Arctic origin and domestic development of Chinook Jargon

William J. Samarin

1. Introduction

It is entirely appropriate that Chinook Jargon was included in a conference on Arctic pidgins even though its linguistic form has little to do with the Arctic. Furthermore, the Chinook were not themselves Arctic people but lived at the end of the eighteenth century (and into the nineteenth century, of course) at the mouth of the Columbia River in what is today the state of Washington.

But Chinook Jargon has a right to be considered a pidgin of probable (or at least possible) Arctic origin, as I would like to argue. (The phrase “Arctic origin” in this paper is to be understood in a special sense, as will immediately become clear.)

The history of Chinook Jargon necessarily starts with the earliest contact that Europeans had with the northwest coast of North America, for trade was maritime. It brought certain kinds of foreigners (not all of whom were white, as will be seen) into the area. It was this contact, I believe, that led to the origin of Chinook Jargon, and arguments for a pre-contact existence, while reasonable (but not thoroughly argued), are in my opinion weaker, as I hope to have already demonstrated in print (Samarin 1986b, 1988b; cf. Hymes 1980, Thomason 1984).

It should be made clear, however, that I see no linguistic, sociocultural, or psychological reason why pidgins could not have emerged from time to time in contexts other than those of European trade and colonization. (Indeed, attestations of some such pidgins in recent years are fairly convincing.) It is simply that we happen to know most about colonial or trade pidgins.

In this chapter the history of Chinook Jargon is advanced by considering the domestic relations between foreigners and native women that soon followed contact, the argument being that it may have been mixed marriages, as much as, if not more than, what has been called trade, that led to the development of this lingua franca. Whatever may have been the jargon’s conception, its gestation, shall we say, was in this social context.¹

It should be noted that I make a distinction between the origin of a pidgin and that of its development. Others might prefer to call the implied two stages those of a pre-pidgin and an extended pidgin.

The purpose of this chapter is therefore a sociohistorical one. Its aim is to characterize a part of the population early in the nineteenth century that would have found Chinook Jargon useful if not indeed necessary for some, or much, of its communicative needs.

I make no linguistic inferences from the demographic information provided here, other than one mentioned in the conclusion. It seems to me eminently reasonable, however, to suppose that Indian speakers (and, of course, those of indigenous Lower Chinook, sometimes referred to as Chinook proper) influenced the development of Chinook Jargon in ways that were different from the ways found among speakers of European languages.

2. The “Arctic roots” of Chinook Jargon

Before proceeding, let us begin with what concerns us in this volume – the “Arctic roots” of Chinook Jargon.

What came to be called Bering Strait, for which see below, was discovered by a Russian in 1678. But further south Sir Francis Drake had arrived a hundred years earlier: at Chetko Cove (42.3 degrees north latitude) in Oregon and again at Trinidad Bay (41.4 degrees north latitude) in 1579, which was actually claimed by Heceta and Bodega in 1775.

In 1728 the Arctic strait that came to bear his name was sailed by Vitus Bering (1680–1741), a Danish navigator in the employ of Russia. (For Russian trade and colonization see, for example, Strausz 1962, Sarafian 1970, Cook 1973, Makarova 1975, Gibson 1978, and Barratt 1981.) Without going into the details of the Russian trade in and of the occupation of the Arctic region (with the first permanent settlement probably at Captain’s Harbor on Unalaska Island [one of the Aleutian Islands] in 1773), let us summarize the use of indigenous peoples by the Russians in the early period (Black 1881: 117–118):

1745–1770: Large numbers of eastern Siberians, predominantly Kamchadal [about whom see below], are among the crew [in the trading voyages].

1770s to end of 1780s: Smaller proportion of Siberian natives among the crew, but more Siberian tribes represented.

1799–1817: In the Eastern Aleutians, the majority of the Aleuts are impressed into the labor force...

We shall come back to the Aleuts below.

Russian trade with the coastal peoples in the southern regions of the Pacific northwest does not appear to have been as intense as that of the successors of the Russians, who were mostly Americans. Nonetheless, their use of indigenous labor at different places was not negligible, and it must have played a significant role in linguistic communication between the expatriates and the indigenous peoples. (Our insistence on linguistic evidence for language contact and language change, unimpeachable in characterizing the nature and activities of linguistics as a scientific discipline, should not blind us to the realities of human sociality. As historians we must be imaginative, without, however, being fanciful.)

The major center for the activity of the Russian–American Company, most of whose ships were American, seems to have been Kodiak (57.48 degrees north latitude, longitude 152.23 degrees west), where in 1818 there was a population of 12,000 to 15,000 people, a sizeable community in that inhospitable place, with only 30 Russian inhabitants and already about 60 locally-born creoles, as they were called: that is, people of mixed blood (de Roquefeuil 1823a,2: 27, 28).²

Among the early indigenous people employed by the Russians, as we have seen, were “Alaskans”. They were apparently the natives first exploited by the Russians in acquiring pelts along the northwest coast and later in colonizing California, whose agricultural products were necessary for the Arctic. At Fort Ross, early in the nineteenth century, 50 to 60 Kodiak Indians were generally employed (Davydov 1977: 77). In the year 1818–1819 there were at that place 75 to 78 “natives” of unspecified ethnicity as well as Russians (Gibson 1976: 12). In the hunting season of the years 1809, 1810, and 1811, the Kodiaks had come in convoys of 30 to 50 kayaks (de Roquefeuil 1823a,1: 161–162). Another index of the amount of labor that was used at the Russian colony in California is that between 1816 and 1824 four brigs were built there (Wrangell 1980: 9). Given the tonnage (160–200 tons) and the fact that they were built with local oak, we can imagine the number of men that were needed to cut down and then saw the lumber, not to speak of the women needed for cooking the meals.

Some of these “Alaskans” were even taken to Hawaii, where they had contact with the local people – an ethnic group that would constitute a

significant part of the work force on the American continent. In 1817, for example, there were 40 Aleuts there with the 24 Russians and their mixed-blood workers (Gibson 1976: 147).³

As for the Aleuts, according to one Russian source of 1820 (cited by Gibson 1978: 52), the Russian–American Company’s “maritime fur trade was completely dependent upon the Aleuts, since no Russians had bothered to learn how to hunt sea animals”. In 1820 there were about a thousand Aleuts in the Company’s posts, the largest contingent of them at New Archangel (now Sitka, Alaska [57.03 degrees north latitude, longitude 135.02 degrees west on Baranof Island]). It was founded possibly as early as 1799, and in any case by 1808 had, it is reported, replaced the settlement at Captain’s Harbor in importance. From this statement we can assume that it might have been even more populated than the other. (Since the indigenous population of the island might have been Tlingit and since there is no evidence of either prior Aleut–Tlingit bilingualism or an already established lingua franca of some kind [jargon, pre-pidgin, or whatever] between the Aleutian Islands and Baranof Island [a distance of at least 2,000 km], it is reasonable to suppose that these two ethnic groups would have arrived at some linguistic means to communicate with each other. As to whether or not this is speculation, see below.)

Some idea of the intensity of trade along the coast is deducible from the number of ships trading at New Archangel for the period 1801–1841. There was a total of 119 – excluding the years 1803 and 1804, for which there are no figures – of which 110 were of American registration. In the years 1801–1809 there were 18, but in succeeding decades the average was about 34. Many, if not all, of these probably traded at other places along the northwest coast.

We are therefore fully justified in assuming that over the decades up to the end of the eighteenth century and early in the nineteenth century, Siberian and Alaskan natives were the ones who made contact with some of the people of the Pacific Coast, learning something of their languages as they did of that of their Russian employers and patrons. Indeed, employment provided many of the American indigenes opportunities to acquire European languages. At La Bodega, for example, one of the Kodiaks, who had escaped from San Francisco, “spoke tolerable Spanish” (de Roquefeuil 1823b: 39).

The preceding remarks have demonstrated, I hope, that jargonized speech of some variety or varieties – and even the beginnings of a pidgin – could have emerged in the eighteenth century as the result of the arrival

of whites in the arctic region and along the coast. The chronology of exploration and trade would suggest that there might first have developed some Sibero-Alaskan medium for the northernmost areas, based in part (we can speculate) on a considerable amount of multilingualism that already existed in the area, where Eskimo, Tlingit, and Athapaskan groups were found. This jargonized speech may then have been adapted for communication with people further and further south. It would have overlapped for a time with other varieties of jargon along the coast, including a Nootka-based jargon. (The putative existence of the latter is discussed in Samarin 1988b.)

The preceding remarks would have been justifiably considered speculative were it not for the fact that D'Wolf, captain of a ship that traded at New Archangel, had an interpreter who was a Tlingit, identified as Kaluschian (D'Wolf 1861: 29, 43, 44, 54, 57). Three aspects of this case are important to our understanding the sociolinguistic history of this early period. The first, the ethnicity of the interpreter, has been mentioned. It will be remembered that the Tlingit were probably inhabitants of what came to be known by Europeans as Baranof Island. However, Tlingits, regardless of what varieties of their language may have been spoken, were also found on the coast for some distance. Second, the date for the interpreter's employment is 1805. In other words, not long after – and possibly even before – New Archangel had been founded, D'Wolf was able to find someone who knew enough of some other language or languages other than hers that she was able to be an intermediary between him and others (possibly in a chain of interpreters). If she could speak directly with the captain, she must have done so in a reduced form of a language that he knew: English probably, but possibly Russian, or a mixture of at least these two. However, the jargon might have been more “Alaskan” than European in some or most respects. The third has already been revealed: the interpreter was a woman. This fact is a thread in the tapestry of the history of the Pacific Northwest that is being written in this chapter: women played an important role. (On the role of women in colonization see Samarin 1989a.)

The next stage in the origin of Chinook Jargon, we conclude in this section, could very well have been a jargon properly called – one that never had time to develop into a pidgin because of the disappearance of otters along the northern coast and particularly around the Queen Charlotte Islands. Limited space does not allow me to develop this argument, which, in any case, has already appeared in print (Samarin 1986b, 1988b).

3. Trading personnel

There was no hiatus between the maritime and the terrestrial trade. The Pacific Fur Company of John Jacob Astor was established at the mouth of the Columbia River in 1811, where he had had a station since before 1808. The significance of this fact is that when Astor's company founded several posts along the lower Columbia, his men were mostly Canadian "peddlars of the wilderness", as they were called (Gibson 1985: 3). It is generally understood of this period that "Canadian" referred to "French" traders as opposed to "English". (These so-called Canadians seem to have been predominantly men of mixed blood, that is, issue of European and Indian biological parentage.)

In the year 1821–1822 there were in the Columbia District alone 184 servants (as the Hudson's Bay Company employees below the rank of officer were called), and in the decade that included 1831 the average was 223 per year (Gibson 1985: 20). The Hudson's Bay Company presence in what was then called the Oregon Country consisted of 13 posts and about 200 servants in 1825, which grew to 22 and 450 respectively by 1836 (Gibson 1985: 18). Twenty years later (1856) the affairs of the Company's 152 establishments had 3,000 male employees, among whom were 500 voyageurs and 1,200 servants (Schenk 1932: 19). It has been said that the Northwest Company "employed only Canadians and Catholic Iroquois" (Blanchet 1956: 217), and the Hudson's Bay Company may have favored them too. In any case, there were "scores of Canadians" in Fort Vancouver (opposite what is now Portland, Oregon, and not to be confused with Vancouver, British Columbia) in 1833 engaged in such vulgar work as beating and cleaning furs of dust, vermin, and coarse hairs. In 1839 there were 76, and in 1841 about 100, of which 25 were English, out of a total population of 700 (Schenk 1932: 9, 11).

4. Domestic relations

The "traders" of this early period cannot be imagined romantically – as a cliché from a film from the era of silent movies – as unattached European males occupied with doing business with western Indians. Women were not kept by men to satisfy only their sexual needs; they were necessary for survival and for economic success. They constituted, along with their children of course, a work force skilled in the ways of living in, and

exploiting the resources of, North America. By 1821, one contemporary reported, probably conservatively, “practically all officers of [the Hudson’s Bay and the Northwest Company] ..., and many lower-ranked employees as well, were allied with women born in the Indian country,” in marriages “according to the custom of the country” (Brown 1976: 130). In Vancouver in 1836 the officers’ wives were either half-breeds (as they were called) or full-blooded Indians (Schenk 1932: 34). In 1839 a European traveller observed that the Canadian “half-castes” also had their Indian wives (Belcher 1979: 61). For the period 1841–1843 George Simpson reported, without making a distinction, that “most of the men are married to aboriginal or half-breed women” (Schenk 1932: 51).

It might be observed here somewhat tangentially that women may have also figured in the development of Pidgin Eskimo, for it has been said that Eskimo women helped arctic explorers and that interracial contact was of more benefit to Eskimo women than to Eskimo men (McElroy 1976).

5. Catholic demographics

Some idea of the ethnically diverse nature of the society of the early Chinook Jargon region is gained from the analysis of the records (1972) of Frs. Francis Blanchet (1795–1883) and Modeste Demers (1809–1871), the first Catholic missionaries to the Pacific Northwest. These constitute the registry of religious acts performed by these priests in the 1830s through the 1850s, and contain precious demographic information about marriages and births. In them are facts about 1,056 individuals: 608 men and 448 women; from them the marital and procreative histories of 318 and 386 woman can be reconstructed.⁴ For example, of the 386 women cited, 319 (83 percent) were Indian, of whom 84 (22 percent) are explicitly designated as Chinook.

The ethnicity of husbands reflects that of the personnel of the fur trade, which is already well established. Of the 386 marriages, rounding the figures, 57 percent had French husbands, 21 percent had English husbands, 8 percent Hawaiian, and 14 percent Indian.

Figures were established for all but 21 of the 386 marriages in the corpus, including 310 of the 328 marriages with Indian women, and they reflect the economic history of the area. The highest number of marriages seem to have taken place in the two decades of 1830–1849 (72 percent). Only 4 percent pre-date 1820. (Of course, some of these marriages may

have sacralized the unions of cohabiting couples that had preceded these dates.)

The temporal dimensions of marriages can be summarized to this point in the following manner: (1) there was a steady decline in marrying Canadian Indian women; there was a rise and fall in the proportion of Pacific coastal women, although their large numbers dominated the period; (3) there was a steady number of western women marrying from 1820 onwards.

6. Indian wives

Indian Wives did not necessarily come inexpensively. In 1795 a certain Captain Bishop (Tobie 1927: 202) found that a wife on the Columbia River cost the following: 20 slaves, 20 sea-otter skins, one canoe, and 20 war dresses, but it is not clear who was acquiring the wife, a European or an Indian. This could very well have been what an important Indian had to pay for the daughter of another important Indian. And slaves, some of whom “Canadians” acquired, would have cost much less.

Think of these demographic facts in terms of their significance for the establishment and development of Chinook Jargon.

“Overall, marriages seem to have been extremely stable given the circumstances of the multicultural social setting of the fur trade years and the seasonal nature of the industry,” as one observer puts it (Swagerty 1980: 168). All of the works that have dealt with mixed marriages cite examples of the stability of the marriages and, in fact, the high status sometimes achieved by the Indian and metis wives. In this connection might be cited the case of Lady Calpo, as she was called, a “well-connected Chinook matron”, who had been a friend of Europeans since Northwest Company days and was George Simpson’s source of news and gossip. Her connection with the traders gave her a position of influence among the Chinook second only to that of Chief Concomly (Van Kirk 1980: 66, 77).

In the Chinook Jargon area, then, practically from the beginning of the permanent land-based trading, Indian wives were numerous. It is also important to understand that they seem to have constituted a society of their own. It was a long-established practice of the Hudson’s Bay Company that Indian wives were not allowed to live in the post. It has been observed of Fort Vancouver in 1836 that the wives of the whites did not

only eat separately but were rarely seen, in a separation that was similar to “semi-oriental seclusion” (Schenk 1932: 34).

On the trapping brigades it was different, because the men were company servants (therefore presumably Canadians). Brigades went out for long periods of time, as expeditions for trapping and trading beaver, and consisted of 50 to 60 men or 100 to 200 persons, since wives and children were included (Schenk 1932: 24, 25).

7. Where Chinook Jargon developed

It was the subsociety consisting of the wives and children of the men employed by the Hudson's Bay Company, I suggest, where Chinook Jargon could have developed from a jargon (or pre-pidgin, if one prefers to start with that hypothetical kind of language) into a really viable means of communication. The society would have been a self-contained one, given the nature of indigenous culture.⁵ In this setting the women could manage very well on their own, one suspects. Some of the women may have been entrepreneurs in their own right. It has been suggested, for example, that native women, whether married to Europeans or not, had a lot to gain by trading with them: although life may have been hard for women, it was much easier for these women than it was for those who were living fully traditional lives (McElroy 1976, Van Kirk 1980: 76, Peterson 1981). It is known, moreover, that among the personnel of the Hudson's Bay Company there were two to three slaves for each man on trapping parties, but that these slaves were the property of the women married to Company workers (Schenk 1932: 55).

The number of children is of special importance. Although the priests recorded only 768 children for 386 marriages, ranging from 0 to 14 per family, George Simpson, whose visit has already been cited, said that the “swarms of children ... present a strongly suggestive contrast with the scantiness of the rising generation in almost every native village on the Lower Columbia” (Schenk 1932: 51). And these were multilingual communities. When the first school was opened at Fort Vancouver in 1832 the children spoke Cree, Nez Perce, Chinook, Klickitat, and “other Indian languages” (Schenk 1932: 47, 9).

It is reasonable to suppose, because of similar experiences elsewhere in the world, that the children spoke to each other in Chinook Jargon, perhaps believing that they were speaking their fathers' language. In fact, many adult Indians may have shared this belief. In 1839 Captain Belcher

observed at Fort Vancouver that “it is not a little strange in a community so long established, that the women should still be almost totally unacquainted with the language of their husbands” (Belcher 1979: 61).⁶ This is confirmed for the same year by missionaries Blanchet and Demers: “these women and children did not all understand French; and what is more, there was a diversity of language among the women, according to the districts and places from which they came...” (Blanchet 1956: 11). Elsewhere it is said, as I read the text (Demers 1871: 8), that the wives and children of whites “spoke only” Chinook Jargon.

This failure of French to spread is of considerable importance in understanding the history of Chinook Jargon. How are we to explain it? One of the factors may be the “communicative distance” between the husbands and their families, leaving the latter with little opportunity to practice or even hear the language of the men. But another factor may be that no real French model was available. They may have spoken different varieties of French – those deriving from the patois that came to Canada, a form of French that was to develop (or had already developed) into Cree-French, that is, Michif (Crawford 1983), or a jargonized (that is, “broken”) French.

8. Number of people speaking Chinook Jargon

In any discussion of the development of Chinook Jargon some attention must be paid to the number of various kinds of people who were speaking it in any period of its history and at whatever places it was being used. Although the present study does not attempt to address itself directly to this question, it suggests that the female population and the children of mixed marriages constituted a not insignificant speech community. But how did this community compare in size with the total Chinook Jargon-speaking Indian population when the language was emerging as a *lingua franca*? It is unlikely that we are going to find a direct answer to that question. One way to approach the problem, however, is by studying morbidity and fatality in the areas where Chinook Jargon might have had its earliest history. This is too large a topic to be undertaken here with any seriousness. The least that one should know is that the decimation of the population was of catastrophic proportions. Possibly before 1829 there may have been 9,000 to 10,000 Chinooks in the Lower Willamette Valley who had survived earlier smallpox epidemics, but “by 1841 there seem to have been not over 1,000 Indians left in the Willamette

Valley” (Tobie 1927: 90; cf. 48, 51, 54, 94). Blanchet (1956: 18) estimated that nine-tenths of the Chinook population had been destroyed by disease by 1830. (For more on this topic see Gibson 1985).

With respect to the size of the population that might have spoken Chinook Jargon we can only speculate at the present time about the effect that the decimation of population had on the development of the language. Did the language not develop more than it did because there were not enough people speaking it – in addition to the fact that English speakers quickly came in large numbers? I am inclined to believe that such factors are not irrelevant to the history of Chinook Jargon. On the other hand, if the Chinook population was small by comparison to that of other ethnic groups in the whole region, we are confronted with the task of evaluating the relation between number of speakers and their influence on the development of a pidgin, a topic addressed in my work on Sango (for which see the reference list).

9. Conclusions

This study has not demonstrated, I would like to make clear, that Chinook Jargon emerged (i. e., was created) in this social setting, but it makes very reasonable the hypothesis that it was here, as much as in the relations between Euro-American and Hawaiian male workers and other Indians that Chinook Jargon developed. (Of Hawaiians there may have been 500 at one time [Blanchet 1956: 133].) This study is at least an antidote to the male bias in investigations on Chinook Jargon in particular and in considerations of pidgin genesis in general.

This study further supports an alternative explanation to that of Thomason (1984) for the “Indian” nature of Chinook Jargon phonology. Hers was that it is due to the pidgin’s having arisen among Indians before whites arrived. Mine was that this new language may have been “‘nativized’ as it spread and became more widely used by the indigenous population” and that “Indian–Indian contact could conceivably have had a great deal to do with the development and spread of Chinook Jargon ...” (Samarin 1986b: 26, 27). The data presented here suggest the kind of contact this might have been.

This hypothesis about the “nativization” of Chinook Jargon is supported by what one finds in Sango, the pidgin that emerged in the Ubangi River basin of central Africa in the last two decades of the nineteenth century, a time when the area was being occupied by representatives of

the Congo Free State and the French government – with support by personnel from men (and some women) from other parts of Africa (see the several references under Samarin). Since most of the latter appear to have been speakers of Bantu languages that have two contrasting levels of pitch, it is remarkable that the mid tone of the source language is extremely common in the vocabulary of all speakers of at least Bangui today. (Practically all of the grammatical use of tone has been lost in Sango.) However, forty years ago, when I first learned Sango from two-tone Gbaya-speaking people, mid tone was – and even today is – infrequent and variable with high tone. If the earliest forms of Sango had two tones, or no systematic use of tone at all, the vocabulary of the language was repossessed, we might say, by those who knew that this *lingua franca* was derived from their own language.

If, as Thomason claims, the “Indianness” (as one might call it) of the phonology of Chinook Jargon argues for its pre-contact origin (a view accepted by Silver and Miller 1991), how does one explain the richness and complexity of this phonology when Chinook Jargon had a restricted vocabulary, estimated between 500 and 1000 words (similar to what Sango had thirty years ago) and “a greatly simplified grammatical structure, which is in stark contrast to the very complicated morphology and syntax of Lower Chinook and other languages of the region” (Silver and Miller 1991: 196)? Would it not be because it is easier to nativize all or part of a pidgin’s phonology than it is to remake the language in the image of the source language at a time when the pidgin is already used by many people far afield?

Finally, it will have to be demonstrated where, when, and by whom this phonologically complex variety of Chinook Jargon was spoken. If it is true that in the heyday of its use, the last quarter of the nineteenth century, “it was spoken by perhaps 100,000 people, from the Alaskan panhandle to northern California, and from the coast into the interior of British Columbia, Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and western Montana” (Silver and Miller 1991: 198), is it not reasonable to suppose that many varieties coexisted? Indeed, Franz Boas, who said that he learned Chinook Jargon in 1885 (from “a number of Bella Coola” [Boas 1933: 209]), points out that in 1887 “the various tribes were liable to introduce words of their own languages into their Chinook Jargon speech. ... This shows, that a slight tendency to intermingling with native language occurred ...” (Boas 1933: 209).

In the 60 years that have passed since the above statement was made we have learned a great deal about linguistic variation, and I am incredu-

lous of Boas' reducing variation to only a "slight tendency" and obviously limiting variation only to lexicon. Perhaps he was even guilty of a bias toward the variety he had first learned, for he admits that at the time when he wrote (around 1933), the Puget Sound variety, where on his own admission Chinook Jargon was used more extensively than on the Columbia River and in neighboring parts of Oregon and Washington, had a smaller number of words when the vocabulary was compared with printed vocabularies (not specified). Furthermore, we must note that he made a historical and interpretive observation when he said that in this Puget Sound variety a great number of Chinook words were dropped. Clearly, in his opinion this variety was simpler, as a pidgin, than the variety he favored. Was he implying that the pidgin, which we all believe arose on the Lower Columbia River, had been further pidginized in Puget Sound? Can we not also consider the possibility that this and other simpler varieties (if such existed) descended from the earliest pidgin, before the more Chinook-like variety emerged? After all, this seems to be the best way to explain why Bangala, the language resembling Lingala, found in northeastern Zaire, is so much simpler than the variety of Lingala found in other parts of the country (Samarin 1990–1991). (This language, I am informed by Europeans working in the area, is becoming increasingly more like "standard" Lingala, an instance of a pidgin being "absorbed" by another more complex variety or by a creole with a similar history.)

The hypothesis I suggest for the "Indianness" of late nineteenth-century Chinook Jargon, I confess, confronts phonologically complex data: sounds that an ordinary European (and not someone like Boas) would find difficult to imitate. This fact is illustrated, for example, by the text that Boas wrote down verbatim from a Tsimshian in 1888 (Boas 1933). This fact notwithstanding, I shall be satisfied if I have proposed a hypothesis that might stimulate further discussion and research.⁷

Notes

1. Arrived at independently (see Samarin 1985b), the views expressed here bear some similarity with those of Hancock 1986, a work followed by Williams 1988; see also Keesing 1988 and a course paper written by Miller (1992) for Hancock.
2. One might have expected in this settlement some kind of "reconstructed" language, but according to Wrangell (1980: 15), an observer from that early period, "all Creoles are thoroughly conversant with Russian, but not with the Aleut nor the Kodiak languages. Their way of life is the same as that of the Russians ...". If this was so, it may have been

the result of a deliberate practice of what one might call "Russification" of those on whom the Russians could have some direct influence. From the earliest years, it appears, they forced Koniags, to cite just one ethnic group, to give up children as hostages and to "raise them" [as was reported by a very old man in the 1850s] (Shelikhov 1981: 13). However, E. V. Golovko, as a Russian scholar, is of the opinion that those who married indigenous women adopted "native" life and did not see themselves as superior (personal communication).

3. It would appear, however, that at this time other people were given, or took upon themselves, the name Aleut (E. V. Golovko, personal communication). Needless, to say, ethnic names here as elsewhere in the period of colonization must be scrutinized very carefully. Such must certainly be the case of so-called Kodiaks and Kamchadals.
4. Under my supervision the data were collated by Helvi Virkamaki and cross-tabulations established with the help of Wladyslaw Cichocki. Their help is gratefully acknowledged.
5. A parallel can be found, I believe, between what the stabilization of mixed-marriage households did for Chinook Jargon and for what it did in the development of Katanga (now Shaba) Swahili in the twentieth-century mining towns (Fabian 1986). And I believe that my "domestic" argument can be made for the development of Mobilian Jargon, given the kind of information that one finds in Penicaut (1953) about the colonization of Lower Louisiana by the French. (I am indebted to Penelope B. Drooker for this reference, but my incredulity towards Emanuel Drechsel's arguments about the pre-contact existence of Mobilian Jargon [e. g. Drechsel 1984] is of long standing and is limited to personal correspondence.)
6. It is not clear whether or not the phrase "so long established" should be restricted to the establishment of Fort Vancouver in 1825 or used in a more general sense. I am inclined to believe that he was speaking of Fort Vancouver itself.
7. Bernard Comrie, Ian Hancock, and Peter Trudgill asked questions at the conference in Tromsø that led to a revision of the original paper. Wick Miller, who allowed me to see pages on Chinook Jargon from the book manuscript of Silver and Miller (1991), also read a revision of my original paper. None of these colleagues, of course, can be held responsible for any of the present paper's shortcomings. Golovko's personal communications have already been acknowledged. I am grateful to all. This chapter was prepared while I pursued research on "The linguistic consequences of the creolization of Sango", supported by a grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (Canada). Its indulgence is very much appreciated.

References

- Barratt, Glynn
1981 *Russia in Pacific waters, 1715–1825: A survey of the origins of Russia's naval presence in the North and South Pacific*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.
- Belcher, Edward
1979 *'H.M.S. Sulphur' on the Northwest and California coasts, 1837 and 1839: The accounts of Captain Edward Belcher and Midshipman Francis Guillemard Simpfkinson*. Edited by Richard A. Pierce and John H. Winslow. (Materials for the Study of Alaska History, No. 12.) Kingston, Ontario: The Limestone Press.

Black, Lydia T.

- 1981 "The nature of evil: Of whales and sea otters", in: Shepard Krech (ed.), *Indians, animals, and the fur trade: A critique of 'Keepers of the game'*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 109–153.

Blanchet, Francis Norbert

- 1956 *Notices and 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. Containing much remarkable information on the areas and inhabitants of the Columbia, Walamette, Cowlitz, and Fraser Rivers, Nesqually Bay, Puget Sound, Whidby and Vancouver Islands while on their arduous Mission to the engagees of the Hudson's Bay Company and the pagan natives, 1838 to 1847.* Englished out of the French by Carl Landerholm from related papers and documents in the Oregon Historical Society collections. Portland: Oregon Historical Society. [Also listed as Society for the Propagation of the Faith, Quebec diocese.]

Blanchet, Francis Norbert – Modeste Demers, et al.

- 1972 *Blanchet records of the Pacific Northwest. Vancouver, Volumes 1 and 2; and Stellamaris Mission.* Translated [from the French] by Mikell de Lores Wormell Warner; annotated by Harriet Duncan Munnick. St. Paul, Oregon: French Prairie Press.

Brown, Jennifer

- 1976 Company men and native families: Fur trade social and domestic relations in Canada's Old Northwest. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago.]
- 1983 *Strangers in blood: Fur trade company in Indian country.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Boas, Franz

- 1933 "Note on the Chinook Jargon", *Language* 9: 208–213.

Cook, Warren L.

- 1972 *The flood tide of empire.* New Haven: Yale University Press.

Crawford, John C.

- 1983 "Speaking Michif in four metis communities", *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies* 3: 47–55.

Davydov, Gavriil Ivanovich

- 1977 *Two voyages to Russian America, 1802–1807.* Translated by Colin Bearne and edited by Richard A. Pierce. (Materials for the Study of Alaska History, No. 10.) Kingston, Ontario: The Limestone Press.

Demers, (Rt. Rv.) Modeste

- 1871 *Chinook dictionary, catechism, prayers and hymns. Composed in 1838 and 1839 by Rt. Rev. Modeste Demers. Revised, corrected and completed in 1867 by Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet. With modifications and additions by Rev. L. N. St. Onge missionary among the Yakamas and other Indian tribes.* Montréal.

Drechsel, Emanuel J.

- 1984 "Structure and function in Mobilian Jargon: Indications for the pre-European existence of an American Indian pidgin", *Journal of Historical Linguistics and Philology* 1: 141–185.

D'Wolf, John

- 1861 *A voyage to the North Pacific.* Cambridge, Mass.: Welch, Bigelow, and Co.
[1968] [Reprinted Fairfield, Washington: Ye Galleon Press.]

Fabian, Johannes

- 1986 *Language and colonial power: The appropriation of Swahili in the former Belgian Congo, 1880–1938*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Gibson, James R.

- 1976 *Imperial Russia in frontier America: The changing geography of supply of Russian America, 1784–1867*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- 1978 “Old Russia in the New World: Adversaries and adversities in Russian America”, in: *European settlement and development in North America: Essays on geographical change in honour and memory of Andrew Hill Clark*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 45–65.
- 1985 *Farming the frontier: the agricultural opening of the Oregon Country, 1786–1846*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press.

Hajda, Yvonne – Henry Zenk – Robert Boyd

- 1988 The early historiography of Chinook Jargon. [Paper given at the 87th Annual Meeting of the American Anthropological Association.]

Hancock, Ian

- 1986 “The domestic hypothesis, diffusion and componentiality: An account of Atlantic anglophone creole origins”, in: Pieter Muysken – Norval Smith (eds.), *Substrate versus universals in creole genesis*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 71–102.

Hymes, Dell

- 1980 “Commentary”, in: Albert Valdman – Arnold Highfield (eds.), *Theoretical orientations in creole studies*. New York: Academic Press, 389–423.

Keesing, Roger M.

- 1988 *Melanesia Pidgin and the oceanic substrate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Makarova, Raisa V.

- 1975 *Russians on the Pacific, 1743–1799*. Translated and edited by Richard A. Pierce and Alton S. Donnelly from the Russian. Kingston, Ontario: The Limestone Press. [Originally published in the USSR, 1968.]

McElroy, Ann

- 1976 “The negotiation of sex-role identity in arctic culture change”, *Western Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 6: 184–197.

Miller, Theresa A.

- 1992 The early histories of Krio and Tok Pisin: A comparative study. [Course paper for Linguistics 396. Austin: University of Texas.]

Penicaut, André

- 1953 *Fleur de lys and calumet, being the Penicaut narrative of French adventure in Louisiana*. Translated and edited by Richebourg G. McWilliams. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press.

Peterson, Jacqueline Louise

- 1981 The people in between: Indian–white marriage and the genesis of a métis society and culture in the Great Lakes Region, 1680–1830. [Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago.]

Roquefeuil, Camille de

- 1823a *Journal d'un voyage autour de monde, pendant les années 1816, 1817, 1818, et 1819*. Paris: Librairies Lesage, Gide, et Ponthieu.

- 1823b *A voyage round the world, between the years 1816–1819*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Samarin, William J.
 - 1982a “Colonization and pidginization on the Ubangi River”, *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 4: 1–42.
 - 1982b “Goals, roles, and language skills in colonizing central equatorial Africa”, *Anthropological Linguistics* 24: 410–422.
 - 1984a “The linguistic world of field colonialism”, *Language in Society* 13: 435–453.
 - 1984b “La communication par les eaux et les mots oubanguiens”, in: *Recherches centrafricaines: Problèmes et perspectives de la recherche historique*. [Table ronde: ASOM, CHEAM, IHPOM, Paris, Septembre 1982], Études et documents, No. 18.] Aix-en-Provence: Université de Provence (Institut d’Histoire des Pays d’Outre-Mer), 179–239.
 - 1984–1985 “Communication by Ubangian water and word”, *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 6: 309–373.
 - 1985a “Plurigenesis in pidginization”, *Journal of Historical Linguistics and Philology* 2: 100–119.
 - 1985b Work and women in the emergence of Chinook Jargon. [Paper presented at the Fifth North American Fur Trade Conference, Montreal, May 29–June 2.]
 - 1986a “The source of Sango’s ‘be’”, *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 1: 205–223.
 - 1986b “Chinook jargon and pidgin historiography”, *Canadian Journal of Anthropology* 5: 23–34.
 - 1988a “Creating language and community in pidginization”, *Canadian Journal of Linguistics* 33: 155–165.
 - 1988b “Jargonization before Chinook Jargon”, *Northwest Anthropological Research Notes* 22: 219–238.
 - 1989a *The black man’s burden: African colonial labor on the Congo and Ubangi rivers, 1880–1900*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
 - 1989b “Language in the colonization of central Africa, 1880–1900”, *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 23: 232–249.
 - 1989c “The colonial heritage of the Central African Republic: A linguistic perspective”, *The International Journal of African Historical Studies* 22: 697–711.
 - 1990–1991 “The origins of Kituba and Lingala”, *Journal of African Languages and Linguistics* 12: 47–77.
- Sarafian, Winston Lee
 - 1970 Russian–American employee policies and practices, 1799–1867. [Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles. Ann Arbor: University Microfilms.]
- Schenk, John Frederick
 - 1932 The Hudson’s Bay Company in Oregon, 1821–1860. [Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Oregon (Eugene).]
- Shelikhov, Grigorii I. [Šelioxov, Grigorij I.]
 - 1981 *A voyage to America, 1783–1786*. Translated by Marina Ramsay, edited by Richard A. Pierce. Kingston, Ontario: The Limestone Press.
- Silver, Shirley – Wick Miller
 - 1991 American Indian languages in their social and cultural context. [Unpublished book length ms.]

- Strausz, David A.
1962 The Russian–American Company to 1825. [Unpublished Master’s thesis, University of Washington, Seattle.]
- Swagerty, William R.
1980 “Marriage and settlement patterns of Rocky Mountain trappers and traders”, *Western Historical Quarterly* 11: 159–180.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey
1984 “Chinook Jargon in areal and historical context”, *Language* 59: 820–870.
- Tobie, Harvey Elmer
1927 The Willamette Valley before the great immigrations. [Unpublished M.A. thesis, University of Oregon (Eugene).]
- Van Kirk, Sylvia
1980 “*Many tender ties*”: *Women in fur trade society 1670–1870*. Winnipeg: Watson and Dwyer.
- Williams, Jeffrey P.
1988 “Women and kinship in creole genesis”, *International Journal for the Sociology of Language* 71: 81–99.
- Wrangell, Ferdinand Petrovich
1980 *Russian America: Statistical and ethnographic information*. With additional material by Karl-Ernst von Baer, translated from the German edition of 1839 by Mary Sadouski, edited by Richard A. Pierce. Kingston, Ontario: The Limestone Press.