Review: VLADIMIR BELIKOV
INSTITUTE OF ORIENTAL STUDIES
U.S.S.R. ACADEMY OF SCIENCES
Moscow

This book undisputably shows the crucial importance of the substrate in the formation of diverging pidgins, from the earliest jargon stage till now. It makes a valuable contribution both to the general theory of

pidgin/creole formation and to the history of English-based pidgins of the South Pacific. Its concentration on Solomons Pidgin fills many gaps in sociohistorical and synchronic grammatical descriptions of this language. Since the book is quite consistent with my own ideas on the subject, I will not challenge any of its main theses but simply make some minor suggestions.

The skeleton of the historical scenario for the formation of Pacific pidgins is the same among all the authorities: From the early nineteenth century on in many areas of the Pacific, a lingua franca based on a kind of nautical English has been used. Its incipient formation dates back to the sandalwood period and the language(s) was (were) enriched on sugar plantations beginning in the late 1860s, gradually became the main means of interethnic communication in various parts of Melanesia, then undoubtedly diverged at this stage; the process of creolization, mainly in an urban context, slowly began only in the last decades.

The crucial points of disagreement among researchers are as follows:

1. Was it generally the same idiom throughout the South Pacific or was it a set of idioms emerging rather independently at different points? In other words, who was responsible for its incipient formation--diverse Oceanic peoples or sailors?

2. When did this idiom (or each of the idioms) turn from the jargon stage into a pidgin, reaching stability in lexicon and grammatical devices?

3. When did it (or they) gain enough vocabulary to serve as the means of everyday communication?

4. What is the ratio and correlation between different sources of the grammatical repertory of modern pidgins: substrate languages, English, and universal tendencies?

All these questions are interconnected.

Before Keesing's book, the prevailing scenario in the field was that of P. Mühlhäusler, summarized in his *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* (1986). Leaving aside many details, the scenario can be shortly represented in the following way. Before the plantation era there was a set of loosely connected, unstable jargons in Melanesia; based on these jargons two pidgins formed, one in the canefields of Queensland, the other in Samoa. The former is a predecessor of modern Solomons Pidgin and Bislama (which were lexically anglicized during the expansion stage). The latter finally resulted in Tok Pisin, which became a separate stabilized and expanded entity enriched by a Tolai substrate and a German (later English) superstrate.

Keesing effectively challenges many points of this scenario. I think that even half of the documentary evidence given in the book would be

enough to support his concept of the emergence of a rather stable pidgin aboard ships during the first half of the nineteenth century. According to Keesing, in the early sandalwood period "the key area for the development of a Pacific lingua franca" (p. 9) was the central Pacific: the eastern Carolines, the Gilberts, Rotuma, and Fiji. This territory was frequented by European ships and many inhabitants became seamen. In 1840s the main center of pidgin formation transferred into southern Melanesia (p. 27): Keesing puts special emphasis on the role of Loyalties' natives. [1] The language became fully developed during the first years of the Labor Trade period. "By the first half of the 1880s, and in many cases well before 1880, the essential patterns of Melanesian Pidgin --syntactic, semantic, and lexical-- were thus well established" (p. 50). At this period it already began to be used as a lingua franca by the islanders returning from the sugar plantations (p. 44).

At the beginning of Melanesian Pidgin's formation the majority of its speakers were natives of the central Pacific. Keesing gives a lot of thoroughly documented evidence of substrate influence via morpheme-by-morpheme correspondences. It was not Europeans but Pacific Islanders who were the most fluent speakers of the language--even in the middle of the nineteenth century many of them knew it from their childhood (p. 14) and they were responsible for its standardization and dissemination. The pidgin of the Pacific Islanders was a target variant for the Europeans. These two groups of pidgin speakers interpreted the same surface strings differently (pp. 100-101). [2] The stigmata of the inadequate European filter greatly degrades the quality of written representations of the language, leading, in particular, to the usual underestimation of its stability and grammatical richness (pp. 100-101, 149).

This scenario looks quite appealing but has, to my mind, weak points.

First, during the sandalwood period Polynesians, especially Hawaiians, were by no means less numerous among the seamen than Micronesians, Fijians, and Rotumans. In the early 1840s a thousand natives left the Hawaiian Islands each year (Simpson 1847:15); in the 1850s the figure was not less than five hundred per year (Day 1955:134). The number of the Hawaiians scattered in the Pacific ports and on the ships can be estimated for the period as three to five thousand. Some early jargon examples from Hawaii, Tahiti, the Marquesas, and New Zealand can be found in Clark 1979. Eastern Polynesian languages have no morphologically marked transitives, no preposed subject pronouns, and the standard word order is VSO. Some Polynesian vocabulary items have a universal distribution in the Melanesian pidgins (e.g., *kanaka* is undoubtedly of Hawaiian origin). So why did not Polynesians "bend' the

grammatical structure in the direction of their own substrate languages?

Second, according to Keesing, during the late sandalwood period the "pidgin became rich enough lexically and syntactically to serve as a primary language of daily communication in the 'communities,' mainly shipboard settings, where it was used, in what may have been a phase of at least incipient and partial nativization" (p. 94).

There is no doubt that the ship variant of South Seas Jargon quickly became grammatically enriched and lexically expanded in some semantic fields, but it could not be stabilized. Each ship "community" was small and mixed, with a large proportion of fluent English speakers. I think that in this situation the only imaginable interpretation would be a "post-jargon continuum" with newcomers as basilectal speakers, each bending the jargon to his own substrate language, and with an acrolect approaching substandard English. Keesing himself gives evidence for this supposition (pp. 41, 95, 151): Some acrolectal speakers could read and write English (p. 34). It is hard to believe that sailors with Oceanic background used a kind of "foreigner talk' to communicate with their colleagues of European origin (p. 212). Even in case it were true, they should do more the same interacting with the Pacific Islanders on the shore.

The Pacific pidgin of the nineteenth century was a second language to practically everybody. Its idiolects can be grouped, to my mind, into sociolects functionally similar to those of modern Pacific pidgins (bush pidgin, rural pidgin, urban pidgin, Tok Masta); independently of the previous classification the same idiolects can be grouped into classes with the same substrate. These substrate classes can be arranged according to typological similarity of the substrate languages. The whole story was complicated by a quick and individual evolution of each idiolect.

The supposition that at the end of 1880s "there was no room or need . . . to expand its [pidgin's] syntactic possibilities" (p. 39) seems too optimistic. Keesing's own story of the constant bending of Solomons Pidgin to the direction of the Kwaian substrate suggests that such "room" exists even now, especially taking into account the additional substrate bending of "standard" Solomon Islands Pidgin by the western islanders, described in one of his later papers (1988).

A neatly connected question is the lexical richness of the pidgin before separation of the Tok Pisin lineage. I have not found in the book the direct evidence for the claim that the Vanuatu-Solomons variant is lexically more archaic and the "historically aberrant New Guinea offshoot" (p. 61) was relexified by Tolai.

Unquestionably Tok Pisin was "Tolai-ized" and "Bismarck-ized"--but was it a *re*lexification? The attempt to measure the degree of lexical similarity between modern Melanesian pidgins with the standard instrument of lexicostatistics gives unexpectedly low results (Belikov 1987, 1988). The main reason is the absence of some items of the Swadesh list in the "protopidgin." It is but natural that some semantic fields are poorly represented in a language of this kind.

The only fundamental attempt to reconstruct the lexicon of the nineteenth-century pidgin is that of Clark (1988). According to Clark, "five hundred words would have been a bare minimum vocabulary for a competent speaker of Early Melanesian Pidgin circa 1880 . . . , a lexicon of a thousand words would not have been uncommon" (1988:8). Previous estimations have been much lower, even for a later period. Mühlhäusler, for example, gives a figure of about three hundred words for Samoan Plantation Pidgin (1983:51). The list of some six hundred vocabulary items appended to Clark's paper does not confirm the thesis of the later relexification in Tok Pisin.

Sometimes Tok Pisin has a circumlocution corresponding to an English-derived item in Bislama and Solomons Pidgin (cf. *sit bilong paia* vs. *asis* 'ashes', *skru bilong lek* vs. *ni* 'knee'). In some cases two or more specialized words in Bislama and Solomons Pidgin correspond to one general term in Tok Pisin (cf. *rip* vs. *rif* 'reef and *korel* 'coral'; *kaikai* vs. *kaikai* 'meal', *dina* 'dinner', and *sapa* 'supper'; *papa* vs. *papa* 'father' and *angkel* 'uncle'). The easiest way to qualify these cases is to consider the Tok Pisin variant a retention; hence the counterpart would be an English borrowing.

Sometimes it is not clear whether the semantic item was present in the "protolanguage" (cf. *abus* vs. *mit* 'meat',[3] *meme* vs. *nani* 'goat'). Some of these words, but not many, of course replaced previously existing words of English origin.

The final category--not numerous but significant--contains words definitely archaic in Tok Pisin and not used in the other pidgins. For example, *pato* 'duck', unmistakably of Ibero-Romance origin, also is attested in the Samoan *pato* borrowed from Pidgin (there were no contacts with Spaniards or Portuguese), so Bislama and Solomons Pidgin *dakdak* should be considered as an innovative loan after the separation of Tok Pisin.

One more point should be mentioned about calquing the most characteristic substrate features.[4] "In SIP [Solomons Pidgin], as in Melanesian languages, reduplicating a verb . . . implies continuation or repetition of an action" (Keesing n.d.:20). Vanuatu Bislama has the same

feature. This salient morphological device is not mentioned in the book under review. Was it absent in the pidgin or plantation period? If so, why did it emerge later on? Did the substrate influence become more intense?

Finally, I should like to make a metalinguistic complaint about the instability of the terminology. In some cases it can be a real obstacle to understanding one other. In Keesing's conclusion he puts the question that "allows of no easy answer" (p. 227): How can syntactic complexity of Solomons Pidgin "be reconciled with the view linguistic theorists have consistently taken of pidgins as radically simplified and syntactically limited?" The question is not in reconciliation but in unification of terminology. Pidgin in Bicker-ton's (1981) sense is a mere jargon in Mühlhäusler's (1986) sense! The existence of regional dialects in Bislama is a sign of its instability for Mühlhäusler (1986: 19) but not for Keesing, I suppose. We should be accurate in labeling natural phenomena and in understanding each other's labels. This will solve some problems.

It is always a pleasure to conclude a review with the statement that the only vexing points of the book are misprints. I have found only two: The work of J. Chignell mentioned on p. 165 is missing from the bibliography and the citation of J. Charpentier (1979:310) on p. 161 should be read "it is not common to say *olketa i* + verb."

NOTES

1. The number of languages in the Loyalties is only four, not a dozen (p. 33).

2. This is equally true for many other pidgins; in Russenorsk, speakers of Russian and Norwegian ascribe different deep structures to the similar surface strings (Belikov 1989).

3. Animals were not numerous in Oceanic context. Some Oceanic languages use a general term "fish" for both fish and animal flesh. Newly introduced European animals had special labels, which could be used for different types of meat.

4. The author gives sufficient examples to demonstrate the typological similarity of the Oceanic languages on the points under discussion. So his appeal to Proto-Oceanic is not necessary. Moreover, methodologically it is a weak argument: The typology of a protolanguage often has nothing to do with that of similar modern languages.

REFERENCES

Belikov, V. I.
1987 "Neo-Melanesian Languages and Chinese Pidgin English" (in Russian). In *Vozniknovenije i funktsionirovanije kontaktnych jazykov,* ed. I. F. Vardul and V. I. Belikov. Moscow.

1988 "Creolized Languages of Melanesia and the Traditional Genetic Classification." In *Linguistics: A Soviet Approach,* ed. M. S. Andronov and B. P. Mallik. *Indian Journal of Linguistics* (Calcutta).
1989 "Perekhvalskaya E. Russian-Norwegian po reconsidered." *JPCL* 4.

Bicker-ton, D.
1981 *Roots of Language.* Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.

Charpentier, J.-M.
1979 *Le pidgin bislama(n) et le multilinguisme au Nouvelles-Hébrides.* Paris: SELAF.

Clark, R.
1979 "In Search of Beach-la-Mar: Towards a History of Pacific Pidgin English." *Te Reo* 22/23.
1988 "The Lexicon of Early Melanesian Pidgin." Paper for the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Auckland.

Day, A. G.
1955 *Hawaii and Its People.* New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce.

Keesing, R. M.
1988 "Melanesian Pidgin and Oceanic Syntax: Further Evidence from Solomons Languages." Paper presented at the Fifth International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics, Auckland.
n.d. Solomons Pidgin as a Melanesian Language: A Sketch Grammar. Unpublished.

Mühlhäusler, P.
1983 "Samoan Plantation Pidgin English and the Origin of New Guinea Pidgin." In *The Social Context of Creolization,* ed. E. Woolford and W. Washabaugh. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.
1986 *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics.* London: Basil Blackwell.

Siegel, J.
1987 *Language Contact in a Plantation Environment: A Sociolinguistic History of Fiji.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Simpson, G.
1847 *Narrative of a Journey round the World during the Years 1841 and 1842.* Vol. 2. London.