Possible links between Melanesian and Hawaiian English Pidgins

Craig Alan Volker
Gifu Shotoku Gakuen University, Japan

Abstract: Because modern Hawaiian Creole English and Melanesian Pidgin (e.g., Tok Pisin) have many apparent similarities, it is logical to assume that they share a common ancestor. Nevertheless, careful examination of the speech of an early speaker of Hawaiian Pidgin English and Melanesian Pidgin shows that these similarities are only lexical and morphemic, not syntactic, and are more likely to be the due to the influence of Chinese Pidgin English than to a common Proto-Pacific Pidgin English ancestor.

Key words: Tok Pisin, pidgin languages, creole languages, Hawaiian Creole, Hawai'i

1. Introduction[1]

To even the most casual visitor to Hawai'i from Melanesia, the superficial similarities between Tok Pisin and Hawaiian Creole English are striking. For example, after my first visit to Hawai'i, I was able to entertain friends in Papua New Guinea with pictures of the 'Royal Kaukau Restaurant' (*kaukau* means 'food' in Hawai'i Creole English and 'sweet potato' in Tok Pisin). Similarly, when I first moved to Honolulu from Papua New Guinea, I was surprised when my new neighbours helped me open a locked door, saying in perfect Tok Pisin, '*Yu no laik yusim hama?*' ('You don't want to use a hammer?') and '*No ken brukim, isi*'' ('Don't break it, slowly!'). This paper will examine evidence of similarities between Tok Pisin and an earlier form of Hawai'i Pidgin English and discuss the extent to which these similarities provide evidence for a genetic link between Melanesian Pidgin, as exemplified primarily by Tok Pisin[2] and Hawaiian Pidgin English, the historical antecedent of modern Hawaiian Creole English.

The evidence comes from data provided in 1988 by Marion Sonomura about the kind of Hawaiian Pidgin English speech used by her grandfather, Ichihei Odawa, who came to Hawai'i from Japan at the age of nineteen in 1894. These data were compared with contemporary Tok Pisin as used by the author and standardised in Volker (2008). Of course, interviewing someone about the speech of a relative with whom she had not lived for many

years is not without its problems. Thinking of examples of a particular grammatical construction without a context is difficult even for a linguistically sophisticated informant such as Ms Sonomura, then a doctoral student in linguistics. To overcome this problem, a variety of forms were read out in Tok Pisin and occasionally Solomons Pijin, and she told me whether any particular construction sounded like something her grandfather would have said. When a phrase triggered a memory, we would try to reconstruct what form had been used and in what context. Many of these reconstructions were later confirmed or redefined by other members of her family.

The limitations of this method are obvious. Even though Ms Sonomura was very meticulous in not agreeing too readily if she was not certain that she had heard a particular construction, at the time of the interviews her grandfather had passed away six years previously, so that all her family's memories were somewhat dated. Nevertheless, while the data obtained in this way cannot be considered final proof of a particular hypothesis, they do provide some representation of the unwritten speech of a now extinct pidgin spoken a century ago. This can substantiate arguments based on more conclusive evidence and point towards areas where further research is needed.

2. Reconstructions from the interviews

A number of morphological and syntactic similarities between Mr Odawa's speech and Tok Pisin were noticed, but relatively few phonological similarities were found. His pronunciation seems to have been influenced by his native Japanese. For example, while Ms Sonomura's grandfather did not differentiate between /l/ and /r/, merging them into single flapped consonant, as in Japanese (written *r* below), he seems to have differentiated /p/ and /f/, which have merged in the speech of most Tok Pisin speakers, and consonant-vowel sequences generally followed the constraints of Japanese.

2.1. Sentence word order. Mr Odawa used both SOV and SVO word order, the former undoubtedly the influence if his native Japanese and the latter the influence of English and, possibly, Hawaiian. A typical SOV sentence was

(1)   Taim   mi   Japan   go,
       when   I   Japan   go
       'When I went to Japan,'

while a typical SVO sentence was

(2)   Yu-**fera**   gachi   diswan.

          you-**PL**   get   this

          'You folks get this one.'

2.2. Noun phrases. In all the sentences which Ms Sonomura could remember, the same word order in the noun phrase was used: determiner (i.e., article, indeterminate numeral such as 'some', or a numeral) + adjective + noun, as in

(3)   tufera   gudu   wahine

          two   good   woman

          'two good women'

This is the same as English, Tok Pisin and most SVO Oceanic languages.

2.2.1. Nouns. Although the structure of the noun phrase in Mr Odawa's speech was basically the same as that of Tok Pisin, the nouns themselves are different, with many of Mr Odawa's nouns derived from Hawaiian, a language he apparently did not speak. Ms Sonomura related a family anecdote that shows that her grandfather could not recognise which nouns had a Hawaiian origin. When he was visiting a branch of the family who had emigrated to California rather than Hawai'i, he used the Hawaiian word *pirikia* 'trouble' when speaking to a young niece. When she looked confused and said she did not understand, he became surprised and said, *'O, yu no save 'pirikia'?!* ('Oh, you don't know 'pirikia'?!').

     Perhaps because of the availability of commonly understood Hawaiian nouns, speakers of Mr Odawa's generation apparently did not make use of noun compounding, which is used in other pidgins, including Tok Pisin, to expand the lexicon. A noun phrase in Tok Pisin, for example, often consists of a modifying noun following a head noun, e.g.,

(4)   haus   buk

          house   book

          'library'

or

(5)   manki   Papua

           youth   Papua

           'a Papuan youth'

Ms Sonomura could not recall a similar construction in her grandfather's speech.

2.2.2. Determiners. The determiners show some similarity with Melanesian Pidgin in the use of the suffix *-fera* (cf Tok Pisin *-pela*, which some speakers pronounce *-fela*). Although there was no indefinite article in Ms Sonomura's grandfather's speech, as in Tok Pisin, the word *wanfera* (Tok Pisin *wanpela*) 'one' was available for emphasis. Interestingly, although there are no restrictions on Tok Pisin *wanpela*, Ms Sonomura could remember *wanfera* being used only with persons, e.g.,

(6)   wanfera   man

           one   man

           'one / a man'

She said phrases with *wanfera* and inanimate nouns sounded ungrammatical, e.g.,

(7)   *wanfera tebol

           one   table

           'one / a table'

In this regard *wanfera* acted somewhat like a +human noun counting classifier such as *nin* (人) in Japanese.

     Ms Sonomura remembered the plural marker *ol* in her grandfather's speech. In contrast to *wanfera*, its use was not limited to one class of nouns. This plural marker is used in modern Tok Pisin, but not in modern Hawai'i Creole English.

2.2.3. Adjectives. As has already been shown, some constructions are the same in both Tok Pisin and Mr Odawa's Hawai'i Pidgin English because of the use of the similar suffix *–pela* / *-fera*. It is therefore not surprising that this is also where there is similarity in the construction of adjectives. As in Tok Pisin, the suffix *–pela* / *-fera* is added to most adjectives preceding a noun, e.g.,

(8)   *gut-fera* (TP *gutpela*),   *big-fera* (TP *bikpela*)
             good-ADJ   big-ADJ
             'good',   'big'

In Tok Pisin, the *-pela* suffix is optionally deleted when the adjective is a stative verb, so that either of the following is grammatical:

(9)   Man   i   gut-pela. / Man   i   gut.
             man   PM   good-ADJ   man   PM   good
             'The man is good.'

This deletion seems to have operated in exactly the opposite fashion in Mr Odawa's speech. Ms Sonomura remembered her grandfather saying the following sentence with the adjectival stative verb with the suffix *-fera*:

(10)   Man   him   big-fera.
             man   3SG   big-ADJ
             'The man is big.'

In the following phrase, where the adjective precedes the noun, there was no *-fera* suffix:

(11)   tu-fera   good   wahine
             two-ADJ   good   woman
             'two good women'

In this sentence, only the determiner *tufera* 'two' has the suffix *-fera*. No noun phrases were recorded with a prenominal adjective with the suffix *-fera*.

    Two high frequency adjectives with English etymologies appearing both in Mr Odawa's speech and dialects of contemporary Melanesian Pidgins are *rerebet* (Bislama and Solomons Pijin *lelebet*) 'very little' and *tomachi* (Tok Pisin *tumas*) 'much', e.g.,

(12)   rerebet   mani,   tomachi   pirikia
             very. little   money   much   trouble
             'very little money, too much trouble'

2.2.4. Pronouns. The similarity between the pronominal systems this early form of Hawai'i Pidgin English and Tok Pisin is particularly interesting. The following system could be reconstructed from Mr Odawa's speech:

Figure 1 Hawaiian Pidgin English Pronouns

	Singular	Dual	Trial	Plural
1	mi	mitufera	mitrifera	mifera
2	yu	yutufera	yutrifera	yufera
3	him	(data not certain)		

With one important exception other than minor phonological differences, this is virtually the same as in Tok Pisin and other forms of Melanesian Pidgin. One striking similarity is the use of the same dual and trial infixes *-tu-* and *-tri*.

The one noticeable difference between the pronominal systems of the two languages is the lack of differentiation between inclusive and exclusive first person plural in Mr Odawa's speech. This is an important distinction in all forms of Melanesian Pidgin (e.g., inclusive *yumi* and exclusive *mipela* in Tok Pisin), as well as of all Oceanic languages, but not Japanese.

The use of *-fera*, which Keesing (1988: 95) and others have attributed to Chinese Pidgin English, especially as a pluralising suffix, does not seem to have been mentioned previously in the literature on Hawai'i Pidgin English although it is found in sources from earlier in the century, such as in an Adam and Eve parody in Mobley (1938: 8).

The reflexive and interrogative forms did not show the same degree of parallelism. Unlike in Tok Pisin, there was no special form for reflexives, as the following example shows:

(13)   Mi   kachi   mi.
        I   cut   I
        'I cut myself.'

Tok Pisin uses yet to mark reflexives, e.g.,

(14)   Mi   katim   mi   yet.
        I   cut   I   RFL
        'I cut myself.'

However, because the special reflexive form in Melanesian Pidgin differs from dialect to dialect (Tok Pisin *yet*, Solomons Pijin *seleva*, Bislama *nomo*, the latter only in some dialects (Tryon 1987: 182)), it is probable that these are relatively late independent developments in each of the three dialects, and not part of the original Melanesian Pidgin.

The only similarities with interrogatives were those which could be expected from having the same English lexifier, e.g., *hu* (Tok Pisin *husat*) 'who' and *watpo* 'why' (present in only some dialects of Tok Pisin). An equivalent of Tok Pisin *wanem* 'what' (from English *what name*) was not recorded. Ms Sonomura reported that her grandfather often used interrogatives derived from Japanese, such as *nashite* 'why' and *naze* 'why'. As in Oceanic languages, Tok Pisin, and Japanese, English-style WH-movement was not obligatory, e.g.,

(15)   Yu   laiki   wat?
        2SG   like   what
        'What would you like?'

The distributive pronouns used by Mr Odawa showed some similarity with those in Tok Pisin. 'Each one' for example, was expressed by *wanfera wanfera* (Tok Pisin *wanpela wanpela*), although Ms Sonomura also remembered hearing *wanman wanman*, which has no parallel in Tok Pisin. Similarly, 'the one...the other' was expressed by *narafera....narafera*, just as in Tok Pisin *narapela...narapela*.

2.3. Verb phrases. The verb phrases reconstructed for Mr Odawa's speech show both similarities with and differences from their Tok Pisin equivalents. As has been mentioned above, Mr Odawa's word order varied between SVO and SOV, so the order of constituents within the verb phrase was only the same as Tok Pisin when he was using SVO word order. Further research is needed to determine which actually represents the underlying structure of the Hawaiian Pidgin English verb phrase. At this stage, however, it is possible to determine several similarities and differences between the individual constituents of Mr Odawa's verb phrases and those of Tok Pisin.

2.3.1. Verbs. The verbs themselves in Mr Odawa's speech came from English (e.g., *laiki*

'like' in the previous example) and Hawaiian (e.g., *hanahana* 'work'). A few also seem to have common etymologies with words in Tok Pisin (e.g., *kaukau* 'to eat'). Reduplication does not seem to have been a productive strategy for word formation for Mr Odawa, as, with a few exceptions, the only reduplicated verbs are those which would have been borrowed as reduplicated words from Hawaiian. This is in contrast to Tok Pisin, which uses reduplication of English-derived words to form transitive / intransitive pairs, such as:

(16)   was-im /   was-was
        wash-TR   wash-wash
        'to wash something' / 'to wash'

(17)   tok-im /   tok-tok
        talk-TR   talk-talk
        'to say' / 'to talk (together)'

2.3.2. Transitivity. Perhaps the most obvious difference in the actual verbs themselves is the lack of a transitive *-im* suffix in Mr Odawa's speech except in the word *givim* (as in example (18) below). This is surprising because its use has been attested in the speech of early nineteenth century Hawaiians (Keesing 1988: 119), and as either *-im* or *-om* it still has this function in modern Hawai'i Creole English, as in the sentences at the beginning of this paper. According to Keesing (1988: 119), the transitive suffix and obligatory transitive / intransitive distinction are 'unmistakable evidence of the stamp of Oceanic grammar' on Tok Pisin and other forms of Melanesian Pidgin.

2.3.3. Predicate markers. Another distinctive feature of the Melanesian Pidgin verb phrase system that was apparently lacking in Mr Odawa's speech is the predicate marker *i* or, in Bislama, *ol i*. Keesing (1988: 143-170) gives evidence for interpreting this predicate marker as an Oceanic subject-referencing pronoun, i.e., a clitic attached to the verb phrase that is co-referenced for person and number with the subject. It is possible that Mr Odawa's use of *him* in sentences such as (10) above reflects this usage. From the small sample of sentences reconstructed, it is not possible to confirm this. If this is actually a predicate marker or subject-referencing pronoun, there does not seem to have been a first or second person predicate marker as examples (18) and (19), respectively, show[4]:

(18)   Mi   givim   yu   kaukau.
          I   give   youSG   food
          'I'll give you some food.'

(19)   Yu-fera   olsem   haole.
          you-PL   similar   white.person
          'You people are just like White folk.'

One sentence with a dual subject that has an element which acted like an Oceanic subject referencing pronoun was:

(20)   Mi   yu   mama   tufera   go.
          1SG   2SG   mother   two   go
          'Both your mother and I are going.'

Further research is needed to confirm that *tufera* in such sentences is actually a subject referencing pronoun. It should be noted that one characteristic of Japanese that would have produced sentences similar to those in Oceanic languages which have some subject referencing pronouns realised as zero, is the optional, and indeed usual, deletion of the subject when it is clear from context. Thus in the following sentence, the lack of overt sentence subjects could be the Oceanic-derived result of the first person subject reference pronoun being zero, or it could be the result of a Japanese-derived discourse governed subject deletion rule:

(21)   Nufu   kaukau,   baimbai   slip.
          when   eat   FUT   sleep
          'When we've eaten, we'll go to sleep.'

2.3.4. Tense and aspect system. Mr Odawa's use of tense and aspect was quite simple when compared to Tok Pisin or his native Japanese. For example, although *stap* was remembered as an independent verb in Mr Odawa's speech, it was not remembered in constructions marking durative aspect, as in the following Tok Pisin sentence:

(22)   Mi   wok   i   stap.
         I   work   PM   DUR
         'I am working.'

Similarly, Ms Sonomura could not remember him using *bin*, which is used today in both Hawai'i Creole English and Tok Pisin as either an anterior or past tense marker.

One similarity with Tok Pisin that was reconstructed was his use of Hawaiian-derived *pau* to mark nondurative completed aspect in a way similar to *pinis* (from English *finish*) in Tok Pisin. The use of *pau* in this way can be attested in Hawai'i Pidgin English at least as far back as 1835 and seems to be a reflex of a particle that exists in most Oceanic languages (Keesing 1988: 14).

Another similarity was the use of the future or irrealis marker *baimbai*, as in (21) above. This marker is still used in Tok Pisin, although most speakers prefer a shortened form *bai*. In Tok Pisin, using *bai or baimbai* for future or irrealis is optional. This was also the case for Mr Odawa, as the following sentence shows:

(23)   Hanahanapau,   orait,   yu-fera   slip.
         work   CMPL   all.right   2-PL   sleep
         'When you're finished working, you'll sleep.'

2.3.5. Serial verbs. Serial directional verbs similar to Melanesian Pidgin *(i) kam* 'hither' and *(i) go* 'yon' were also reconstructed in Mr Odawa's speech, as in

(24)   Yu-fera   kachi   diswan   kam.
         2-PL   catch   this   come
         'All of you, bring this one here'

and

(25)   Gachi   diswan   go!
         catch   this   go
         'Take that one over there.'

It is probable that *kachi / gachi* come from English *catch*, used today in Hawaiian Creole English for 'take', and the source of Melanesian Pidgin *kisim* (Tok Pisin) and *kasem*

(Bislama). Ms Sonomura could not remember any forms of serial verbs derived from prepositions, such as Solomons Pijin and Bislama *agensem* 'against', *raonem* 'around', and *wetem* 'with'.

2.3.6. Adverbs. There was not as much agreement between the adverbs used by Mr Odawa and those in Tok Pisin as there was in the adjectives. One of the more surprising differences was in the use of 'yes' and 'no' with negative questions. Tok Pisin and Japanese have 'yes we have no bananas' constructions for answers to negative questions; 'yes' and 'no' refer to whether the speaker agrees or disagrees with the questions: 'yes, you are right' or 'no, you are incorrect', rather than with the truth value of the statement itself, as in English. This is shown by the Tok Pisin answers in (27) and (28) to the question in (26):

(26a)   Yu   no   dringim   wara?
         you:SG   no   drink   water
         'Aren't you drinking water?'

(26b)   Yes,   mi   no   dringim.
         yes   I   no   drink
         'No (you're wrong), I'm not (drinking water).'

(26c)   No,   mi   dringim.
         no   I   drink
         'Yes (you're correct), I am (drinking water).'

This type of response is also present in the speech of contemporary Hawaiian Creole English speakers, especially children. However, Ms Sonomura reported that while her grandfather might have answered the equivalent of question (26a) with

(27)   No,   mi   drinku.
         no   I   drink
         'Yes (you're correct), I am (drinking water).'

he would not have said:

(28)   *Yes,   mi   no   drinku.

        yes   I   no   drink

        'No (you're wrong), I'm not (drinking water).'

Another difference was in the choice of English etymology for the adverb of proximity. In Melanesian Pidgin, this comes from English *close*, e.g., Tok Pisin *klostu* (from *close to*), Bislama *klosap*, and Solomons Pijin *kolsap* (the latter two from *close up*). Mr Odawa used *preresun* (from *pretty soon*).

One adverb borrowed as a chunk from English into Tok Pisin and Solomons Pijin is *ating* 'maybe' (from *I think*). This was remembered by Ms Sonomura in her father's speech, as in

(29)   Ating   mi   Japan   go

        maybe   I   Japan   go

        'Maybe I'll go to Japan.'

The modern Hawaiian Creole English *maetbi* (from *might be*) or Solomons Pijin *maet* (from *might*) were not remembered in Mr Odawa's speech.

2.4. Prepositions. Besides verbal prepositions, the most noticeable prepositions in Melanesian Pidgin are the locative and temporal marker *long* and the genitive marker *bilong*. *Long* was not reconstructed in Mr Odawa's speech, either by itself or in conjunction with other prepositions.

In Melanesian Pidgin, the preposition *antap* 'above' must be followed by *long*. This follows an Oceanic pattern in which locative prepositions with specific meanings act like nouns and are followed by a 'real' preposition, so that in Hawaiian, for example, locative prepositions are followed by o 'of', as in:

(30)   lalo   o   ke   kumula'au

        under   of   ART   tree

        'under the tree'

This pattern is followed in modern Hawaiian Creole English, as in

(31)   andanit   a   da   chri
        under   of   the   tree
        'under the tree'

It is therefore somewhat surprising that Mr Odawa did not use this construction.

Long is also used in Melanesian Pidgin to mark indirect objects, e.g.,

(32)   Mi   givim   kaikai long   yu
        I   give   food   LOC   you:SG
        'I'll give food to you.'

Mr Odawa used word order rather than prepositions to express indirect objects, e.g.,

(33)   Mi   givim   yu   kaukau.
        I   give   you:SG   food
        'I'll give you food.'

Bilong, in contrast, is conspicuous by its presence in Mr Odawa's speech. Pronounced *brong*, it was used to mark possession as in Melanesian Pidgin, e.g.,

(34)   Him   haus   brong   mi
        3SG   house   POSS   I
        'It's my house.'

In Melanesian Pidgins, *b(i)long* can be used to describe an attributive relation, e.g.,

(35)   wara   bilong dring
        water   POSS   drink
        'potable water'

or

(36)   meri   bilong toktok
        woman   POSS   talk
        'a female gossip'

Ms Sonomura could not remember these uses of *brong* in her grandfather's speech.

She did remember that he often used Japanese post-positions while speaking Hawaiian Pidgin English, as with the use of Japanese *made* 'until' in the following example:

(37)   Mi   stap   ten   klok   made.

        I   stay   ten   o'clock   until

        'I'll stay until ten o'clock.'

This is interesting because post-positions are characteristic of SOV languages, such as Japanese. Although Mr Odawa often did us SOV word order, in this sentence he used SVO word order, where we would expect prepositions, not post-positions. This is an indication that the underlying representation of all his sentences was SOV, not SVO.

2.5. Conjunctions. The most noticeable similarity in the conjunctions used by Mr Odawa and those in Melanesian Pidgin is *olsem* with the meaning 'the same as', as in example (38) or as a general connector as in (39):

(38)   Yu-fera   olsem   haole.

        you-PL   similar   white.people

        'You're the same as white people.'

(39)   Yu   hanahana diswan.

        you:SG   work   this

        Olsem   hanahana nau...

        similar   work   now

        'You do this work and then, when the work's finished...'

Olsem, or other variants derived from English *all the same*, are attested as early as 1835 in Polynesia (Keesing 1988: 14). Today in Melanesian Pidgin there are a number of compound conjunctions using *olsem* such as *olsem na* 'therefore' and *olsem wanem* 'why'. None of these was remembered by Ms Sonomura in the speech of her grandfather.

Another conjunction common to both Mr Odawa and Melanesian Pidgin speakers is *sapos* 'if'. This conjunction has also been attested in the Hawaiian Pidgin English of the early twentieth century (Keesing 1988: 108).

Similarly, both Melanesian Pidgin and Mr Odawa's speech have *taim* as a conjunction,

as in

(40)   Taim   mi   Japan   go
        when   I   Japan   go
        'When I went to Japan...'

A third conjunction that is used similarly is *orait* for 'then' as in

(41)   Hanahanapau,   orait,   yu-fera   slip
        work   finish   then   you-PL   sleep
        'When the work's finished, then you can sleep.'

3. Analysis

Keesing (1988) hypothesises a Proto-Pacific Pidgin English, which began in Micronesia and Polynesia as a result of contact between Europeans and various Pacific Islanders aboard ships, and in Pacific ports during the beginning of European expansion into the Pacific. This early Pidgin English was given a definite East Oceanic grammatical framework, which continued more or less intact as the centre of European trading, and therefore Pidgin English, shifted towards the western Pacific, including Melanesia. At the same time, Europeans (and presumably Asians) learning this Pidgin English either interpreted its oceanic features according to the grammars of their own languages, or else failed to recognise these distinctive features.

This hypothesis would argue that Hawaiian Pidgin English would have had its origin in this common Proto-Pacific Pidgin English, which would have been brought to Hawai'i by sailors and ni-Kiribati plantation workers around 1870, the date Goodman (1985) gives as the beginnings of Hawaiian Creole English. It is true that a number of striking similarities can be observed between Mr Odawa's speech and Melanesian Pidgin. The obvious question is whether these similarities are due to convergence, borrowing, or a common ancestor. Only the latter would be evidence for Keesing's theory.

The most striking similarities are the use of the suffix *-fera* / *-fela* to mark non-singular person pronouns, determiners, and adjectives in certain positions, the use of *brong* / *b(i)long* to mark possession, the use of the conjunctions *sapos* and *olsem*, and the use of directional serial verbs. Striking though these similarities may be, they do not provide conclusive evidence of an Oceanic origin for Mr Odawa's Pidgin English speech. For example, since *-fera* existed in Chinese Pidgin English, its presence alone does not

constitute evidence of a genetic link between Mr Odawa's Pidgin English and Melanesian Pidgin. Two major differences are that for Mr Odawa, *-fera* was a human classifier and was not affixed to adjectives immediately preceding a noun, while in Melanesian Pidgin, *pela* / *-fela* is not a classifier and must be affixed to adjectives preceding nouns.

Similarly, although *brong / blong / bilong* and *olsem* are found in both Pidgins, their use can also be traced back to Chinese Pidgin English. Mr Odawa's serial verbs of direction are very much like those in Melanesian Pidgin, but again, other sources are also possible. Both Chinese and Mr Odawa's native Japanese have similar serial directional verbs. Since sentences such as (42) and (43) are virtually word-for-word translations of their Chinese as well as Melanesian Pidgin equivalents, and very similar to Japanese equivalents as well, this construction cannot be considered as conclusive evidence of a common origin for Melanesian Pidgin and Hawaiian Pidgin English.

(42)   Yu**-fera**   hapai   diswan   kam.
        you**-PL**   bring   this   come
        'Would you guys bring that one?'

(43)   Yu**-fera**   gachi   diswan   go.
        you**-PL**   take   this   go
        'You folks, take this one.'

There are several differences between the two pidgins that point to a non-Oceanic underlying structure for Mr Odawa's speech. The two most important are the lack of an obligatory transitive marker for the verb and the lack of a distinction between inclusive and exclusive non-singular pronouns. Both of these are important, marked characteristics of Oceanic languages. In the same way that their presence in Melanesian Pidgin is used by Keesing (e.g., 1988: 98ff) as proof of an Oceanic origin for the underlying structure of Melanesian Pidgin, their absence in Mr Odawa's speech is strong evidence for a non-Oceanic underlying structure of his speech.

4. Conclusion

It appears, therefore, that although individual words and morphemes in Mr Odawa's speech had a common ancestor with their Melanesian Pidgin counterparts, unlike Melanesian Pidgin, the underlying structure of his grammar was not Oceanic in origin. Some of these cognate morphemes and lexemes were the result of a common English superstrate, such as

the interrogatives. Others seem to have come from Chinese Pidgin English, and it is these which give the false appearance of a genetic link between Mr Odawa's early Hawaiian Pidgin English and Melanesian Pidgin. We must therefore conclude that Mr Odawa's speech does not provide evidence that Hawaiian Pidgin English and Melanesian Pidgin are derived from a common ancestor.

Notes

1. I would like to express my appreciation to the Sonomura family, in particular Marion Sonomura, for patiently providing the data used in this analysis. I hasten to add that any errors in recording or analysing these data are entirely mine.

2. Using Tok Pisin in examples and as a point of reference is not meant as a repudiation of Keesing's (1988) claim that Tok Pisin is a deviant dialect of Melanesian Pidgin in comparison with more conservative Solomons Pijin and Bislama. Tok Pisin has been chosen simply because it more widely known than the other two dialects of Melanesian Pidgin, and its standard orthography, as used in *Buk Baibel* and Volker (2008), is more like the Odo orthography in which data from Hawai'i have been written in this paper.

3. The following abbreviations have been used in this work:

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
CMPL	completive marker
DUR	durative marker
FUT	future marker
LOC	locative marker
PL	plural marker
PM	predicate marker
POSS	possessive marker
RFL	reflexive marker
SG	singular
TP	Tok Pisin
TR	transitive marker

4. As Karen Watson-Gegeo (personal communication) has pointed out, in at least one Oceanic language, Kwara'ae in the Solomon Islands, the use of first and second person clitics is optional.

References

Bible Society of Papua New Guinea. (1989) *Buk Baibel*. Standard Edition. Port Moresby: Bible Society of Papua New Guinea.

Crowley, Terry. (2003) *A new Bislama dictionary*. Port Vila: Institute of Pacific Studies, University of the South Pacific.

Goodman, Morris. (1985) Review of D. Bickerton 'Roots of language'. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 51:1, 100-137.

Keesing, Roger. (1988) *Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic substrate*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Mobley, Milly Lou. (1938) *Me spik English*. Honolulu: Honolulu Star-Bulletin, Ltd.

Simons, Linda and Hugh Young. (1978) *Pijin blong yumi*. Honiara: Solomon Islands Christian Association.

Tryon, Darrell. (1987) *Bislama: An introduction to the national language of Vanuatu*. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics D-72.

Volker, C.A. (2008) *Oxford Papua New Guinea Tok Pisin English dictionary*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Warner, Sam Noe'au. (1988) Hawaiian influences on syntactic features of Hawaiian Creole English. Lecture at the University of Hawai'i, 29 September 1988.