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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

1 Special thanks are due to Tony Johnson, Language Project Manager, and to Henry Zenk for providing access to their published and unpublished materials on Chinuk Wawa and for helping in so many other ways. The research reported here has been generously supported by the Language Project of the Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon.
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. 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LONG FORMS</th>
<th>SHORT FORMS</th>
<th>CLITIC FORMS</th>
<th>FOCUS FORMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Pre-verbal Subjects and Noun Possessors; typically unstressed</td>
<td>(Same patterns as Long Forms)</td>
<td>Preverbal subjects and noun Possessors only; typically unstressed</td>
<td>(Heavily Stressed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Objects and Post-verbal Subjects; typically stressed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 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 | ũáska | ũás | ũas | ũáska |

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.'

(2) ? uk mán nánich uk tíchmán 'The man saw the woman.'

(3) uk mán *ya*(ka) nánich uk tíchmán 'The man saw the 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 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) \[
\begin{array}{l}
\text{CP}\quad \text{TopP}\quad \text{FocP}\quad \text{TopP}\quad \text{FinP} \\
\quad \quad \text{[}\quad \quad \text{SUBJECT}\quad \quad \text{]} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{[}\quad \quad \text{]} \\
\quad \quad \quad \quad \text{[}\quad \quad \text{]} \\
\end{array}
\]

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) lili áltə chaku-chxóp uk pʰáya ‘After a while the fire went out.’
   a while then (be)come-extinguished the fire

(6) uk tanas-ačxman 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 kənɪm is indicated by the pronoun appearing before that possessed NP.

(7) uk mán yə(ka) kənɪm ‘the man’s canoe’ (lit., ‘the man his canoe’)
   the man s/he canoe
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) ʼỳáxka  ya  nánich  kʰapa  looking glass
S/HE  s/he  see  PREP  looking glass
‘She herself is the one she sees in the looking glass.’

(9)  ya  qʼwát ʼnáyka  álta  na  qʼwát ʼỳáxka
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 tómtóm ‘his/her heart’ is used as a reflexive pronoun.

(10)  ya  munk-hílu  ya  tómtóm  ‘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  mímólust  táska  ‘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
from Kamloops Wawa, I show in parentheses the Grand Ronde ("G.R.") spellings of the words in the examples. 

(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 Tayi munk tátwa tsáqw kʰánawi kʰanumákWEST)  
  '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 mimolust '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. In actual fact, though, (12) and (15) are not quite as similar as they may seem on a superficial level. In (12), munk mimolust 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) húlha be alcur de gida-ha  
  rebel ACC Alcur LOC defeat-PERF.PARTICIPLE  
  '(They) defeated the rebels at Alcur.'

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

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

(d) boigon be emu tanggu cooha be twwakiya-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.
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 münk-mímə́lə́ust ʔásáka
    s/he    make die    they

(17) battery münk mímə́lə́ust ‘The battery conked out’
    battery    make    die

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

(18) ya tiki münk háyash-man ‘He wants to make himself an important man.’
    s/he    want    make    big-man

(19) yaka münk hóm ‘He stinks’
    s/he    make    stink

In (20) the münk + 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 aspectral interpretation.

(20) álta yaka münk t’úqʰwin yaka latit
    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 aspectral interpretation can also be seen in (17), which could perhaps be translated as something like ‘the battery up and died’. This aspectral 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) münk k ámbə́tsə́ks is part of a “transitive” münk + VERB construction, whereas in (22), munk-k ámbə́tsə́ks is part of a causative construction. The aspectral part of the meaning of (20) can perhaps also be seen in (21), where münk k ámbə́tsə́ks ‘to recognize’ could be interpreted as something like ‘commence to know’.

(21) álta yaka münk k ámbə́tsə́ks yáka ‘Then he recognized her.’
    then    s/he    make    know    s/he

(22) munk k ámbə́tsə́ks 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: mímə́lə́ust ‘to die’ and k ámbə́tsə́ks ‘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).

\[(23) \text{nayka münk} \text{ John mōk}mōk \text{ lipwá} \quad \text{‘I made John eat beans.’}\]
\[\text{I make John eat bean}\]

\[(24) \text{nayka münk pus} \text{ John ya(ka) mōk}mōk \text{ lipwá} \quad \text{‘I made John eat beans.’}\]
\[\text{I make that John s/he eat bean}\]

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.

\[(25) \text{Kamloops Wawa: ayu naika mamuk pus masachi wek tolo naika}\]
\[\text{a lot I make that sin not win I}\]
\[\text{(G.R.: háyu nayka münk pus masháchi wík tůlu? náya)}\]
\[\text{‘I try hard that sin does not win me over.’}\]

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

\[(26) \text{nayka tiki pus yaka k’ilapay} \quad \text{‘I want him to come back.’}\]
\[\text{I want that s/he return}\]

\[(27) \text{ya wáwa pus ya pálach k’ilapay} \quad \text{‘He told him to give it back.’}\]
\[\text{s/he say that s/he give return}\]

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

\[(28) \text{pus álta ntsayka münk pus tilxam mǐməłuxt,}\]
\[\text{what if now we make that, when people die}\]
\[\text{tāska chaku-k’ilapay }k’apa qwinəm sān\]
\[\text{they come-return PREP five sun}\]

‘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).

\[(29) \text{ya münk ya pálach k’ilapay} \quad \text{‘He made him give it back.’}\]
\[\text{s/he make s/he give return}\]
It would be reasonable to assume that (23) and (29) are typical control constructions with a structure like that shown in (30).\footnote{Example (29) is somewhat problematic in this respect, however. The fact that the second occurrence of the pronoun yu is unstressed might suggest that it could be the subject of pûlach, not the object of mûnk. 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).}

(30) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[ nayka mûnk John }_i \text{ [ [ PRO }_i \text{ mûk }h\text{ mûk }_i \text{ lipwá } ] ]}
\end{array}
\]

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

(31) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{yá } \text{lima } \text{yáxka } \text{yaka } \text{mûnk } \text{lalám}
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{c}
s/\text{he hand it s/\text{he make paddle}
\end{array}
\]

‘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) \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{[ [ yá lima }_i \text{ ] [ yáxka }_i \text{ ] [ yaka mûnk }_i \text{ [ [ PRO }_i \text{ lalám } ] ]}
\end{array}
\]

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, mûnk 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 mûnk + 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 mûnk [ PRO i mimâlúst ] ‘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 mûnk and mimâlúst in (17). Furthermore, the fact that mûnk and mimâlúst are verbs in separate clauses accounts for the
fact that they are both stressed. We can account for examples like (20) in this same way, as shown in (34).

(34) [ álta yaka₁ münk [ PRO₁ t‘aqʰwin yaka latit ] ]

Returning now to the common Chinuk Wawa causative construction, it is clear that these must have a very different structure from both the münk + VERB construction and the kinds of causative constructions illustrated in (23-24). If the proposed analysis of the münk + VERB construction is correct, then it would seem reasonable to assume that the combined münk-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 münk-VERB forms are actually compound lexical items. There are some cases, such as the ones seen in (35-36), where münk- does participate in compounds.

(35) münk lakamás → munk-lakamás ‘dig camas’
      make     camas

(36) münk pʰáya → munk-pʰáya ‘make (a) fire’
      make     fire

We have already seen in (11) that münk 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, münk 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-hóm ihwali ‘He smells meat’
    s/he      make-smell    meat

One can compare (37) with (19), the latter of which is a perfectly regular münk + V construction. Example (37), on the other hand, despite its form, does not mean ‘He made the meat smell’. Here münk- seems to be functioning solely to derive a transitive verb from the intransitive hóm. 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-tátis ‘He’s fixing himself up; he’s grooming (himself).’
    s/he PROGRESSIVE-make-flower

Here, tátis, which can mean either ‘flower’ or ‘(be) pretty’, combines with münk- 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 münk + V construction either. It should be noted, however, that münk-tátis also has the meaning ‘to tend flowers, to garden’. With that meaning, this appears to
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-tatis must be an intransitive construction since the subject can appear following the complex verb form.

(39)  munk-tatis  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)  [ yaku  [ munk-mimolust ] ]
     IP  VP  V’
     s/he  make die  they
‘He killed them’

Here the lower verb (mimolust 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 tâska (which is assigned its θ-role by mimolust) 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 mink + 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 Vržić 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 Vržić. One might conclude that if the present analysis is correct, then Vržić’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 Vržić. In light of this latter possibility, one might remember that Vržić 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.
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