples like (20) in this same way, as shown in (34).

(34)   [álta   yaka ᵢ   múnk   [PRO ᵢ   t'áqʰwin   yaka   latít]]

Returning now to the common Chinuk Wawa causative construction, it is clear that these must have a very different structure from both the *múnk* + VERB construction and the kinds of causative constructions illustrated in (23-24). If the proposed analysis of the *múnk* + VERB construction is correct, then it would seem reasonable to assume that the combined *munk*-VERB causative form, with a single primary stress, must appear in a single clause, contrary to the analysis assumed by Vrzić. One way to do this would be to assume that the *munk*-VERB forms are actually compound lexical items. There are some cases, such as the ones seen in (35-36), where *munk*- does participate in compounds.

(35)   múnk   lakamás   →   munk-lakamás   'dig camas'
       make   camas

(36)   múnk   pʰáya   →   munk-pʰáya   'make (a) fire'
       make   fire

We have already seen in (11) that *múnk* can be used as a simple transitive verb. However, as seen in (35-36), with a certain few direct object NPs like *lakamás* and *pʰáya*, *múnk* can optionally form a compound with the direct object noun, sometimes with an idiomatic meaning. These compounds, like the causative forms, have a single primary stress on the second element.

Example (37), although it has the form of a causative construction, does not have causative meaning and apparently must also be treated as a compound with idiomatic meaning.

(37)   ya   munk-hə́m   iɬwəli   'He smells meat'
       s/he   make-smell   meat

One can compare (37) with (19), the latter of which is a perfectly regular *múnk* + V construction. Example (37), on the other hand, despite its form, does not mean 'He made the meat smell'. Here *munk*- seems to be functioning solely to derive a transitive verb from the intransitive *hə́m*. This is the only example of this type that I am aware of in Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa.

Another interesting example to consider is (38).

(38)   ya   hayu-munk-tatís   'He's fixing himself up; he's grooming (himself).'
       s/he   PROGRESSIVE-make-flower

Here, *tatís*, which can mean either 'flower' or '(be) pretty', combines with *munk*- to form a verb meaning 'to fix oneself up, to groom (oneself), to decorate'. Note that while (38) appears to be a causative construction, its meaning is not quite like that of other causative constructions: it does not seem to mean 'he makes it pretty' but rather 'he makes HIMSELF pretty'. At the same time, (38) does not have the form of a *múnk* + V construction either. It should be noted, however, that *munk-tatís* also has the meaning 'to tend flowers, to garden'. With that meaning, this appears to

116

be another example like (35-36); and therefore one could argue that the meaning seen in (38) is just an idiomatic extension of this. Furthermore, example (39) shows that *munk-tatís* must be an intransitive construction since the subject can appear following the complex verb form.

(39) *munk-tatís*   *ya*   'He fixes himself up.'
      make-flower   s/he

Thus, it would appear that (38), rather than being a true causative construction, is simply a compound intransitive verb, like the ones in (35-36), with the basic meaning 'to tend flowers' and extended meanings 'to groom, to decorate'.

One could also consider the possibility of analyzing forms like (35-36) and (38) not as compound lexical items but rather as examples of noun incorporation. While this may be possible, I am rather inclined to think that this would not be correct. For one thing, it is not clear that such "noun incorporation" constructions are even productive. The three cited examples are the only examples that I am aware of. Furthermore, if one were to claim that these really are cases of noun incorporation, then one would probably also have to claim that *munk* is the only verb in the language which can incorporate an object noun. Thus it seems best simply to treat these as compound lexical items with possibly idiomatic meanings.

The normal causative verb constructions, on the other hand, appear to be completely productive, and to simply treat them as compound lexical items seems to miss a number of generalizations that can be made about them. One possibly better way of analyzing causative constructions, still within the Principles and Parameters framework favored by Vrzić, may be to treat them as involving complex predicates derived by verb incorporation as illustrated in (40) (cf. Baker 1996:348-352).

(40) [*yaka* [[*munk-mímalust* $_i$ [[[t $_i$]   [*táska*]]]]]]
      IP   VP   V'   VP   V'   V   NP
      s/he   make die   they
      'He killed them'

Here the lower verb (*mímalust* in 40) is raised out of the lower VP into the upper VP and adjoined to *munk*. Then by the Government Transparency Corollary (Baker 1988:64), *munk* will govern *táska*, which will allow *táska* (which is assigned its θ-role by *mímalust*) to be case marked. If we assume that *munk* can only assign case to at most a single object NP, which seems to be true, this would account for the fact that the lower VP can only be intransitive (and unaccusative). This would also account for the fact, noted by Vrzić, that the single argument of the lower intransitive verb always appears following that verb; and this is done without having to impose any special word order constraints. Furthermore, this would account for the stress pattern we have observed which distinguishes this construction from the *munk* + V construction.

However one decides to analyze the causative construction in Chinuk Wawa, one important point should be clear: in order to properly distinguish between certain types of syntactic constructions in this language, it is important to pay attention to prosodic features such as stress. It was primarily through noting patterns of stress and juncture that we were able to get a handle on the differences between sentences like (16) and (17). Some of the researchers who have worked on Chinook Jargon in more recent times, such as Melville Jacobs, Henry Zenk, and Tony Johnson, have been careful to note such features in their work. But others, particularly

those working in the 19th century, have not always recorded such features very thoroughly or consistently, especially in texts. This somewhat limits the usefulness of some of the older materials for syntactic analysis, and this limitation would even apply to materials such as those used by Vrzić from *Kamloops Wawa*, which otherwise present a rather rich corpus of data for analysis.

One final word must be said about the verb incorporation analysis of Chinuk Wawa causatives proposed here in comparison with the bi-clausal analysis suggested by Vrzić. One might conclude that if the present analysis is correct, then Vrzić's analysis, which it must be admitted she did not argue for in any detail, is simply incorrect. However, another possible conclusion may be that these two different analyses represent actual structural differences between Grand Ronde Chinuk Wawa and the variety studied by Vrzić. In light of this latter possibility, one might remember that Vrzić has argued that subjects in Chinook Jargon are not raised out of the VP into AgrSP. She also argues (1999:205-211) that verbs in Chinook Jargon are not raised out of the VP into INFL categories. While this latter point may be correct, it has been argued here that verbs can be raised out of a lower VP into a higher one as part of a verb incorporation process in Chinuk Wawa. Thus, at least one type of verb raising does seem to be possible in this language, and this again may represent a significant structural difference between the creolized variety of Chinuk Wawa spoken at Grand Ronde and the more pidgin-like variety represented in the texts in *Kamloops Wawa*. Further research will obviously be needed to determine whether or not this is true.

REFERENCES

BAKER, MARK C. 1988. Incorporation: a theory of grammatical function changing. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

——. 1996. The polysynthesis parameter. (Oxford studies in comparative syntax.) New York: Oxford University Press.

JACOBS, MELVILLE. 1936. Texts in Chinook Jargon. (University of Washington publications in anthropology, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 1-27.) Seattle: University of Washington.

SILVERSTEIN, MICHAEL. 1996. Dynamics of linguistic contact. Language, ed. by Ives Goddard, 117-136. (Handbook of North American Indians, ed. by William C. Sturtevant, v. 17.) Washington: Smithsonian Institution.

THOMASON, SARAH GREY. 1983. Chinook Jargon in areal and historical context. Language 59.820-870.

——, and TERRENCE KAUFMAN. 1988. Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.

VRZIĆ, ZVJEZDANA. 1999. Modeling pidgin/creole genesis: universals and contact influence in Chinook Jargon syntax. Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Linguistics, New York University.

ZENK, HENRY B. 1984. Chinook Jargon and native cultural persistence in the Grand Ronde Indian community, 1856-1907: a special case of creolization. Ph. D. dissertation, Dept. of Anthropology, University of Oregon.

——. 1988. Chinook Jargon in the speech economy of Grand Ronde Reservation, Oregon: an ethnography-of-speaking approach to an historical case of creolization in process. International journal of the sociology of language 71.107-124.

——, and TONY A. JOHNSON. 2001. Chinuk-Wáwa kákwa ntsayka úlman tílixam łaska munk-kə́mtəks ntsáyka = Chinuk-Wawa as our elders teach us to speak it. Working draft. Grand Ronde, OR: The Confederated Tribes of the Community of Grand Ronde.

REPORT 12

SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND
OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
50TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

June 8-9, 2002
University of California at Berkeley

REPORT 12

SURVEY OF CALIFORNIA AND
OTHER INDIAN LANGUAGES

PROCEEDINGS OF THE
50TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

June 8-9, 2002
University of California at Berkeley

Lisa Conathan and Teresa McFarland, Editors

Leanne Hinton, Series Editor

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

June 8-9, 2002
University of California at Berkeley

Fieldwork and the Survey: Remarks from the panel discussion

PROCEEDINGS OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY CONFERENCE

June 8-9, 2002
University of California at Berkeley

Fieldwork and the Survey: Remarks from the panel discussion

And Other Indian Languages