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FOREWORD

This thesis might never have been. At the time when I undertook research on the sociolinguistics of Solomon Islands Pidgin (hereinafter referred to as Pijin or SIP), I was the first anthropologist to be allowed back into the country after a ban on research by expatriates which lasted three years. The Government of the Solomon Islands, wanting to control research, drew up a Research Act to lay down the conditions under which research would be done henceforth in the country and what priorities would be accorded to research. Even after the Research Act was passed by the National Parliament in October 1982, it was still not easy to get into the country to do research; the Government, in a wave of post-independence nationalism and anti-expatriate sentiment, banned most researchers entirely; those few who were allowed in were given research permits for only three months at a time.

I applied for a permit to do research in the Solomon Islands in January of 1982 and was given one in July of 1983. My research permit was renewed once, for a total period in the field, with permission to do research, of six months. Even though the Solomon Islands Government had let me into the country because they felt that my research proposal was important to them, I was subjected to constant harassment and obstruction by the Ministry of Education and Cultural Affairs during all the time I was in the field. This included refusal
of permission to work outside of Guadalcanal, summons to go to the Ministry at any time for the sole purpose of being verbally insulted, threats of deportation, arrests. I spent six months in the country with a research permit, during which I was able to do systematic observation, and five months with a tourist visa, during which I was only able to make unsystematic observations.

Given the short time I was allowed to do research in the Solomon Islands and the difficult administrative conditions under which this was done, it is obvious that I was not able to gather all the data I had set out to collect when I designed my thesis proposal. However, the data I have on the use of Solomon Islands Pijin in the context of urbanization are very detailed; and further research may be impossible. In view of the fact that hardly anything has been published on the pidgin of the Solomon Islands, whereas its cousin languages - Tok Pisin of Papua New Guinea and Bislama of Vanuatu - have been extensively described, I feel that it is important that my data on contemporary pidgin in an urban context be made available.
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ABSTRACT

Solomon Islands' Pijin, the least well documented dialect of Melanesian Pidgin, has been for a century a second and secondary language, a lingua franca of plantations and administration. As with Tok Pisin and Bislama, Pijin has long been expanded and stabilized to a degree far beyond the pidgins whose transformation into creoles has become a focus of universalist grammatical theory.

The thesis argues that Pijin, like Tok Pisin and Bislama, is undergoing creolization. But this, it is proposed, is not primarily a process of nativization, whereby Pijin is becoming the mother tongue of monolingual speakers. It is a concomitant of urbanization, particularly in Honiara, where Pijin has become the main language for a substantial, stable population. Urban life creates a set of conditions, for which I introduce the term "creolicity", which provide the context in which a secondary lingua franca becomes the main language of a community. Under conditions of creolicity, the first generation of speakers for whom such a pidgin becomes the primary linguistic medium of everyday life, comprises adults who learned it non-natively. The emergence of nativization, in the generation of their children, is a natural concomitant of this change; but I propose that it is not in itself the primary criterion of creolization, which must be defined in social and functional terms.

Comparing the linguistic forms produced by rural and urban speakers, and by urban adults and children (both monolingual and bilingual), the thesis assesses what changes are initiated by adults for whom Pijin has become the primary language, and what changes emanate from the "nativizing" generation.
ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations used within the text:

BSIP  British Solomon Islands Protectorate
KPC   Kanaka Pidgin Creole
KPE   Kanaka Pidgin English
QVP   Queensland Votes and Proceedings
SIC   Solomon Islands Creole
SIP   Solomon Islands Pijin
SSEM  South Sea Evangelical Mission
WPHC  Western Pacific High Commission

Abbreviations and symbols used in interlinear glosses and in tables:

> More important than
* Not attested in corpus
1 First person
2 Second person
3 Third person
ADJ Adjective
ADV Adverb
ASP Aspect marker
AUX Auxiliary
CAUS Causative
CON Connective
COND Conditional marker
CONJ Conjunction
D Dual
DEM Demonstrative
DIR Directional
FUT Future marker
FP Focal pronoun
IA Indefinite article
INT Interrogative
IT Iterative
LOC Locative
MOD Modal
NEG Negative
NP Noun phrase
O Object
OBL Oblique
OP Object pronoun
P Free pronoun
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>Perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI</td>
<td>Present includer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLU</td>
<td>Plural marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Predicate marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREPV</td>
<td>Verbal preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSP</td>
<td>Preverbal subject pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUANT</td>
<td>Quantifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>Relative marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEQ</td>
<td>Sequencer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST</td>
<td>Stative verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STM</td>
<td>Statement marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP'</td>
<td>Subject pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>Time delimiter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOP</td>
<td>Topicalizer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>Transitive marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb phrase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

When I manifested some interest in becoming a scholar of Pacific Pidgins, Peter Mühlhäusler suggested that I should study the pidgin of the Solomon Islands. Hardly anything was known about it, and our field of studies badly needed comparative data.

When my research proposal became more precise, it was clear that Solomons Pijin (or simply Pijin, as it is referred to in the country) was going to be interesting in several respects: 1) As was the case with the other Melanesian pidgins, Solomons Pijin was becoming the lingua franca of urban centres and in the process, was becoming the mother tongue of a generation of children. 2) Nativization was taking place almost a hundred years after the lingua franca had appeared, long after it had been spoken as a second language, and transmitted as a second language to three or four generations of Solomon Islanders. This challenged recent theories of creolization and nativization; if only for that reason, the problem was interesting.

For this research, my "problematique" was then: 1) to study the processes by which a language that had for decades been a second and secondary language was becoming a main language in town. 2) To evaluate whether and how urbanization and its off-shoot, nativization, affected the language itself.
1.1 The problem

Pidgin and creole studies used to be the backwaters of linguistics; over the last ten years they have become very fashionable in the social sciences, in the wake of studies which attempted to show how pidgins and creoles reflected with direct clarity innate faculties of language and universals underlying linguistic diversity. Bickerton's book *Roots of Language* (1981), with its controversial view on the transformation of pidgins into creoles as direct expression of innate linguistic faculties brought to bear in the process of nativization, has been a major catalyst to this renewed interest (see Bickerton 1984 and comments thereon). Bickerton's view that a true creole could only appear almost ex nihilo, challenged more sociological and functional approaches to the problem, according to which creoles represented a natural development of pidgins, when the sociological contexts were appropriate. In Bickerton's view, the creative and transformative role of children as native speakers is fundamental. Earlier sociological and functional approaches had stressed the processes whereby a pidgin could expand and stabilize, attributing no central creative role to nativization.

Even though Bickerton (1977:57) argued that "One is forced to conclude that a pidgin can creolize at any stage of its development", he insisted that true creoles were the ones that developed at a particular time on the continuum: thus not all pidgins qualified to be "true" creoles. Bickerton announces (1981:4) that

1 I shall use the word creole to refer to languages which
1) arose out of a prior pidgin which had not existed for
more than a generation.
2) arose in population where not more than 20 percent were
native speakers of the dominant language and where the
remaining 80 percent was composed of diverse language groups.
Criterion 1) excludes pidgins like Tok Pisin and Solomon Island Pijin; criterion 2) excludes, as Harris (1984:65) notes, "those where large numbers of target-language speakers were present at the inception of creole, such as Reunion Creole".

On the other hand, other scholars, and Muhlhausler in particular (1980:32), argued that a creole could arise at any stage on the developmental continuum.

I disagree with Bickerton that creolization after stabilization is very rare and of limited general interest. This type of creolization appears to be common with the pidgins and creoles of the South-western Pacific and some of the English derived Australian Creoles.

Critics of Bickerton's position have argued as well that a creole was essentially linked to the development of the social context that fostered it. Le Page, for instance, stressed the importance of social focussing, in which the notion of identity is included (1977:239).

Thus, while a pidgin is a product of interaction between cultures, a stable creole is the product of subsequent intra-action leading to focussing.

Sankoff and Laberge (1980) and Sankoff and Brown (1980) downplayed the role of children in the transformation of Tok Pisin in town, while Polome (1983:131) emphasizes the impact of socioeconomic phenomena on the recent development of creoles in Africa. Recently pidgins and creoles have been studied from the perspective of language acquisition, leading to further new directions for research (see Andersen 1980 and 1983; Schumann 1974 and 1978; Traugott 1977).

It is not my intention here to do a review of theories of creolization, since this has recently been done from a Pacific
This brief sketch will suffice to indicate why I undertook this study of creolization in the Solomon Islands. More theoretical issues, treated in the light of the data I present in Chapter 5, will be addressed in Chapter 6.

The pidgin of the Solomon Islands is one of the three Melanesian pidgins that are, more or less directly, the offshoots of the Pacific trade jargon of the 19th century, known as Beach-la-Mar (Clark 1979), and of the further expanded and stabilized pidgin of the latter nineteenth century Labour Trade. Tok Pisin (in Papua New Guinea), Bislama (in Vanuatu) and Pijin in the Solomon Islands share the characteristic of having remained the second language of their speakers for almost eighty years before becoming the main language of a significant portion of the population (in terms of numbers). In that respect, they are not considered as true pidgins by Bickerton, who dismisses them as being anomalies (1984: 187).

...the circumstances that gave rise to Tok Pisin were quite different from those that gave rise to true creoles. [These include] the several generations during which it existed as a nonnative language, and the degree of complexity it attained prior to nativization ....

In Melanesia, this change from being a second language to becoming a primary language has regularly taken place in the context of urbanization, suggesting that urbanization creates social contexts and relationships that may be a catalyst to linguistic change. The urban context of pidgin usage, in contrast to the more traditional

---

1 The degree of separation of the Tok Pisin lineage need not concern us here.
contexts of pidgin usage (principally the plantation system), requires that different linguistic strategies be used. The conditions of multilingualism are different in both contexts; so are the pidgin speakers' aims in communication. Multilingualism implies, moreover, that a lingua franca be used to create a linguistic bond between speakers from different language groups. As urbanization implies that there be long time urban dwellers, children will be born in such a multilingual context; the lingua franca of the town might then become the mother tongue of some children.

But urbanization implies as well that the functions, roles and status of the languages concerned might vary to meet the needs and demands of a permanent multilingual society and that the new distributions of these functions, roles and statuses might be different from those prevailing prior to urbanization. Traditionally, a pidgin is always a second language for its speakers. What happens, then, socially and linguistically, when this pidgin becomes their main language? This is an important question on theoretical grounds, as I will argue that a pidgin can become the main language of a population prior to, and in some cases without, nativization.

1.2 Aims of the thesis.

The main concern of this thesis will be to study the effects of urbanization on the pidgin of the Solomon Islands. As this pidgin is becoming the mother tongue of a new generation of children, it is tempting to associate urbanization and nativization. However, in my view, the important question is not whether urbanization is correlated with nativization (or creolization, in its traditional and restricted meaning), but rather: what are the processes by which urbanization,
or any other form of social change, effects changes in the use of a language by the speakers, and by extension, changes in the language itself?

In this frame of analysis, nativization is considered as one of the results of social change and is distinguished from creolization. Creolization is the process by which a pidgin, used formerly as a second and secondary language by a population, becomes the main language of this population. Creolization is thus, in the conceptualization I am advancing, the sociolinguistic process which fosters nativization. To avoid confusion with the traditional meaning of creolization, I shall introduce the term "creolicity" to describe the new sociolinguistic context of pidgin usage, in which speakers use their pidgin as a creole, socially and functionally; that is, whereby it becomes the primary language of their everyday lives. I shall develop this concept of "creolicity" in Chapter 6.

In this study, I will argue that it is not necessary for a pidgin to become nativized in order for it to become the main language of a speech community. I will propose that one generation of nativization of a pidgin need not have much creative effect on the language, if the pidgin which has been nativized is already expanded and if the two varieties of language - the parents' and the children's - fill the same functions in the community. However, we shall see that the children have an impact on the language, as they tend to streamline and regularize the forms that are in variation in the speech of the parental generation. It will become clear, then, that the dichotomy between pidgin and creole in the Solomon Islands can be seen as an opposition between MAIN LANGUAGE and SECONDARY LANGUAGE, rather than
as an opposition between MOTHER TONGUE and SECOND LANGUAGE. I will show that there are no significant differences in the Pijin of children for whom it is the sole mother tongue and of children acquiring native command of Pijin and a vernacular. Solomons Pijin will be seen not as a monolithic or homogeneous language; but rather as a language which has acquired diversity and flexibility, with multiple registers and striking code variability.

The pidgin of the Solomon Islands (called hereafter Pijin, or SIP) is becoming the mother tongue of children. Therefore, it provides us with a marvellous opportunity to study the processes involved, socially and linguistically; particularly because rare are the cases of nativization we are able to witness. In the literature, only a few cases have been described while the changes were actually happening. Tok Pisin is one of the best known examples. The analysis of the changes taking place in Solomons Pijin will then contribute more comparative data on the processes of creolization and nativization. Muhlhausler (1980:19) suggests that such evidence is badly needed.

To date, studies of the developmental aspects of pidgins and creoles have been restricted to small components of their grammars. The principal reason for this appears to be the lack of suitable data. In order to achieve theoretically more adequate accounts, the collection of such data has to be given more prominence.

1.3 Organization of the thesis.

This thesis is divided into seven chapters. The introductory chapter includes a section on methodology and a section on transcription. Chapter 2 presents a summary of the sociohistory of Solomon Islands Pijin prior to urbanization. This chapter does not
document' in detail the transformations undergone by Pijin in the course of its history, but rather aims at showing how the history of Pijin reflects the history of its speakers. When Solomon Islanders were a dominated people in their own country, Pijin, too, was dominated: subjected to colonial ideology, perceived by the British administration as a bastardized language and temporary abomination. When Solomon Islanders started to take their destiny in their own hands, Pijin became the language of unity of the country.

Chapter 3 describes the characteristics of urbanization in Honiara, the capital of the Solomon Islands, where most of my research was done. I show the socioeconomic basis of the urbanization of Honiara and show in what respects life in this town is different from life in the village. This is a fundamental chapter, in which the social context of creolization is presented.

Chapter 4 focuses on multilingualism in town. The role and importance of Pijin in such a Tower of Babel-like town will become obvious. We shall see how urbanization leads to marriages between speakers of different vernaculars and how families deal with multilingualism in everyday life. I shall pay special attention to children in town, to show that despite different sociolinguistic backgrounds, the children use Pijin in similar contexts.

In Chapter 5, I describe the linguistic changes taking place in Pijin. Examining phonology and some elements of syntax, I shall compare rural and urban Pijin, and assess the differences between the speech of the adults and the speech of the children in town.

Chapter 6 is a discussion of the data in the light of the theoretical framework described above. The notion of "creolicity" is further developed. The role of the adults and the children in the development of Pijin in town is analyzed.
Chapter 7 presents a summary of the argument of the thesis as well as some reflections on the place and future of Pijin in the country.

1.4 Methodology.

This is a study of the anthropology of language. As such it lies at the interface of many disciplines, and draws on the methods of history, sociology, demography, social anthropology and linguistics.

For reasons linked to Solomon Islands research policy at the time I was in the field, I was not allowed to work outside of the island of Guadalcanal and had to make multiple short trips. Whereas I had originally intended to study sociolinguistic patterns and domains of transmission of Pijin, on plantations and in smaller towns and rural areas as well as in the urban centre, I was forced to focus on the social nature and use of Pijin in Honiara, the capital, and on what urbanization meant for the language and its speakers. As urbanization meant that some nativization of the language was bound to be taking place, I wanted to study the relationship between the two phenomena and ascertain if urbanization and nativization had any effect on the language, beyond the effect of the generational change. This was seminal in determining the research methods I was to use in the field.

Thus, even though the study focussed on the urban context of Pijin, it was obvious that, for the purpose of linguistic analysis, I would need material allowing me to compare urban Pijin with non-urban Pijin. I thus decided to build two corpora: an urban corpus and a rural corpus. The urban corpus would be built in Honiara. The rural corpus had to be built in an area located far from Honiara, so that the variety of Pijin spoken there would not be affected by the
proximity to the town. However because of the restrictions on research already mentioned it had to be in an area of Guadalcanal and in a place where Pijin had some historical depth and was well established. The village of AvuAvu, located on the south coast of Guadalcanal, met the conditions and was thus chosen as locus for the rural sample. In addition, I was able to work with visitors from rural areas passing through Honiara, from Malaita and other islands. 

Building the urban corpus posed problems. For theoretical, methodological and practical reasons, I decided against taking a sample across town and thus limiting my contact with the informants to a single interview. I wanted to be able to study most of all the place of Pijin in the everyday life of the people of my sample. For this, regular visits to and contact with the population would be required at different times of the day, as often as possible, so that sociolinguistic survey and interview data could be complemented with in-depth participant observation. This was possible only in a small community; it would have been impossible in a town in which the elements of the sample were widely spread out. Hence, I decided against taking a sample across town and chose instead to limit my universe to Vura, a suburb of Honiara where I was able to find accommodation with a family. Focussing on Vura would allow me to do a community study as well as a linguistic study. I decided that by making this strategic choice, my sample was going to be smaller than I had anticipated; but that I would then be able to do in-depth interviews on language choice, language praxis and attitudes, along with recording samples of Pijin spoken in Vura. For the purpose of the linguistic analysis, both corpora comprised adults and children, male and female. Because of nativization, the sample subgroup of urban
children included children who had Pijin as a second language and children who had Pijin as a mother tongue.

I had planned to have a sample of 80 in town (40 adults and 40 children) and one of 40 in AvuAvu (20 adults and 20 children). However, because of the limits imposed on me by the short time span of my research permit, I was unable to gather that much. Therefore, the corpus on which this study is based appears in table 1-1. Figure 1-1 presents the houses of the sample.

Table 1-1: Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urban sample</th>
<th>Rural sample</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vura</td>
<td>AvuAvu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the size and the structure of the corpus, I am not able, for the most part, to make statistically significant quantitative analyses of Solomon Islands Pijin. But the corpus is more than adequate for the purpose of making qualitative comparisons between urban and rural speech, and adults' and children's speech in town.

I lived in the Solomons for 11 months in all, spread out over a
Figure 1-1: Houses of the Vura Sample
period of two years: from September to December 1982, from July to December 1983 and from March to May 1984. At the expiration of each of the permits I had to leave the country. During the first field trip and the first part of the second one, we (my then two-year-old son and I) lived with a Solomon Islands family in the part of Vura called Vura 2. There we experienced Solomon Islanders' hospitality and family life from the inside. During the second half of the second field trip and during the last one, we lived by ourselves in a house located in the part of Vura called Vura 1. There we were out of the family circle and experienced and relied more on friendship and neighbourhood ties. Both systems had great advantages and they yielded equally fascinating results. Bringing my child with me was considered by the Vura population as a token of trust, especially as I was alone with him. It proved excellent for rapport and contributed to harmonious relationships with informants and to friendship with most. Of course, there were bad days....

1.5 Vura.

Vura is a suburb of Honiara, located 4 km east of the city centre. As the town stretches along a narrow coastal strip between ridges and hills to the south and the sea to the north, Vura is well inside the town boundaries. It is a housing estate developed in three phases since 1971 by the Honiara Housing Authority, originally to provide housing for government employees. The small agglomeration has been built to follow or make the best of the geographical configurations of the Honiara surroundings and lies in a gully surrounded by ridges, along Vura Creek. (Refer to plates 3.1 and 3.2 in chapter 3). It is serviced by buses running approximately every
hour taking passengers to Honiara for a fare of 25c. Taxis regularly cruise the area and charge $2.00 for a trip to town. This transport system, augmented by individually owned cars, allows for quick and frequent access to Honiara. Most people working in town commute twice a day, thus giving to the small agglomeration a definite atmosphere of suburbia. The last 1981 census gave the population of Vura as 2859 people, i.e., 13% of the Honiara population. Most of the Vura dwellers are young people, couples with young children, working either in the public service or in stores and private companies. Men are usually employed as skilled workers - like carpenters, plumbers and mechanics - or as clerks or office workers for the government or private enterprise. Some, very few, have their own enterprises; only one in my corpus had a professional occupation. Women work as nurses or secretaries and, most often, as domestics (called haosgel or haogele) in European households. Vura has some services, including a primary school, a clinic and two stores; all the religious denominations have churches nearby. There is a small market in Kukum, within walking distance, and all this contributes to make Vura almost self-supportive in terms of amenities. The Vura dwellers come from different islands of the Solomons and most of the vernaculars of the island group are represented. The majority, however, comes from the island of Malaita, the most populous of the Solomon Islands and the one which has been historically the most involved in the labour trade to Queensland and the circular migration within the archipelago. Table 1-2 shows the ethnic composition of Vura, compared to Honiara and to two other wards of the town. In its ethnic composition, Vura is representative of Honiara. Many families have been living in Vura for 10 years or more and children now as old as 13 were born there. In this multilingual
Table 1-2: Ethnic composition of Rove, Kukum, Vura and Honiara showing percentage of total composition in each ward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rove</th>
<th>Kukum</th>
<th>Vura</th>
<th>Honiara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western Islands</td>
<td>11.84%</td>
<td>14.11%</td>
<td>10.74%</td>
<td>9.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>3.74%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>9.71%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td>6.56%</td>
<td>3.40%</td>
<td>4.13%</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guadalcanal</td>
<td>8.20%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>7.74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V aria</td>
<td>21.68%</td>
<td>14.59%</td>
<td>10.80%</td>
<td>17.98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaita</td>
<td>37.87%</td>
<td>49.02%</td>
<td>49.88%</td>
<td>44.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makira</td>
<td>5.39%</td>
<td>2.40%</td>
<td>2.47%</td>
<td>2.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>5.74%</td>
<td>4.80%</td>
<td>2.93%</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulawa</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td>0.80%</td>
<td>0.90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: compiled according to 1976 census.

Community, Pijin is the main language of communication, even though it is the second language for a great number of people. It is definitely the main language at school, at church, in the clinic, in stores and at the market. It is the language of public life. Vernaculars are widely used even though Pijin tends to be the main language of most families in which parents come from different linguistic backgrounds. In some cases, and this is happening more and more often, it is becoming the main language of communication between parents and children even when they share the same vernacular (refer to Figure 1-2).

In Vura, two questionnaires were used. Questionnaire 1 was used as a guide during the interviews. I had tested it in 1982 and it proved useful in eliciting information on language habitus, attitudes,
Figure 1-2: Linguistic origins of the Vura informants
choices etc. Besides the questionnaire, the interviews comprised life histories, reflections on everyday life, myths or stories and other relevant material. They were all conducted in Pijin and lasted between one and two hours for the adults and half an hour to 45 min for the children.

For each recorded interview I have the following documentation:

1. A Census card.
2. An interview follow up.
3. An index to interview.
4. A kinship terminology list (for a future comparative study of vernacular/Pijin).
5. Comments on the interview and first impressions of the informant's Pijin.
6. Transcription of the interview.

Samples of Questionnaire 1 and of forms 1, 2, 3, can be found in Appendix A.

All these elements of information were gathered in the course of at least six "interview related" visits to informants.

1. Census visit, during which I not only recorded the composition and activities of the household, but as well explained what the purpose of the research was. This gave me a chance to know the people before the interview.

2. Visit to make an appointment for the interview. Although in some ways this does not conform to Melanesian ways, making an appointment was mandatory in the town setting, as most people are working for wages outside their home. They are not available all the time, and when they are, they control their time. This provided another occasion to get to know the informants better.

3. The interview itself which, with all the conversations held before and after, took about two hours.
4. Visit to check the interview follow-up form. A kind of abstract of the life history and linguistic habitus of the informant, which allowed me to make sure that I had all the needed information.

5. Visit to check kinship terminology in language of informant and its correspondence in the informant's Pijin. Even though not directly linked to this research, this information proved useful as it allowed me to understand the rules of Pijin kinship terminology behind what I thought were idiosyncrasies.

6. Visit to give a copy of the transcription of the interview, or a copy of the interview tape, according to informants' choices. This was a nice way of saying "thank you".

Of course, except for the sixth visit, all these visits and enquiries could have been made, if I had been rushing things, during the first or second contact with the informant. But I believe that all these different steps gave me the opportunity and the excuse to visit people regularly and to establish good rapport with them. It further gave me opportunities to make less systematic observations of interaction within households and with neighbours. In addition to these six basic visits, I went and talked to people as much as possible, shared meals with them and exchanged food with them, went to church and to the market, took children to the clinic when a mother could not go, shopped at the Vura shop and at the Vura Coop rather than in town, walked everywhere and enjoyed with everybody else the almost obligatory stroll after dinner on the Vura main road, the local Promenade.

The other important aspect of my research dealt with the Pijin spoken by the children and with the use they made of it. I paid
special attention to them, recording their speech or their utterances in their houses or their garden or in mine when the neighbourhood children came to play with my son's toys. But I wanted to see the children's linguistic habits outside of the family circle and in a context where peer group pressure was most likely to be more important than family pressure. Moreover, I wanted to know what were the places of English and Pijin respectively in school. I therefore spent a month in the Vura Primary School, sitting in on lessons every day, taping classes, taking pictures, writing down observations on Pijin and English usage and finally running a questionnaire, which is included as Questionnaire no. 2. For the sections on attitudes I drew on Nancy Dorian's questionnaire as it appeared in Language Death (1981).

However, the questionnaire proved difficult to run on a large scale. There were three main reasons for this, which have to do with the discrepancy between social science methods of investigation and the subjects to whom the methods were being applied; in other words, a lack of fit between the tool and task for which it was being employed. The three problematic factors were:

1. The physical presentation of the questionnaire and the exercise the questionnaire entailed were a puzzle to the children. They had never seen a questionnaire before and had never been trained to do the kind of mental exercises required when filling in a questionnaire, selecting an appropriate answer among several fixed possibilities.

2. The questionnaire was in English. I had done that on purpose, as these children are supposed to be literate in English and not in Pijin. Moreover, there is no standard orthography for Solomons Pijin, so their literacy is, in most cases, only in English. English is the
official language of education in the Solomon Islands. To my great surprise, the children could not understand such sentences as "Where were you born?", or "What is your mother's language?" after they had spent many years learning English for two hours a day every day of the week. Of course this had nothing to do with their cognitive capacities, but with the fact that they do not know English beyond the school-English they are being taught, and beyond the situations described in books or in the singing chants that are being used with them in lieu of oral drill. These children have no natural exposure to English and the only English they learn is acquired through the process of repetition in groups and not in ways that foster creativity. Therefore as soon as the model of English they are exposed to differs from what they are used to, they are lost. This is nothing more than false literacy. Problems of comprehension also went beyond the linguistic barrier caused by English. In some cases they had to do with the question being totally irrelevant in the life of these children and totally out of the contexts of their preoccupations and experiences. For this reason I decided to eliminate Section F from the questionnaire.

As soon as I translated the questions into Pijin, the children knew exactly how to answer them. When I realized that, I decided to go over the questions one by one in order to translate them into Pijin and to give the children the time they needed to write their answers.

3. Controlling what was answered in the questionnaire and what was really happening in real life of the children was not a small task, since, because of the problems mentioned above, some children at first answered almost randomly. Fortunately by the time I administered the questionnaire, I knew almost all the children
individually and knew their parents as well. Realizing the discrepancies between their answers and the reality during the first test I made, I decided to administer the questionnaire only in two classes of the Vura school, Std.4 and Std.6, to 70 children. This reduced sample size gave me the opportunity of working with the children individually, asking the children questions orally, and filling in their answers myself. A copy of this questionnaire appears in Appendix B.

1.6 The rural sample: AvuAvu

AvuAvu is a Catholic mission station located on the Weather Coast of Guadalcanal. AvuAvu was founded by the Marist Brothers around the end of the First World War and has since been a stronghold of Catholicism on Guadalcanal. Like all the Weather Coast villages, it is very isolated from the rest of the island and from Honiara in the north, by a high mountain ridge running parallel to the south coast. Except for a small tractor trail linking AvuAvu to Marau Sound at the eastern tip of the island, there is no easy means of access to the outside world. Cutter boats sail around the island irregularly, and because of their unreliability and the length of the trip to Honiara, people tend to avoid taking them and prefer taking the plane. A small airstrip at Haemarao (5 kms east of AvuAvu) allows a link twice a week with Honiara. Flying is expensive (SDB$36.00 = AUS$35.00 return in November 1983) and not used very often by people on private trips. Except for the two small shop owners, the government agent, the nurse

2Years 4 and 5 of the primary education system. Each year is referred to as Standard [Std.].
at the clinic, and the teachers of the primary and secondary school, the people of AvuAvu have a subsistence economy, augmented in some cases by the yields of cash cropping. All the adult men recorded in AvuAvu learnt their Pijin before the Second World War, in the course of plantation work, either in the Russell Islands, or on the other side of Guadalcanal, thus following a very traditional pattern of pidgin acquisition. Most of them have been to Honiara at least once. Children do not know Pijin before they get to primary school, even though they might have heard some villagers or some older children using it with strangers. The local vernacular, Tolo, is the main language of day-to-day activities. In the beginning when the mission station was first founded, the language of the west of Guadalcanal, Ghari, was used for mission purposes, as it was the lingua franca of the Catholic mission in this region. Adults who went to school at the AvuAvu primary school were taught in Ghari language by the Catholic sisters. In general, Pijin is a second language and secondary language for everybody, except for the students and teachers of the Provincial Secondary School, who, coming from different parts of the Weather Coast, have to rely on Pijin for daily interaction.

In AvuAvu no stratified sample of any sort had been planned, for the simple reason that not all the population was going to know the language. I gathered a sample of AvuAvu Pijin according to a "boule de neige" sample. A slightly modified version of Questionnaire 1, adapted for the rural scene, was used, and was supported by the kind of documentation which supports Questionnaire 1.

Fieldwork in the Solomon Islands generated 118 hours of taped Pijin and a substantial corpus of fieldnotes. I was able to work in the
National Archives of the Solomon Islands to study unpublished material (patrol reports, surveys and reconnaissance trips, official administrative reports, commissions of enquiry, etc) and in the National Archives of the State of Queensland to gather material on the Labour Trade. Two months of fieldwork were carried out in Mackay (Queensland) in 1983 to study the Queensland end of Solomons Pijin and the death of the local pidgin, Kanaka Pidgin English from which SIP derived (Jourdan 1983).

1.7 Phonology and transcription.

Pijin phonology is highly variable and flexible. This is due to three main factors: 1) The consonantal phonology of vernaculars. This is so obvious that many people recognize the geographical and cultural origin of Pijin speakers by their pronunciation of Pijin. 2) The presence of interconsonantal vowels (i.e., the absence of consonant clusters) in most Solomons languages: most people will use interconsonantal vowels in Pijin as well, thus avoiding consonant clusters. 3) The influence of English phonology: obvious in the speech of some speakers who have knowledge of English. We shall see these variations in detail in section 5.1. The two following tables represent Pijin phonetics.

A word of caution is necessary here. This table represents the possible phonetic inventory of Pijin. Not all people will use all the elements of these tables, as speakers, particularly in rural areas, tend to speak Pijin with the phonology of their vernaculars, (refer to section 5-1). The place where the entire inventory of Pijin sounds is most likely to be heard is Honiara, because of the multilingual character of the town.
Table 1-3: Vowels and diphthongs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>oe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>ae</td>
<td>ao</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My transcription, even though not phonetic, aims at reproducing the speaker's speech as faithfully as possible; whatever I heard is written down. No correction according to a hypothetical phonetic and phonological rule has been made. In some ways this transcription follows the transcription designed by SICA (Solomon Islands Christian Association), but only when it does not interfere with the speakers' idiosyncracies.

Thus when a transcription shows the same speaker producing *bilong, bulong, blong, bloN and blo*, this is not due to transcription or typing mistakes. This represents what the speaker has actually said. The *oN* sound of *bloN* is similar to the sound of *mon* in French, usually represented in phonetics by [*...*]. Similar sounds in the corpus will written *N*, to differentiate them from the sound *n*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bi-</th>
<th>Apico-</th>
<th>Apico-</th>
<th>Alveo-</th>
<th>Dorso-</th>
<th>Glot-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labial</td>
<td>Dental</td>
<td>Alveolar</td>
<td>Palatal</td>
<td>Palatal</td>
<td>Velar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td></td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prenasalized</td>
<td>mb</td>
<td>nd</td>
<td></td>
<td>ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasals</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flap/Trill</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affricates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>z</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fricatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiceless</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>voiced</td>
<td>v</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glides</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIJIN IN PERSPECTIVE PRIOR TO URBANIZATION: AN HISTORICAL OUTLINE.

Pijin has been present in the Solomon Islands for over a hundred years. Its history is closely linked to the history of contact between Solomon Islanders and Europeans. When such contacts were sporadic and scattered, so was the knowledge of Pijin by the population and the use they made of it. When the nature of the contacts changed and when their intensity increased to the point that they eventually became permanent, the importance of Pijin as vehicle of these relations, and the range of its use, progressively increased.

The first contact that the Solomon Islanders had with a pidgin was probably through the whalers and traders who roamed the South Pacific in the 19th century. Bennett (1979:47) states that:

By the 1830s people on Santa Isabel could repeat to D'Urville and his crew English words learned from whalers. Of Sikaiana in 1847, Cheyne reported that 'nearly all speak more or less broken English'.

On the basis of reports by ship masters, explorers, beachcombers, whalers, etc. it seems that between 1820 and 1860 there had been, in the Solomon Islands, a fair amount of contact with the Pacific whalers and traders jargon known as Beach-la-mar (Clark 1979). How this Beach-la-mar jargon became a fully fledged pidgin is beyond the scope of this thesis. However, as it is important to have an understanding of the social evolution of Pijin in the Solomon Islands prior to
urbanization in order to grasp the intricacies of its present situation, this chapter will give an outline of the expansion of Pijin in the island group. This will take the form of a brief look at the sociohistory of Pijin by pointing out the events or developments which were significant in the expansion of the language throughout the archipelago. As the country was under British rule from the turn of the century until 1978, most of these events are linked to colonial rule; others date back to an earlier period of capitalist expansion and took place outside the Solomon Islands; thus, the Labour Trade to Queensland, Fiji, New Caledonia and Samoa in the second half of the 19th century took young men away from their island homes but had a strong direct and indirect effect on indigenous communities. Some of the significant events and processes took place in the islands themselves: the Pax Britannica for instance, the circular migration between islands used as labour reservoir and islands where plantations were set up, the Second World War. Finally, probably the most important event in the pre-urbanization period was the political movement known as Maásina Rule, which swept the eastern islands from 1946 to 1953: it was through Pijin that the unity of the movement was achieved.

2.1 The Solomon Islands

The Solomon Islands are located in the southwest Pacific between east longitudes 155 degrees 30' and 170 degrees 30' and between south latitudes 5 degrees 10' and 12 degrees 45'.

Eight main islands comprise the archipelago geographically. They are from east to west: Makira (formerly San Cristobal), Malaita, Guadalcanal, Nggela (formerly Florida), Ysabel (formerly Santa-
Isabel), New Georgia group, Choiseul and Bougainville. The western islands of Buka and Bougainville were part of Australian New Guinea and are now politically attached to Papua New Guinea. The rest of the group became a British protectorate in 1893 and now comprise the political entity of Solomon Islands, independent since 1978.

The Solomon Islands are part of the Melanesian arc spreading from Papua New Guinea to New Caledonia. However some Polynesian outliers such as Ontong Java in the north; Sikaiana, Tikopia and Anuta in the east, and Rennell and Bellona in the south are part of the country. As is the case almost everywhere in Melanesia, the Solomon Islands are characterised by wide linguistic diversity. In 1983 Tryon and Hackman identified 63 different languages plus many dialects (see Map 2-1.)

These languages fall into two linguistic families: Austronesian (or Malayo-Polynesian) comprising 56 languages, six of which are the languages of the Polynesian outliers, and Papuan (or non-Austronesian)\(^1\), comprising seven languages scattered across the island group.

In the major part of the Solomon Islands, language groups can be equated with cultural groups, but they cannot be equated with political groups. Until colonization most of the Solomon Islanders lived in the interior of the islands, due to an economy based on shifting cultivation and as defensive response to head hunting. Except for South Malaita and the Shortlands where wider political units provided for a hereditary system of chieftainship, social units were small and were mainly based on family units. Settlements were

---

\(^1\)Which, being a negatively defined category, may not all be genetically related.
Figure 2-1: Languages of the Solomon Islands.
small and scattered throughout the bush areas of the islands. In the Polynesian outliers, political systems were hierarchical, dominated by hereditary chiefs. There, language group corresponded to political unit.

The islands were discovered in the 16th century by the Spaniard Mendana. They were afterwards "lost", as Mendana could not find them again on his second voyage in the southwest Pacific. It is only in the 18th century that they appear on the world maps after the exploration voyages of Bougainville, d'Entrecastaux and Carteret in that part of the world.

During the second half of the 19th century, the Solomon Islands became a labour reservoir for the plantation economy of Queensland, Fiji and New Caledonia. The labour trade that developed between Melanesia and Australia saw some 63,000 Solomon Islanders taken as recruits to work in Queensland (Price and Baker 1976:110). The archipelago became a British protectorate in 1893 in an attempt by Britain to circumvent French expansion in the western Pacific. Following the imposition of Pax Britannica, a process which lasted into the 1920s, the islands turned into a colony whose economy was based on the production of copra. Many plantations developed in the centre of the group (Russell islands, Isabel and Guadalcanal mainly); this meant alienation of land and the establishment of an internal circular migration set up by planters to secure the labour force. The economy of the group stagnated during the Great Depression of the 1930s, and the Solomons were a forgotten backwater of the British Empire. All this changed with Japanese expansion into the southwest Pacific in the Second World War. In 1942, the now famous battle of Guadalcanal put the Solomon Islands on the world map. Solomon
Islanders, mainly from Malaita, were recruited during this war period to form the Solomon Islands Labour Corps, commanded by British officers (mainly Solomons planters) but working with the American invasion and occupation force. This gave the Islanders the occasion to get to know the American soldiers and to be struck by their wealth and by their friendliness towards the "natives" whom the Europeans in the Solomons had so far treated with racist inhumanity or paternalism.

The war was another occasion for some Solomon Islanders to leave their home islands, but in ways that were, of course, very different from pre-war experiences.

In 1946 a political movement called Maasina Rule surfaced in Malaita and expanded to Guadalcanal, Makira and Nggela. This movement was to become very successful, uniting previously divided kin groups, language groups and religious congregations. It developed out of an effort on the side of Malaitans to resolve contradictions caused by colonization and christianization, and to bargain politically and economically vis-a-vis the colonial administration. Pijin provided the vehicle by means of which this unity was achieved, as it was their only common language. By mid-1947, the British administration moved against Maasina Rule with a heavy hand and repressed it; by 1953, the movement on a large scale was considered to be over. At about the same time the Government moved its capital from the war bombed Tulagi on Nggela to Honiara, the former American military base on Guadalcanal.

The post war and post Maasina Rule period saw an increase in circular migration and the beginning of urbanization, linked to changing patterns of migration and settlement. In 1978, the British Protectorate became independent under the name of Solomon Islands.
2.2 The origins of Solomon Island pidgin.

During the 1860s, Australia developed in its tropical state of Queensland a plantation economy based on the production of sugar cane. The country had almost all the elements necessary to the success of such an enterprise: vast amounts of land, an adequate climate, and both capital and market. But it lacked cheap labour. For reasons linked to the colonial ideology of the time as well as to the need to maintain production and labour costs at their lowest levels, European labour was considered inappropriate to work the land in such a harsh climatic environment. Planters turned toward the neighbouring islands of Melanesia. The then New Hebrides (now Vanuatu), the Solomon Islands and New Caledonia, became the labour "reservoir" of the Queensland plantation economy. A labour trade developed between Melanesia and Queensland. It lasted 40 years, from 1863 to 1906 (Corris 1973; Saunders 1974; Moore 1981) and involved about 63,000 persons (Price and Baker 1976). At the beginning of the trade, the planters started recruiting in the New Hebrides, the closest of the Melanesian archipelagos; they then moved north towards the Banks Islands, the Santa Cruz archipelago and later around 1874 toward the Solomon Islands, when recruiting in the southern islands became difficult.

By 1883, i.e. twenty years after the beginning of the trade, more

---

2 During the second half of the 19th century, the plantation system was the main economic venture of the European expansion in the Pacific. Sugar cane, cocoa, copra and cotton plantations were set up, particularly in Fiji, Samoa, New Caledonia and Queensland. By taking part in the Labour Trade, and later in the indentured labour system, these islands were able to secure the cheap labour they would otherwise have lacked, as the local population refused to work the land for the Europeans.
than half the total number of labourers ever to be involved in it had already been recruited. Most were from the New Hebrides and represented around 66% of the Melanesian work force.\footnote{Compiled from Price and Baker 1976:110-111.} By the end of the trade the ratio of New Hebrideans being recruited diminished considerably, as the recruiting grounds shifted from south to north.

During the forty years of the "trade", a pidgin language was used in the Queensland plantation world (Dutton 1980; Mühlhäusler and Dutton 1983). Based on the Pacific Trade Jargon known as Beche-de-Mer or Beach-la-Mar (Clark 1979), it had taken by the beginning of the trade much of the linguistic shape it would keep during the trade (Jourdan 1983). It became widely used as the lingua franca of the plantation system, between Melanesians not sharing the same language and between Melanesians and their Europeans overseers. Even though the Melanesian languages spoken by the labourers taken to Queensland were not mutually intelligible, they belonged to the same language family (Austronesian, mainly Eastern Oceanic Subgroup) and thus shared common basic syntactic structures. It would be reasonable to believe that this probably contributed to an early stabilization of the pidgin, as the substrate syntactic influence was quite homogeneous. (Keesing 1985).

At the end of their three year contracts, the labourers had the possibility of either returning to their home island or of extending their stay in Queensland for another three years or more. In 1906, most of the Melanesians still in Queensland at that time were repatriated to their island of origin. Solomon Islanders who comprised the main bulk of the Melanesian labour force at the end of
the trade (59.44%) were particularly affected by this repatriation. Some who had been in Queensland long enough or otherwise met the Government exemption conditions were able to stay in Queensland. The rest of the Melanesian labour force was sent home. As the Melanesian community remaining in Queensland had lost its strength after 1905, so had the need for Pidgin. Because of various sociolinguistic pressures put upon them by their new life in Queensland, the Melanesians lost the need to use Pidgin. Except for a few words and expressions used occasionally by some members of the third generation of Melanesians in Queensland (the youngest ones being in their fifties), "Kanaka Pidgin English" has almost totally disappeared from Queensland (Jourdan 1983). On the other hand, the pidgin brought back to their islands by the returning Solomon Islanders became the lingua franca of the archipelago when the need for such a language arose out of extensive contact between Melanesians and European traders and planters. Plantations developed locally and recruited labour from the different islands; and not surprisingly, the first labourers who engaged themselves to work on the local plantations, were men who had been to Queensland before and knew pidgin. Thus the "Kanaka Pidgin English" of Queensland was reactivated on a larger scale by people building on their previous knowledge of it (as early as 1910). Because of the extensive usage they made of it, this pidgin became localized, acquiring linguistic and social Solomonic specificities.

1Compiled from Price and Baker 1976:110-111
2.3 Pax Britannica

The second important event in Pijin's life in the Solomon Islands is undoubtedly the annexation of the archipelago in 1893 and the Pax Britannica which followed and was almost completed by 1920. Before the establishment of the Protectorate, Solomon Islanders were able to control their relationships with Europeans, as these relationships were peripheral and mutually satisfying. After the beginning of the Protectorate, the Melanesians were no longer able to do so. Hand in hand with the establishment of the colonial system in the archipelago came the beginning of exploitation, particularly through the plantation economy. Pax Britannica in the Solomons was to have three major repercussions: first, the nature of contacts between Melanesians and Europeans was changed as the political support provided by Britain allowed an economic expansion based on secure investment and land alienation. Second, the British government was to insist on the implantation of the colonial administration even in the remotest parts of the islands. Subjugation was achieved through the creation of artificial group boundaries and status bearing positions which were totally foreign to the Melanesian concepts of group identity and authority, and through the mechanisms of Protectorate law and head tax. Third, pacification changed the nature of intertribal contacts by allowing traditional exchange systems to expand out of the usual networks and to involve wider groups of people. As the traditional systems of authority broke down, some regional unity began to appear. Inter-tribal and inter-island contacts began on a wider scale, with Pijin as the lingua franca. From then on, Pijin was used for communication between members of the colonial administration and the Solomon Islanders. Some indigenous employees of that
administration, such as the constabulary, were recruited amongst the Pijin speakers, because they had had a previous contact with Europeans. Choosing Pijin as the medium of communication was thought of by the British Administration, even though they despised it, as being judicious. Practically, the language was already known by a good proportion of the local population. Ideologically, it was the only common language in the island group that the population might associate with the dominant European culture.

Quickly the administration found itself in the position of the sorcerer's apprentice: Pijin proved so successful as a lingua franca that it expanded very quickly. As early as 1911, Florence Coombe was noting the speed with which the language was spreading in the archipelago:

... and doubtless in his turn, this (the Savo language) will give place to the hideous mongrel jargon which is rapidly encroaching everywhere on the vernacular and is called Pidgin English (Coombe 1911:336).

Eventually, Pijin was to become so widespread throughout the archipelago that in 1928, the British Administration, which used the language but despised it, hoped to circumvent Pijin's successful expansion and eventually eradicate it by recommending that English be the medium of education, even in the mission schools. To no avail.

Owing to the diversity of the languages spoken within the group it seems essential that the teaching should be in some Lingua Franca which would become the common language outside the village, and I would strongly support what I believe to be the view to which the majority of the missionary societies are coming that that language should be English. A short experience of the horrible variant of that language at present spoken [reference is made to Pijin, emphasis mine] leads one to encourage any attempt that may be made to obliterate it, but I do not think that this will be achieved by teaching English as a subject in the schools, but by teaching in
2.4 Circular migration and the local plantation system.

If it is admitted that the Queensland plantations played an important role in the stabilization and expansion of Pidgin in the Pacific, there is no doubt that it was the local plantation system and the concurrent circular migration between islands which contributed to its localization and its expansion in the Solomon Islands. This plantation system, which was established in the island group at the beginning of the 20th century, is crucial in the history of Pijin, because it transformed the nature of contacts between Melanesians and Europeans. In the 19th century, the Solomon Islands were a labour reservoir; in the 20th century they became a colony based on a copra plantation economy. In the 19th century the contacts between Melanesians and Europeans were sporadic and geographically limited to the shores. In the 20th century, the contacts became permanent and were linked to territorial occupation and land alienation. This social and economic transformation occurred at a time when a large quantity of labour (although the universal complaint by the planters was that there was not enough labour in the archipelago) was available in the Solomon Islands, following the 1906 repatriation from Queensland of some 4800 Solomon Islanders. According to Corris (1973:129), 2500 of them were from Malaita alone.

The need for a labour force was solved by recruiting the local population and, not surprisingly, the first men to engage in the

---

5H.C. Moorhouse. Report to the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific. 22nd September 1928.
Solomon labour trade were former Queensland and Fiji "returns". The reasons that pushed Solomon Islanders to enroll again were probably the same ones that had pushed them to enlist to go to the Queensland and Fiji plantations - namely, the need to secure such valued material goods as metal axes, calico, tobacco, and guns (when possible). However, as the British government had imposed a headtax on the Solomon Islanders, going to work on the plantations proved to be a way to get the money necessary to pay the tax. As most eastern islanders had no cash crops, they had to rely on plantation work and wages to pay the tax. Bennett (1979:289) estimates that between 1911 and 1940 2/3 of the Solomon Islanders involved in the circular migration worked on the plantations in order to pay the tax. Over the years it seems that going to the plantations had become defined as a ritual by which young boys became men, as it was for them a chance to get away from the village context and assert some kind of independence from their kin. Most men were curious and anxious to see the outside world. Some wanted to escape the obligations to which they were subjected in their village. At the end of their term, most of these men were able to go back to their villages with prestigious goods and sometimes with some money; they were surrounded by an aura of mystery and knowledge, on which the wise ones were able to build to better their social position. There is no doubt that from very early on, recruitment had been very popular amongst Solomon Islanders. Corris (1973:107) states that as early as 1907, 1200 Islanders were employed on various

6The term "returns" was first used in Queensland in the 19th century to design workers who had finished their contracts and were being returned home. It was used by opposition to "new chum", designating workers coming to Queensland on their first contract.
plantations of the archipelago. The length of the working contract was two years, after which most labourers were sent back home. The Malaitans were very active in this circular migration. In 1920 Cameron (1923:281) noted that 2,000 of the 50,000 inhabitants of Malaita were, at any given time, working on plantations on other islands. The Labour Commission appointed in 1928 to investigate Labour Regulations in the British Solomon Islands Protectorate (BSIP) found that over a period of ten years from 1919 to 1928, the average number of Solomon Islanders recruited annually for service under contract, amounted to 2,380 persons. Of the 2,176 recruits of 1928, 1,459 or 67.06% of the total number were from the island of Malaita, 399 or 18.34% from Guadalcanal and 318 or 14.61% were from all the remaining islands of the Protectorate. In 1929, all available labour was employed. During the Depression, the demand for labour decreased as the copra market collapsed. Many plantations were deserted or worked with minimum labour. But by 1937, 188,843 acres of land had been alienated, and during the same year, as the copra market was once more booming, 4000 labourers were employed in the Protectorate.

---

7 BSIP 3/II/I, 1929. Report of the Labour Commission appointed 19/12/1928 to investigate labour regulations in the British Solomon Islands protectorate. The report adds that: "The largest number of natives recruited in any one year during the period under reference was 3,036, the smallest number 2,020. During the year 1928, 2,176 natives entered into contracts and service, this figure showing a decrease of approximately 500 since 1926.


9 BSIP I/II. F34.22. Confidential letter to the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific from F. Ashley, Resident Commissioner in the Solomon Islands, 12/8/1937.

10 Refer to Appendix I.

mainly from Malaita, Guadalcanal and Makira.\(^{12}\)

As in the Queensland trade, Solomons' circular migration is characterised by the labourers' very high mobility and by a continual aggregation and rotation of labourers with different cultural and linguistic backgrounds, on the plantation settings. As had been the case in Queensland, multilingualism was a natural feature of the Solomon plantations, as it still is nowadays; but this was a milieu in which the only common medium of communication, except of course among speakers of the same language, was the Pidgin English initially brought back from Queensland by the "returns". And it is only normal that the labourers should build on their early knowledge of Pijin, which proved very useful in Queensland, to overcome the communication gap existing on the plantations. One can say that prior to the development of the local plantation system, Pidgin English was dormant among the returned Solomon Islanders: they had no need for it as they had almost no community or social contexts in which they could use it. Most of the "returns" were returned to the "passage" from where they had been recruited and then went back to their own village. They were scattered across the islands and except for the SSEM mission stations of Malu'u (in To'ambaita country), Fiu (in Fataleka country) and Onepusu (in 'Are'are country) - all on Malaita - no permanent

\(^{12}\) BSIP I/III, F34/22, Letter from Major Frank Hewitt to the High Commissioner for the Western Pacific, 10 May 1937.
settlement of former Queensland labourers was established.\textsuperscript{13}

Back in their villages, "returns" are hardly likely to have had any need for Pijin, or any contact with someone who could have spoken it. In the event that former fellow workers were in the vicinity some Pijin might have been spoken to acknowledge the Queensland bond between speakers, and in some cases, reinforce it; or again, to create a difference in status between the returns and the sedentary population. One has to remember as well that a large member of Solomon Islanders who had worked in Fiji knew Pidgin Fijian (Siegel 1985), to the extent that some Europeans were arguing that Fijian should be used as the lingua franca of the Solomon archipelago. As we have seen earlier, Pijin in the Solomon Islands at the turn of the century was not the apanage of the Queensland and Fiji "returns" only. Islanders who traded regularly with the European comptoirs established in the islands, or with the boats doing some cabotage around the islands, had a fairly good command of Pijin, even if they made only a sporadic use of it.

On the other hand, one of the main characteristics of the Solomons circular migration, with regard to Pijin, was to allow over the years, one or two generations of young men to be in contact with the

\textsuperscript{13}The South Sea Evangelical Mission, originally from Bundaberg in Queensland under the name of the Queensland Kanaka Mission. Created by Florence Young in 1882, its purpose was to give the Kanakas some rudiments of schooling, but most of all to christianize them. The teaching medium was Kanaka Pidgin English. The mission was highly successful in Queensland and in 1906 Miss Young was claiming that around 5,000 people per week attended the 14 mission stations of Queensland [QVP 1906.II,51-55]. In 1904, one mission station was opened at Onepusu on Malaita [the main island of the Solomons in terms of labour supply] with the object of providing for the returning labourers.
language. Young men did not learn Pijin until they went to the plantations, as witness an interview I made with Geoffrey Kuper, who was a recruiter with Ernie Palmer in the Solomon Islands in 1927-1928:

Olketa niu chum, olketa no save eni somting ia. Mi long 1927-1928, mi riculta wetem Ernie Palmer. So olketa pipol mifala pikimap long olketa pasis blong olketa, olosem olketa se pasis nao, olketa i barava bus pipol ia. I no save eni pisin tae olketa i kcm long sip. Taem olketa i go long planteson nao, bifo olketa save lanem pisin from olketa.14

The pool of Pijin speakers thus became enlarged and quickly the Queensland "returns" ceased to have the quasi monopoly of Pijin. Obviously, the "returns"' role in the propagation of Pijin in the islands is crucial, as they were the ones who were able to teach it to non speakers of Pijin. What they taught the new recruit was a variety of Pijin that was in direct link with Kanaka Pidgin English, if not the same. But one can assume that as the Queensland "returns" became outnumbered by local recruits as speakers of this pidgin, and as the context of plantation work and social relations differed from the Queensland's plantation milieu, the language very quickly acquired Solomonic specificities. The most obvious examples of localization are found in the lexicon linked to the copra plantation work and to the recruitment process and it is probably during the same period that lexical items from Solomons vernacular languages started to permeate Pijin. It is worth noting at this point that because the eastern islands of the archipelago became primarily involved first in the

14 The new guys did not know anything. Me, in 1927-1928, I was a recruiter with Ernie Palmer. The people we used to pick-up at their passage places, what nowadays they call passages, they were real bush people. When they came aboard the ship, they did not know any Pijin. They had to go to plantation before they were able to learn it from the others.
Labour Trade to Queensland and later on in the local plantation labour, whereas the western islands played a minor role, most of the vernacular influences found in Pijin nowadays come from the languages subgrouped as Southeast Solomonic (Pawley 1972), particularly those of Malaita. The general pattern of Solomons circular migration was such that the eastern Islands of Malaita, Makira and Guadalcanal (especially the Weather Coast) provided the plantations of the central and western islands with the necessary labour. While working on the plantations, the indentured labourers had hardly any contacts with local populations, as the latter refused to work for the Europeans. They met at the local markets, or outside working hours, but in most cases kept to themselves. On the plantations, the workers were separated by island of origin, in an effort on the part of the managers and overseers to avoid fights between rival groups. But inevitably some fights involving Melanesians only occurred; causes were multiple but would in most cases have been related to rations, thefts, rivalry between groups, intimidation, or curses. Some fights also took place between Europeans and Melanesians and entailed sheer defiance of authority, retaliation for curses, violence and punishment, as well as working conditions, rations and wages. Invariably, Malaitans would be involved in the fights, as their

---

The peoples of the western Solomon Islands did not take part in the circular migration or in plantation work. They preferred to deal with the Europeans on their own terms as they had sufficient local resources, such as copra and sea shells, to sell in order to get cash. See Jackson 1978 and Bennett 1979.

There were of course, plantations on Guadalcanal — Kaukau, Pendoffryn, Ruavatu, Aruligo, Ndoma, and even on Malaita, in the form of Malaita Co. at Baunani. But their requirements in labour were never as important as were the requirements of the Western islands plantations and those of the Russell Islands in the central Solomons.
numerical importance gave them social support and as they cultivated a reputation for toughness and violence. However, witnesses of that period report that most of the time the relations between workers were harmonious. They tell of storytelling in Pijin in the evening, among friends and workmates; chewing betel nut or smoking tobacco. But most workers were disillusioned with plantation life and the description given by some people emphasized drudgery, work, and harsh conditions:


Workers and overseers alike learnt Pijin naturally by listening to other people talk. The workers learnt it with their fellow workers. The rule was that you spoke your language with people belonging to your language group and Pijin with everybody else, the overseer included. Some old-timers acted as interpreters for the newcomers.


17Question: Did you like working on the plantation? Answer: It was not good. Question: Not good? Answer: You only worked, you know? You only had to work, nothing else. In the morning, you go to work; in the evening, you come back, you sleep. In the morning, you go to work. Nothing else. At home, you do not care about work. Any where you want to go, you go.
But it seems that the Europeans learnt it to some extent from one another. As Geoff Kuper points out, it was a natural process:

Q. And how did the expatriates talk with their employees? Answer: In Pijin English. Question: Where did they learn it? Answer: They came, they heard their employees. It was easy. Not like today; the Peace Corps people came, they spent 6 months learning Pijin first. [Before], you came, you went straight to the plantations. But most of the time they came, the overseers, the plantation overseers, under one manager. They learnt it with their boss. When they heard him talk to the labourers then they [learnt].

Except for the Catholics who stayed at their posts. Laracy 1983:14
standstill. In February 1942, the Japanese air force bombed Tulagi, the capital of the Protectorate. In May, they launched a full scale invasion and started to consolidate their position in the archipelago by building an airfield on the plains of Guadalcanal. The Japanese advance was stopped when the Americans stormed the island in August. Except for Guadalcanal most of the eastern islands of the group were not affected directly by the War. However Malaitans in particular took part in the War through the Solomon Islands Labour Corps, in which some 2,000 men enrolled, and through the BSIP Defence Force in which 680 Islanders enlisted. Once more, the Malaitans were predominant as the war replaced the plantations in terms of work opportunities and chances to leave their village. Frazer (1981:41), citing Hogbin, reports that 90 to 95% of the young men of Malaita between 17 and 24 years of age were away from home at one time compared with 70% during the pre-war period. The recruiting period was 12 months.

For the Melanesians, the main effect of the war was to change their ideas on the relationships they could have with white people, and thus change the expectations they had from them. They were able to fraternize with the American soldiers, to eat with them (an ever so important symbol of acceptance in the Solomons), to see them in great numbers attend religious services, to work with them and to be befriended by them. The Americans had become the heroes of the place, the ones the Melanesians would have wanted to see replace the British Administration. Moreover, their material generosity with government rations and equipment as well as their money and personal items, only

added to the impact they had on the Islanders. It is during the war that the Solomon Islanders had a chance to see in the persons of black Americans, black people being treated much better than the way they were treated themselves. Although in those days the black American soldiers were still segregated and discriminated against in many ways, they were nonetheless accorded a status much higher than any Solomon Islanders had imagined they might have. What was changed as well was the ratio European/Melanesians, which augmented the chances for rapport that the Melanesians could have with an English speaking population. Just before the War, the number of Europeans in the archipelago was very small, and the number of Europeans the Melanesians were likely to hear or see at one time on a plantation was probably not more than five a day, and in some smaller plantations probably not more than one a day. During the war not only the quality of rapport with Europeans changed radically but it was as well more extensive.

Solomon Islanders who witnessed that period say that they spoke to the American soldiers in their pidgin and sometimes in English when it was known by them. Many of the Americans had some basic knowledge of pidgin, the Pidgin English spoken in New Guinea, as Papua New Guinea was called at the time. This pidgin, now called Tok Pisin, was then called Melanesian Pidgin. It was one of the forty Pacific languages that the American army deemed potentially useful to their soldiers fighting in the Pacific, through the medium of a small handbook that had some phrases in Tok Pisin. In 1943 Wickware notes that:

22 U.S. War and Navy Depts. 1943.
"One of the more obscure yet diverting byproducts of global war is that the U.S. Army is teaching soldiers in the South Pacific to say: CUT-IM GRASS BELONG HEAD BELONG ME! for I WANT A HAIR CUT; CAPSIZE IN COFFEE\'LONG CUP for FOUR THE COFFEE and HE GOT SHEEPY-SHEEP? for IS THERE ANY LAMB?"¹⁴

The influence of the war on Pijin was important in two respects. First there is no doubt that, from an ideological standpoint, the prestige accorded to the Americans by the Melanesians encompassed their language as well. Living with the Americans, eating with and like the Americans, talking with and like the Americans, made life and duty in the BSIP Labour Corps and Defence Force look more appealing and more interesting. It is difficult to assess the degree of the transformation that Pijin underwent during that period. It is, however, obvious that the more the contact with English that the Pijin speakers must have had, on a equal footing that is, and in diversified contexts of use, the more the presence of English was going to be felt in Solomons Pijin. Second, one has to remember that a substantial number of Solomon Islanders (2,000 persons) experienced for over a year a great deal of exposure to English, and to the variety of Melanesian Pidgin that some American soldiers knew. Some Islanders who had been in contact with English before the war were quite at ease with the Americans. For the others, the linguistic exchanges were a bit fuzzy. This is how Tomu Kwalafaneia, who was in the Labour Corps during the war, remembers their relationships with the American soldiers:

Olketa long Merika hemi ruku diferen moa. Mifala waka dionem olketa ia; olketa save gifim olketa gutu samting, gifim hanwasi long samfala man, gifim seleni tu oo samting olsem

¹⁴I am indebted to P. Muhlhausler for supplying me with a copy of Wickware's paper.
Through the years Maasina Rule was labelled many things: "Nativistic cult" by Allan (1951), "Cult" by Belshaw (1950); "Cargo Cult" by Worsley (1968) and Cochrane (1970), a "Politico Religious Movement" by Keesing (1978) and a "Political Protest" by Larcy (1983).

This profusion of terms only reflects the complexity of a movement which swept the southeastern Solomon Islands after the Second World War. How to label this movement is not pertinent here. However, I feel that as it sprung out of Melanesian dissatisfaction with the British Administration, and as it was an attempt to resolve the contradictions, both socio-economic and religious, in which the Islanders found themselves in the colonial system, it can very well be

25 The Americans looked different. We the workers joined them; they used to give us good things; they gave handwatches to some, they gave money as well or something like that they gave me. They gave me anything. That's it. They were different from the other white men. We did not see them like that. [...] We spoke in Pijin, it seems that they understood it too. And they answered back, we understood but not very well, but we understood anyhow. Some of us only, that's it. Men like Fifi'i and our bosses too - one was Fifi'i, one was Tomu. But the men, even if they had not been to school, if they had spent some time with the white men, they knew a bit of English. They were able to talk with the Americans, but the young men, no. We spoke Pijin only. As we are speaking Pijin now.
called "politico-religious". Maasina Rule was among other things, a very shrewd piece of collective bargaining, to renegotiate the terms of colonial rule after the war, in terms of law, local government, plantation wages and working conditions, and recognition of the dignity and rights of the "natives".

The American presence in the Solomon Islands during the war can aptly be considered the ferment and catalyst of the movement, as it developed partly out of contacts and talks that a few "Big Men" from the south of Malaita had with some American soldiers. Not only did the American presence help break the "White Man" stereotype, but it made manifest that the British Administration in the Solomon Islands was far from ideal. The Solomon Islanders had been dissatisfied with the latter for some time already, particularly over the issues of head tax and plantation wages, and were quite ready to articulate their discontentment within a broader frame of revendication. As Keesing (1978:242) pointed out, Maasina Rule shows close continuity with Malaita pre-war history as expressed both in political struggle against invasion, taxation and alien laws, and in millenarian cultism; it was not simply a product of wartime experience.

By 1946, the movement was organized around nine chiefs. As Laracy (1983:21) puts it "Malaitans set about asserting their control over their own affairs". This meant putting the Malaitan economy into the hands of the Islanders by making the island self-sufficient in terms of money-making activities and in terms of food. Big gardens and villages were built on the coast, genealogies were written down, customary laws were gathered into codes. For the colonial economy the main blow was the impossibility of recruiting any new labourers, as the movement imposed a total ban on labour recruiting in Malaita. As
the plantations had been totally depleted in terms of labour when the labour force was repatriated at the break of the war, hardly any workers were available when planters tried to restore their plantations after the war.

The movement itself had a very strong popular base, as shown by the massive meetings held in Auki\textsuperscript{26} when crowds of 5,000 people and later on 7,000 gathered on two occasions to present their grievances to the British Administration.\textsuperscript{27} By the end of 1946, Maasina Rule started to spread to Ulawa, Makira and Guadalcanal and the people came from all over the islands for the meetings. Jonathan Fifi'\textsc{i}, one of the nine Head Chiefs of Maasina Rule, explains\textsuperscript{28}:

\textit{Mifala se bambae mifala go long Aoke [Auki]. Mifala' sendem nius long olketa nao. Ana olketa kam. Pandol ia, hemi had bata olketa pandol kam. Olketa long Ulawa, olketa long Santa Ana, olketa pandol kam nongo.\textsuperscript{29}}

After a few months, the British administration cracked down on Maasina Rule and had the nine chiefs arrested and sentenced to gaol. By 1949, the movement was already fading; by 1952, it had been driven underground.\textsuperscript{30}

Restrospectively, it is probably through Maasina Rule that the first steps towards nationhood were taken. People realized that their differences were minimal and only superficial; they learned to talk to

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{26}The capital and administrative center of the district of Malaita.
  \item \textsuperscript{27}Laracy 1983, passim.
  \item \textsuperscript{28}Interview with Jonathan Fifi'\textsc{i} in Honiara 24/11/82. Tape P.13.
  \item \textsuperscript{29}We decided to go to Auki. Thus we sent a message to everyone. Every one came. By canoe, it is hard but all of them came rowing. All the Ulawa ones, all the Santa Ana ones, they all came rowing.
  \item \textsuperscript{30}For a good analysis of Maasina Rule vide Keesing 1978. For a collection of texts relating to the Movement written by Solomon Islanders and for a chronology of the movement vide Laracy 1983.
\end{itemize}
one another and to exchange their views and their hopes, realizing that their expectations were not different from one another. Pijin became crucial to the movement very early on, as it is through it only that intertribal meetings could be held; it is with it too that the political ideology of the movement was disseminated. Pijin assisted not only with the communication of the ideas of Maasina Rule (Bennett 1979:41) but with forging the unity of the movement as linguistic barriers were broken down and as the notion of group identity gradually incorporated the wider notion of brotherhood. Through Pijin, the movement mobilized the Malaitan population and spread through traditional exchange networks, through mission links and through big meetings gathering people from different language groups.

2.7 The Malaitan connection

Throughout this chapter the importance of Malaitans in the life cycle of Pijin, and of Pijin in the life of the Malaitans, has been obvious. From the days of the Labour Trade to Queensland at the end of the last century, to the postwar Maasina Rule, Malaitans have always been found in contexts where the usage of Pijin was useful or practical, and in some cases, was the basis for social survival. The knowledge they had of the language allowed them to make socio-economic choices but at the same time reinforced their position in the archipelago. They went to Queensland because they were curious to

31 Fifi'1, Tape P13.
32 The term MAASINA means BROTHERHOOD in the 'Are'are language. For a discussion of the ambiguity linked to the name of the Maasina Rule movement, vide Laracy 1983:19-20.
know the outside world or eager to leave theirs behind. But they went
to the local plantations, to war, to Maasina Rule and later on to
Honiara, because their knowledge of Pijin linked to their knowledge of
the outside world allowed them to narrow the gap between their
traditional way of life and the new situation they were creating for
themselves. Of course the concept of "choice" and "libre arbitre"
here is to be taken with caution; once the Solomon Islanders were
incorporated in the Western world economic system, there was no going
back to a subsistence economy. The British Government made sure that
the Islanders had to remain dependent on cash cropping and the
capitalist economy by imposing onto them laws and measures that
obliged them to keep on earning money: the Head tax for instance.
Their needs for Western goods, most of all steel tools, gave Islanders
no option but to work for wages.

Pijin was very early on perceived as the only way out of the
village, the medium through which one could have access to the much
coveted European wealth and way of life, the main path to social and
economic exchange and change.

The Malaitan connection and in some ways the Guadalcanal
connection are important for the linguistic as well as the
sociological shaping of the language.

2.8 Contemporary Solomon Islands Pijin

Solomon Islands Pidgin is now spoken throughout the Solomons
archipelago by about 175,000, of whom only 1302 speak it as a first
language.\textsuperscript{33} It is the overwhelming lingua franca of the island group.

\textsuperscript{33}1976 census of population: Text table 19A.
superseding missionary lingua francas. Intrinsically linked to the 19th century Labour Trade to Queensland and to the 20th century local circular labour migration, Pijin was from the start an adult male prerogative, to which women had no access. It is still quite common nowadays to come across mature women in remote areas of the Solomons (such as the weather coast of Guadalcanal or the middle bush of Malaita) whose knowledge of Pijin is limited to passive competency or is non-existent. These women, because they were never incorporated into the traditional settings or contexts of Pijin usage and transmission (plantations or missions like the S.S.E.M station at Onepusu on Malaita and later on, schooling), had never had any need for Pijin and/or any opportunities or incentive to learn it. The situation is being modified nowadays with increasing urbanization, schooling, development and reinforcement of a cash crop economy, providing all members of the population, and not exclusively young men as had been the case before, with money and opportunities to travel within the island group. An increasing movement of population led to contact between people of different linguistic traditions, in a way and on a scale that differed drastically from traditional inter-group and/or-inter island contacts; and thus opened the way for Pijin to establish itself as the lingua franca of the island group. For a long time (80 years or so) Pijin remained the second language of the male

The main missionary lingua francas of the Solomons were: Babatana -Choiseul Island- and Roviana -New Georgia Archipelago- used by the United Church; Marovo -New Georgia Group-, Maringe -Isabel- and Nggela -Nggela, used by the Melanesian Mission along with Mota -Banks Islands- used by the Mission as a general language of missionization in the New Hebrides and the southeast Solomons; Ghari -Guadalcanal- and Kahua -Makira- were used by the Roman Catholic Church, eventhough the latter's language policy was to use vernaculars whenever possible.
population, a second language that they tended to learn in young adulthood, in particular work settings. Nowadays Pijin is undergoing creolization, particularly in urban settings and is (to borrow from the anthropomorphific phrasing of Sankoff and Laberge), acquiring native speakers.

Probably just as importantly, people tend to have access to and to learn Pijin at a much earlier age and in wider communication contexts than they did before. Pijin is no longer a language associated with particular activities, settings, sex and age groups; it is now associated as well with geographical concentration and distribution of population, with day to day activities in urban settings and with the development of a culture of which it is the medium, thus transcending the linguistic prerogatives in term of sex and age which had restricted access to it.

\[35\] In Sankoff 1980:195-209.
CHAPTER 3
PIJIN AND URBANIZATION IN HONIARA

The urban context of Pijin usage, as opposed to the more traditional context of use in the Solomon Islands, i.e., the plantation system, requires that existing socio-linguistic strategies be adapted to prolonged, permanent and different socio-cultural organizations. The conditions of multilingualism are different in both contexts; so are the Pijin speaker's aims at communication.

Urbanization in the Solomon Islands implies that children will be born in a multilingual context and that the lingua franca of the town (in this case Pijin) will most probably become nativized. Urbanization implies as well that the functions, roles and status of various languages might vary to meet the needs and demands of a permanent multilingual society and that the new distribution of such roles, functions and status might be different from what it was prior to urbanization.

No one who has spent time in Honiara could dissociate the life in town from Pijin; both are intermingled in day-to-day activities of the capital to the point that it is difficult to decide which one, the town or the Pijin, comes first. Is the town what it is because of Pijin? Or is Pijin what it is because of the town? Each serves as support and context to the other. Each lives and breeds on the other in a symbiotic relationship. A Solomon Islander could scarcely live in
Honiara without knowing Pijin; and without the presence of Pijin there would be no Honiara. If it is possible for a Solomon Islander to arrive in the town without knowing Pijin, it is virtually impossible to leave it after a stay of a few weeks without having any knowledge of Pijin. A few individuals do so, but they are the rare exceptions; they come to town not to create urban ties or initiate an urban life of their own. They are older people, mostly older women, who come to town to visit their kin and whose communication network is limited to their wantoks.\(^1\) The relation between the town and the language is a dialectic one, in which the interests of each are linked to and depend on the success of the other. We shall see this relationship in detail in the next chapter.

In this chapter we shall look at Honiara, the capital of the Solomon Islands to show the particularities of the town, social and economical. A short synopsis of the town socio-history is presented at the beginning. The rest of the chapter will deal with migration, relationships between urban dwellers and the village, and life in town, in order to understand the social context that fosters Pijin and makes it the unchallenged language of the town.

---

\(^1\)One who shares the same language and thus belongs to the same language group. The definition of "wantok" seems nowadays to be encapsulating ideological notions of group identity as well as of linguistic group boundaries. However in this context, our usage of "wantok" refers to the linguistic aspect of the definition, even though the two aspects cannot be easily dissociated.
3.1 Honiara

In the South Pacific, urbanization is a recent phenomenon. In all cases it is linked to colonization, and in this respect Honiara is not different from all the other capitals of the region. It is a colonial town. However it is the youngest capital of the Pacific. Created after World War II on the grounds of the military base built by the American Forces on Guadalcanal, Honiara is only forty years old. A young capital, but a very active one, demographically. According to Chapman and Shaner (1970:69), the town population increased by 222.3% between 1959 and 1970, rising from 3,534 to 11,389 inhabitants. This represents the most important augmentation of urban population in the Pacific for the same period. As witnessed Table 3-1, population increase has been enormous throughout these forty years. Honiara is now a town of 21,334 inhabitants, 39.8% of whom are under 15 years of age. The sex-breakdown shows that the male population represents 57% of the total urban population. This represents a slight decline from the 60% of the 1976 census and a drastic one if compared with the Bellam’s figures of 1962 (Bellam 1970:81) which put the male ratio of the Honiara population at 85% +/- 7%.

Honiara is located on the north coast of Guadalcanal, around Point Cruz, the anchorage point in which the Spanish fleet of Mendana called in the 16th century. The town stretches on a narrow coastal strip between ridges and hills in the south and the sea in the north. (refer to plate, Figure 3-1).

5 1981 Statistical Bulletin. Ministry of Finance, Honiara. The national average for the child population is 49.0%.
Table 3-1: Population of Honiara, 1959-1981

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>2,292</td>
<td>7,237</td>
<td>8,905</td>
<td>12,103</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>3,954</td>
<td>6,037</td>
<td>9,130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>2,805</td>
<td>11,191</td>
<td>13,942</td>
<td>21,233</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2 1959 Census of Population, Appendix 1, Table 1, page 51. The BSIP annual report of 1961-1962 on page 9, attributes a population of 4,300 to Honiara. The overall figure, including Europeans and Chinese, was 3,548.

3 Census Report of 1976, Table 2.3, page 18.

Figure 3-1: Aerial view of Honiara
The town boundaries extend from the White River in the west to the Lungga River in the east. As the geographic configuration of the terrain does not allow for easy urban expansion, people had to make the most of the terraces and gullies that comprise the natural landscape of the town.

In 1962 (Bellam 1970), the ecology of Honiara was typical of a colonial town. A small administrative and commercial area lied on the water front, with European residential areas located on the ridges overlooking the sea. With views and breeze, these areas were built with spacious and comfortable houses. The Melanesian residential areas were located in the gullies, with no views and even less breeze.

To the old European areas of Lenggakiki, Vavaea and Kolaa Ridges, new ones have been added: Tavioa in the west, Panatina in the east, and past the Lungga River, the suburb of Red Beach has been recently added. However these suburbs are not nowadays exclusively European, as they are being used more and more by the local Melanesian elite. The Melanesian residential areas have undergone dramatic transformations in nature and location as well as in social composition since 1962, when the first town plan limited the Melanesian areas to labour lines and married quarters of Kukum and Vara Creek (refer to map, Figure 3-2).

Their location, conditions and limited number as of 1962 reflected the socioeconomic character of the town. The Melanesian population was then predominantly a transient one, mainly comprising single men coming to town to work for cash. As this transient population expanded and as some Solomon Islanders started to settle in town with their families, the need for housing for the Melanesian

6For a discussion on the nature of the Honiara population in terms of transient as opposed to permanent vide Charman 1969:132-133.
ECOLOGY OF HONIARA - 1983

Figure 3-2: Ecology of Honiara
population became acute. New Melanesian residential areas were
developed at the end of the 1960s and beginning of the 1970s by the
Honiara Housing Authority. Housing estates such as Vura or Mbuavale
were built in order to reduce the housing shortage but particularly to
cater for the housing needs of an emerging class of Melanesian civil
servants. Through the use of cheap building materials and
pre-fabrication methods, the cost of the houses was kept low. This
had double effects: it made the houses affordable to Solomon Islanders
and thus in a way encouraged people to settle in town if they could
find work there as well. But as the best central areas for housing
development were already being used by Europeans, the housing estates
developed for Melanesians were in most cases located along gullies,
with no views and even less breeze. Houses in these estates are very
small, badly built, and not being adapted for the local climate, are
very hot. Moreover, most of the houses are built very close to one
another and thus hardly provide their inhabitants with enough land for
cultivating even a small garden. This is particularly the case in
Mbuavale and in the first phase area of Vura.7 Refer to plate, Figure
3-3.

7 However some houses have a big enough piece of land adjacent to
their house on which they grown well kept and weed-free vegetable
gardens. In season, people will have yams [Dioscorea esculenta].
They plant basic sweet potatoes [Ipomoea batatas] (putete, poteto) and
will try to have some taro [Colocasia esculenta] (taro). However most
people will grow tapioca [Manihot esculentus] (kasava, kaibia). The
main greens are [Hibiscus manihot] (sliperi kabis), Chinese cabbage
(saena kabis), pumpkin leaves [Curcubita pepo] (pamken). The main
fruit found in urban gardens are sweet bananas along with plantain,
Pawpaws [Carica papaya] (poupou) are widely found. Sugar ' cane
[Saccharum officinarum] (sugaken) is an overall favourite. Some
Western plants are being slowly tried out and one can see in some
gardens tomatoes, capsicums and cucumbers.
Figure 3-3: Aerial view of Vura Estate.
In the 1950s and the 1960s, living in Honiara was predominantly a male prerogative, as the housing facilities for families were insufficient to cater for the needs of the workers. Most workers came to town and left their families in their villages. At the same time, the education level of the population rose, so that the previously labour force was progressively transformed into a semi-skilled and skilled one. At the same time, more work opportunities became available to Solomon Islanders in Honiara, as the Protectorate moved gradually toward localization, self-government and eventual independence.

As shown by the sex ratio, the presence of females became more important, as more and more families settled in town and young single women would come to town to look for work, for eventual husbands, or to visit their kin. The main result was that children were born in Honiara, thus creating a first generation of Solomon Islanders who identified primarily with Honiara rather than with the home village of their parents: the first generation to be born into a permanent Pijin speaking world. The 1976 census (Table 18, p.142) showed that 7,177 persons or 48% of the population were born in Honiara.

In the Solomon Islands, direct population pressure on land is not the main cause of migration, except in the case of the residents of the urban villages who have to seek urban employment for subsistence. As Oram (1976) has suggested for Port Moresby, the need for cash to set up a particular project, the desire to maximize education possibilities, the desire to expand options and in many cases the wish to be part of exiting new ways of life (see Belshaw 1963:20) are the main reasons for migration. Nowadays, the population of Honiara
comprises more permanent residents than temporary ones. However the transient population is still important and is composed mainly of unskilled workers, single or married men who come to town with the hope that they will be able to earn some money and to send remittances to their families back home. In most cases, they hardly earn enough money to subsist in town and all they can afford to send home is 20kg bag of rice or a gallon of fuel once in a while. When they arrive in Honiara their intention is to stay for a few months only. However, for many it often takes a year or more before they can return home. Some of my informants left home five years ago, and even though their home in Malaita is only six hours by boat and a $9.00 fare away, they have not been back to visit their families in all that time. In his study of To'ambaita, Frazer (1981) shows how these young men drift out of work, and become very mobile. They contribute to the growing ranks of the cyclically unemployed who rely on wantoks for shelter and subsistence when they are out of work and liu in town. Frazer (1981:306) describes the phenomenon:

'It [liu] accentuates the mobility element in this behaviour and underplays the fact that those involved do work occasionally. This is in keeping with the kind of attitude towards work that is part of a high level of job mobility......Unemployment and frequent job changes are something that are more common amongst young people than any other group of town migrants. They are also the ones with least experience of living in town. It is something which distinguishes them from other migrants, not only because of their different attitude towards employment and staying in one

8The northern most language group of Malaita.

9liu: To'ambaita word meaning 'to wander around, to walkabout'. Incorporated in the Pijin lexicon, it means 'to walkabout, to wander aimlessly, to be jobless'. By extension, it refers to the people who liu. The same form liu or riu is found in all the Malaita languages, from To'ambaita at the northwestern end of the island to 'Are'are at the southeastern end.
job, but also because those that are highly mobile are in a dependent relationship with those that are more settled.\(^{10}\)

The phenomenon is widespread, as unemployment becomes more noticeable, among the migrant population. Witness this song: *Wakabaot long Saenataon* (literally: Wandering in Chinatown) written by Edwin Sitori, which crystallizes the despair and fatalism often found amongst *ilu*. Frazer\(^{1981}\) cites it as well.

*Wakabaot long Saenataon,*

*Makem kos, angga long kona*

*Sutiap, seke-m hed, kikim baket enikaen*

*Tes, iu laf hagenis wata nating.*

*Nomata mi dae long Honiara*

*Santing mi lus long taem long iu*

*Bat sapios iu ting long mi*

*Tu mas woi fo tu iia moa*

*Herem kam laet sikin long lelebet.*

*Koras)*

*Tingting baek long iu*

*Lusim hon long taem*

*Tu iia ova mi no lukim iu*

*Dastawe mi no lackem iu*

*Man i krangge, krangge hed lusim mani.*\(^{11}\)

Some families establish themselves in town to maximize the

\(^{10}\)For a detailed analysis of the "Liu" phenomenon see Frazer 1981:351-379.

\(^{11}\)Translation:
Wandering in Chinatown Follow a path, hang around at the corner
Yell, shake head, kick in any direction Yes, you laugh, no brains But
water.

It doesn't matter if I die in Honiara What I had with you had been
lost a long time, But if you still think of me You have to wait 2 more
years, Until my skin gets a little lighter.

Thinking back to you It's been a long time since I left home, I
ever seen you for more than 2 years This is why I do not care for
you anymore. This is a stupid man, a stupid head who loses money.
[Translation mine]
education opportunities of their children. They have the hope to go back to their village as soon as their children are established, as "home" is still very much perceived as the best place for them to be. For these people Honiara is a temporary solution which will yield many economic and social benefits; but they hope as well to be able to leave it before what they perceive as the problems linked to living in town (violence, dirtiness, sexual laxity, alcohol and rising living costs) affect them. It is an ambivalent but lucid outlook as reflected in this poem by Robyn Seni.

Honiara

Honiara,

What sort of place are You?
Are you a nice place?
Are you a bad place?
What sort of place?

Honiara,

I think that you are a nice place,
You have good things,
A car to travel about,
A good house to live in
A gaz stove to cook on it
Electricity to give light at night
Yes, you have some nice things.

But this is what spoils it
You have the beer that ruins my family,
You have the dirt that ruins my nose,
You have plenty of noise that ruins my ear,
You have plenty of dust that ruins my eye.

Honiara,

What sort of place are you?
Are you a nice place?
Are you a bad place?

Honiara,

Maybe you are not for me.

12 Translation:
Honiara,

Iu waatkaen ples ia?
Iu gudfala ples?
Iu ravis ples?
Iu watkaen ples?

Honiara,

Mi ting iu wanfala gudafala ples
Iu garem olketa gudfala samting
Ka fo go long hem
Gudfala haos fo stap long hem
Spid-i-gas fo kuk long hem
Elektrik fo laet long naet
Ia iu garem samfala gudfala samting.

Bat, o hemi na spoelem
Iu garem bia wea spoelem famili blong mi,
Iu garem ravis wea spoelem nous blong mi,
Iu garem staka noes wea spoelem ia blong mi,
Iu garem staka dast wea spoelem ae blong mi.

Honiara,

Iu watkaen ples ia?
Iu gudfala ples?
Iu ravis ples?

Honiara,

Ating iu no fitim mi.

Others come to town in order to get money for a special project. They stay in town until they have gathered the needed lump sum which will enable them to start their own business in their village: a small store or a passenger truck. This will yield the double advantage of producing cash income while allowing them to stay home.

There is as well a category of commuting workers who come from the neighbouring villages and sometimes from as far as 40km away. They have to pay a high transport fee which, in some cases, costs them the equivalent of all the earned daily wages. Once the excitement of working in town has faded away, a very high level of absenteeism settles in. Eventually, the workers walk out of the job or move to town.
As urban migration to Honiara has created a saturation of the job market, people are trying to get work in other places. Recently some workers have been tempted to go to work in Nauru, the independent phosphate island lying north of the Solomons. Offering attractive salaries and working conditions, Nauru is a very likely destination for town dwellers who are not able to find wage labour in Honiara and who are not prepared to go back to their villages. Men once again in the history of Solomon Islands migration go overseas for work and wages. They leave their families behind and come back home once a year at Christmas for a month holiday. Usually the work contracts are for three years. While I was in Honiara in 1983, one of my informants, J.T., a Kwara'ae man who had been living in Honiara for ten years, left for Nauru, leaving behind his wife and his twin daughters. He used to work as a taxi driver but as this job was not profitable any longer and as his car needed repairs which he could not afford, he decided to change work. He looked for different jobs in town but could not find any, even in his old trade, carpentry. The only solution left to him to earn sufficient wages was to enlist to go and work in Nauru in the phosphate industry.

A similar case is found in the Lau fishing village located at the junction of the Kukum Highway and the Vura main road. Two men have enlisted to go and work in Nauru and they are now in the second year of their contract. They used to be fishermen in the fishing village, but as the fishing cooperative of the village could not afford to have so many fishermen, some of them had to find employment outside the fishing industry. Some were able to find work in Honiara, some went to plantations and others went to Nauru.
Early on, many families established permanent settlements in-town. In most cases, one or both parents came to Honiara as teenagers, either to find work or to go to secondary schools in one of the mission schools surrounding Honiara. Their children go to school in town and are raised as urbanites. They hardly ever go back to their parents' villages and know their grand-parents only because the latter came to town to visit them. For these town dwellers, the links with the home village are of unequal value. Some town dwellers, even though they cannot go back to the village very often, because of employment obligations, or because the transport costs are too high, still consider the village as their social security. At least, if the worst comes to the worst, they know that they will be able to eat in their village.

But the village has lost its importance in the eyes of other town dwellers, who now regard Honiara as their home. If they go back to the village, it is only once a year for their work leave or for the Christmas holidays. Occasionally, they might go back home in case of a wedding or a death of a relative or to participate in bride price, in order to maintain alive or reanimate their family ties and their place in the village. At the same time they try to avoid going back to the village too often because of the obligations toward kin that they are obliged to fulfill. Such obligations are higher for them than for others because they are wage earners and are thus perceived as rich by the village population.

The main mission schools around Honiara are: Betikana (Seventh Day Adventist Church), Tenaru (Catholic Church) located at 15km east of Honiara; Visale (Catholic Church) located at 40km west of Honiara and Selwyn College (Church of England).
In Honiara, the social relations and social networks are organized differently from the way they are organized in the village. The privileged relationships are, of course, bonds of kinship and affinal ties. However these links are limited by the fact that not all the generations and all the members of the family are present in town. The wantok system makes up for the loss in a way, as it creates and reinforces social links based not on affiliation with a family or a clan but on membership in a wider social and cultural network.

Therefore in Honiara, if one's primary obligations are towards kin and affines, one's obligations toward wantoks are just as important. Undoubtedly, this phenomenon is closely linked to the development of ethnic identity in town. In certain neighbourhoods the ties between wantoks are very strong. This is sometimes felt as a threat by the rest of the community and causes some antagonisms between the different segments of the population.

Not only does the wantok system provide shelter and subsistence to visiting wantoks and 'liu', but it provides as well physical help in case of trouble. Within the ethno-linguistic and ideological group boundaries that constitute the wantok system, however, primary allegiance is due to one's clan and to one's kin. This is particularly true, for instance, in cases of marriage break-ups, when parents fight over custody of the children. Physical violence erupts. All ideological notions of group identity and belonging are then foregone. For example, in Honiara in December 1983, a young To'ambaita couple who had been married only one year and had a seven month old baby, decided to separate. They were married in the village.
and bride price had been paid. Living in C.D.C. 2 (the Commonwealth Development Corporation settlement outside of Honiara) with her family, the young woman kept her son with her and refused to hand him over to her husband when he repeatedly asked her to do so. The young husband's mother came to town all the way from Malaita, gathered all members of her clan who were in Honiara, chartered a truck especially for the trip and drove all the way to C.D.C. 2, 40 km away, on a Saturday afternoon. Foreseeing trouble, the young wife had gathered her own kin. The two groups fought each other over the child, using their hands, sticks, knives and axes, causing serious injuries to both parties. Finally the wife's side relinquished the child and the father's family went back to Honiara. Two weeks later, the young husband was sentenced to jail for a year for a conviction in another violent fight and the baby was taken to Malaita, away from both father and mother, to be raised by his paternal grand-parents.

But inevitably new kinds of social networks based on neighbourhood, work place, church membership, and friendship cut across the traditional kinship and wantok ties and allow new social relations to be established. To the permanent town dweller this is an important aspect of urban life. It is the proof that one's urban social participation is a success. It is at the same time an affirmation of the independence one has acquired from the omnipresence of the village social order, its structures of kinship and affinity. This newly acquired social (and to a lesser extent economic) incorporation into a very much valued way of life, as it serves to reinforce the town dweller's ties to the urban environment and contributes to a loosening of his/her ties with the village.
In such a socioeconomic environment structured by circular migration and wantok relations, the size and composition of households vary markedly.\(^{14}\)

There are four main characteristics of a Honiara household:

1. The equation 1 nuclear family = 1 house is not always true and is not the rule.

2. The composition of the household is very fluid and varies markedly through time; the size of the household may shift significantly.

3. The size of the household has nothing to do with the size of the house.

4. The equation 1 language = 1 household is not necessarily true.

As we have seen earlier in this chapter, the population of Honiara is very young and composed mainly of young couples with their children. Most other members of the family are absent from the urban scene. This is particularly true of the grandparents, who remain in the village and come to town only for short visits. However brothers and sisters of one of the spouses often are living in town as well. Not considering members of the family who come for a visit, the fluidity of the household is due mainly to the high rate of circular migration between Honiara and the villages and to the presence of temporary migrants. Newly arrived families, like newly arrived individuals, will be accommodated by their wantoks indefinitely until they find a place of their own or go back to the village. Very often people keep on coming back; after a sojourn in town during which they

\[^{14}\text{Given the high mobility of the population and particularly the high mobility of the peripheral members of the household, my definition of household encompasses notions of participation and contribution [in work money, role models, responsibility] as well as notions of belonging.}\]
earned some money, they go back to the village. When they need cash again, they return to town and very often will be lodged and fed by the same wantoks. Usually, young siblings of the couple will live with them, particularly when they are single. Single nephews and nieces, young cousins etc., are usually present in an urban household. Very often the wife's cousin or the husband's sister's daughter will be sent from the village to be the household servant (haogete). Very seldom do we find in Honiara households composed on a regular basis, of only a couple and their children (refer to Figures 3-4 and 3-5). Because of 1 and 3, houses in Honiara are bound to be too small. As a rule, the houses built in Honiara for the Melanesian population are very small — and this, despite the fact that the houses are mainly used as shelter against the rain and against the coldness of the night. As sexual discrimination is very strong, sleeping arrangements are modified accordingly when the houses overflow with visitors. In some cases when there are not enough rooms in a house, couples will be separated and the new sleeping arrangements will ensure that men are

15 For a young village girl, coming to town for the first time as a house girl, is full of anticipated excitement. The disappointment comes fast and hard however as these are uneducated young girls, usually between 13 and 17, who leave their family and their home environment for the first time, do not know Pijin when they arrive in town and have to work hard. Some get homesick very quickly. Very often they do not get any money for the work they are doing; they are fed and lodged, and as gift when they go home, they might receive a bunch of second-hand clothes that makes their delight and are eagerly sought after. Being the house girl is being the servant; they spend their day baby-sitting, cooking, cleaning, gardening, shopping, washing and so forth and in fact have almost no chance or opportunity to go liu in town as they had hoped to be able to do when they arrived. Moreover, these young girls are closely watched by their family, "nogud wanfala rebis boe mek trabol lo hém". Not only do they have to work hard with no recognition, but they do not enjoy the same level of liberty they have at home.
Figure 3-4: Variation in the composition of households: example A.
Figure 3-5: Variation in the composition of households: example B.
in one room and women in another. But this is not possible in all households, as in most cases, particularly in Malaitan families, the couple's bedroom is taboo. The couple will remain in their room and will take their children with them, leaving the rest of the house for the visitors. This is what happened with regards to sleeping arrangements in the house of the F.... family with whom my then two year old son and I stayed between September and December 1982. (Refer to chart 2) S and E and their children K and J plus S, E's younger sister, slept in one room. All the other women, K, H, L plus my son and I, slept in the other bedroom. All the other men slept in the main room or in the outside kitchen. The same principle of sexual segregation was applied to the sleeping arrangements when I went back to the field in July 1983. S was away, but E and her children kept their bedroom. The women slept in the other bedroom and the men in the main room. In March 1984, when the house was not too crowded (and by that time I had managed to get my own house), S and E kept their bedroom for themselves and their newborn baby boy S. The two elder children, then aged four and three, slept in the other bedroom with E's mother. E's brother and S's brother slept in the main room.

4. With regard to 4, above, as will be demonstrated in the next chapter, multilingualism\textsuperscript{16} is the rule in Honiara rather than the exception. Even in the case of families having the same ethnic origin and thus the same vernacular, there is always Pijin to add to the linguistic reality and repertoire of the family. If we look at the

\textsuperscript{16}Following established usage by such writers as Fishman, Gumperz and Sankoff, I use the term "multilingualism" to describe communities where many languages are spoken, and not necessarily the repertoire of individual speakers.
linguistic origin of the members of the Vura corpus and the linguistic origin of their spouses (in the case of children, their parents), we observe an enormous linguistic diversity: 150 persons share 39 different languages. Appendix A gives details on the informants' and their family's linguistic background.

The population of Honiara is nowadays still mainly occupied with semi-skilled and unskilled labour. But the proportion of skilled employment is rising, particularly within the settled urban population. The semi-professional category is expanding due to an upgrading of the educational system. However, the Public Service, which in 1981 was the main employer in Honiara (and of the country as well) with 3,338 employees\footnote{1982 Statistical Yearbook, table 9.5, page 135.}, is almost getting to the point of saturation when it comes to absorbing high school leavers. The private business sector is expanding. New manufactures are being established, which absorb the unskilled labour force. In 1981, 7,560 persons were officially working for wages in Honiara compared to 4,915 ten years earlier.\footnote{1982 Statistical Yearbook, Table 9.2, page 130.} Table 3-2 gives a breakdown of the Honiara population according to major industrial classification as of 30th June 1981. In my sample of the Vura community, the distribution of the population in different types of employment was as in Table 3-3 and Table 3-4.

Most of the Vura dwellers are young people, couples with young children, working either in the Public Service or in stores and private companies. Men are usually employed as skilled labourer (e.g.
Table 3-2: Employment in Honiara according to major categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Industrial Categories</th>
<th>Honiara %</th>
<th>Total Solomons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>7173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>1762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity &amp; Water</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>1448</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale &amp; Retail Trade</td>
<td>1324</td>
<td>2085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport &amp; Communication</td>
<td>1042</td>
<td>1397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Services</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community, Social and Personal Services</td>
<td>2563</td>
<td>5981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>7560</td>
<td>20988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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carpenters, plumbers and mechanics) or as clerks or office workers for the government or private enterprises. Some, very few, have their own enterprise and only one (in my corpus) has a professional occupation. Women work as nurses or secretaries and most often, as haosgele (domestic servants) in European households.

In the male population of my corpus, the main categories are skilled and semi-professional occupations. This reflects the characteristic of Vura as an above average suburb in term of employment, education and wages. It reflects as well the fact that it
Table 3-3: Male population occupation, Vura 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business men</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical practioners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ship captains</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical workers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health inspectors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skilled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painters</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanics</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi drivers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other drivers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plumbers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>41.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Semi-skilled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance workers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishermen</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unskilled</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage collectors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployed</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Fieldnotes October 1983.*

is a suburb where home ownership has been heavily developed, and is therefore mainly constituted by settled residents who have been living
Table 3-4: Female population occupation, Vura 1983

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store-keepers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashiers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office clerks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-skilled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House girls</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unskilled</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>64.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Fieldnotes October 1983.

In town for over 10 years. Most are young couples who arrived in town before being married and acquired enough practical or educational training to give them marketable skills. In this corpus, the semi-skilled and unskilled categories are poorly represented and so is the unemployed category, which again, is consistent with the overall picture of the community.
As for the female population, the distribution in various categories differs from the male population. Neither the professional nor the unskilled category (the two extremes of the professional scale) is represented in Vura. As there are no work opportunities in town for unskilled women, as opposed to the opportunities offered to unskilled men, unskilled women who would want to work could not. This is one reason for the high proportion of unemployed women; another is the very conservative attitude of husbands when it comes to their wives' employment. Many women in the sample clearly wished to get some training in the Honiara Technical College in order to obtain marketable skills, but were prevented from doing so by their husbands. In this kind of socio-economic environment, non-working wives are becoming dependent on their husbands even for the food they give their families, as opposed to the responsibility they have on this matter in their home villages. For a Solomon Islands woman, producing food for domestic subsistence with her own labour has been, along with childrearing, the main source of self esteem and social fulfilment, even if that role was in some sense imposed on her. Without land to make gardens, and without an alternative socially valued outlet for her labour, she may be seriously alienated and marginalised despite the often convivial social relations in urban neighbourhoods.

All religions in the Solomon Islands are represented in Honiara. The most important ones in terms of numbers are the Anglican Church (Diocese of Melanesia), the South Sea Evangelical Church, the Roman Catholic Church and the Seventh Day Adventist Mission. In Vura, however, the relative importance of these churches is slightly different. The S.S.E.C represents 32.75% of my corpus, the Anglican
Church 27.14%, the S.D.A Church 22.85% and the Catholic Church 5.71%.
The United Church, the Assembly of God and the Jehovah's witnesses are
the three other denominations represented in my Corpus.

In Vura, the S.D.A congregation is the most visible one, given
the location of their main church at the corner of the Vura road and
the Kukum Highway. Every Saturday morning the S.D.A families of Vura
and their children walk down the main road to go to the Sabbath
service. As the Sabbath School and Service is an all day affair, food
that has been cooked the previous day, usually in the motu (the stone
oven), is taken to the church, where people will spend most of the
day. The Anglicans of Vura usually attend services in the Cathedral of
the Church of Melanesia next to Lawson Tama and the Catholics attend
the mass of the Holy Cross Cathedral in the centre of town.

Even though the Solomon Islands have only been independent since
1978, a Melanesian elite is firmly established and already reproducing
itself. Formed and structured in the last phase of the Protectorate
by the British Administration, educated or trained abroad, they owe
their power to the facility with which they alternate between Western
oriented values and attitudes and traditional ways of life and
interests. Most members of the contemporary urban elite, be they
politicians, businessmen, educators, highly ranked civil servants or
professionals, are children of men who were already powerful in their
own way under the British Protectorate. These men 'acquired local
importance through church status, political activities, entrepreneur-ship, or links with the colonial administration, and built
a name for themselves outside the traditional channels of
"bigmanship", while using the latter to reinforce their base and their.
status. Some were village based - headmen or local pastors - and sent
their children away to mission schools; some were based on government
stations (Auki, Gizo and Honiara) or in mission headquarters where the
children grew up in incipient towns. This established the basis for the
development of "grandes familles" with names that are nowadays
familiar to many and have become, if not household names, good
introductions. These men are mainly village based, and their urban
links (if they ever had any) are a matter of the past, as most are
already in their 60's or more. Their children however are mainly
urbanites; whose links with the village are looser but maintained
alive, in part due to filial allegiance and obligations and in part to
the need to see their rural support consolidated, as the village is
still seen as the frame of reference for any valued social behaviour.
This is therefore a first generation urban elite, most of whom were
graduates from King George VI School, the first national secondary
school of the country. They are well educated, fluent in English as
well as in Pijin and in vernacular. They attach an extreme importance
to the education of their own children, sending them to the private
Chinese primary school of Chung Wah or to St. John Catholic school,
for instance, rather than to the government primary school of their
suburb. They attach great importance to home ownership and to
prestige consumer goods. The supreme status symbol being a car, many
members of the elite will try to buy even a run-down car for the
prestige it brings them to be independently mobile and to fall, in
terms of transport, in the same category with the Europeans. To pay
back the loan, the car will be run as a taxi during the week by a
trusted wantok, and will be used by the family to go to the market on
Saturdays, to the religious service on Sundays or to a picnic near one
of the rivers of the north coast. I witnessed many disputes amongst car-owning couples regarding the use to which the car would be put and regarding the choice of wantok on which side of the family the car will be lent to. I have seen cases where people would eat only dry white rice at every meal for a week at the end of the month in order for them to be able to put petrol in the car and keep going to work and on errands by car.

Having a car is important, for the town presents a totally different physiognomy whether one sees it by car or by foot. And moreover, the relationship one will have with the town will differ if one is motorized or not. On the basis of transport, Honiara dwellers can be divided into two categories: the baeleg people (the pedestrians) and the wetem trake people (the motorized people). Basically, the baeleg people do not own a car or a means of transport. In this respect, this nomenclature refers to the fact that people own or do not own a car and not to the fact that they could be baeleg on one particular instance. Thus baeleg people could take the bus to go to town and would still fit into the baeleg category. Wetem trake people going to town will consider the final destination rather than the itinerary and will most likely miss out on fortuitous encounters even though they might stop en route to give a lift to a baeleg friend. Being baeleg is important as it is the basis to social encounters. This is particularly crucial for the niu people and the recently arrived migrants looking for work and a place to stay; as

\[19\] Pijin word, from English 'by leg', meaning to walk. Mi baeleg go long makete: I am walking all the way to the market.

\[20\] Pijin expression. With a car or with a truck. Mi wetem trake naita: I have a truck now. Mi go long makete wetem trake: I am going to the market by car.
Frazer (1981:385) has shown, meeting in public places in the only way for them to find out what is happening in town. Settled town dwellers have their own circles of social relations and even though they do not rely on chance encounters for daily survival, meeting in public places is still the best way to take the pulse of the town, to have the feeling that one is part of it and to maintain and enforce social relations.

In Honiara there are a few strategic meeting places and strategic meeting times. For instance, going baeg from Vura to Point Cruz (the commercial centre of Honiara 5 km away) will take the walker into many social interactions and will take him/her through many vital and vibrant Melanesian gathering places. Baeg people will not take the main road to go to town; instead they will walk along the small trail which runs parallel to the highway but crosses the Kukum labour lines\(^\text{21}\) and leads to the Kukum market. This is a very densely populated area where someone one knows might be living. Besides, the place is alive, and as many people are going to the market one does not walk alone. Chats, exchange of greetings such as "Monel!" (Good morning) or "Waswe?" (How are things?), are frequently heard as people pass one another. Beyond the labour lines, one finds the Kukum market. It is a small market compared to the Honiara market, but it is more than adequate to meet the daily food needs of the surrounding Melanesian suburbs. One finds there, in small quantities, the basic staples such as sweet potatoes and tapioca and some delicacies such as

\(^{21}\) The Kukum labour line are located along the Kukum highway, east of the centre of Honiara. They were built at the beginning of the 1960s, to cater for the needs the transient labour force, which in those days, were only male. Labourers only were housed there. Nowadays, some of these 'labour lines' are used for family housing.
sugar cane, peanuts, coconuts and areca nuts. Men and women sell their foodstuffs; only men sell the areca nuts. Not too many vendors, not too many buyers; this is not so much a place for commercial exchanges but rather a place for social encounters under the shade of the big mango trees, away from the already hot sun of mid-morning.

On the way to town, the next big meeting place is Chinatown, along the Matanikau River; this is, par excellence, the commercial centre of the town with the bazaarlike atmosphere of the Chinese shops. It is also the best place to 111, with the small cinema showing films in matinees for $1.00, the Chinese shops selling beer along with cassettes of pop music dubbed in Singapore. As Frazer (1981) described it, this is essentially a male place, as 111 activities are predominantly male ones: young men sitting down under the front-eyes of the stores, moving from porch to porch according to the people they see, waiting for people to pass by, hanging around between two jobs, two conversations, two hopes. This is not a place were women feel comfortable: the road is wide, bare, hot and exposed. However women will go and shop there, looking for bargains, to buy rice by bags of 20kg, to quench the thirst with a cold soft drink on their way home from the market or to buy the fashionable delicacy of the day, the suit potato, the common Irish potato which is imported from Australia and New Zealand at the price of up to $2.50 per kilo.

However, the epitome of social activities and meeting places is the Honiara market. Beyond the purpose of food buying, the main

\[\text{\footnotesize of course, one might argue that areca nuts are a necessity more than a delicacy.}\]
purpose of going to the market is to see and to be seen. This is the place one wants to go to meet people. Women will dress up to go to the Saturday morning market and will spend as much time as possible there until the heat of the day drives them home. The market seen as a locus for social intercourse is never as obvious as in the areca nut selling area, in the back of the market along the sea shore, where only Melanesians (and the occasional passing anthropologist!) go. People buy their nuts, sit down with friends, chew, spit out the red tinted juice, wait for a friend to arrive or simply look at passers by.

It is in the market that one realizes particularly well the linguistic complexity of Honiara. All the vernaculars of the town, together with Pijin and English, can be heard. Some vendors coming from as close as the hinterland of Honiara or the plains of Guadacanal do not know Pijin. If one does not know their language, buying anything from them is difficult. Aware of the problem, these people will generally keep an obliging wantok handy to help with the transaction. But more often than not, people can buy and sell simply by an exchange of gesture as this particular context of communication is brief and limited usually to two basic verbal exchanges: the non-Pijin speaking vendor needs only to understand what is the meaning of a single question: haomas? (how much?) and needs to be able to tell the price, which she/he usually does by shortening the utterance to the round figure. People do not discuss the price. They either buy or they move along.

Living in town is expensive, as newly arrived people quickly
discover, from their own experience or from hearing long time residents complain about the prices. Basic salaries are not high in town, with a basic minimum wage of SDB$ 0.26/hour. This amounts to very little money, which does not go very far if one considers all the temptations existing in the shops of Honiara, be they imported edible items or other consumer goods. People enjoy the comfort of electricity, kerosene lamps, Spid-i-gas (propane), and running water but deplore having to pay for it. Moreover, whatever is consumed by the household has to be bought either from the shops or from the market, as the miniature gardens that people sometimes cultivate on their small plot of land do not yield enough to feed a family. In town, prestigious imported food, canned, dried or frozen, has supplanted the local produce in the eyes of the town dwellers. People, for instance, will prefer the Australian husked white rice to the much healthier locally grown Feasteime Rice. Rice has replaced sweet potatoes as the main staple of the town. People will rationalize their choice by saying that rice is easier to handle and cooks quicker than traditional foods. For instance, visiting wantoks will bring to the house of their host a bag of rice (usually a 1kg bag) bought from the local Vura shop which they will bring for the host's wife to cook. They might add a tin of tuna fish of second

---

quality (called locally Taiyo\textsuperscript{24} blue) or a tin of corned beef. The only traditional island food that I have seen presented in town comprised ritual food gifts for a Tikopia mortuary feast, food exchanges between neighbours after an unusually big motu had been cooked, or contribution to a pati (party). Sometimes a visiting wantok or member of the family will bring to town from the village, big bags of potatoes, yams, coconuts or live poultry as a gift to his host. In most cases the visitor is merely the messenger who has to deliver the presents when he goes to town. The recipient of these gifts is likely, in return, to send back with the visiting messenger or any returning trusted wantok, gifts such as a big bag of rice and some kerosene, some bread or some personal soap or washing powder, some pieces of kaleko\textsuperscript{25} (cloth), which are very much in demand in the rural areas.

As Strathern (1977:262) has shown for the Hageners in Port Moresby and Frazer (1981) has shown for the To'ambai'a in Honiara, the main budget items are personal expenses (clothes, toiletries, etc) and luxury items, social expenses (entertainment costs, exchange obligations) and food for the family (the latter being the least important of the three). The most important item comprises the social

\textsuperscript{24}Taiyo is the name of the Japanese Fishing Co which formed a joint-venture with the Solomon Islands Government and has the monopoly of tuna fishing in Solomon waters. The catch is processed on the ship and is then sent overseas for marketing. It was in 1982 still possible to find first grade Taiyo tinned tuna, the best chunky tuna quality in oil or brine. In 1983 and 1984, it was impossible to find any and the only tinned tuna that was available to the local population was the second grade Taiyo tinned tuna, the flaky quality made out of the brown meat of the Tuna fish.

\textsuperscript{25}Pijin word from English: calico. Cloth, garments, pieces of material. "Haosgelo blon mi nao bae go waswas olketa kaleko blon mifala". My house girl will wash our laundry.
expenses, in which extra food bought while wantoks are visiting has to be included. These expenses are incurred by the town dwellers in accordance with the rule of Melanesian hospitality and the rules of obligatory reciprocal exchanges. Accordingly, any wantok or family members visiting the town can expect to be fed at any time. Most /u people, for instance, will turn up only at meal times, will be fed, and will go. If it happens that there is no food in the house at that time, because of shortage of money or lack of preparedness, the host will borrow some money (from neighbours or from the handy resident anthropologist) and will quickly go and buy food and put a meal together. Some people will come and ask for cash to be reimbursed later on or to be bartered for food when the host goes back to the village. Very often visiting people who are from the same family line as the host will claim material goods (such as knives, saucepans, kerosene lamps, watches or mattresses) belonging to their hosts and will take them home to the village when they go back. The host can only give them away or will be taxed with being selfish. In one particular family, the hostess would find her bokis kaleko raided by her mother-in-law every time the latter prepared to go back to her village. Dresses, underwear, combs, linen will then find their way to the village, to be distributed as gifts to the women of the village by the mother-in-law in her husband's name, thus contributing to his and her prestige. Most settled urban dwellers are caught between fulfilling their social obligations and the realization that they
They reflect on the appropriateness of the obligatory exchange in town, suggesting that such a custom should apply only in the villages where the food is free and the time is not counted. As Sally, a Vura housewife put it: "Diskaen kastom ia hem sud stap loN hom nomoa. Hem no fitim laef loN Honiara".27

One of the indirect socio-linguistic results of urbanization is the "creation" or development of a system of family names. Traditionally, most Solomon Islanders had only one name, the name given to them as babies (although some had a childhood name and a subsequent adult name). Generally, the name used in adulthood is the name of an ancestor or a name passed down in father's or mother's

26 With the rising number of regular town dwellers and the increasing number of people coming to Honiara just to visit their families or try their luck at earning money, the obligatory exchange system is strained and becomes unbalanced. The regular town dwellers are becoming a family pension where, in fact, all members of the family and friends can drop in and be fed. The problem lies in the fact that these town dwellers, because they are such, never get a chance to go back to their village and to get back the reciprocal part of the system. Thus, in their case, the system works one way with them always being in the role of the supplier, and the reciprocity is never paid back to them. Moreover, when these urbanites go back to their village for holidays, they are expected to bring all sorts of gifts from town, because of all the prestige they get from living in town, and because, being wage earners, they are perceived as "rich" by the rest of the village community. In one particular household of Vura I visited in August 1983, ten adults plus three children were living in a two bedroom house. They were Mary and John [the owners] plus two brothers of John's and two of his cousins, plus four nephews of Mary's plus the three children of her sister that she adopted. All the men present in that household worked for money. But they had been staying with Mary and John for a few months already and had never offered to help them long saed long sale [with money]. When I asked Mary why she did not asked them for any financial help she answered: "Mi fraetim olketa" [I am afraid of them.] In the meantime, Mary and John hardly make ends meet on John's meager carpenter's salary and had to borrow some money from neighbours and friends to feed their visitors.

27 This custom has its place only at home. It is not adapted to the life in town.
lineage (but not the name of the lineage). Since the beginning of missionization, those who have been christianized have been given Christian names. In some cases even, pagans working on pre-war plantations were often given European nicknames (first names) by overseers and kept them afterwards. When used together with the custom name, the Christian name comes first. This is in this way that Solomon Islanders have been giving their names to European since. To wantoks, or fellow Solomon Islanders, the usage is still to give only the custom name. In town however, more and more urbanites will introduce themselves with their two names to compatriots. Doing so, they follow the British and French model of patronymic surname (in this case the custom name) and the Christian name given to them by the administration or the missionaries.

In town and in schools nowadays, the size of the communities require that people be identified easily by their names with the least confusion possible. In Honiara, more and more adults and children alike use their father’s custom name as a family name, using their own Christian name as first name. This is true even though most of them still have custom names of their own which are used with them by their parents, family members or close friends. For instance, Fifi’i and ‘Adifika are two Kwaio brothers in their 60’s. These are their custom names; when they were christianized, the Seventh Day Adventists missionaries who baptized them gave them the names of Jonathan and Andrew respectively. When they are with foreigners, or away from their villages, traditional activities and relationships, they use both names and thus are known as Jonathan Fifi’i and Andrew Adifaka. Among themselves, they call one another by their custom names and so do their wives. For instance, Jonathan’s wife is always addressing him
and referring to him as Fifi'i; but talking to me and to other foreigners, she refers to him as Jonathan. The peculiarity here is that the two brothers do not share the same family name and that their children do not have the same family name either, despite the fact that they are first cousins in the male line. Figure 3-6 illustrates this case.

Figure 3-6: Family name

Moreover, the wives adopt the family names of their husbands, instead of using the same system and keeping their own custom names as their family names. Thus Elizabeth, who is Jonathan Fifi'i's daughter-in-law and whose custom name is Muina, is called or calls herself either Elizabeth Fifi'i or Muina Fifi'i, but never Elizabeth Muina. Her children will use their father's father's custom name as their family name, even though they have themselves a custom name along with their Christian name.

I believe that the generation of Solomon Islanders now between 60 and 80 years old is the first one to have had two names and to have used their custom names as family names. Of course one remembers that many Solomon Islanders returned from Queensland during the second half of the 19th century, already christianized and having two names. Hence, Peter Abu'ofa or Timothy George, who have passed under these names into the history of the country.
Some families whose insertion into the Western style of life has been more recent, are just starting to acquire family names in this way. Some children, for instance, create a name for themselves by applying the same principle. They use their custom name as their family name. The family name is therefore totally untraceable in the ascending line as it was non-existent. But it will be traceable in the descending generations, as it is most likely that their new family name will remain, and will be passed on to their children. This is how Barry Fata, a Kwaio boy of 14 years of age who arrived in Honiara 6 years earlier, acquired a family name.


Q. Fata nao?
A. Ia.

Q. Wanem nao 'nara nem blong iu?
A. Nara nem blong mi Barry nao.

Q. An, olem taim iu raetim nem blong iu long exisaes buk blong iu long skul, wanem nao iu raetim?
A. Putum Barry Fata nao.29 (Ps 53b)

Translation: Me, I was born in, in 1969, at the Atoifi Hospital. This is where I was born. When I was born, ah!, the nurses gave me a name. They gave me a different name. The name they gave me was Barry. This is the name that the nurses gave me. Then, when I was a little bit older, I was called Fata. It has always been my name until today. Question: Fata ? Answer: Yes. Question: What is your other name? Answer: My other name is Barry. Question: And when you write your name in your exercises book at school, what name do you write? Answer: I put Barry Fata.
3.2 Conclusion

Traditionally in the Solomon Islands, Pijin has always been a second language. What is happening to Pijin then, socially and linguistically, as it becomes the main language of the urban population? The question commands our attention partly because it seems that this can happen prior to and in some cases exclusively of nativization. This has been happening recently in Honiara; this happened in the same manner to Tok Pisin and probably happened as well almost a hundred years ago to the Kanaka Pidgin English of Queensland, now extinct.

We have seen in this chapter that there is in Honiara an urban culture in the making, of which Pijin is the medium and the only linguistic common denominator. Beyond the diversity created by the vernaculars and the ethnic groups, Pijin has a unifying function, or rather a levelling function. We have seen as well the characteristics of the urban context in the Solomon Islands and how they differed from the village. We have also seen that Honiara has become a permanent place of residence for many town dwellers.

In the next chapter we shall see in detail how Pijin is used by different groups of the population in relation to vernacular usage. It will become evident that it is not necessary for a pidgin to become nativized in order to become the main language of a speech community.
CHAPTER 4

URBANIZATION AND MULTILINGUALISM

4.1 Babel

In a country where 63 languages and many dialects are spoken amongst a population of 232,936 people, multilingualism is the rule more than the exception. Almost everybody, particularly in the adult population, can (to some extent) understand and/or speak one of the languages or dialects of neighbouring groups. As Sankoff pointed out for Papua New Guinea, multilingualism in the Solomon Islands constitutes a natural environment. And in this respect, Honiara itself is a microcosm of the Solomon Islands linguistic situation. The 1976 census of population (Table 1) showed that most of the vernaculars and dialects of the country were represented in the capital, the most important in terms of numbers being the Kwara'ae\(^1\) language, from Malaita, with 1850 speakers. The same year, 417 persons in Honiara declared having Pijin as their first language; however it is difficult to interpret such a number as the questions were not very clear and precise.

However, there is a big difference in the degree and practice of

\(^1\)Kwara'ae is the most important language group in the country in terms of number of speakers, who totalled 13,216 in the 1976 census of population.
multilingualism between the rural milieu and the urban scene. In rural areas, multilingualism is latent and intermittent, and optional for most people. In all cases it is linked to the degrees of social and economic exchange between various language groups and between individuals. In Honiara, multilingualism is active, obligatory, permanent and almost constant. It permeates through daily activities as the principles of urban life and the requirements of social relations in town cut across the more traditional boundaries of social networks. In town, the last bastion of monolingualism is not the family, as might be expected, but rather the wantok system. In such a multilingual context, people living in town have as many chances of marrying outside their language groups as they have of marrying inside them.

For instance, in the sample of 76 urban dwellers comprising the Vura corpus (adults and children) 37 informants or parents of informants were married in the same language group and 38 were married into a different language group. One adult was not married. Town life as a factor promoting intermarriage is even more important if we look at the language situation of couples who were married before coming to town and of those who were married after they had lived in town for some time. On the 37 informants or parents of informants who were married in the same language group, 26 were married before coming to town. On the 38 informants or parents of informants who were married into a different language group only five were married before coming to town. Table 4-1 shows these differences.

This shows strikingly the wider marriage possibilities offered to someone living in town. As a result, the language situation in most of these families is complex.
Table 4-1: Number of informants (or parents) of informants married in the same language group or not, before or after they came to town

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Same language group</th>
<th>Different language groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before coming to town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Before coming to town</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>70.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37

Source: fieldnotes.

If the spouses do not share the same vernacular, they usually have Pijin to fall back on. But it might happen as well that one of the spouses has learnt the vernacular of the other and that allows the couple to converse in vernacular and Pijin. In this case, even a passive competency in vernacular is useful as it allows a partner to follow conversations held between the spouse and visiting wantoks and in-laws. Multilingualism is perceived as an important element of the urban social system, particularly in its transition period, as it often happens that Pijin is not well known by newly arrived visiting wantoks who come into a Pijin world. As the composition of an urban household is very fluid, most of the inhabitants rapidly develop skills of code switching. I observed in my host family's household typical urban conversational code switchings involving various members of the family and their visiting wantoks. This is how the exchanges took place as I recorded them in my fieldnotes over a few days of October 1982.
October 20th

E [from To'ambaita] and her friend J [from the Western Solomons] are talking in Pijin in the kitchen while E is cooking. J is sitting on an empty bin. L [E's MZD, from To'ambaita and the house girl] is sitting on the floor, listening, laughing, commenting in Pijin about the story. Occasionally, E asks L to take care of the children. E always does so in To'ambaita. S [E's husband, a Kwaio man] is having a conversation in Kwaio in the main room with his brother J and his father J. The children are being noisy and J scolds them in Pijin. S [the children's father] switches to Pijin too to scold the children. From the kitchen, E asks H [her BW, a Lau woman] in To'ambaita to look after the children with L. L and H speak to the children in Pijin and entice them to go out with them and play. E then goes to the main room and asks S in Pijin about the car. All the Kwaio people and the To'ambaita people join in in Pijin. However when S and his brother J talk to one another during the same conversation they use Kwaio. J who is visiting from Kwaio country, does not speak Pijin well.

October 21st.

E's mother arrives early morning for breakfast with her youngest daughter Sauna and Pritas [the daughter of E's elder sister]. Sauna, E's younger sister, is only 8. She lives near Malu'u [North Malaita] with her parents and this is her first visit in town. She only speaks To'ambaita. Pritas is 5 and was born in Honiara. Pritas and E's children talk to one another in Pijin while Sauna listens. E's mother speaks Pijin to E's children and to Pritas as they do not know To'ambaita, but she uses To'ambaita exclusively to speak to E, Sauna and to Lilian. She occasionally speaks To'ambaita to the Kwaio, men who understand her language a little, but answer back in Pijin. E's
mother lives near Malu'u in North Malaita. She learned Pijin in Honiara, where she stayed for 6 years while her husband was manager of the Guadalcanal Club.

October 22nd

E's mother comes for breakfast. Speaks To'ambaita to Sauna, E and L. Speaks Pijin to the children, to the Kwaio men and to me. Sometimes she tries to induce E's children into speaking To'ambaita. In the afternoon, E and S try to teach their son Kevin, some Kwaio, and want to assess how much he already knows, if any. The first time I actually see them trying to teach some 'home language' to one of their children. for all I know, it seems to me that S and E are trying to show S's father that they are not neglecting what he might be considering as Kevin's basic linguistic education. Kevin is 3 1/2 and apparently the only Kwaio word he knows is also a To'ambaita word, koko'o. In both languages it is the self-reciprocal term for grand-parents/grand-children, irrespective of gender.

October 23rd

L [a Kwaio man] comes in the afternoon to paint the house. Speaks Kwaio to S and the other Kwaio men and Pijin to everybody else. In the evening, S, his brother Samson and Phillip [S's MBS] are talking in Kwaio while everybody else is talking in Pijin. E obviously understands some Kwaio as she sometimes interferes in the men's conversation by talking Pijin. She does not speak Kwaio, except for a few words. Once in a while during the same conversation, S uses To'ambaita to speak to E.

In this particular household, as in many others I visited, everyone except the young children born in town is at least bilingual in one vernacular and Pijin. Some adults very often have an active or
passive knowledge of additional vernaculars and the schooled ones and those whose activities require it, have some knowledge of English, in different degrees. All settled town dwellers of this household use Pijin as the principal linguistic medium of everyday life, as it is the universal language of the town. The visitors who do not yet know it by the time they come to town - women and children who always stayed in their village or who never went to school, for instance - acquire the language very quickly. When Elizabeth's mother went back home to Malaita, she left behind E's younger sister. Sauna stayed with us for a month at the end of which she was quite fluent and was able to converse, shyly at first but more confidently later on with the other children of the neighbouring houses. At the end of the month, I recorded a few children conversations in which they are telling me about their little cousin's surgery and later on started to play and fight.

Janet: Mifala go leN Philip estede.
We went to see Philip yesterday.

Kevin: La man!
We did!

Sauna: Seti hem karae nao.
Seti is crying.
Olketa nilam hem long Hospitol ia.
They gave him an injection in the Hospital.

Kevin: Olketa katem bele olsem ia.
They cut his tummy like that!

The following interaction involves the same three children plus Dennis [E's S] in a very loose conversation pattern where it seems that they are talking to themselves.

Kevin: Marbol go insaed. Hem insaed. Go tekem!
The marble went inside. It's inside. Go and get it!

Sauna: Olketa marbol lus nao!
The marbles are lost!

Kevin: He, mi no save man!
Hey, I don't know!

Sauna: Olsem iu nao iu holem hem nao; den iu sut go loN mi.
So, it's you who has to hold it, then you throw it to me.
Marbol ia kam insa ed lo dea. Olsem! Lukim!
This marble goes in there. This way! Look!

Janet: Putum marbol bloN mi.
Put my marble.

Kevin: Bae mifala go baem Japanis trak foa mi. He mami!
We'll go buy japanese trucks for me, won't we mum!

And later on, after that Kevin's mother had bought a set of plastic soldiers, the children gathered to play a war game in the main room of our house.

Kevin: Dennis!, kam bangem ka bloN iu, letem olsem nomoa.
Dennis, come and bang your car, do it like that.

Dennis: Taem hem sutim hem; mas karem ples foa sutim tu ia!
When he shoots it, he has to have the room to shoot as well!

Sauna: Eh!, iu spoelem nao!
Eh!, you are ruining it!

Kevin: Hao nao iu mekem Dennis!
How do you do it Dennis!

Sauna: Taem iumi ispid go nomoa ia?
When we are speeding like that?

He lukim! Merika ia ontop lo hed bloN mi!
Hey!, have a look! The American (soldier) is on my head!

Kevin: Lukim, iu lo daon nomoa, hem foldaon nomoa!
Look, you are at the bottom, he fell down!
Sauna: Lukim, merika dae nao, hem no garem but! Look, the American is dead, he has no shoes!

Dennis: Lungga nao lo dea! Lukim! This is the Lungga (river)! Look! Look!

Lukim! big krokodael lo dea. Look! there is a big crocodile there!

Kevin: He mi laek suim! Iu suim wetem krokodael. He!, I would like to swim! You go swimming with the crocodile!

Sauna: Iu lalaek suim no moa! You just want to swim!

As Sauna started to develop an active competence in Pijin, she was incorporated in her little nephews' games. She used the language very much as the children around her did as she learnt it with them; she was able after just a month of practice to produce a wide range of Pijin constructions and handled expertly pronoun duplication, topicalization, plural marking, future marking and directionals.

4.2 Families

As shown in Fig. 4-1 families living in remote areas are still predominantly language-group endogamous. Families who are from areas more-open to intra and inter-island contacts, like the To'ambaita of north Malaita, show a tendency to intergroup marriage. It is worth noting in this case that all the members of these two families who

2The main battlegrounds of the Guadalcanal campaign, during World War II. Old men who fought during that campaign talk freely about it. It is however quite interesting that a child as young as Dennis ~8 years old at the time- and who has lived most of his years on Tikopia should know about it. Obviously these children are familiar enough with the events to incorporate them in their war games.
have married into a different language group had left their village
early in their teens, or in their young adulthood, either to pursue
some course of studies or to look for work outside of their village.
Nowadays, all members of these two families who are married into a
different language group are living in town with their spouses and
children, except for F.T.  

Of course, the fact that children are born from intergroup
marriages is not at all a guarantee that they will be bilingual. We
shall see that phenomenon later on.

Let us look first at the three main intergroup marriages on this
chart. In the Kwaio family shown on Fig. 4.1, at the first generation
level, A typifies the pattern: as a young man, he married a Kwaio
woman in his village. When he married his second wife A (a Kwara'ae
woman) after the death of his first wife, he had already left his
village for many years and was living at the time in Auki, the capital
of Malaita Province. He had been for many years involved in the
colonial life of the Protectorate by being for a long time a member of
the constabulary of Malaita and later on a recruiting agent in Yandina
(Russell Islands) for Levers. A lives in Auki now and his linguistic
praxis is as follows: from his first marriage with a Kwaio woman, A
now in his fifties, has three grown up children. One of his daughter,
T is married to a Kwaio man; his son is married to a woman from
Choiseul. Both young couples live with A and his wife in Auki. With
his older children, A speak in Kwaio when his wife is not present. If

3 F.'s father was Baegu and his mother To'ambaia. The two groups are
located next to one another. When F. got married to K., a To'ambaia
woman, he decided to go back to To'ambaia country where he had land
from his mother's side.
Figure 4-1: Multilingualism within families
4-1 (a)
Family tree showing ethnic origin of spouses.

4-1 (b)
Family tree showing main language in respective regular place of residence.
4-1 (c)
Family tree showing main language in wife’s home village.
For the non-married persons, mother’s home village.

4-1 (d)
Family tree showing main language in husband’s home village.
For the non-married persons, father’s home village.
she is present, everybody speaks in Pijin so that A's wife can be incorporated into the conversation. A's wife, does not speak Kwaio even though she would like to because, she claims, her husband fears that not knowing the language well she might break some language taboos (see Keesing and Fifi'i, 1969). This is how she phrases it.

...mi fræt fo talem, bikos kastom bloN olketa olsem ia. Una woman hem talem samting, samtaem hemi tok sue o olsem tok nogud, hasban nao bae hem givim mani loN saed loN hasban bloN mi nao bikos, samting hem kolem rong bae hem sik kompenseson nao. LoN Kwaio. Hem nao hasban bloN mi hem stopem mi fo rong. Mi no toktok. LoN mifala hemi dadieres tumae ia.... Gogo, olo bloN mi hem se:"No, iu stopa fo tok loN, iu stop foa spik loN toko bloN mi nao".

However, A's wife has a passive competency in Kwaio, the neighbouring language group. She speaks to her husband and her children in Pijin only. A's children from his second marriage are five and seven respectively and are being raised in Pijin only, even though Auki, the town where this family lives, is located in Kwara'ae country.

In Honiara, S and M have been married for almost nine years. They belong to the second generation of this family tree. S (from Kwaio) had just started to work for the public service when he met M (from To'ambaita) in Honiara, where she was living with her sister J. Soon after, they were married. M was 15 at the time. S had completed Form 5 (year 5 of the secondary education system) at Betikama, the S.D.A

---

4. I am afraid to speak, because their custom is like that. If a woman says something, sometimes she swears or does not speak right, then her husband will have to give money to my husband's family, because of the word-taboo she broke, then he will ask for compensation. In the Kwaio way. This is why my husband prevents me from saying something wrong. I do not talk [Kwaio]. For us it is very dangerous. Eventually, my husband said:" No, you will not speak in [Kwaio], you will not speak in my language anymore".
mission school outside of Honiara, and he had been in town for many years. M had arrived in Honiara with her family when she was 10, and had lived in town ever since. Their two children (they now have a third one) are raised in Pijin only. Both parents always address the children in Pijin and always talk to one another in Pijin only. They however tend to use their vernacular with their visiting wantoks, but might not obligatorily do so with the wantoks living in town. S, who is a high ranking civil servant, speaks English fluently and has travelled abroad for training courses. His wife speaks a little English. However no English is ever used in their household. They own a house in Vura and are committed to make a life in Honiara, where their children go to school. In their opinion it is important that their children know Pijin first rather than one of the family vernaculars. This is what M has to say on the subject:

Mi laek hem (her son) save Pijin bikos bae hem had fo hem, taem hem go lo skul. So mi laekem hem save fastaem Pijin; langgus bae hem save bihaen.5

For this family, speaking Pijin is not only the consequence of living in a multilingual environment. It is a deliberate choice made in light of the importance they recognize and attribute to Pijin in such a milieu.

J is M's elder sister. She lives with her husband C, from Tikopia, two houses up the road from M and S. From her first marriage to a man from Choiseul, J has a little boy of 11 who lives with J's.

5I want him to know Pijin otherwise it will be hard for him when he goes to school. So, I want him to learn Pijin first, he will learn "langgus" later.
mother in To'ambaita country. This little boy has been living with his grandmother almost all of his life and his mother tongue is To'ambaita. He acquired some Pijin very recently when he started to go to the local primary school. This at least allows him to talk to his siblings, J's children from her second marriage, whenever he comes to town for a visit. J's and C's first child, D is being raised by his paternal grand-parents on Tikopia. "Kastom blen mifala Tikopia", C argues. D is now 8 years old, and being raised on Tikopia he only knew the vernacular when he arrived in Honiara after many years on the island. He is now fluent in Pijin and is thus able to talk to his siblings P and S who are only monolingual in Pijin. While in Honiara, D uses only Pijin, even to talk to his father. As J does not speak Tikopia and D does not speak To'ambaita, the only language that mother and son have in common is Pijin, a second language to both.

Comparing Fig. 4-1(a) and Fig. 4-1(b) one sees clearly that the people most likely not to use their vernacular as main language in their usual place of residency are the settled urban dwellers. For these town dwellers Pijin is the main language when they are in town. Looking at Fig. 4-1(c) and 4-1(d) one notices that the people who will adapt linguistically to a new sociolinguistic environment are the

6 "A custom from Tikopia".

7 It appears that this custom of having the first born of Tikopia family living in town, be raised on Tikopia, is a widespread custom amongst urban Tikopia. However in this cases it seems that J and C have some trouble getting their son back to town even for a short visit, because the grand-parents want to keep him. It happened in one instance that J and C had sent some money to Tikopia for D's passage to Honiara, along with many service messages asking C's parents to send D to Honiara. When the ship finally arrived a few weeks later, C's father was on board and the little boy had been left behind on Tikopia.
settled town dwellers, or, more generally, the bilingual people who know Pijin.

4.2.1 The adults' position

There is in Honiara a tacit sociolinguistic rule. The town is a pidgin world and people, resident or transient, have to act accordingly and speak Pijin in order to have a social life, and sometimes a private life in this linguistic imbroglio. As the town is recent, and as the settlement of Melanesians in Honiara is recent as well, few if any adults so far have had Pijin as a mother tongue, either as sole mother tongue, or in conjunction with a vernacular. For the adults Pijin is always a second language, which they have acquired in late childhood or young adulthood. As children they acquired it from the neighbourhood, and/or by going to mission schools for their secondary education. These secondary mission schools catered for children coming from different parts of the islands; they were boarding schools in which Pijin was used as the lingua franca among the students, whereas in most cases, English was the teaching medium. Some got a smattering of Pijin as children in their villages by listening and following the older men who knew it, as they associated the language with a bigger and more fascinating world outside the village. They were eager to learn and to be taught, as recounted in the interview I made with the Paramount Chief for East Kwara'ae, Jamuel Misialo:

"Oh, taem mi smol olketa pipol kakam, olketa iuropian visit kam long bles nao wea mi stap, an mi lukim olketa, mi sasapraes tu, bikos samfala olo mane, granfata bloN mi wea hem jes dae nomoa, hem go bin loN Kwinslan ia. Hem save loN Pijin, toktok bloN olketa kangaru. Tu save olketa toktok olsem ia, difren langguis ia.

Ia, hem save tumas ia. Oraet, taem olketa kakam olsem ia wetem D.C. olketa D.C. pipol olketa turtur long bush ia, mi
Some women acquired Pijin when they got married, because their marriages coincided with moving to town with their husbands. This is the case for Alice Adifaka, for instance:


8Oh, when I was a child, the people used to come, the Europeans came to visit the place where I stayed; and I saw them, I was very surprised because some old men [like] my grand-father who just died, had been to Queensland. He knew Pijin, the language of the Kangaroos, [i.e. the Australians]. You know, these languages are different languages.

Yes, he knew a lot. Good, when they came like that with the D.C [District Commissioner], the D.C. who used to patrol the bush, I was small, I saw them, I said: "Eh! how do they know these people". This is an old story, this thing. I do not know it too, because these people who came long ago fooled the people to go and plant sugar cane in Queensland, they stole them. The first ones did not know anything. Even their names they did not know, progressively they learnt. Then I said: "Eh! grand-father I would like to know this thing too." He said: "Eh! just hang around, that will be easy, you will know it in no time." I was very interested. If these two were having a conversation, I was very interested to listen to the people, or if different people came to talk to grand-father, I was eager to listen. I said: "Oh!, this way I'll learn well."
Some acquired Pijin when they joined the work force. This is particularly the case of unskilled labourers who came to town to get cash without having gone to school or who went to another Pijin speaking community, such as a plantation. But in all cases, despite the fact that Pijin in town is a second language for all adults it is functionally their main language. Many parents recognize that fact, and many told me that they want their children to learn Pijin first so that they can have a life in this community and go to school. There will be time later on for the children to learn their parents' vernaculars.

As noted earlier, Pijin encroaches on every aspect of daily individual and family life. Pijin with the shop owner from Choiseul; Pijin at the clinic with the nurse from Isabel, Pijin at the SDA church with the pastor from the Shortlands, Pijin at school with the teacher from Makira and the children from everywhere; Pijin at the bank with the teller from 'Arc'are; Pijin at the pharmacy with the employee from the Reef Islands, in Chinatown with the Chinese store keeper who sells calico, Pijin at the market to buy the best kumara coming from Isabel and Pijin to buy the fish from the Lau fishing village. Pijin with the colleagues at work, with the taxi driver, with the supervisor or

---

9 I just started to learn Pijin when I married Andrew. Before that, no. Before I did not know Pijin because we lived in the middle bush and we were not in the habit of coming down to town to Auki. No. I learnt Pijin five years ago. In Yandina [the general quarters of Levers Pacific Plantations Ltd located in the Russell Islands] when I stayed there with my husband. When I stayed in my village I did not know it yet. But nowadays, I know how to speak Pijin.
the foreman. Pijin at the fast food counter, and at the Kukum cinema, Pijin with the mother in law and the children.

4.2.2 Position of the children

On the other hand, Honiara has now a growing generation of children and teenagers for whom Pijin is the mother tongue, and/or the main language. For some it is a main language, second chronologically to their vernacular mother tongue, that they have learned very early on, as soon as their participation in the wider society brought them out of the family circle and involved them in activities which required a wider medium of communication: interaction with neighbours (children or adults), games, local day to day activities, etc., and later on, schooling. Some children learnt Pijin even earlier, concurrently with their family's or mother's vernacular and acquired from a very early age a kind of native bilingualism.10

They are very fluent both in Pijin and "langgus"11. Some children use the languages in a very diglossic (according to Fishman's terminology) manner, using one language with one parent and another language with the other parent. For other children, the languages tend to overlap, in functions and in contexts, indifferently.

10These children learn their vernacular in the urban context, and have hardly any occasion to go back to the village. They acquire native competence in their vernacular within the narrow family circles in town, and they mostly use this competence within the same contexts. It is therefore likely that they acquire a lexically and sociolinguistically limited command of these vernaculars, not having participated in a full speech community or full range of activities, and using these languages outside of the physical and social environments for which they provide labels. The children will often acknowledge this fact by saying: "langgus, mi save. Bat mi no save tumas." In the same manner, parents will often complain that their children do not speak "langgus" well.

11Piggin word meaning: vernacular.
Even if some children do not acquire Pijin until they actually go to school (between the ages of seven and nine), most are exposed to it before then. For instance, in the sample of children I interviewed at the Vura school during the month of September 1983, only three out of 70 arrived at school for their first year of primary education without knowing Pijin. Such a small number is only normal, for this is a community in which most social interaction is conducted in Pijin. There is an urban culture in the making, crystallized around Pijin and for which Pijin is the cement and the only common linguistic denominator. It is both a means of access to this culture, and a reflection of it.

At this stage, it would be useful to refine the description of what has been characterized as the almost automatic linguistic habitus of children born in bilingual families. One would expect in a multilingual situation where Pijin is the lingua franca that such a child would automatically be raised in Pijin only by his/her parents. In a survey I made of 70 school children of the Vura school in Honiara, all were found to have fluent knowledge of Pijin. Forty-two were born in Honiara and had lived there with their families all their lives. Of the remaining 28, ten arrived in Honiara a few months after they were born; nine arrived before they were of school age\(^{12}\) and nine arrived after they had already started school. Obviously, the great majority of these children was in contact with Pijin from a very early age.

Out of these 70 children, 30 had parents who did not share the

\(^{12}\)In the Solomon Islands, children start primary school between the ages of seven and nine and finish it after six years of primary education, between the ages of 13 and 15. Schooling is not mandatory.
same vernacular. According to the traditional definition of creolization, the children of such couples living in a multilingual context should use the Pijin their parents speak and "transform" it into a creole. However it happens in most of those cases that one of the parents knows the vernacular of the other, and that the couple uses both one vernacular and Pijin at home. In this kind of context, the children very often acquire both vernacular and Pijin at the same time.

For 16 children in this group, Pijin was the main home language. For eight, it was their father's language and for four it was their mother's language. But out of these 30 children, 20 could speak their mother's language and 20 could speak their father's language. In such families, children use both languages fluently and indifferently at home. It appears as well that some of these children use one language with one parent and the other language with the other parent. Out of the same 30 children, 11 would use Pijin with both parents, six use Pijin with their father and their mother's language with her; five use their father's language with both parents and five use their mother's language with both parents; three use their mother's language with their mother and their father's language with their father.

Therefore it is in no way predictable that children born into bilingual families will automatically end up speaking only Pijin. Most such children grow up bilingual, as the parents, mothers particularly, tend to use their own vernaculars to speak to their children. In other words, when children are born into bilingual families and brought up in town, it does not necessarily follow that they have to be automatically brought up only in Pijin. Most of the town children know another language as well, even if in most of the cases they use Pijin
more than they use the vernacular. They are in fact bilingual from the age of language acquisition and in effect have two mother tongues. On the other hand, it is common to find bilingual children using the languages in a diglossic manner, keeping the vernacular as almost exclusively a language of the home (sometimes along with Pijin) and using Pijin almost exclusively in the outside world. Because of peer group pressures and the wide range of contexts in which they can use Pijin, most of these children become more fluent in it than they actually can be in their vernacular mother tongue. Moreover, in most cases, as soon as children get old enough to wander alone outside their household, they hear more Pijin than they hear their vernacular mother tongue, and in a much wider range of contexts.

Out of the 40 remaining children whose parents have the same vernacular, 32 have their parents' vernacular as the main home language, seven have Pijin and one has both Pijin and a vernacular as a main home language. Six children are using mainly Pijin to talk to their father, and five were using it to talk to their mother. Four were using mainly Pijin to talk to both of them - and this despite the fact that everybody in the household was fluent in the vernacular as well.

There are, however, some children who only have Pijin as a mother tongue and differ from the preceding ones in being monolingual Pijin speakers. Their parents have in all cases different mother tongues, sometimes belonging to different linguistic families (Chinese and Fijian for example). Among these children some might be exposed to a vernacular in and around their home, but were never taught to speak
it. These children constitute the monolingual Pijin speakers of my corpus. For the moment, they are a minority in Honiara. However, given the number of intergroup marriages in town and the reinforcement of an urban way of life linked to the encroachment of Pijin in the town, the number of monolingual speakers is increasing rapidly. A great number of these monolingual Pijin speakers are still under school age.

Therefore, I consider it very important to differentiate between children who have two mother tongues (Pijin and vernacular) and children who have only Pijin as a mother tongue and are monolingual Pijin speakers; and I shall do so in the linguistic analysis in Chapter 5. However these two groups of children belong, pragmatically, in the same group, as they encounter Pijin in the same manner and in the same circumstances. We shall see in Chapter 5 that they belong in the same group linguistically, too. Moreover, given the sociolinguistic environment in which these children are living it is important to stress that just as we cannot expect that children born into a two-vernacular household will necessarily be raised in Pijin only, we cannot expect either that children born to families sharing the same vernacular should use this only vernacular as their main language for daily interactions.
4.3 Language Praxis

In order to see if there were particular domains in which children used Pijin (P), vernaculars (V) or both (B), I had included a section on domains of use in Questionnaire II, (section C) (refer to appendix A).

After analysis of that section of the questionnaire, it became obvious that interactions in the house or with members of the family were held overwhelmingly in Pijin and vernacular (B) and in vernacular (V). Interactions held with non members of the household and in the public domain, were held overwhelmingly in Pijin. Table 4-2 shows the proportion in which the languages are used in the private and public domains. Columns A to I included represent the family domain, columns J to U represent the public domain and columns V and W represent the village 'domain'.

Looking at the table, it is clear that Pijin is used by the children in the great majority of their public interactions. Particularly in the school domain, where usage of Pijin only, reaches almost 100%. At home, Pijin only is used up to 35% of the time to talk to siblings (columns G and H) as opposed to 15% of the time to talk to mother (column A) and 10 to 15% to talk to grand-parents (columns C to F). Looking at the vernacular table, we note that grand-parents are being talked to in vernacular between 55 and 65% of the time and siblings only in 20% of the time. This is quite normal. Children who know their grand-parents' vernacular(s) address them

---

13 I am indebted to Dr. Jacques Guy for writing a special computer program to treat the data on which this analysis is based, for devising the graphic format of these tables and for making insightful suggestions about the results.
Figure 4-2: Comparative usage of Pijin and vernaculars 
in the public and private domains by the 
children of Vura school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pidgin</th>
<th>Vernacular</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100% PP</td>
<td>100% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95% PP</td>
<td>75% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% PP P</td>
<td>60% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85% PP F P PPPP</td>
<td>55% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80% P PPPPPP P PPPP</td>
<td>50% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75% PPPPPP PPPP F PPPP</td>
<td>45% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70% PPPPPP PPPP F PPPP</td>
<td>40% VVVV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65% PPPPPP PPPP F PPPP</td>
<td>35% VVVV</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 60% PPPPPP PPPP F PPPP | 30% P PPPPP
mostly in vernacular. Not too many older persons know Pijin, particularly if they live in remote areas. We observe that columns C to F (grand-parents) and V-W (village), are correlated. Almost no children use their vernaculars only in the public domains. When they do so, it is usually with their neighbours, with a teacher who happens to be from the same language group or a wantok met at the market, and so forth.

I knew that the background of these children was very diversified in terms of place of origin, time spent in Honiara, 1st language learnt Vs 2nd language learnt, bilingual families or not. I decided therefore to see if these variables, alone or combined with others, would influence the children's general patterns of language use. The data was thus sorted according to two criteria at the time. For instance in the rightmost column of Table 4-3 the main variable was the age of the children (column 1) and the secondary variable was the first language (column 6) that these children had learnt. Table 4-3 presents only a sample of the combination that have been tried. Visually, it is clear that these combinations of variables do not produce any pattern, beyond the domain pattern presented above, that would indicate the significance of one or more variables. Statistically, these variables do not prove to be significant either; when we compared the frequency of change, from one speaker to another in each of the tables produced by combinations of two variables, we obtained figures that were very similar to one another with the mean being 61% +/- 2. These figures were obtained by dividing the number of changes by the number of comparisons from one speakers to another. They appear in Table 4-2.
Figure 4-3: Examples of tables obtained by sorting the data according to two variables.
Table 4-2: Number of changes divided by number of comparison, from one speaker to another, by combinations of two variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination of variables</th>
<th>Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unsorted</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age x bilingual family or not</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age x first language</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in Hon. x first language</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in Hon. x bilingual family or not</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in Hon. x age</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language x age</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language x years spent in Hon.</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual family x age</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age when arrived in Hon. x first language</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age when arrived in Hon. x bilingual family or not</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First language x age when arrived in Hon.</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual family x age when in Hon.</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age when arrived in Hon. x time spent in Hon.</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time spent in Hon. x age when arrived in Hon.</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These results show that the sociological variables listed above do not influence the specialisation of vernaculars and Pijin in the public and private domains. It seems that the town context has a levelling effect; it neutralizes the sociological variables when time comes for the children to choose the appropriate language for each domain of use.

Keeping this in mind it is possible now to classify the different types of urban dwellers according to their language praxis. As town dwellers, they share the constant of having Pijin as their main language of daily interactions, particularly outside the home. But as they belong to different generations and as their experience of life in town varies from that of circular migrants to that of "native
urbanite", and as their sociolinguistic and support networks are built in different spheres, putting more emphasis on and having different attitudes towards one language as opposed to another one, their level of vernacular retention varies. In fact it is possible to show that the degree of vernacular retention is inversely proportional to the degree of urban participation and the degree of Pijin usage. In families and individuals, the level of vernacular retention is linked to 4 main factors.

1. the degree of contact with the home village.
2. the strength and importance of family and wantok relations in town.
3. The degree of engagement of families in the urban way of life.
4. The identification of the individual with the urban way of life.

In a way this is a paradigm very similar to the migrants paradigm described by Fishman et al. (1966). The less important factors 1 and 2 become and the more important factors 3 and 4 become, the greater the chances that the individuals will be monolingual in Pijin. It is therefore not surprising that, so far, only young children born in town fit into the category of monolingual Pijin speakers. This reflects their position in the sociolinguistic relations of the community: monolingual Pijin speakers are the result of a series of sociolinguistic transformations that have taken place in town; their linguistic praxis reflects these developments. Table 4-3 illustrates this point.

As expected, urban dwellers are found scattered across Table 4-1. However, there are constant elements here: circular migrants are never found speaking Pijin only and it is among the children that monolingual Pijin speakers are to be found. As the migrants arrive and settle in town, they add Pijin to their repertoire, and the degree
Table 4-3: Language praxis in Honiara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C3.1</th>
<th>C3.2</th>
<th>C3.3</th>
<th>C3.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular Only</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular&gt;Pijin</td>
<td>+ + + +</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernacular=Pijin</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pijin&gt;Vernacular</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pijin&gt;Vernacular&gt;Superstrate</td>
<td>+ + + + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pijin&gt;Vernacular=Superstrate</td>
<td>+ + +</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pijin&gt;Superstrate=Vernacular</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pijin Only</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key
A = Circular migrants.
B1 = Adult urban dwellers who arrived in town as adults.
B2 = Adult urban dwellers who arrived in town in young adulthood or in their teens.
C1 = Children urban dwellers who arrived in town in their late childhood.
C2 = Children urban dwellers who arrived in town in early childhood.
C3.1 = Children born in town, monolingual family, school age, going to school.
C3.2 = Children born in town, bilingual family, school age, going to school.
C3.3 = Children born in town, monolingual family, not school age.
C3.4 = Children born in town, bilingual family, not school age.

Source: Fieldnotes.

of use will be in direct relation with the degree of their participation in urban life. The length of time spent in Honiara is not here a relevant variable, as there are people, old ones particularly, who have been living in town for ten years and still have not mastered Pijin, as their social engagement in town is limited
to the wantok network, and in many cases to the immediate family circle. These people are in some ways marginalized. The circular migrants represent a category whose repertoire is limited, as they are characterized by short sojourn in town, dependence on wantoks and some degree of marginalization. At best their usage of vernacular will be matched by their usage of Pijin.

4.4 Conclusion

Honiara is a multilingual town. The last census of population, in 1976, showed that 63 languages and dialects of the Solomon Islands were represented in Honiara. 14 Born here or not, but living in this rich linguistic imbroglio, the town dweller has no other choice but mastering Pijin, and rather quickly, in order to have a social life in this community. And so did I. Some of my informants were puzzled by the fact that I was not aiming at learning their language in order to talk to them, (unlike many anthropologists they had seen or heard of before me). I had to explain that I wanted to talk to everyone in town, and that I could not be expected to learn all the 63 languages and dialects used in Honiara in order to do so. My best avenue, with regard to communication, that is, was to learn Pijin quickly, as they themselves had to in order to deal with the multilingual situation. They and I were in the same situation linguistically, as the only language we could use with one another was a language foreign to all of us, but yet common to all of us. It was the only language we could use consistently and regularly all over town, with everyone, in many

14 The same census reported that in Honiara alone, 407 persons over five had claimed to have had Pijin as their "first language", whatever that means. Only nine persons in that group were aged 20 and over.
sociolinguistic contexts, despite the parallel presence of 63 other local languages. Days went by without my hearing my friends and informants use their vernacular mother tongue, either by default, or because they had become so comfortable in their Pijin or because they rested assured that Pijin would see them through any urban communication context, that they would not even bother switching to "langgus" to talk to their wantok.

In this tower of Babel-like town, many people are married into another language group, and have neighbours, friends and colleagues belonging to other language groups. Pijin is not only the cement of this culture in the making, it is as well the cement of many families, when parents do not share the same language and raise their children through and with it. Pijin is then, for these families the only medium that will ensure communication, both at the generation level (between siblings for instance) and at the cross-generation level (between parents and children, or grand-parents and grand-children). Multilingualism is a natural environment for Pijin usage to which nobody pays attention; it is taken for granted and, so to speak, never considered to be an impairment to social interaction, probably because Pijin is there to fall back on in case of sociolinguistic difficulties. I recorded in an evening of October 1982, a volleyball game organized in the garden of my host family, in which 12 people, neighbours and friends, took part. No less than eight different languages, Pijin not included, were heard during that game; participants gave orders, or made comments and criticisms, and joked
in their language and Pijin alike. Vernaculars were heard mostly when everything went smoothly, but Pijin was relied on all the time. when disputes occurred between the two teams, to sort the situation out and discuss the rules. After the match when everybody sat down to rest and enjoy the cool night breeze, all conversations and discussions were held in Pijin, as if a return to normal and casual life in town meant an automatic return to Pijin as well.

*Sapos nimi mitim lumi, bae iumi 'save iusim Pijin moa*. "If we run into one another, (some time,) we'll talk in Pijin 'again". This sentence recorded in Honiara in October, 1983 from an adult speaker, reflects the resourcefulness with which adults, and children, use the language. At the same time, it sums up and symbolizes the linguistic "fate" of Honiara dwellers, who perceive that Pijin is their major linguistic resource for every day social life.
CHAPTER 5

LANGUAGE CHANGE

In the last chapter I described multilingualism in Honiara and showed how this multilingualism was being dealt with by urban dwellers and by visitors. I showed how Pijin was being used as the main language of the town, by the children and the adults alike. From this, it was obvious that in such a multilingual situation as Honiara, the differences between a pidgin and a creole could be seen as opposition between MAIN LANGUAGE and SECONDARY LANGUAGE, rather than between MOTHER TONGUE and SECOND LANGUAGE. In this light, I found more differences between the rural and urban varieties of Pijin than between the variety spoken by urban adults and the variety spoken by urban children. This is what I intend to show in this chapter, by focusing on language change in Solomon Islands Pijin.

Linguistic change in Solomon Islands Pijin is qualitative as well as quantitative. It is manifest in both diachronic changes through generations and synchronic linguistic variations. My main purpose in this chapter is to show the direction of linguistic change through time. However, in doing so, I will inevitably present forms that are in variation at one particular point in time, as a result of diachronic change taking place. For instance, as a formerly obligatory copy pronoun is being dropped from the pronominal syntax by the adult
urban speakers, several developments are possible in the speech of their children's generation and in the speech of the subsequent generations; but while these changes are taking place, the new and old patterns will coexist. The new patterns may entail several possibilities:

a) The new pattern eventually may take over the old one and become THE FORM. In the case of Pijin pronominal syntax, the new pattern not including the copy pronoun is now being used by the children as the basic form.

b) The new form and the old one may eventually find for themselves an appropriate discursive or syntactic niche, and will remain in complementary distribution. In our example, the old form is being used by the children as a way of marking relative sentences; that is, the formerly pervasive copy pronouns have come to serve a restricted, marked function. Alternatively, free variation may settle in, if the two forms are judged as equivalent by the speakers and the speech community.

c) The new pattern may not settle in and will disappear.

This is of course one way of looking at the problem. There are others. But in my view an analysis of language change should, by definition, be done in a dynamic frame.

For the purpose of this analysis, the informants have been grouped in four subgroups: rural adults, urban adults, bilingual urban children and monolingual urban children (having Pijin as their sole language).
Grouping the informants in this way enables me to test the hypothesis that changes in contemporary Solomons Pijin are not solely due to its nativization (or in traditional terminology, to its creolization) but to new sociolinguistic pressures, such as what I call "creolicity", which the previous generation encountered.

These subgroups have been defined sociolinguistically, on the basis of variables such as methods and contexts of acquisition, age of speaker at time of acquisition, place and role of Pijin in the speaker's community, role and importance of Pijin in the speaker's life, and bilingualism or monolingualism in Pijin. The main characteristics of each subgroup are:

a) Rural adults: they have learned their Pijin in traditional contexts of Pijin acquisition (usually mission stations or plantations) and have learned it in adulthood as a second language. They use it as a second language, and as a secondary language, because they live in environments in which Pijin is never more than secondary. These speakers are in a prototypical pidgin-speaking situation.

b) Urban adults: they have been living in town for a long time and constitute the first generation of Solomon Islanders to have used Pijin extensively as the main language of their everyday life. They acquired Pijin in young adulthood and/or in their late teen years in contexts such as school, urban work and town life; these differed from the traditional acquisition contexts of the previous group. They are

---

1Rural children have been left out of consideration except in the section analyzing the future markers. This was done for the simple reason that having first started to work on the future markers in Pijin, I realized that the rural children's data did not provide significant information. I kept that subgroup in the analysis of the bae markers, but decided to leave them out of further description.
the ones who initiated and shaped Honiara urban culture and thus have been seminal in the formation of this new speech community.

c) **Bilingual urban children**: they were born in town or arrived there at a very early age and acquired Pijin in young childhood, in most cases concurrently with one or two vernaculars. Most tend to be actively bilingual and passively multilingual. Pijin is their main language, even if the vernacular is still used predominantly at home.

d) **Monolingual urban children**: born in town and having lived in town all their life, the only language they know actively is Pijin. Pijin is their mother tongue and the only language they can use, even though some might have a patchy passive knowledge of one vernacular.

This chapter will show the direction of linguistic changes by comparing the speech of rural and urban groups, old and young speakers, bilingual or monolingual Pijin speakers, through a description and an analysis of four areas of Solomon Pijin:

- phonology
- pronominal syntax and predicate marker
- relativizers and relative clauses
- future markers

These particular features have been chosen for many reasons: 1) They are areas in which linguistic change is clearly discernible. 2) They have been studied in other pidgins/creoles of the Pacific and thus provide more material for comparison. 3) They are central elements of Pijin syntax, and through them one can have access to other aspects of the language.

All the examples used in this chapter are taken from the corpus, except where indicated by an * preceding the example. The number appearing between parenthesis after each example refers to the number allocated to each of the informants of the corpus, as they appear in
the list in Appendix D. To find out 'who says what', the reader might want to refer to Appendix D.

5.1 Phonetic regularization and phonological change

In order to show how these changes are affecting the Pijin phonological system, shall start by describing the main causes of variation within the system itself. I shall then go on to show that the changes consist mainly in neutralization of variable forms, through apocope, deletion of epenthetic vowels and suppression of phonological substitution.

5.1.1 Causes of Variation

Pijin phonology is highly variable and is strongly influenced by the phonology of the speaker’s vernacular. This influence takes 3 different forms:

1) Phonological substitution
2) Insertion of epenthetic vowels
3) Addition of final vowels

5.1.1.1 Phonological substitution

Not all languages of the Solomon Islands have all the consontal

2The term substitution should be taken cautiously. This word makes sense in this context only as opposed to an eventual norm or model. There is no norm in Pijin as yet, and Pijin is phonologically very diversified. So far, the only variety of Pijin showing a lesser degree of phonological variation is the variety of Pijin spoken by the children in town. There is not one way of pronouncing Pijin, there are many. However for the purpose of this demonstration, I shall consider that the repertoire of sounds described in Table 1-3 and Table 1-4 represents the norm.
phonemes of "standard" Pijin as it is coming to be codified. Therefore, speakers – especially those for whom Pijin is a second language – will characteristically replace some Pijin consonants with the closest possible equivalents available in their vernaculars, contrasting, where possible, with the canonical ones in a single distinctive feature (e.g., voicing, bilabial vs. labiodental, nasal vs. non-nasal). For example, if one's mother tongue includes $p$ and not $f$ as in Tolo (Guadalcanal), the Pijin spoken by Tolo speakers will likely include $p$ whenever Pijin has $f$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pijin</th>
<th>Tolo</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bifoa</td>
<td>bipoa</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>finis</td>
<td>pinis</td>
<td>finish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fis</td>
<td>pis</td>
<td>fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foldaon</td>
<td>poldaon</td>
<td>fall down</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lif</td>
<td>lip</td>
<td>leaf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pijin phonemes not available in the phonemic inventory of the speaker’s native language will be used where no close equivalent is available.

Table 5-1 represents the possible sound substitutions most likely to take place according to the speaker's vernacular.

These substitutions are illustrated in the samples of speech appearing in section 5.1.2.

---

3This standardization is mainly the work of the Solomon Islands Christian Association (SICA) located in Honiara and whose main enterprise, besides translating the Bible and the New Testament in Pijin, is to run a Pijin Literacy Project. This project aims at bringing literacy in Pijin to adult learners. To achieve this aim, the SICA team has devised a standard Pijin orthography based mainly on Simons and Young's orthography, in which part of the consonantal system of English has been kept in lexical items having an English origin. Refer to Table 1-4.
Table 5-1: Sound variation due to vernaculars

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Pijin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>p blong, plong</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>v kabis, kavis</td>
<td>edible greens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>mb baebae, baembae</td>
<td>(future marker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>t nogud, nogut</td>
<td>bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>nd oda, onda</td>
<td>order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>b fis, bis</td>
<td>fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>p wanfala, wanpala</td>
<td>one, a, an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>h fastaem, hasaem</td>
<td>before</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>k pig, pik</td>
<td>pig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>ngg sigaret, singgaret</td>
<td>cigarette</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>s jump, samp</td>
<td>jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>di jump, diamp</td>
<td>jump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>r liu, riu</td>
<td>to wander aimlessly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>b pensol, benso</td>
<td>pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>l riva, liva</td>
<td>river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>d rabis, dibas</td>
<td>rubbish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>f riva, rifa</td>
<td>river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>b muv, mub</td>
<td>to move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>w hevinat, hevinat</td>
<td>sago palm and nut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>ngw wesis, ngwesis</td>
<td>wages</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.1.2 Insertion of epenthetic vowels

In most languages of the Solomon Islands, consonant clusters do not occur. Most speakers therefore will insert epenthetic vowels in Pijin words in order to avoid consonant clusters. The choice of the vowel is directed by a rule of vowel harmony.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>skul</th>
<th>sukul</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oloketa</td>
<td>oloketa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supun</td>
<td>tarae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trae</td>
<td>bisinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bisinis</td>
<td>kalaem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>klaem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1.1.3 Addition of final vowels

Just as vernaculars do not have consonant clusters, they very seldom have words ending with a consonant. Most older and rural speakers add a final vowel to the Pijin words:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Regularised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sukul</td>
<td>sukulu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>supun</td>
<td>supuni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bisinis</td>
<td>bisinisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kabis</td>
<td>kabisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>talem</td>
<td>telemu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sikarap</td>
<td>sikarapu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.1.2 Regularisation

Among most rural speakers and many older urban speakers all these phonetic interferences from the vernaculars are obvious. In the urban Pijin of the younger generation and of the children particularly, these variations tend to be neutralized: the phonetic system is regularized; the epenthetic vowels are disappearing and thus consonant clusters are more common than they are in rural Pijin; apocope is taking its toll and final vowels are disappearing. The following excerpts of text will allow us to compare the speech of two rural adults with the speech of two urban adults and two urban children.

Mi kanoto ridim, bat evripisti we raonem hia Gualakana (Guadalcanal) anda Malaita, olo i se Pranst (French), prom Pranis (France). Bata oloketa bipoa kam noto isi laeka distaemu. Bipoa kam oloketa pristi ia, prom Pranis oloketa i sapa pogud he! Mi mas talemu iu. (PS 84)

Taem wao, taem merika hemi landim longo Solomone, ia hem naq, oloketa waatemane mifala, waawaka longo oloketa bipo, oloketa tiki onda fo mifala tuu. Sifi i no bikiafu mifala kamu, ia, mifala baeke kam fo 'Aoke nomoa. Wokabaoti nomoa long loti fo 'Aoke. (Ps 8)
Note in both texts the epenthetic and final vowels. In the first one note the substitution of Tolo p for Pijin t. In the second one note the substitution of Kwaio f for Pijin p and the prenasalization of d.


In these two texts note that the epenthetic and final vowels do not appear as regularly as they do in the two first texts. Some influence of the vernacular is evident in prenasalization of g. Note as well the phonological reduction of mifala into miala in the speech of informant PS 18.


These two texts are strikingly different from the first four: no phonetic substitution, no epenthetic vowels, no final vowels. But they show even more phonological deletion than in the text produced by PS 18. We find otta or oeta instead of olketa; wantaa instead of
wantala; samfala instead of samfala⁴.

How are these changes to be explained? Phonetic regularization and suppression of epenthetic and final vowels seem to be associated with a loss of contact with vernaculars. This is certainly obvious in the children's case. As I showed in chapter 4, these children have Pijin as a main language of everyday life, even though they might have a vernacular as mother tongue. The exposure that these children have to a vernacular is not as important as the exposure they have to Pijin. Looking at these excerpts from texts, it seems that the influence of vernacular phonology on Pijin phonology varies with the speaker's degree of exposure to or use of a vernacular. When Pijin is only a secondary language, people apply to it the phonology of their local vernacular. When Pijin is the main language, the vernacular becomes secondary and so becomes the influence of the vernacular phonology on Pijin. In the process, Pijin in town is becoming phonologically more homogeneous. An urban variety of Pijin which is phonologically different from the rural varieties is thus emerging. The children appear to systematize and stabilize this new phonology.

Another factor could contribute to these phenomena: the increasing speed with which urbanites speak Pijin. This of course is linked to the fact that Pijin is their main language. The more they use it and hear it, the faster they speak it. In the process phonological deletion is taking place either in the form of apocope, or in the loss of epenthetic vowels. Phonological reduction, already present in the speech of urban adults, is even more obvious in the

⁴Note the increase in the number of deictics and statement markers [which we shall see in section 5.2.2] and the use of a third person singular object pronoun after a transitive marker [see section 5.1].
speech of urban children, either monolingual or bilingual. Pronouns, prepositions, deictics and statement markers are particularly affected by phonological reduction. *Oiketa* becomes *oketa, oeta* or *otta*; *sapos* becomes *saos, pos* and even *soos*; *nao* and *la* becomes compounded into *naia; wantala* and *somala* lose their *l* and become *wantaa* and *somaa*. *Mitufala* becomes *mitala* and *mita* becomes *miala*. *Blong* and *long* lose their velar nasal *g* and become simply nasalized as *bloN* and *loN*; very often they lose the nasalization as well and become *blo* and *lo*. These words appear very often in discourse; speed is acquired at their expense.

5.1.3 Influence of English

Another cause of variation in spoken Pijin is the speaker's contact with English. Since the Pijin lexicon is essentially drawn from English, one's knowledge of English can influence one's Pijin. Pijin's *s* will then become *ʃ* or *ch*; *t* or *d* will become *θ* and *ð*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Pijin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vilis</td>
<td>vilij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brata</td>
<td>brothā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diswan</td>
<td>thiswan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sios</td>
<td>chioch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siusim</td>
<td>chiusim</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This adds to the variation found between speakers as it leads to the emergence of levels of speech and registers in Pijin. People educated in English or having access to English will shift, often, from a more Anglicized register phonologically (and lexically often as well) to a more "bush" register depending on context and audience.
5.2 Pijin pronominal syntax and predicate marker.

It is not by chance that I start this syntactic analysis with the pronominal system and its syntax. This pronominal system is in a way, the core of Pijin grammar, and has ramifications in various areas of the language. This will become obvious in the sections of this chapter studying the relativizers and relative clauses and the future markers.

In Solomons Pijin, personal pronouns do not mark gender or case. They distinguish between three persons, three numbers (and sometimes more) and for first person non-singular, whether the hearer is included or not.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sing.</th>
<th>Dual</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>Plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st pers. exclusive</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>MITUFALA</td>
<td>MITRIPALA</td>
<td>MIFALU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st pers. inclusive</td>
<td>IUMITUFALA</td>
<td>IUMITRIPALA</td>
<td>IUMI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>IU</td>
<td>IUTUFALA</td>
<td>IUTRIPALA</td>
<td>IUFALA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>HEM</td>
<td>TUFALA</td>
<td>TRIPALA</td>
<td>OLVETA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traditionally, only singular, dual and plural forms are noted in sketch grammars of Solomon Pijin (Simons and Young, 1978:163; Huebner and Horoi, 1979:41). The trial is included here as an example of the productivity of the dual type form. Specified pronouns for specified numbers of people have been recorded, thus attesting to the productivity of this category in adults' and children's speech alike.

Object pronouns in Pijin pose no particular analytical problems, and with one partial exception, usage of these pronouns does not appear to vary among the sample groups. The personal pronouns are
used: a) as direct objects of transitive verbs:

(1) Mi luk -im tufaia.9
SP look TS OP
I see/saw the two of them.
(PS16)

b) as objects of a preposition, both oblique objects of the verb and
as heads of prepositional phrases:

(2) Bae mi giv -im buka ia long oiketa.
FUT SP give TM book DEM PREP OP
I'll give this book to them
(PS58)

c) as objects in possessive constructions:

(3) Bae mi go long hom bloN mam bloN mi.
FUT SP go PREP home FOSS mummy FOSS OP.
I'll go to my mother's place
(PS41)

For most speakers in the rural and urban samples, the transitive
suffix -im, -em, -um appears to embody a ŋ-marked but implied 3rd person
singular pronominal element:

5In Pijin, transitive verbs are marked by the suffixes -im, -em or
-um. The form selected is determined by a rule of vowel harmony. For
the purpose of this section on object pronouns, the transitive suffix
is transcribed as being hyphenated to the verb. In subsequent sections
it will be transcribed as forming part of the verb.
(4)  
Mi no luk-im yet.  
SP NEG look TS yet  
I have not seen it/him/her yet.  
(PS6)

The only apparent change in object pronominal usage, although my data are inconclusive on this point, is that some urban speakers, particularly the children, apparently are coming to analyse such sentences as lacking a pronominal element, and hence use a 3rd person singular pronoun after the verb.6

(5)  
Sak is protekt-em hem  
Shark DEM protect TS OP  
This shark protects her  
(PS47)

(6)  
Iu' nao i-te hol-em hem nao.  
P TOP SP hold TS OP STM  
You, you hold it  
(PS51)

With subject pronouns, the changes are more pervasive and more complex. I shall show in this section that a "double subject" rule or a "pronoun copying" rule which exists in the rural and urban adults speech, tends to be deleted from the children's speech. This change however is already foreshadowed in the urban adult population.

As illustrated in the following sentences, subject pronouns in Pijin can be found in various slots.

6It seems that the same phenomenon is occurring in Bislama, the pidgin of Vanuatu. [Tryon, private communication; 1/8/1985.]
(7)
Hem nao hemi bos.
He is the boss.
(PS27)

(8)
Ia, mi mi no kasem dea iet.  
Yes FP SP NEG reach LOC yet
Yes, I have not been there yet.
(PS8)

(9)
Olketa pipol bipo kam, olketa i wael.  
The people before were wild.
(PS84)

(10)
So dadi bkeN woman ia hem se:  
So this woman's father said:
(PS57)

(11)
Hem susut IoN oketa banana.  
He shoots at the bananas
(PS46)

(12)
Osem ilumi go haedim go osem nomoa.  
Therefore we are going to hide.
(PS36)

Examples (7) to (10) are produced by adults and examples (11) and
(12) are produced by urban children. Looking at the frequency of the each of these types of sentences in each subgroup of the corpus leads me to make the following observations.

Older speakers, rural or urban alike, use either a subject pronoun (SP) or a predicate marker (PM) (i) or both to reiterate an explicit noun when it is the subject of the sentence, as in (9) and (10). Thus constructed, the sentences seem to have two subjects; a noun subject and a pronoun subject. However, the repositioning of the SNP does not constitute an emphatic construction, as in Pijin emphasis is created by the use of topicalizers such as *nao*, and deictics such as *ia* and *nai*. In constructions with double subjects, the SNP carries the semantic load while at the same time it complements the subject pronoun.7 This 'double subject' rule is optional and gives the speakers the pragmatic possibility not to use it, as in (11) and (12) for instance. A single speaker would produce a sentence of the type: SNP+SP+VP when using the 'double subject' rule, and would produce a sentence of the type: SNP+VP when not using it. The two sentences would be equivalent and using or not the 'double subject' rule would not change the meaning at all. The following sentences are equivalent:

7These two subjects correspond in some ways to the opposition in French between *sujet apparent* and *sujet reel*. 
(13)
a) Dadi bloN mi hem siki  
   dad POSS OP SP ADJ.

b) Dadi bloN mi hem-1 siki. 
   dad POSS OP SP PM ADJ.  
   My father is sick.

c) Dadi bloN mi i siki.  
   dad POSS OP PM ADJ.

d) Dadi bloN mi siki.  
   dad POSS OP ADJ.

Using or not using the 'double pronoun' rule, the speaker can achieve topicalization of the subject by the adjunction of topicalizers in the slot immediately following the SNP or the noun subject as in:

(14)
Mam bloN mi .hao bae go  
Mummy POSS OP TOP FUT go  
It is my mummy who will go.  
(PS66)

(15)
Olketa fata nao i sapa pogud. 
Plu father TOP PM suffer ADJ.  
It is the fathers who really suffered.  
(PS84)

Once the subject reference as been established in the context of discourse it can be maintained either by using a subject pronoun as in (16), a predicate marker as in (17) or both as in (4-2):
In this kind of sentence, topicalization is achieved in two ways:

1) by inserting a pronoun, which I call a focal pronoun (FP) corresponding in person and number to the SP, plus a topicalizer in

8 In Pijin, pronouns are not case marked: the focal pronoun takes the same form as the subject and object pronouns.
a slot preceding the SP. Thus a sentence such as: \( \text{SP} + \text{VP} \) would become when topicalized: \( \text{FP} + \text{TOP} + \text{SP} + \text{VP} \) as in (7). This is particularly true for pronouns of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd person singular (\( \text{mi, iu, hom} \)) and for the first person plural inclusive (\( \text{lum} \)).

2) simply by inserting a topicalizer in the slot immediately following the SP. Thus a sentence such as: \( \text{SP} + \text{VP} \) would become \( \text{SP} + \text{TOP} + \text{VP} \) as in the next example. This is possible for all persons and numbers.

(19) Olketa nāo kipim. SP TOP keep

Them, they kept it.

(PS14)

An alternative analysis of the pronominal system has been proposed by Keesing (1985), examining the influence of substrate languages on Pijin pronominal syntax. This alternative view is sketched briefly.

In most of the Oceanic Austronesian languages of the Solomons, particularly the Southeast Solomonic languages of Malaita, Makira, Guadalcanal and Nggela, an old Oceanic pronominal system is preserved in which a copy pronoun, situated within the verb phrase, references a noun subject.\(^9\) This copy pronoun, marked for person and number, is the obligatory subject-pronominal constituent of a verbal sentence (Keesing 1985); once the referent is clear in a context of discourse,

\(^9\) Whether these subject pronouns within VP's are ultimately best treated as copy pronouns, copying an underlying noun or pronoun subject which is then optionally deleted, will depend on the vicissitudes of syntactic theory. Such a transformational analysis, exemplified by Chung (1978) for Polynesian, may prove less powerful than an analysis that views these as the obligatory subjects of verbal sentences, of which subject NP's nouns or focal pronouns, are optional expansions.
the copy pronoun serves to maintain reference across subsequent clauses. The subject NP (SNP) slot remains empty, or may optionally be filled with a pronoun (what in Oceanic languages has been called a "free" or "focal" pronoun) when the reference is to be emphasized. According to Keesing (1985), it would appear that speakers of Solomons Oceanic languages that incorporate such a pronoun-copying rule, analyse the subject pronouns of Pijin in a parallel manner. The pronoun that recapitulates a noun subject in Pijin appears to be, for them, a constituent of the verb phrase, not a second subject NP; and it appears to be equated with the copy pronoun in the speaker's native language. Lichtenberk (1984) and Simons (1978) refer to these pronouns as "subject markers"; Keesing (1985), (n.d.) as "subject-referencing pronouns" (SRP).

However, whatever name we give to these pronouns and the functions we attribute to them, the surface structures in which they appear are the same. Applying or not applying the 'double subject' rule or the 'pronoun copy rule' has the same result, and produces sentences that are equivalent. What is important here is, the fact that fewer and fewer people in the urban corpus are applying the 'double subject/pronoun copy' rule. They tend to delete SP and double subjects (the predicate marker / included) from their speech. In town, the shift is already taking place among the members of the young adult generation, who use or drop the copy rule alternatively. Emphasis is realized through the double subject/pronoun copy rule and through the use of a topicalizer such as nao. Generally the PM / is clitized to the 3rd person singular hem, a process that is already present in the older generation's speech; and very often it is simply omitted. As / is part of the pronoun paradigm (as we shall see in
section 5.2.1), it disappears from the sentences in which the double subject/pronoun copy rule is not used. Sentences of the type: SNP + i + VP become SNP + VP, and sentences of the type: SP + i + VP become SP + VP.

The children carry this tendency further, to the point that the basic patterns of their pronominal syntax do not include realizations of the double subject/pronoun copy rule. When they do use the copy rule it is to achieve particular discursive effect (emphasis) and syntactic effect (relative constructions, as will be seen in the next section). The predicate marker has almost completely disappeared from their speech. The main sentence patterns followed by the children are: SNP + VP, rather than SNP + SP/SP +VP/V, and SP + VP rather than FP + SP/SP + VP/V. We shall see later how and why this transformation is occurring. We need first to take a closer look at the so-called predicate marker /.

5.2.1 The PM / and the pronoun paradigm.

The Pijin pronominal system cannot be studied separately from the so-called predicate marker as, in my view, this represents the vestige of an old pronominal paradigm, in which it was the subject pronoun for third person singular.

In contemporary SIP, the predicate marker is located between the subject (noun or pronoun) and the verb. According to Huebner and Horoi (1979:12) its function "is to mark the beginning of the verb phrase". The predicate marker does not appear with all persons. It is never used with first person singular and a sentence such as the following is unheard of in Pijin.
In general, the predicate marker is optional but rare when the subject is first person dual or plural (mitufala, mifala), but never occurs with iumi.¹⁰ It is optional, but very rare, when the subject is second person singular iu and more common for dual or plural (tutufala, lufala); it is optional but very common when the subject is third person singular, dual or plural (hem, tufala, olketa). There is no difference of meaning between sentences incorporating the PM or not. Thus, the following two sentences are equivalent:

(21)
Ana oltketa / joinem Maasin Rulu.
CON SP PM join Marching Rule
And they joined Marching Rule
(PES92)

(22)
*Ana oltketa joinem Maasin Rulu.
CON SP join Marching Rule
And they joined Marching Rule.

However, for old rural speakers of Pijin, the predicate marker is obligatory for the 3rd person singular and plural and optional for the others, and never occurs with first and second person singular, the first person plural inclusive, and almost never occurs with mitufala

¹⁰Most recorded occurrences of mifala / and mitufala / are recorded prior to the verb stap, and on closer listening appear to represent instead an initial epenthetic vowel of the verb: mifala / stap.
It never occurs with the first person singular. Thus sentences such as (22) would be almost unheard of in old rural 'speakers' speech. Moreover we have seen earlier that the PM is becoming optional in urban settings when it used to be obligatory in the speech of rural speakers with third person singular and plural, to the point where it tends to disappear. Therefore typical sentences produced by young urban speakers will be like (12).

Now the question is this: if the function of the predicate marker is to indicate the beginning of the VP by marking the predicate as Huebner and Horoi (1979) and Simons and Young (1978) indicate, why is it not obligatory at all persons and numbers? Probably because the real function of the so-called predicate marker has nothing to do with the verb but has to do with the subject, and with the pronoun system in particular. It is true that the PM / introduces the VP, but it is true as well that any SP filling the same slot has the same function. Therefore, it seems to me that if / is analysed as a predicate marker, all the other SP having the same functions in the sentence should be analysed as predicate markers as well. It seems that what gives / its appearance of being a predicate marker is the fact that it is not marked for person and number. If we could find examples showing that in the slot occupied by / other forms exist or existed, we could then be sure that / is the remnant of a pronominal paradigm case marked for subject, and in which / would indicate the third person singular.

Indeed, many excerpts of Kanaka Pidgin English give examples of / (written he) being located in the slot of the copy pronoun.
(23)
What name work you want em man he do.
INT work SP want TM NP SP do

What work do you want the man to do.
(Tanna, 1877; Giles 1968:40)

(24)
Boy he like go.
Boy SP like go

The boy wants to go.
(Wawn's log. 1879; Wawn 1893:15)

(25)
Cappen, man Vila he come!
Captain, NP Vila SP come

Captain, the man from Vila is coming!
(Wawn's log. 1879; Wawn 1893:124)

In all these examples, he is a strong pronoun. However it is already during that time in variation with him in the same slot, as illustrated in the next sentences:

(26)
Man belong bullamacow him stop.
NP POSS cow SP stop

The cow man stopped.
(New Caledonia, 1883. Layard, reported by Schuchardt, 1883)

(27)
You savey where man him stop?
SP know INT NP SP stay

Do you know where the man is?
(Source: idem)

Him as a subject pronoun in these sentences, cannot be confused with him as object pronoun, which as early as the 1870's had already become a transitive marker. The following sentences recorded in 1877 (Giles 1968:41) are good examples:
Darky: 'You buy him yam?' 'Yes; suppose you let him some boy go along a Queensland, we buy him altogether, my word, good fellow. Very good, you let him boy come, good fellow place, he no work along a sugar, you savey, he work along o' bully-me-cow....' Darky: 'You want to buy him boy, what name you give it belong a boy?'

When the pronoun he weakened, the pronoun him (later on hem) took over. He (later on i) became most often cliticized and lost its marking for number. It did not lose all of its marking for person, as it is mostly used with 3rd person subjects.

In my corpus, two informants regularly used / in variation with de in the predicate marker slot, as if they had a pronoun paradigm for 3rd person which was as follows:

- singular: /
- plural: de

instead of what most of the other informants had:

- singular: hem and /
- plural: oketa and /

These informants, (PS8) and (PS12) learned Pijin as children on the SSEM mission station of Onepusu, around 1920-1927. If you recall, Onepusu station had been created at the turn of the century to cater to the religious needs of Solomon Islanders repatriated from Queensland. The station was staffed mainly by returned Islanders who had learned their Pijin in Queensland. These two informants do not know one another, and do not recall having met as children. However their Pijin presents strikingly similar features, particularly in the use they make of the nominative pronouns for third person. In most cases, they produce sentences of the type: SNP + SP + V or FP + SP + V. When the SNP or the FP is singular, the SP is either hem, i, or hemi (when / is cliticized.)

In their grammar of subject pronouns, two dominant patterns are
emerging: for the third person singular, two forms seem to be in variation:

1) SNP+SP+V = SNP+hem(i)+V = SNP +i+V.
2) SP +SP+V = SP +hem(i)+V = SP +i+V

Each of the two forms usually bears a PM cliticized to the SP hem. Thus hem is usually heard as hemi.

(28)

Disfafa gele ia hemi kuki blong Mrs MacMillan.
DEM girl DEM SP cook POSS

This girl was Mrs Macmillan's cook.
(PS12)

(29)

Spos 'man' i kaekaem, hemi blong mate ia.
COND someone PM eat SP POSS die STM

If someone eats it, one dies.
(PS8)

For plural actors, the sentence constructions are the same as above. But applying the concordance rule between SNP/SP and SP, these two informants use the third person pronoun plural de in the SP slot:

(30)

Ana olketa tisa de ste long Onepusu.
COOR Plu teacher SP stay LOC Onepusu

And the teachers were staying at Onepusu.
(PS12)
(31)

Tufala de waka long sevis tu.
SP SP 3PP DUAL 3PP work LOC service ADV

The two of them worked for the church.
(PS12)

(32)

Evri bik sif ia de go loc' prisin naia.
ADV big chief DEI SP go LOC prison STM

All the big chiefs went to prison.
(PS8)

(33)

Bata plande pipol de no getem mani.
COOR ADV people 3PP NEG have money

But a lot of people did not have money.
(PS8)

Informant SP8 used de as a SP pronoun consistently and used oketa (or oketa) as a focal pronoun:

(34)

An den, oketa wea de getem peman ia,
COO SEQ FP REL SP have payment DEI

And then, those who have received payment,

de baem pikpik,
SP buy pig,

bought pigs,

de baem iams and samting olsem.
SP buy yams COOR thing ADV

bought yams and things like that.
(PS8)

Therefore we have here a predicate marker looking very much like and behaving very much like a 3rd person pronoun. For the 3rd person
singular; it is in variation with *hem*, or is often cliticized to *hem*, as in *hemi*. For the 3rd person plural, it is in variation with *de* and *olketa* and is often cliticized to *olketa*, as in *olketaI*.

**Singular**

- **SNP/SP + HEM + V**
- **SNP/SP + HEMI + V**
- **SNP/SP + I + V**

**Plural**

- **SNP/SP + OLKETA + V**
- **SNP/SP + OLKETA(I) + V**
- **SNP/SP + I + V**
- **SNP/SP + DE + V**

Keesing (1985) has suggested that, because in the Eastern Oceanic substrate languages focal and subject pronouns are different, distinguished by case-marking, there has been an inherent instability in the developing pronominal paradigm of Melanesian Pidgin for the past century, as speakers of these languages sought in the pronouns of the superstrate language separate case-marked forms for the two subject-pronoun slots. For third person singular, English offered "him" and "he". For first person singular, English offered "me" and "I"; and as Sankoff (1980) has noted, there is some 19th century evidence of "I" as a subject pronoun in Kanaka Pidgin. For second person, singular and plural, English offered only "you". For third person plural, English "they" (occasionally contrasted with a form derived from "them" as focal pronoun) has seemingly offered a possible subject pronoun; and for first person plural exclusive, "we" has offered a similar form. Keesing illustrates from 19th and 20th century evidence that *olketa ... de* and *mitale ... wi* have recurrently appeared, perhaps as separate innovations, in Pidgin through the past century, probably introduced both by Melanesians themselves as lexical input from English and by superstrate speakers who, substituted English pronouns for Pidgin ones. Both patterns, the first attested
here by Solomons Pijin speakers who learnt the language at Onepusu, provide further evidence that the cliticized / derives from English "he" and fills a subject-pronominal slot.

For what this hypothesis is worth, it is nonetheless interesting specially in the light of the sentences produced by my informants (PS8) and (PS12). We have seen that it is now impossible to consider / as a predicate marker for three reasons. First, it is not obligatory. Second it appears in sentences from which the copula (never present in Pijin) is absent and in which it fills the slot of the SP. (That is, / can stand alone as subject pronoun, even in the first clause of a sentence: it is simply the unmarked form of the third person pronoun).

(35)

i no olsem man 10N plantesone.
SP NEG ADV someone PREP plantation

It is not like someone for the plantations.  
(PS84)

(36)

i no blo iu man!
SP NEG POSS.

It is not yours man! 
(PS52)

Third it is in variation with other forms of pronouns, and that would not happen if only / could be inserted in that slot. Sankoff (1980) argues that in Tok Pisin, a sister language of Solomons Pijin, / is a pronoun. The demonstration she makes of its origin and stabilization as a "pronom fort" in 1885 Kanaka Pidgin English is even more appropriate to Solomon Islands Pijin, as the latter is a more
direct daughter dialect of the former. The data I presented earlier show that in Solomons Pijin as well, / is part of the pronominal paradigm and has been mis-analyzed as a predicate marker. And it is as part of the pronoun paradigm, in the copy slot, that / is being deleted from the urban speakers' speech. We shall see in the next section, how / is now being deleted from the urban speakers' speech.

5.2.2 Pronoun deletion in Solomons Pijin.

We have seen earlier that over the years, there has been a systematic shift in the grammar of subject pronouns in Pijin. A double-subject rule or pronoun copy rule required that a SP/SP, indexing the SNP in persons and number, be put in the sentence. This SP/SP paradigm incorporated the so-called predicate marker /, which I have shown to be a pronoun. We showed that / was in variation with the 3rd person pronouns, singular and plural and was often cliticized to both. Hence, all three following sentences are equivalent:

(37)

a) John hem siki. [SNP][SP+V]  
b) John hemi siki. [SNP][SP+V]  
c) John i siki. [SNP][SP+V]

Urban adults who have been living in town for some years, optionally apply the pronoun-copying rule and are therefore likely to produce sentences such as SNP/FP+SP+V, or such as SNP/FP+V. The deletion of the SP does not alter the meaning of the sentence, nor does it create ambiguity. The SP is in fact redundant. Deletion of the SP is at the basis of a new "grammar", which the children (bilingual and unilingual Pijin speakers) and the young adults (always bilingual Pijin speakers) use predominantly. When a pronoun copy
appears, it is used to achieve discursive effects such as topicalization; and it is then reinforced by a topicalizer. It is used as well to mark relativization, as we shall see in the next section. As a weak pronoun, I is totally disappearing from the young urban speakers' speech, both with children and young adults. It is optionally used by most of the older urban speakers, but is usually cliticized to the 3rd person pronouns; these people will then produce in free variation sentences such as: Hem talem mi and Hem talem mi. Pronoun deletion implies two successive deletions. The first is the deletion of I when it is cliticized. Thus hemi and oltetai become hem and olteta, a deletion in which I is the prey to what Sankoff and Brown (1980:269) colourfully described as the "grim reaper": phonological deletion. The second deletion is the deletion of the SP and the encroachment of a new "grammar". The subject pronoun is syntactically redundant and is already very weak in the speech of older urban speakers. The younger Pijin speakers systematically drop it from their speech unless, as we have mentioned earlier, they want to achieve special discursive or syntactic effect.

Through the years, the dominant pattern of Pijin pronominal subject syntax has changed in the following manner:

a) Rural adult = 1) SNP + SP + VP  
2) SNP + VP
b) Urban adult = 1) SNP + SP + VP  
2) SNP + VP
c) Urban children = 2) SNP + VP  
1) SNP + SP + VP

In a), 1) is the main pattern and 2) represents the option.  
In b), 1) and 2) are options, with a predominance of 1).  
In c), 2) is the main pattern and 1) is a syntactic and discursive option.

We shall see in the next section the role played by pronouns in
the building of relative clauses in Pijin. We shall see how this use has changed in parallel with changes taking place in the pronominal system.

5.3. Relativizers and Relative clauses.

In this section we shall see once again that the changes in the pronominal system affect other areas of Pijin syntax. This is never as true as in one of the first types of change affecting relativization. As mentioned earlier, the copy rule allowed the copy SP/SRP to embed a relative clause. However, when the children delete the copy rule from their grammar, they do it selectively: they apply the rule when they want to achieve topicalization or emphasis, or to embed relative clauses. In other words, the children delete the copy pronoun only when it is redundant. The second type of change affecting relativization in Pijin is associated with a proliferation of deictics (DEIC) and statement markers (STM) in the speech of urban speakers. These deictics appear often as devices for embedding relative clauses, in a pattern similar to the one described by Sankoff and Brown (1980) for Tok Pisin. We shall see now how these two phenomena are manifest in the speech of members of the different subgroups.

Simons and Young (1978:161) state in the sketch grammar appended to their Pijin-English dictionary that there are two relatives (which I prefer to call relativizers) in Pijin: *Hu* and *Wea*. They note that *hu* is a new relative device still not used very much. Huebner and Horol (1979:173) further note that "*wea may be used with either persons and things, but *hu may be used only with human nouns". In my corpus, *hu* as relative marker is so rare that I only found one occurrence of it (it is however very common as an interrogative
marker). *Wea* is more common, but tends to be associated with certain age groups and certain varieties of Pijin. What is obvious in looking at the corpus is that using relative markers to build relative clauses is not very common as in Pijin, one can build relative clauses with or without a relative marker. We shall therefore start the analysis of relative clauses in Pijin by looking at those which are built without any relative markers.

5.3.1 Relative clauses built without relative markers.

Free relatives (without relative markers) are the most important way of building relative clauses in Pijin, whether the relative clause is embedded or not, and whether the focus of the relative clause (the head noun) is a subject, a direct object or an oblique object. Some examples, with the embedded relative clauses bracketed, will serve to illustrate.

(38)

Oketa pipol [oketa ranave] oketa go stap lcn bush.
Pulu people SP run away SP AUX stay LOC forest

The people who ran away settled in the forest.

(PS58)

(39)

Oketa pipol ia [oketa go stap insaed bush ia,]
Pulu people DEM SP AUX stay LOC forest DEIC

These people who settled in the forest.

Oketa stap nomoa olsem oketa mental pipol ia.
SP stay DEIC PREP Pulu mental people STM

behaved like crazy people.

(PS58)
Den oketa beid, diskaen smol beid
SEQ Plu bird, DEM small bird

Then the birds, these small birds,

[hem save tiktik olsem ia,] kam nomoa.
SP AUX tiktik ADV. DEIC, come STM

that make a 'tiktik' noise like that came.
(PS48)

Evriwan [i stap lo hia ia]
Everyone SP stay PREP LOC STM

Everyone who lives here,

giant ia kaekaem otta finish.
giant DEM eat 3PP OBJ. PERF

this giant ate them.
(PS48)

Oketa go nomoa lukim giant [hemi itim man ia.]
SP go STM see giant SP eat man STM

They go looking at this giant who eats man.
(PS53)

Mi go wetem olketa pipol [olketa-i go waka loN Ruasura.]
SP go PREP Plu people SP AUX work PREP

I went with the people who went to work in Ruasura.
(PS84)

Almost all of these sentences have one thing in common when it comes to relative clauses: the SP co-referential with the focused head noun signals the beginning of the relative clause and serves as its subject. This is possible only when the focused head noun is co-referential with the subject of the relative clause, as in (38),
(39), (40), (41), (42) and (43), or/and the co-referent of the matrix
11 as in (38), (39), (40). This is obviously impossible in sentences
where there is a switch of reference in which the head noun is the
object of the relative clause, whether it is the subject of the matrix
as in (44) or the object of the matrix as in (45).

(44)
Pig 3PP kill PERF SP ADJ ADV
The pig they had killed was very fat.
(PS9)

(45)
Samfala raesi [mi kuki loc evening]
Some rice SP cook LOC evening
Some rice that I cook in the evening
oketa nao save tekem lo skul.
SP TOP MOD take LOC school
they take to school.
(PS18)

When the SP of the relative clause has as co-referent the focus
head noun, it always introduces the relative clause and therefore
plays the role of the relativizer. Recall that the SP indexes the
noun subject it copies in person and number, and is part of the VP. If
we were to remove the SP from the relative clause, the relativization
of the clause would be lost. The whole sentence would be
ungrammatical or contextually unclear, or would become a chain-claued
sentence. And the only thing that would disambiguate such a sentence
would be the intonation and the pauses; on which speakers rely heavily

11 Matrix refers here to the embedding sentence.
to mark relative clauses as such. For instance, a sentence such as (39) could, with a different intonation, become a chain-claused sentence, instead of a relative one. As a relative sentence, the pause and intonational patterns are as follows:

\[ \text{Oketa pipol} \text{ oketa ranawe], \text{ oketa go stap loN bush.} \]

As a chain-claused sentence, the pause and intonational patterns are as follows:

\[ \text{Oketa pipol}, \text{ oketa ranawe], \text{ oketa go stap loN bush].} \]

The pause and intonational patterns are particularly important to mark a relative clause when the head noun is the object of the relative clause, and when the SP of the relative clause is of the same person and number as the focus head noun. For instance the following sentence could be analysed in two ways according to the pause and the intonation.

*a) [Pikpik ia hemi kilim], [mifala kaekaem]:
\[ \text{Pig DEM SP(3SP) kill SP(1PP) eat.} \]

We ate the pig that he had killed.

*b) [Pikpik ia] [hemi kilim], [mifala kaekaem]:
\[ \text{Pig SP(3SP) kill SP(1PP) eat.} \]

This pig killed it, we ate it.

These relative clauses built without a relative marker are very similar to the ones found in the vernacular languages of my
informants. For instance Lichtenberk (1984:99) states that in To'aba'ita (one of the languages of Malaita) "relative clause simply follow the head noun. They are not introduced by any special form". However Deck (1934:27) states that there are relatives in To'aba'ita and Kwara'ae, and he cites na for To'aba'ita and ne'e for Kwara'ae. This, however, appears to be a special form used where the head noun is direct object of the relative clause, as in Lau (north Malaita), a dialect closely related to To'aba'ita:

(46)
Doo na 'o kwatea
The thing you gave him
(Fox 1974:139)

All of the well described languages of Malaita use pronouns to embed relative clauses. None of the small sketch grammars of the Guadalcanal languages mention relatives, and one specifically states that in'Ghari "La pauvreté de conjonction et de relatifs fait que l'on se sert aussi peu que possible d'incidents et du style périodique. Les propositions viennent à la suite les unes des autres; sans autre lien que la conjonction et". (R.P Bouillon 1915:780)

The unmarked relative clauses are used overwhelmingly by the rural speakers and by the older urban Pijin speakers. Some speakers will use the relative wea, particularly when the head noun is the object or the oblique of the relative clause, as if to avoid any ambiguity. (This seems to be an analogue of the north Malaita na or ne'e).

It is among the urban children that the use of SP as a relative (subject focus) is particularly obvious. As I have mentioned earlier, the children do not generally use the double subject/pronoun copy
rule. Therefore sentences of the type \( \text{SNP+SP+V} \) are rare amongst the children, because for them, the copy pronoun is contextually redundant. However, this otherwise redundant \( \text{SP} \) regularly appears in relative sentences, where its function, as a signal of relativization, is obvious.

5.3.2 What about \( \text{ia} \) bracketing in Pijin?

In Pijin, \( \text{ia} \) bracketing appears in position which could be equated with relativizers. It is therefore worth looking at this phenomenon. Looking at the corpus, it is obvious that in Pijin many relative sentences appear in conjunction with \( \text{ia} \) in bracket positions (Sankoff and Brown 1980). But it is obvious as well that overall, many non-relative sentences appear with \( \text{ia} \) brackets as well. As in Tok Pisin, \( \text{ia} \) in Pijin is a deictic. Following a noun, it acts as a demonstrative, referring back to the word just mentioned, as in:

(47) Den otta putum dish \( \text{ia} \) antap oven.

\( \text{SEQ SP put plate DEM LOC oven} \)

Then they put this plate on top of the oven.

(P547)

Or it is simply marking the end of a sentence, or the end of a meaningful sequence of the sentence, with rising intonation; I then call it a statement marker (STM) as in:

(48) Distaem, mi reredi fo kukim nao \( \text{ia} \).

\( \text{TD SP ready PREP cook DEIC STM} \)

Now I am ready for cooking.

(P568)

Many young speakers literally inundate their speech with deictics
and statement markers (STM) such as *nao, ia, nomoa* and *naia* (a new compounded form of *nao* and *ia*). This passage is an excerpt from a story told by an eight year bilingual girl from Vura:


The children, particularly, use deictics very liberally. They punctuate their sentences with them and change the rhythm and the fluidity of the utterances by marking them with deictics. In the process, some deictics acquire grammatical functions. *Nomoa*, for instance, is in the process of becoming a perfective marker.

The children, either bilingual or native speakers of Pijin, use *ia* extensively, not only to mark the end of a statement, but to mark the end of a meaningful element of a statement. In those statements, *ia* appears in positions that are very similar to the positions of *ia*-relative markers described by Sankoff and Brown for Tok Pisin. Compare for instance (49), and (50).

(49)

Saos iu go *ia*, bae samtting *ia* kaekaem iu *ia*.

COND SP go STM FUT thing DEM eat O STM

If you go, this thing will eat you.
(PS46)
This woman stays inside the hole; she does not go out.

(PS53)

In (49), *ia* is never more than a demonstrative or a statement marker. In (50), it could be either a deictic or a marker of relativization. If it were not for the long pause after the second *ia*, (50) could very well be a sentence with an embedded relative clause bracketed by the two *ia*, in a very typical pattern of *ia* bracketing. However this is not the case, and again, it is the intonational pause pattern that allows us to discriminate between the two.

Moreover, *ia* brackets are usually present in sentences which would nevertheless include a relative clause, even if the *ia* brackets were removed. Compare for instance the two following sentences. In b)

I removed the *ia* brackets.

(51)

a) Wande *nao*, wanfala smoel boe *ia* mam bloN hem and dad bloN hem tufala dae *nao* *ia*, hem stap wetem grani bloN hem.

b) *Wande *nao*, wanfala smoel boe [ ] mam bloN hem and dad bloN hem tufala dae *nao* [ ], hem stap wetem grani bloN hem.

Even without the *ia* brackets, sentence (b) embeds a relative clause: *mam bloN hem and dad bloN hem tufala dae *nao*. What do the *ia* brackets do in sentence such as (a)? It is possible that because of their symmetry, they reinforce the relativization of the clause. However, what is sure about them is that they appear where deictics appear in contemporary Solomon Pijin in non-relative sentences, as
shown above, i.e. at the end of a meaningful part of a sentence, or after a noun they refer back to. It is therefore difficult to decide, on the basis of these observations, if ia brackets are a relativization device in Solomons Pijin. What is obvious however, is that ia is used increasingly by urban speakers, and by children and young adults, more than by older adults, or adults who learnt Pijin in a traditional context. When in relative bracketing position, ia is used more by the children than by the urban adults, but in proportion to the frequency of deictics and statement markers in the speech of each subgroup.

5.3.3 Relatives clauses with relative markers: marked relatives

A relative marker can be used to introduce a relative clause whether the subject, the direct object or the oblique object is in focus.

(52)

Evri prist [weaolketa-i kam bipoa ia]
ADJ priest RM SP come ADV STM

All the priests who came before,
evriwan blON Franis.
ADJ POSS France.

were all from France
(PS84)
Ana oketa [wea de getem peman ia],
STM SP RM SP get payment STM

And those who receive payment,

de baem pikpik.
SP buy pig

buy a pig.
(PS8)

ADJ thing RM SP do SP do ADV STM

The things he does, he does them differently.
(PS36)

Mipala saen long gavamane
SP sign LOC· government (officer)

We signed (to) the government officer

[wea nem bulong hem Mista Bengofu].
RM name POSS Mr Bengough

whose name was Mr. Bengough
(PS94)

In (52) and (54), the subject is in focus. It is the subject of
the relative clause as well as the subject of the matrix sentence, in
which the relative clause is embedded. In (ROUGE), the object is in
focus. It is both the object of the embedded relative clause and the
object of the matrix. Sentences in which the focus object of the
relative clause is at the same time the subject of the matrix have not
been recorded in this corpus, even though they are attested in Pijin.
Thus sentences such as the following are quite possible in Pijin.
(56)

Disfala gele [wea mi lukim.] hemi siki.
DEM. girl RM SP look SP STV

This girl I saw is sick.

In (55), the oblique is in focus. Again sentences in which the oblique focus of the relative clause is at the same time the subject of the matrix have not been found in this corpus. They are, however, quite possible in Pijin.

(57)

Man [wea mi lalai loN hem] hemi kros tumas.
Man RM SP lie PREP SP cross ADV

The man to whom I lied was very cross.

All the above sentences would still have relative clauses if the relative markers were not used. The relative markers are optional in all constructions. They are found in all subgroups of the corpus: rural adults tend to use them particularly when the focused head-noun is in oblique or in object position, thus avoiding an ambiguity that might arise when the SP of the relative is similar in person and number to the oblique or the object, but reference is switched. Wea is used very consistently by urban adults. It is in that group that it appears regularly and is clearly established as a relative. For some speakers, wea is consistently used as a relative marker. For others it is in variation with "free relatives" (i.e., relatives marked only by a pronoun). For instance, informant SP17 produced 26 relative clauses introduced by wea out of a total of 32 relative clauses; the remaining 6 were free relatives. Informant SP18 produced 19 marked relative clauses and 16 free relative clauses. But informant Ps72 produced 41 free relative clauses compared to 8 marked ones.
5.3.4 Summary

This section has analyzed alternative structures of relative clauses in Pijin and their importance in each of the subgroups of the corpus. Rural adults have the choice between free relatives, which they use overwhelmingly, and marked relatives, which they use sparingly. They do so mainly when the relativization is ambiguous because of switched reference. No instance of /a bracketing has been found in the rural corpus. Urban adults exploit all possibilities: free relatives, marked relatives and /a bracketing. Older urban speakers use more free relatives and fewer marked ones; younger speakers use the two first possibilities in variation (even though, as shown above, some tend to use more of one construction than they do of the other). /a bracketing is already present in that corpus, in a proportion which is consistent with the overall increase of deictics in the urban variety of Pijin as a whole. This /a bracketing is even more apparent in the children's speech, where punctuation by /a and other markers has increased markedly. Urban children, who seldom use copy pronouns in other constructions, use pronouns to mark relatives; that is, they use free relatives to build relative clauses. Marked relative clauses are rare in the corpus from the children, where only 4 of them were recorded.

The pattern of change in relativization taking place in Pijin could then be summed up as follows:

a) Rural adults: 1) Free relatives 2) Marked relatives
b) Urban adults: 1) Free relatives 2) Marked relatives 3) /a bracketing
c) Urban children: 1) Free relatives, grammaticalized 3) /a bracketing
5.4 Future markers.

Bae, babae, bambe, and ø (hereafter referred to as bae markers) are among the possibilities available to a contemporary speaker of Solomons Pijin to express what we group under our notions of future or conditional. The slots in which each of these elements are likely to appear in a sentence are multiple. So are the possibilities of linking them with conditional markers like sapos, if etc., or time delimiters like jaem, tumoro, astede etc.. In many cases, a combination of time delimiters and conditional markers is used in conjunction with bae markers. In other cases bae markers stand on their own in the sentences. Some speakers (the old ones particularly) tend not to use the bae markers on a regular basis; in their speech, bae markers appear to be in free variation with ø when the sentence is fronted by a time delimiter marker, or a conditional marker; or in free variation with prepositions marking the passage of time (i.e. den, bihaen); or simply the value of the absent bae marker is conveyed by the context.

In this section we shall look at the behaviour of the bae markers in a historical perspective to focus finally on their behaviour in contemporary Pijin, particularly in the speech of urban Pijin speakers. We shall try at the same time to assess the influences of creolization or substratum language, if any, on such a linguistic device. This study will show as well, that so far as bae markers are concerned, there is more continuity between the speech of urban speakers of Pijin for whom it is a mother tongue and the speech of urban speakers of Pijin for whom it is a second language, than there is continuity between the speech of urban speakers of Pijin as a second language and the speech of rural speakers of Pijin as a second
language. We shall see as well that nativization of the language does not seem to affect as yet the position of bae markers in the sentences or the frequency of redundant constructions employing bae markers with conditional markers and time delimiters.

5.4.1 Bae and Babae: early uses

There are many texts dating back from the last century and the beginning of this one, in which one can find renderings of Pidgin English in the Pacific. The main ones are books written by sea captains, recruiters, beachcombers, traders or adventurers relating, in a novel-like form, their experiences in the Pacific. Excerpts of pidgin, or more precisely, of Beach-la-mar are included in these renderings to add colour to the text. They cannot, in any case, be considered as accurate transcriptions of what the authors have actually heard, for reasons linked to racial and sociolinguistic prejudices and linguistic incompetence on the part of the authors.

The Kanaka Pidgin English of Queensland is rather extensively represented in reports of inquiries and tribunals, such as the 1906 Royal Commission of Enquiry into the Sugar Industry. Melanesian labourers were called as witnesses and their statements in pidgin were transcribed. In some cases, one can find questions in pidgin asked by commissioners. For the reasons stated above, they must be taken cautiously. However keeping this in mind it is still possible to analyse these occurrences.

It is clear in the first place that there were many ways, in Beach-la-mar and later in Kanaka Pidgin English, to express the notion of future — either with nuances of causality, immediacy or not, and with presence or absence of bae markers (transcribed in these texts as
by and by.) This could be done with a conditional marker introducing a clause at sentence initial position such as in:

(58)

Suppose ship ready then I go home.
COND. SEQ.
If there is a ship I will go home.
(QVP.1906.II p.84:2862)

or in clause initial position anywhere in the sentence, such as in:

(59)

This man here make'm me tambu and spos me break' em tambu,
TOP COND
me die.
This man made me taboo and if I break the taboo, I will die.
(Cromar:1935 :167)

In both cases, the conditional leading to a future action is clear, even though there is no future marking device. This construction is in variation with the following:

(60)

Suppose me come along school, by and by me no save fight.
COND FUT
If I go to school, I will not fight anymore.
(Young:1923:47) (around 1886-1887 in Bundaberg)

where both conditional markers and future markers are present, in a construction nowadays very common in Solomon's Pijin (80 of them in the present corpus of occurrences). In these particular cases, (58) has a nuance of immediate consequence and (60) has a nuance of distant consequence. When by and by appears, it is either used in conjunction with a conditional marker as above, with by and by in clause initial position, or it is alone and is then in sentence initial position, as in:
He no like'im school, because he no savee. By and By he like'im plenty, he come all the time. He does not like school because he does not know what it is. At some point, he will like it a lot and he will come all the time. (Young; 1923: 46) (around 1886-1887)

It is interesting to note that from the early days of its stabilization, Beach-la-mar and its offshoot, Kanaka Pidgin English offered to their speakers a wide variety of future-marking constructions: a variety which is in fact very much the same as is found in the variety of Pijin still spoken by the old men in the rural areas of the eastern Solomons, as we shall see later on.

5.4.2 Bae markers today

5.4.2.1 Bambae/Babae becomes Bae

Sankoff and Laberge (1980) have shown, for Tok Pisin in Lae, that a reduction of "bambai" into "bai" was almost complete: they registered only five instances of "bambai" among 395 occurrences of bae markers. They note however that "bambai" was still present in the speech community in particular contexts (e.g. radio broadcasts). Even though these five occurrences of "bambai" were found in the adult subgroup, the age factor did not seem to be a discriminating criterion. They concluded that for their subjects, the change into "bai" had already taken place.

In Solomons Pijin, the situation is not that clear, even though it seems that the urban children have eliminated babae and bambae from their speech. Among 209 occurrences of bae markers produced by the urban children of the Vura corpus, only 5 instances of babae were found. In the urban adult subgroup, 83 instances of bae and 71 instances of babae and bambae were recorded. This gives an appearance.
of balance between the two forms, and we could believe that they are in variation. However if we rearrange the data according to the age of the speakers, it is then clear that usage has shifted strikingly across generations. I divided the adult subgroup into two age groups; the age of 35 was chosen arbitrarily as the discriminating age. Table 5-2 shows the results:

Table 5-2: Occurrences of bae and babae in the urban adult subgroup according to age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers between 25 and 35</th>
<th>Bae</th>
<th>Babae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>J.M.</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.F.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.R.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.N.</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.M.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.M.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speakers over 36 years</th>
<th>Bae</th>
<th>Babae</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B.M.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.S.</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.S.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.K.</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.A.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.B.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results present two subgroups that are a mirror image of one another. Babae is a regular feature of the older adults but is only used in 11% of the cases by younger adults. What are the reasons for this difference? If we oppose the number of occurrences produced by the older speakers of B to the occurrences produced by the speakers of A, a change across generations emerges strikingly. However, we have to pay attention to the sociolinguistic characteristics of the speakers. Informants of group B have all learned Pijin in adulthood, and in traditional contexts of acquisition such as plantations, mission schools, etc.. In this period (especially for the older ones)
the regular pattern (as shown in excerpts of Pijin dating back before the war) was bambae and babae, (written by Europeans as by and by and not bae). It seems likely that although Solomon Islanders would have interpreted babae as a reduplicated form, the continuing superstrate influences of English-speaking Europeans, who would have consistently used by and by (as many who do not master the language well keep on doing today), would have encouraged the preservation of the reduplicated form as standard (see Keesing 1985). These people who had learned Pijin in more traditional contexts arrived in town in full or late adulthood and had never before that time had much chance to practice their Pijin in wider communicative contexts. Even though these people speak a variety of Pijin that is very similar to the variety spoken by the younger adults and by the urban children, they are very much aware of the changes which the language has undergone and are able to point them out. Most were conscious, for instance, of the change of babae into bae when I asked them direct questions about the language itself. Some older informants even expressed value judgments and deplored that the younger generation stretched the language too far and were breaking some rules.

Members of subgroup A, on the other hand, learned their Pijin in their childhood or in their teens and have been living in town for at least 20 years. Their Pijin is much faster than that spoken by the older speakers, resembling in that the urban children. The lack of stress of the first syllable is probably a reason for the reduction to bae, a phenomenon widely spread in the young Pijin speakers' community. Reduction of oketa in oketa, okta or even ota is quite common; expressions like nao la become naia; possessive markers such as bilong become blong, and most commonly bia.
In the rural sample, adults produced 68 occurrences of babae and 54 occurrences of bae. The more conservative in this matter were the older members of that subgroup. The younger ones, who had learned Pijin at school with their peers, or in Honiara, tended to use bae more than babae. But even in the rural sample, the children overwhelmingly used bae more fervently than they used babae.

Obviously, the two forms have been available to the speakers of Solomons Pijin for some time. The older speakers tend to be conservative and use the older forms of babae and bambae (the only ones attested in excerpts of Pacific Pijin dating from the previous century, under the graphy by and by\textsuperscript{12}) more than the younger ones do. The younger generation, i.e. in my corpus the children and the young adults, tend to use bae almost exclusively.

5.4.2.2 Other ways of marking future

As we have seen in section 5.4, there are many ways to express "future" in Solomons Pijin; bae markers are only one of them. Let us look at some of the possibilities, as found in the corpus of texts. For each sentence not using the bae device, I add one sentence produced by the same speaker when using it. I want to point out here that the Pijin perfect markers and deictics nao, ia and naia (a combination of nao and ia) do not convey in Pijin the notion of temporaneity, as Simons (1985) has shown. They do not correlate with bae markers in my data.

\textsuperscript{12}It is worth noting that a nineteenth century French-speaking observer recorded the form as banbaître; Pionnier 1913.
In this case, both sentences begin with the conditional marker *sapos* in initial position. However at the clause initial position, *bae* is in variation with zero, without this having any effect on the meaning of the whole sentence. In both cases, the action to take place in the main proposition depends on what will happen in the conditional clause.

In the following examples, there is no conditional marker in sentence initial position or in clause initial position. However the first example definitely bears a future meaning even without any future marking device. The second sentence uses a future marking device in clause initial position.
Pipol no save wokabaot olsem bifo,
People do not know walk as before,

babae hem sensem ol laef blon Solom,
will it change all life of the Solomons.

In the next pair of sentences, both principal clause and
subordinate clause segments begin with an conditional marker or a
modal marker of some sort. In the first one, the future is
hypothetical.

Sapos mi go, ating mi hapi nao.
If I had gone, I might be happy nao.

Sapos oketa kol fo mifala kam mekem, ating bae mi go meko fo hem
If they ask we come make for them

In the next set of examples, a subsequent action is defined by
the sequencer den and indicates that the events in that particular
sequence will take place in the future.
Eitin novemba, afta skul finish, den mi go.

After the school finishes on November 18, I will go.

Mifala paselem, den mifala bae ovenem hem ia.

We wrap it up then we'll cook it in the oven.

All these examples show clearly that speakers of Solomons Pijin have the choice when it comes to use bae as a future marker. Bae markers are in variation with zero, or with time delimiters or conjunctions, or with conditional and modal markers, and sometimes with a combination of two or three of those as in:

Sapos oketa kasem mi moa, den gel ia, den big gel

Ja hemi kasem hem, den hem kom kasem hia, bae gel ia hem

mi go kilim hem nao.

I go and beat her then.

(PS65)
But it seems that urban children have a tendency to use bae markers more than any of the three other groups comprising the corpus (that is, if we take into account the short period of time during which they were taped). They follow this pattern regularly, and seem to favour bae markers when it comes to giving any nuances of future to a sentence. As they are urban children, and because in other Melanesian pidgins (Tok Pisin for instance) creolization is found in the context of urbanization, we could easily be tempted to link this observation to creolization, and to nativization in particular. Or, and more reasonably, we could link it to pressures on the language, due to a diversification and augmentation of contexts of use, requiring that elements of discourse acquire particular and precise functions in syntax (Sankoff and Brown 1980). Let us look in detail at the number of occurrences of bae markers produced by the children. Of a total of 209 bae markers found in their speech, 103 were produced by 8 children speaking Pijin as a second language or as a second "mother tongue" and 106 by 8 children having Pijin as their only mother tongue. The difference is not significant and so far it does not seem that bilingualism or monolingualism in Pijin affects the number of occurrences of bae markers. Thus, if there is a difference between the speech of urban children and the speech of urban adults as reflected by the extensive usage the former make of the bae markers, this may be so simply because the speech community represented by the children of Vura and Vura school is somehow rather homogeneous, and is different from the speech community of the adults. The difference could be due to a generational change. Or it could be due to the regularization aspect of nativization (as opposed to creative process), which allows for regularization and generalization of
patterns already present in the language to the exclusion of others. What the data from the children show is that they belong in the same category. They show as well that speaking Pijin as a sole mother tongue or in conjunction with another one, is not a significant variable in this particular sociolinguistic environment.

5.4.2.3 Positions of bae markers in sentences

Solomon Islands Pijin is being nativized (I mean here that it is becoming the mother tongue of a generation of children); but so far, nativization does not seem to affect the position of bae markers in the sentences. However, Labov (see Sankoff and Laberge in Sankoff 1980:110) argues that:

It is not at all obvious that a pidgin will develop obligatory tense markers when it becomes a native language. Yet this has happened in case after case. ... When pidgins become creoles, the system of optional adverbs gives way to an obligatory tense marker next to the verb. (Labov 1971:29)

I would like to suggest that what is happening to bae markers in Solomons Pijin is slightly different. As yet, bae markers do not show a tendency to move next to the verb in the speech of children who have Pijin as a sole mother tongue. Nativization has been taking place for more than fifteen years in Honiara and this might not be long enough for the changes to appear. However, if there was an innate propensity in the native speakers of Pijin that would impel them to "transform" their language into a creole, the length of time is not a significant variable here. It should happen as soon as native speakers acquire speech. In this respect, what is happening to bae markers in Solomons Pijin seems to be an exception to the universal rule proposed by Labov. In order to see how this rule applies to Solomons Pijin, I shall examine here the position of bae markers in all groups of the
corpus, and their position in sentences produced by the urban children. One has to keep in mind the sociolinguistic characteristics of Honiara at large and of Vura in particular as described in Chapters 1 and 3 as well as those of the children (Chapter 4).

5.4.2.4 Figures and analysis

As the preverbal position of bae markers had been pointed out by Labov as being one of the characteristics of an obligatory tense marker, I took the preverbal position of bae as a possible index of grammaticalization when it came to regrouping sentences. Accordingly, the sentences have been classified into two main categories. The first one regroups the sentences in which the future marker is located in sentence- or clause-initial position: (Bae/babae)+NP/Ps+/V; the second group comprises sentences in which the future marker is located in a preverbal position: NP/Ps+(Bae/babae)+V. Table 5-3 shows the results of this classification. Very clearly, informants in all four groups of this corpus use with overwhelmingly high frequency a pattern placing bae markers in constructions of the type: Bae+NP/SP+V rather than in constructions of the type: NP/SP+Bae+VP. Surprisingly, it is the rural adult group which presents the higher percentage of bae markers in the preverbal position in the corpus. It is rather interesting for the theory of creole universals that a construction associated in another Melanesian pidgin (Tok Pisin) with the development of creolization through nativization could be found in Solomons Pijin used by children and adults alike, and even more by adults than by children. Clearly, in the case of the Solomons Pijin, the children do not carry further the tendencies shown by the adults. Both constructions have always been available to Pijin speakers and
corpus, and their position in sentences produced by the urban children. One has to keep in mind the sociolinguistic characteristics of Honiara at large and of Vura in particular as described in Chapters 1 and 3 as well as those of the children (Chapter 4).

5.4.2.4 Figures and analysis

As the preverbal position of *bae* markers had been pointed out by Labov as being one of the characteristics of an obligatory tense marker, I took the preverbal position of *bae* as a possible index of grammaticalization when it came to regrouping sentences. Accordingly, the sentences have been classified into two main categories. The first one regroups the sentences in which the future marker is located in sentence- or clause-initial position: \((\text{bae/babae})\cdot \text{NP/PS}+\text{V}\); the second group comprises sentences in which the future marker is located in a preverbal position: \(\text{NP/PS}+(\text{bae/babae})+\text{V}\). Table 5-3 shows the results of this classification. Very clearly, informants in all four groups of this corpus use with overwhelmingly high frequency a pattern placing *bae* markers in constructions of the type: \(\text{bae}+\text{NP/SP}+\text{V}\) rather than in constructions of the type: \(\text{NP/SP}+\text{bae}+\text{VP}\). Surprisingly, it is the rural adult group which presents the higher percentage of *bae* markers in the preverbal position in the corpus. It is rather interesting for the theory of creole universals that a construction associated in another Melanesian pidgin (Tok Pisin) with the development of creolization through nativization could be found in Solomons Pijin used by children and adults alike, and even more by adults than by children. Clearly, in the case of the Solomons Pijin, the children do not carry further the tendencies shown by the adults. Both constructions have always been available to Pijin speakers and
Table 5-3: Percentages of sentences in which bae is either in clause or sentence initial position or in preverbal position.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>91.39</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>90.91</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvuAvu</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>94.88</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adults</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AvuAvu</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>87.71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>475</td>
<td>90.64</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that some children are now using this Pijin as a native language does not affect the distribution of possible constructions across generations. But looking at the data one cannot but be struck by the very big difference found in Solomons Pijin between the two different constructions. Obviously, either in rural or urban settings, the immediate preverbal position of bae markers is not a favourite one. Here, however, we need to look again at pronominal patterns. In most substrate languages of the Solomon Islands, the obligatory pronoun indicating the subject of a clause is incorporated in the verb phrase. If at least some speakers of Pijin are following a corresponding pattern in Pijin (as Keesing, 1985, argues) a bae marker
preceding a "subject pronoun" may constitute a future marker within the verb phrase. Hence, Bae+NP+V constructions and Bae+PS+V constructions may, for some speakers, be radically different.

If we break down the classification of these sentences into more refined categories with respect to the positions of NPs, Ps and bae, some differences appear between the four groups of the corpus. These categories have been so devised because, it seemed obvious by glancing at the corpus that the positions of bae markers were inextricably related to the positions of Subject Noun Phrases (SNP) and Subject Pronouns (SP). With this in mind, four categories were devised, each of them being subdivided into two, according to whether the subject is a noun phrase or a pronoun anaphorically referencing the subject. Where such a pronoun stands alone, I shall label it SP (leaving open the question of its grammatical status); where it reiterates an explicit Subject NP, I shall refer to it as an SRP (Subject Referencing Pronoun). Where two pronouns occur, one in the subject NP slot and one in the SP slot, I shall refer to the first as a Focal Pronoun (FP). The main categories are as follows:

A=Bae+SP+V

(71)
Bae mi kom bek ifining ncmaa.
FUT SP V DIR TD STM
WILL/I/COME/BACK/EVENING/
I will come back in the evening only.
(PS87)
B = Bae + SNP + V

(72)

Bae olketa devol devol bCN olketa lukim.
FUT [ SNP ] V
WILL/PLU/ SPIRITS / POSS./ THEIR/ SEE/
Their ancestor's spirits will see.
(PS73)

C = SNP + Bae + SP + V

(73)

No, mami blong mi bae hem stei.
NEG [ SNP ] FUT SRP V
MUM/POSS. / WILL/SHE/ STAY/
No, my mother will stay.
(PS66)

D = FP + Bae + SP + V

(74)

iu bae iu go insaed.
FP FUT SP V ADV
You/FUT/You/go/inside/
You will go inside.
(PS95)

E = SNP + BAE + V

(75)

Dadi blong mi bae go long ples blong him.
[ SNP ] FUT V PREP place POSS
DADDY/MY/ /WILL/GO/ TO/PLACE/HIS/
My daddy will go to his village.
(PS66)

F = SP + BAE + V

(76)

Mitufala nao bae tekem kom wanfala gel ia.
1PSP TOP FUT V DIR QUANT O STM
WE/ SHALL/TAKE/BACK/A/ GIRL/
The two of us will bring a girl back.
(PS76)
G = BAE + SNP + PP + SP + V

(77)
Bae olketa pipol olketa lae kem.
FUT SNP SP V
WILL/PLU./PEOPLE/THEY/LIKE.
People will like it.
(GL 85 13)

H = elliptical.

(78)
Den tumoro bae finis.
SEQ TD FUT V
Then/tomoro/will/finish.
It will finish tomoro.
(PS50)

Table 5-4 shows the distribution of the various occurrences of bae markers in the categories.

Let us have a look at the different types of sentences in detail.
In the first category, the sentences are of the type: "A" = Bae + Ps + V such as in:

(79)
Bae mi iusim Pijin lo hem.
Bae Ps V
Will/I/use/Pijin/to/him.
I shall use Pijin to speak to him.
(Al.85.1)

or of the type "B" = Bae + NP + V such as in:
Table 5-4: No. of occurrences of *bae* per categories for each subgroup of the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bae</em>+<em>SP</em>+<em>V</em> = A</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72.24%</td>
<td>72.07%</td>
<td>92.30%</td>
<td>63.93%</td>
<td>71.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bae</em>+<em>SNP</em>+<em>V</em> = B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8.44%</td>
<td>2.56%</td>
<td>4.91%</td>
<td>8.21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SNP</em>+<em>Bae</em>+<em>SP</em>+<em>V</em> = C</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.30%</td>
<td>5.84%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11.47%</td>
<td>6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>FP</em>+<em>Bae</em>+<em>SP</em>+<em>V</em> = D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4.09%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>SNP</em>+<em>Bae</em>+<em>V</em> = E</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>5.12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PS</em>+<em>Bae</em>+<em>V</em> = F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.34%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Bae</em>+(<em>SNP</em>/<em>FP</em>)+<em>SP</em>+<em>V</em> = G</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3.27%</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclassifiable(^{13})</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.91%</td>
<td>3.24%</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td>2.10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{13}\)These sentences are inclassifiable due to hesitations appearing after *bae*, because some of them are elliptical and have no subject Np or Ps, or because *bae* has been reduplicated.
Together, A and B comprise the main category of the corpus, representing 79.96% of all occurrences. Category A is the most important one. Category B is of less importance, with a total of 43 occurrences or 8.20% of the corpus. It seems normal that this should be so, as in the context of discourse it is not necessary to repeat a SNP in all the sentences of which it is the subject if the context is clear. Once the SNP has been stated, its weight is carried by a pronoun in the remaining clauses of the sentence, or in the following sentences. In this type of construction, bae is either in sentence initial position (110 cases for A) (and 12 cases for B) or in clause initial position, (64 cases for A and 3 cases for B) in a very traditional pidgin pattern. Sometimes bae markers are preceded by a fronted noun phrase (direct object or oblique, or preposition, either in sentence initial position or in clause initial position (13 for A and 3 for B)).

Within category "A", the main subdivision is A2 (Cond...., bae+SP+v). None of the four groups of the corpus shows a tendency to use these constructions more than any other groups. Table 5-5 shows the results:

Looking at the occurrences of A2 in table 4, it seems that this type of construction has always been available to speakers of Solomon Pijin when they want to mark the future or the conditional. It
Table 5-5: Results of subdivisions A1 and A2 for each subgroups of the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A1 Bae+SP+v</th>
<th>A2 Cond...bæ+ps+v</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>77 51%</td>
<td>32 21.19%</td>
<td>109 72.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>63 56.75%</td>
<td>27 24.32%</td>
<td>90 81.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honiara</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>22 56.41%</td>
<td>3 7.64%</td>
<td>25 69.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>35 45.45%</td>
<td>19 24.35%</td>
<td>54 69.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

appears in all four subgroups of the corpus in almost equal proportion, except among the rural children. Certainly, the data from Queensland and from the southwest Pacific (as mentioned above) show that this possibility already existed at that early stage in the development of this language. One can observe moreover that the rural adults of the corpus, mostly old men who learned their Pijin on plantations in the Solomons between the two wars and old women who learned theirs on mission stations (such as Onepusu or Kwailbis in Malaita), during the same period of time and have not had since a lot of occasion to practice it, tend to use A2 as frequently as the urban adults do and slightly more frequently than the urban children. As any direct influence of urban speech patterns onto rural speech is dubious in view of the sparsity of contact between the two varieties, it seems that the redundant construction A2 has always represented an
important way of marking future. Its consistency in the speech of Solomons Pijin speakers cannot be considered as a recent phenomenon.

All groups seem to use A2 with regularity, depending on context and discourse. Looking again at table 3, one notes that rural adults produce A and B in proportions significantly lower than the ones produced by the other groups. The difference can be found in C and D, which are rather well represented in the rural adults group. We shall see in the next section how one can account for these results.

The quality and role of the bae markers in sentences of A1 or A2 type has always been a problem to analyse. It is tempting to say that bae is a fronted adverb preceding NP/Ps and VP in sentences such as:

(81)
Bae mi wokabaot kombaek.
Adv Ps V Dir
I shall come back.
(PS41)

But looking more closely, it is hard to say that bae is "more fronted" in that sentence than it is in the next one. Both are in clause initial position and in a very traditional pidgin pattern, they fill the slot of the future marker.

(82)
Dad blong mi talem bae mifala go lo West.
PUT Ps V
My father said that we'll go to the West(ern Solomon).
(PS52)

To analyse bae markers as future markers is even more economical in the case of sentences of type A2, beginning with an conditional marker. The conditional marker needs not to be tagged by another future marking device in clause initial position, but when it is the
case, the redundant bae looks more like a future marker separated from the VP by an embedded SP or NP, than like an adverb. As we have seen earlier, the redundancy of bae in this type of construction is nothing new in the development of the Solomons Pijin. This redundancy is very frequent as well in sentences starting with a time delimiter. In these cases, bae markers are in the slot immediately following the time delimiter, and may well be a future marker within the VP, preceding the embedded SP, such as in:

(83)

Tude nāo bae mi go askem noa.
TD TOP FUT SP AUX V ADV
Today I will ask her again.
(PS53)

or in constructions similar to A2, such as:

(84)

Tāem skul finish bae mifala go ranran.
TD FUT SP AUX V
When school is over we shall go running.
(PS42)

However, as Keesing (1985) points out, if speakers were following substrate patterns in the last two sentences, the future markers would not be separated from the VP by a pronoun (mi or mifala); rather, the pronoun would be incorporated within the VP, and so would the future marker. In both analyses, the future marker is part of the VP or again, the time delimiter can be found in the slot immediately following the bae marker such as in:
Bae next following wik mifala go lo skul.
FUT TD SP V PREP school
We shall go to school next week.
(P93)

It is worth noting that in my corpus, only rural speakers of Pijin, either children or adults - who by definition speak Pijin as a second and secondary language - are putting time delimiters in such a slot. None of the urban speakers do so.

The next category comprises subdivisions C = SNP+Bae+SP+V and D = FP+Bae+SP+V. This category represents 8.20% of all occurrences. If we look at Table 3 we note that it is more productive in the rural adult subgroup and represents 15.57% (or 19 cases) of all bae sentences produced by this group. These types of constructions are not very frequent in the urban subgroups, where they represent 6.21% of the children's sentences and 6.09% of the adults' sentences. It is interesting to note at this point that the vernacular languages of Malaita and Guadalcanal offer the same possible way of building future sentences. The future marker is placed as free or bound particle either between SNP and SP, or between SP and V. It is difficult at this point to explain why this type of construction is more important in the rural subgroup. One can look at it from the substratophile's (in Bickerton's terminology) point of view and consider that among all the options of marking future offered to the Pijin speaker, rural speakers will tend to use these constructions more than any other groups because it is an option available to them in their vernacular languages as well. Note that future marking constructions such as type A are equally available in the vernaculars of the informants of
If the calquing was really happening, we could only say that the more the Pijin speakers were distanced from their vernaculars the less important this category would be in their speech. Looking at Table 5-6, we note that this is exactly what is happening. Monolingual Pijin speakers who are definitely not in a position of calquing because they do not know a vernacular language, hardly use these constructions. Moreover, they tend to use construction A = bae+SP+V more than any of the other groups. As clearly shown in Table 5-6, monolingual Pijin speakers hardly use the constructions in which bae is in preverbal position. They clearly use A+B more than the other groups. As I mentioned earlier, categories A,B,C and D are part of the future marking system of both vernaculars and Pijin. Pijin speakers and vernacular speakers have, it seems, the same possibilities. With a slight difference however: constructions of type A and B are favoured Pijin constructions to mark future, and constructions of type C and D are favoured vernacular constructions to mark future. Looking at Table 3 again, we see clearly the shift in the proportions of A+B and of C+D sentences in the different subgroups. While the proportion of A+B increases from top to bottom, the proportion of C+D decreases, and this is in parallel with the contact speakers have with a vernacular (and their use of a double subject/copy pronoun rule). What is striking here is the similarity in the occurrences produced by urban

---

14 Their vernaculars are: For the rural corpus: Kwaio, Kwara'ae and Toamba'ita on the island of Malaita and Tolo on the island of Guadalcanal; for the urban corpus: 'Are'are, Baelelea, Kwaio, Langalanga, Lau, To'amba'ita and Sa'a on the island of Malaita; Ghari on Guadalcanal; Arosi on Makira; Varisi on Choiseul; Luangiu on Ontong Java; Renellese on Bellona and Gilbertese.
Table 5-6: Occurrences of A+B and C+D in the corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A+B</th>
<th>C+D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural adults</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban adults</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bilingual urban children (Pijin and Ver.)</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unilingual urban children (Pijin only)</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>384</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aduls and bilingual urban children. While rural adults tend to use more widely all the options offered to them to mark future, urban speakers of Pijin tend to narrow down the use they make of this range of possibilities, to the point of not using C and D at all, as in the case of monolingual Pijin speakers.

Now the problem is this: if all four categories are part of the Pijin system, as I have argued earlier, why would these urban children focus on some constructions rather than others? There are many possible reasons for this. First the overwhelming proportion of A compared to all the other constructions gives it the status of the

15The urban children subgroup has been divided into two groups: monolingual Pijin speakers and bilingual Pijin speakers. The monolingual Pijin speakers do not know a vernacular; the bilingual children do.
main future marking construction. It is the one children will hear most and the one they can identify easily. Therefore if they are to produce a future sentence, it is most probable that they will produce this one; particularly when they do not have a vernacular language that could interfere or suggest a different way of building such a sentence. Second, one has to think in terms of economy of change. If it is theoretically admitted that when becoming creole, pidgins acquire semantic and syntactic redundancy, it is equally admitted that linguistic change can include loss of a non-functional redundancy. It is more economical to produce sentences of type A than sentences of type C.

Note, however, that sentences of Type A can be products of a rule that obligatorily incorporates a subject pronoun in the VP, with option of adding a focal pronoun in the SNP slot, for emphasis (type C). For users of the copy pronoun rule, a sentence of type C may be an optional expansion of type A (hence their differential frequency). A similar distribution of sentences of type A and C probably exists in many of the vernacular (if we accept that in some, the future-marker is suffixed rather than prefixed to the SP with the verb phrase).

Categories E and F (in which bae is in preverbal position) are interesting in many ways. If you recall, these constructions have been identified in Tok Pisin as becoming very important particularly in the speech of native speakers. In Sankoff and Laberge's corpus, this type of bae sentences represented 151 occurrences out of 404. This category represents thus 37.37% of their corpus. Looking at

---

16 Sankoff and Laberge 1980.
Table 2, it is obvious that this category is not an important one in Solomons Pijin: it represents only 7.25% of the corpus or 38 occurrences. Moreover, these constructions are more important in the rural adults subgroup, where they represent 10.65% of the *bae* sentences produced by this group, than they are in the urban subgroups, where they represent 5.85% in the urban adult corpus and 6.69% in the urban children corpus. These constructions seem to be available to all Pijin speakers, across generational and geographical boundaries. And once more it seems that we are dealing here with a rather conservative construction, as urban speakers produced such constructions only half as frequently as rural speakers. If we divide again the urban children into two groups it is clear that monolingual Pijin speakers do not tend to produce this type of construction (8 occurrences) more than bilingual Pijin speakers (8 occurrences). The Solomon Island corpus does not show that this construction could be associated with monolingual or bilingual nativization.

We can thus start to analyse E and F in a new light. For instance one could say that E and F are variants of C and D. If SP in C and SP in D are subject copying pronouns and thus do not fill any syntactical function, they are likely to be dropped as redundant if the context of discourse does not require that the subject be topicalized or if the subject is contextually clear of any ambiguity. As we have seen in 5.1, the otherwise obligatory SP can optionally be dropped in such contexts. The preverbal position of *bae* in E and F would thus appear to be due not to its movement from a sentence or clause initial position into the VP but rather to a redundant pronoun being dropped from constructions such as C and D. This is particularly true in the
case of E where the subject is a noun phrase and is contextually clear. This type of construction is much more important in the rural corpus than F is.

5.4.3 Summary

In this analysis I have attempted to show how bae markers are used by speakers of Solomons Islands Pijin. It is clear that marking future with a bae marker is only one of the possibilities offered to Pijin speakers to build future sentences. It is obvious too that there are many ways to incorporate bae markers in future sentences. In this respect we have to remember some points.

1) When it comes to usage of bae markers by speakers of Solomons Pijin, the main opposition lies between MAIN LANGUAGE vs SECONDARY LANGUAGE rather than between MOTHER TONGUE vs SECOND LANGUAGE. This opposition overlaps the RURAL/URBAN opposition. As I have stressed before, Pijin is always a second and secondary language in rural areas. In urban areas, it is either a second language or a first language (along with a vernacular in most cases), but it is a main language for most of the speakers.

2) In Solomons Pijin, bae markers cannot be studied independently from the pronominal system as their position in various constructions is concomitant with the use of subject pronouns. What superficially appears to be a movement of bae markers close to the verb from sentence or clause initial position, could in some cases be caused by a redundant copy pronoun/predicate marker being dropped. Thus
(86)  
*a) George bae hem kom  
SNP  FUT  SP  V  
George will come  

can become  

(87)  
*b) George bae kom  
SNP  FUT  V  
George will come  

if the redundant SP has been dropped. This explanation is particularly tempting as constructions such as George bae hem kom are found in rural speakers' speech but are hardly being used by urban speakers, and constructions such as George bae kom are less important in urban speech than they are in rural speech. (Refer to Table 3, categories C and E). It seems that these two types of constructions are in variation in the rural adult sample and could represent two varieties of the same form. This would explain why constructions such as "George bae kom" would not be important in the urban sample, as forms with which they are in variation hardly occur in that speech community.

3) Rural speakers tend to use a wider variety of bae constructions than urban speakers. I have noted earlier that the more Pijin speakers were distanced from their vernacular to the point of having none, the more they tended to lose complicated bae structures which incorporate subject referencing pronouns or predicate markers. In this case, monolingual Pijin speakers do not innovate constructions, but rather tend to lose some that were manifest in the speech of bilingual Pijin speakers. Doing so they tend to focus on one
particular construction of *bae* sentences -- type \( A = \text{Bae} + \text{Ps} + V \), which they use overwhelmingly. In some ways, the loss of \( C = \text{SNF} + \text{Bae} + \text{SP} + V \) and \( D = \text{FP} + \text{Bae} + \text{SP} + V \) by the monolingual generation of Pijin speakers can be seen as a dynamic process of regularisation of forms which used to be in variation.

This is probably the most important aspect of the study of the future marking in Solomon Islands Pijin. We observe here, then not a multiplication of future marking devices but a regularisation of the forms which are in variation in rural speech and a specialisation of the functions assumed by these different forms.

4) In Solomon Islands Pijin, constructions putting *bae* markers in an immediately preverbal position are not favourite ones. Nor can they be associated with nativization. They are found in all subgroups of the corpus and particularly in the rural adults subgroup. Because they are more important in the rural adult subgroup than in the urban adult subgroup we can erase the possibility that the occurrences found in the latter could be due to feedback action from the monolingual speakers' speech onto the bilingual urban speakers' speech. I would rather say that this construction has always been available to Pijin speakers but that urban speakers tend to lose it because they do not exploit all the possible *bae* constructions. Indeed, the urban speakers show a more pervasive pattern and a greater frequency of using *bae* markers preceding noun subjects (construction type B) than do the rural adults; whereas the latter more regularly use *bae* markers to mark future tense or "non-accomplished mode" within the verb phrase, preceding a clitic subject referencing pronoun (construction types C and D). They are thus violating "Labov's law".
At the same time, we can put aside a possible explanation that this particular construction be a result of anglicisation. If that were the case, only urban speakers in regular contact with English should produce it. As most occurrences are found in the subgroup having the least contact with English, and mainly no contact at all, I am tempted to say that this is a Pijin construction which has been part of the Pijin grammar long enough for the rural adults to acquire it and that it is due neither to nativization nor to anglicization, although the superstrate influence of "by and by" may have helped to keep bae reduplicated as baebae or bambae and optionally fronted through the period of plantation usage.

Moreover, monolingual Pijin speakers do not follow the trend shown by the adults. But most interesting here is the fact that what is happening to the bae markers in the speech of monolingual pijn speakers after 20 years of nativization of the language, is not very different from what is happening in the speech of bilingual pidgin speakers living in the same sociolinguistic environment. Does this mean that these two groups of speakers living in the same speech community and subjected to the same sociolinguistic expectations and constraints are likely to produce a variety which differs from the other variety of the corpus mainly because the eventual input of vernaculars is not as important or simply absent? Or does this mean that 20 years of nativization (one generation) is not long enough for the effect that have been attributed to it become apparent in Solomons Pijin? Or does this mean that nativization is unrelated to whether one is acquiring one language natively as it is possible to acquire natively a language that is not one's mother tongue in the usual sense?
Solomons Pijin is undergoing changes which have to do with its own system. To think that the changes taking place in Pijin must all be due either to nativization or to anglicization would not do justice to the dynamics of the language or acknowledge the sociological context which fosters it.
Judging by the description I made of Pijin usage in Honiara, there is no doubt that one of the varieties of Solomon Islands Pijin spoken in town is socially and functionally a creole. This variety is shared by adults and children alike. These adults, who speak a creolized variety of Pijin did so before children were born in town in sufficient numbers to form a speech community of their own. Adults, I argue, spoke creolized Pijin before nativization took place and then taught the language to their children. Since this interpretation runs counter to conventional views of creolization, it demands a careful examination of the language variety and of its uses, and of the concepts of "creolization" and "creole".

It also demands a careful comparison between the creole variety spoken by the adults and of the creole variety spoken by the children. If there is a difference, the obvious temptation (given the linguistic theoretical tradition we lived with for so long), is to attribute the differences, if any, to nativization and to the wider contexts of use to which creole is put as a mother tongue by the children. But we must remember as well that these differences may represent the passage of a generation in the history of the language. We know that all languages are changing, that in any speech community the language of
children differs from the language of their parents and even more from that of their grand-parents.

How, then, do we know what to attribute to nativization and what to attribute to the passage of time and the natural transformations the language is undergoing in the course of its social life?

It is time then to return to the main questions raised in the introduction, in the light of the historical, sociological and linguistic evidence I have set out in the preceding chapters.

1) What is creolization?
2) Can a pidgin become a creole without being nativized?
3) Who, of the parents and of the children, initiate the change?
4) To what process is creolization due: language acquisition, language creation or language change due to sociolinguistic expansion?

6.1 Creolicity

We may know what a Pacific (as opposed to Atlantic) pidgin is, but we still do not know what a Pacific creole is. This ignorance is not due to lack of descriptions: the main varieties, Solomons Pijin excepted, have been extensively covered. It is probably due to the fact that we have remained bound by traditional definitions of what pidgins and creoles are, and traditional views of how a pidgin becomes a creole. Definitions of pidgins and creoles have incorporated the following elements: a pidgin is a vehicular language, stabilized and transmissible, coined with the elements of at least two languages; its simplified and reduced structure is in parallel with the limited communication contexts in which it is used. It is always a second language and answers the communication needs of speakers having no other language in common.
In contrast, a creole is a pidgin which has acquired native
speakers and concomitantly, a more complicated structure, in parallel
with the expanded communication contexts of use as a mother tongue.
Pidgin speakers have a native language to fall back on. Creole
speakers have only creole to fall back on. Pidgin speakers are
inherently at least bilingual, where creole speakers do not need to be bilingual.

Clearly, these elements of definition oppose the two varieties of
language, as if they were different from one another and as if this
difference was due to the pidgin becoming the mother tongue of a new
generation of children. When both terms became commonly used in the
literature, they were meant to describe phenomena which were clearly
delimited by social functions and social context, and also by
linguistic characteristics. Scholars of these languages agreed that
pidgins were simplified and reduced forms. But of what? Nobody
agreed, and there is still no consensus. Harris (1984) and Siegel
(1985) have reviewed the theories of pidginization, and showed that in
the fifteen years since DeCamp's summary (1971) of these theories,
nothing has changed. The same stumbling blocks are there. Similarly,
most scholars have agreed that creolization meant expansion of a
pidgin; however, problems arose when the time came to describe the
nature of the expansion and the processes involved. It is only
recently (Mühlhäusler 1980) that some precise and constructive
description of what expansion meant has been offered to us.

To a scholar of a southwest Pacific pidgin, these definitions
seem very "atlanticocentric"; particularly in view of the contemporary
pidgin speaking situation one can witness in Melanesia, where pidgins
remained as such (i.e. as second languages) for almost a hundred years, before recently being nativized. Moreover, the opposition posited between the two forms of language seems much too conservative: it does not take into account the sociolinguistic pressures to which pidgins have been subjected, particularly in urban settings, even before nativization has taken place, or the degree of expansion and stabilization attained by pidgin dialects long before nativization took place. We find an enormous gap between stereotypes of pidgin languages still prevailing among linguistic theorists, such as Givón (1984: 290-291), who asserts that

Pidgins have only a minimal syntax, with virtually no complex/embedded constructions or morphology. Further, the speech of the Pidgin community is even more variable than the norm in non-contact language communities. The Pidgin itself is a rather restricted communicative code, in terms of expressive power, topics of discussion, speed of communication and independence of immediate context. The parent generation thus displays imperfect learning of a second language. Given both the variability and limited expressive range of the parents' Pidgin, the children never try to acquire it. Rather, they extract the only reasonably stable feature from the Pidgin - the lexicon, and then go on to invent the Creole grammar from scratch, presumably relying on their human-universal faculty of language/communication. (Emphasis his)

and the pidgin spoken by fluent older speakers in plantation settings in Vanuatu, the Solomons, and Papua New Guinea, manifesting rich syntactic complexities.

Moreover, these definitions led us to believe that there should be only one kind of pidgin (or pidginization) and one kind of creole (or creolization), thus encouraging some scholars (Bickerton 1981:4; 1984) to dismiss as exceptions or oddities other pidgins and creoles not matching the classic definitions perfectly. I feel that in order to understand what pidgins and creoles are, we should stop pretending that they represent homogeneous categories of languages, or that they should do so.
As Muhlhäuser has shown (1974, 1979), the equation pidgin-simple language is no longer the only analysis one can make of pidgin phenomena, particularly if we accept to take into account the many contemporary situations in which pidgins are spoken. Pidgins in the Pacific have long overflowed the traditional contexts of use within which they were circumscribed, not only by history, but as well by restrictive definitions. They have gone beyond their original bounds, in the contexts of their use and in their semantic and syntactic richness and stability. And in the process, they have gone well beyond the traditional functions they were fulfilling, as mere secondary languages.

Bearing in mind that a pidgin is

1) first and foremost a social phenomenon,
2) that language can be understood only in relation to its social life,
3) and that through their language, speakers engage themselves in a system of social relations,

we can approach the problem of creolization more easily. If we accept that Marcellesi and Gardin's notion of "reflet" (1974:250) is apt and if accordingly "la langue est le reflet de l'histoire en autant qu'elle est elle-même le reflet du monde", then changes in the language and in the functions it usually assumes are linked to changes in the conditions and contexts of use, as well as to the position of its speakers in the interplay of the sociolinguistic relations (Robin 1973).
Pidgins in the Pacific, and SIP in this particular case, have expanded in their functions concomitantly with the social world of their speakers. In pre-war Solomon Islands, for instance, the only pidgin speakers were men, who had been outside of their home village to work as labour on plantations, somewhere in the group. They were typical speakers of pidgin, and the use they made of it was archetypical of the pidgin situation. They used their Pijin in multilingual contexts only, in particular and limited social settings and interactions, with non-wantok co-workers, or with overseers or recruiters. With wantoks or back home, they would return to their mother tongue. According to the old definitions, no one at the time was a creole speaker of Solomon Islands Pijin. It was not even thought possible that such an eventuality could occur, as most members of the then British Administration considered that Pijin had no chance of social or geographical expansion, and expected it to be replaced by, or change into, English.

However, urbanization changed the game, as it recreated the multilingual context earlier provided by the plantation system: with major differences, however, in that all members of the society, and not only the men, became members of and contributed to this multilingualism. Moreover, their participation in this multilingual context could now be for a long time, or permanently, whereas it used to be for only two or three years. Young couples went to town, families settled down, children were born. Some grew up as creole speakers of Pijin, others as pidgin speakers of Pijin (according to the traditional definitions), but both groups used Pijin with the same aims at communications and the same needs.
In arguing that these traditional definitions are inadequate, I am arguing that a pidgin becomes a creole NOT because it has acquired native speakers, but because both the traditional contexts of use and the traditional sociolinguistic positions of its speakers have changed. Nativization need not be the causal factor of creolization. It is only one of many aspects that creolization takes. If we want to push the idea further, it is only one of the results of pre-existing "creolicity". By "creolicity" I mean sociolinguistic conditions in which creolization (i.e. the processes by which a pidgin becomes the main and primary language of a stable and permanent speech community) can be realized, and in which nativization is likely to take place. I have described these conditions, in the Solomons, in Chapter 4. By extension, a creole is a pidgin that has become the main and primary language of a stable and permanent speech community. Because of its new functions, the language will naturally be transformed. Accordingly, pidgin and creole varieties of the same language, defined socially, can coexist. They are not mutually exclusive. What is important here is not that one of the varieties is a mother tongue, but rather that the two varieties serve different functions in the course of their socio-linguistic transformations. If among others, one function of a creole is to serve as a mother tongue, that does not allow us to equate creole with mother tongue.

I believe it is Mühlhäusler (1980) who stressed that a nativized pidgin could emerge anywhere on the pidgin-creole continuum. Depending on the stage at which this nativization happens, sources of
structural expansion will vary. Table 6-1, taken from Mühlhäusler (1980:32), shows the possibilities:

Table 6-1: Types of Creolization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE 1</th>
<th>TYPE 2</th>
<th>TYPE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jargon</td>
<td>Jargon</td>
<td>Jargon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creole (W.I. English Creole)</td>
<td>Stabilized Pidgin</td>
<td>Stabilized Pidgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creole</td>
<td>Expanded Pidgin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Creole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to make a few remarks.

1) A Pidgin can be highly successful (in terms of its syntactic and semantic richness, communicative potential, and stability) without creolization, as the Melanesian pidgins have proved.

2) If one thinks of creolization and nativization in terms of the social success of a pidgin, then Solomon Island Pijin in town has finally "made it", in becoming the "natural" language of the speech community.

3) In order to succeed, creolization in that sense must take place at a point on the social continuum when sociolinguistic conditions require that the functions of the language encompass a variety of communication situations. These new sociolinguistic conditions can emerge within one generation, or after eighty years, as is the case in the Solomons. If nativization takes place too early on the social continuum, it is doomed to failure, because the social context necessary to allow its efflorescence does not yet exist. On
the other hand, creolization in my sense will always take place (assuming that the linguistic preconditions exist) at the proper stage of the social continuum, because it is inherently the product of this continuum. If the social continuum provides pidgin speakers with creolicity, creolization will take place. Subsequently, nativization will probably occur.

Solomon Islands Pijin is being nativized very late in its history, following in that the typical pattern of the South West Pacific Islands pidgins. One hundred years after the beginning of the Queensland era, and sixty years after the beginning of the Solomons phase, Pijin is becoming the mother tongue of a new generation (Chapter 1). But this could only happen in a context where everyday life meant extensive usage of Pijin by the adult population. This was an adult population composed of individuals who had been living in town for many years and who had used their second language as a main language for many years, thus relegating their own vernacular mother tongue to the position of a secondary language (Chapter 4). From no one's language to everybody's language, Pijin became in town the symbol and the cradle of new Melanesian aspirations and identities.

Just as a pidgin does not become a creole overnight, the contexts of Pijin usage do not become the contexts of creole usage overnight. The changes affect almost all sectors of the previous pidgin speaking community, and have as foundation the speakers' new sets of attitudes and expectations towards the speech community and the language itself. Creolicity thus entails:

a) new ideological notions of self-perception and group identity;
b) a permanent pole of identification different from what it used to be (village versus town);

c) new socioeconomic and sociolinguistic conditions;

d) a new consensus on the interplay between the individual, the group and these new conditions.

The notion of consensus is important, and so is the notion of permanency, as it is through them that successful reproduction of the language will be achieved. It is through them as well that adhesion to the language or appropriation of the language by its speakers will be achieved. Without a recognized need by the population to adhere to Pijin, in a particular socio-economic environment where multilingualism is the natural milieu and access to the superstrate is restricted, creolicty and thus nativization could not take place. However, one has to recognize that the sociolinguistic and socioeconomic situation is such that it forces this consensus onto the permanent members of the urban population who want to have a social life in this environment. Even those who do command English must speak Pijin every day in a wide range of contexts. What is even more important is that Pijin becomes the legitimate language of the speech community. History has shown that legitimation of a language is in most cases imposed onto a group. In these cases, legitimacy is achieved through ideology and power. Eventually it is reinforced by the weight of history and by administrative and symbolic artefacts such as schooling and literature. In a case such as that of Pijin, adhesion to and legitimacy of the language comes from within the speech community. Pijin is not imposed onto Honiara dwellers by a particular group or class. (On the contrary, it is the language that the former colonial power, and some members of the contemporary urban
elite, hoped to be able to eradicate.) Pijin is imposed on them by the practical circumstances of life. To ensure that Pijin will be practically successful as the language of the community, most speakers will have to develop positive attitudes towards it, even though some members of the elite espouse the anti-Pijin ideology of the former colonial rulers. In Honiara, most parents have such positive attitudes, as we have seen in section 4.2. The same language they acquired as adults as a de facto necessity becomes in a much more automatic and natural way the language of their children, and part of their linguistic heritage. Thus there is no creolicity in the Solomon Islands plantation systems, whereas creolicity is realized in Honiara, as shown in Chapters 3 and 4. If creolicity is not established, creolization and its offshoot nativization, cannot be successfully realized.

6.2 Solomon Islands Creole and its makers

In Honiara, Pijin is the main language of the population: a main and primary language which has superseded the vernaculars in most sociolinguistic contexts, other than the wantok system. Thus Pijin in Honiara is functionally and socially a creole. However, it would be misleading to believe that this creole is a homogeneous, cohesive and uniform language which prevails in the town to the exclusion of the pidgin varieties of SIP. Many varieties of Solomons Pijin exist in town due to the important linguistically, socially, practically, and functionally differentiated experiences of its speakers. Thus pidgin and creole varieties of Solomon Pijin coexist in town; their existence is intrinsically linked to the position and participation of their respective speakers in the speech community.
Some residents of Honiara use Pijin as a pidgin; however they are a minority. They are usually part of the transient labour force and the use they make of the language as a pidgin is temporary and limited by their lack of urban experiences. The longer they are part of the urban scene and the more deeply they get involved in networks of urban sociolinguistic relations, the more the uses they make of Pijin change and expand. When visitors cease to rely on their wantoks for daily practical, economic and psychological survival; when they start to initiate urban ties and experiences of their own; when they become independent from the village pole of identification and consider and assert themselves as town dwellers, then the use they make of their pidgin overflows the traditionally restrictive and limited usage within which the language has been circumscribed. Their Pijin becomes their life in town and quickly replaces the vernacular mother tongue as the primary linguistic medium of everyday life. The Pijin they use shifts toward the creole used by town speakers, both in its linguistic character and in the uses they make of it. Such a speakers, increasingly caught up in the conditions I have described as creolicity, acquire the linguistic coin of this newly entered realm. What this shift entails linguistically has for the moment been left aside.

I have noted that pidgin and creole varieties of the same language can coexist synchronically in the speech community. Some people are speakers of one variety, some are speakers of the other. Moreover, both the creole and pidgin varieties include not only variant phonologies and alternative patterns, but a range of registers. Some people are able to use these registers expertly and
exploit all the variability offered to them. They adjust their speech, as speakers of any other language do, according to the addressee, the subject and the effect they want to obtain. This is, of course, particularly true of the elite, who have access to all the registers and know their value. But this is true as well of the widely travelled villagers who cannot help notice the difference between the Pijin they use in their village and the varieties of Pijin they might come across in Honiara.

6.3 Parents and children in the creolization process

Let me turn now to the linguistic aspect of creolization. There is no doubt that in Honiara, Pijin is expanded and creolized in some respects. It shows some of the characteristics of creole languages as posited by Mühlhäusler (1980) gradual introduction of redundancy (future markers used in conjunction with conditional markers or sequencers); increase in derivational depth (relatives); development of grammatical devices for non-referential purposes (statement markers); gradual increase of morphological naturalness (prepositional verbs reanalysed as verbs).

This shows that it is not necessary for a pidgin to be nativized to be expanded. The participation of native speakers of Pijin in its creolization has, in the Solomons, been minimal, because the language was already socially and functionally a creole by the time the native speakers were in a sociolinguistic position allowing them to have any impact on the language. In this case, Pijin had already significantly expanded to meet its social requirements.

Therefore, as I suggested earlier, nativization may bring little change to a language if it occurs when creolicity has already taken
place. The case of Juba Arabic, cited by Goodman (1985), illustrates that point very well. Juba Arabic is a pidgin spoken in southern Sudan; its nativized version, Kirubi, is spoken in Uganda. Besides phonological and lexical differences, the two versions differ from one another by only one syntactic feature (Nhial 1975): nativization of Kirubi has not significantly changed its structure. Tok Pisin is another good example. Sankoff and Muhlhausler have shown that the children had a minimal influence of the transformation of the language after nativization. Sankoff and Laberge (1980) and Sankoff and Brown (1980) particularly, showed that the changes appearing in the children's speech were already present in their parents' speech. In the same line of thought, Goodman argued (1985:119) in his review article of Bickerton (1981), that in some cases of creolization, native speakers have a negligible influence.

Thus, it is possible that creole languages likewise achieved stability, homogeneity, and elaboration with negligible participation of native speakers. Furthermore, it is by no means certain that pidgins develop substantially different structures once they become nativized.

We shall see in this section what types of changes we can attribute to the adults and what kind of changes we can attribute to the children.

We have seen in Chapter 5 that Solomons Pijin has been undergoing qualitative and quantitative changes. The qualitative changes are more obvious when we compare rural Pijin and urban Pijin than they are when we compare varieties spoken by urban adults and urban children. The qualitative changes consist mainly, in a streamlining of forms that used to be in variation in rural speech and apparent loss or
reanalysis of morphological forms closely patterned on those of substrate languages. The quantitative changes are of three kinds: further streamlining of variable forms; syntactic or discursive specialization of the remaining forms; and analytical regularization.

Looking at my data, it is obvious that the urban adults are initiating the changes in many aspects of the language: the pronoun copy rule is being left aside; statement markers and deictics are used increasingly with *ia* bracketing as an indirect result; transitive suffixes are being marked with *hem* as explicit object; prepositional verbs are being reanalyzed as transitive verbs. Phonological regularization and reduction are beginning. But for these adult speakers, the new forms are in variation with the old ones, hence do not bear a heavy syntactic or discursive load. The tendencies to change are there to be picked up, expanded upon or regularized. This is exactly what the children are doing.

My data show that the Pijin spoken by monolingual speakers is very similar to the Pijin spoken by the bilingual speakers. What does this mean? It means that nativization, if by that we mean acquisition of a single language natively, does not seem to bring much innovation in Pijin, as the Pijin of the parental generation is already linguistically expanded and socially creolized. It means as well that the role of the adults and the role of the children in the process of creolization are different: adults seem to have a creative impact on the language, whereas the children seem to have a regularization impact. In that sense, the process of nativization in Solomon's Pijin seems to be a process of regularization more than a process of
creation. What regularization does is to systematize what Valdman (1980:217) calls the grammatical machinery. The speech variety thus becomes less dependent on context and less open to free variation.

Looking at Chapter 5, we observe that this is exactly what is happening. The children are streamlining and regularizing Pijin. This happens in two ways:

1) They strip the language of some forms that are irregular or not functionally fixed.

2) Doing so, they get to the core of the Pijin system and exploit it. Language universals are at work, through regularization of paradigms and systematization of functions. For instance, the pronominal paradigm is regularized, and the future markers and copy pronouns are syntacticalized. Like any other children learning a first language, they try to eliminate all forms that they analyse as being anomalies in an otherwise well organized system, while, at the same time, overgeneralizing the rules.

Regularization does not mean that certain forms are going to be automatically eliminated. It means that in certain cases, new forms will be taken from the pool of possibilities existing in the system of the language and will be used to fill new syntactic or discursive functions within a paradigm. In that light, if one wants to regularize the syntax of the object pronouns used after a transitive verb, it is more economical to add one form to the paradigm than to remove all the other ones. Is this process equivalent to a process of creation? I do not think so.

Systematization of functions is another form of regularization. It does not imply addition or suppression of forms, but rather guarantees that variation will be controlled. In substance, what the
systematization process does is to allocate complementary niches (semantic, syntactic or discursive) to the forms in variation.

Some of the modifications appearing in the adults' speech seem to be generated discursively (e.g. the proliferation of deictics and statement markers). The children are reanalysing these modifications as being inherent to the system and grammaticalizing them. The parents, or the adults in general, are supplying the children with the input. Nativization is then seen as reanalysis of Pijin discursive strategies, as stressed by Sankoff (1983:245):

"It has been proposed that creolization involves people generating linguistic rules for which they have no evidence in the linguistic input they receive. I suggest that what people do is reanalyse "grammatical" input that is generated "discursively".

Thus my data show clearly that the creative impact of the children on the language is negligible; however, they show that the regularization impact they have on it is considerable. Of course, these children represent so far the first and only generation of native speakers of Pijin. One can surmise that the differences between the parents' and the children's speech is a difference of degree and not of essence. This is so because they live in an environment where the sociolinguistic constraints are similar, and are, moreover, controlled by the adults.

However, we have to keep in mind that the "nativizing" generation is still very young. The children of my corpus are between eight and 14 years of age. As children they use Pijin in limited speech situations, mainly with their peers, and thus, their register of Pijin is different from their parents'. It is possible that nativization
will have some long term effects, which will be manifest only when these children grow up and encounter different speech situations requiring an expanded syntactic and lexical repertoire, leading to diversified registers. This could only be verified by returning to the field in twenty years time, or preferably by doing a longitudinal study of the speech of the children of my sample, and their generation.

We have then to ask ourselves a few questions:

1) Why are the adults creating linguistic patterns and the children regularizing them?

2) Why are the children expanding on particular forms and not on others?

3) What are the factors most likely to encourage regularization:
   a) increase in frequency of use?
   b) increase in speed and fluency?
   c) absence of norm?

I shall assess the importance of these three questions in turn.

1) The answer to the first question is almost obvious. The parents and not the children are the ones who encountered creolicity for the first time. Thus, they are the ones who found themselves in situations requiring that Pijin became the everyday language for a new type of speech community, and in situations that were very different from the traditional contexts of Pijin usage (refer to Chapter 2). The adults are the ones who made a main language out of their second language, thus making it a "natural" language of a "natural" speech community. Moreover, it could be said that in a sense these adults
nativized the language, as, according to Andersen (1983:13), adults have the capacity of creating viable strategies when learning a language. I would add that this could happen as well when the language is being adapted to new conditions of use.

Nativization is posited to cover those 'natural' acquisitional processes [...] that cause a human child or adult to create a viable (although variable and dynamic) internal representation of a linguistic system when "acquiring" a first or second language under a variety of circumstances [...].

2) What are the children regularizing and overgeneralizing? It does not seem that there is a rule explaining why and how this is happening. However in the case of grammatically and phonologically conditioned variants, certain factors seem to be determinant. Brown (1973:297), reflecting on Slobin (1966), singles out the following:

Where grammatically and phonologically conditioned variant forms exist, one is likely to be learned and overgeneralized and the factors determining that one seem to be: frequency, clarity of acoustical marking, and consistency of function.

If this is correct, it would explain why and how children single out the forms that they are going to submit to the regularization process. They would for instance, regularize the use of copy pronouns as indicators of relative clauses, because the copy pronouns are consistently used as such by the former generation. But the children do not keep the copy pronouns in other contexts (except for emphasis) because they are already optionally deleted by the adults.

3) What are the factors likely to encourage regularization?
a) Increase in the frequency of use. The data show that regularization means that children will focus on certain forms rather than on others, and will use the "selected few" in increasing proportion compared to the other forms. It seems obvious that, comparatively speaking, there would be a propensity to regularize the forms that are more prominent than others in the discourse. Just as overgeneralization is linked to frequency, one can surmise that regularization will "hit" the most common forms. In the data I presented, this is evident. For instance, the Pijin word *olketa*, both a third person plural pronoun (subject and object) and the plural marker, is probably the Pijin word that is used most frequently (vide Appendix E.). It is a rather long word however, and as such is submitted to the easiest form of regularization, phonological deletion.

On the other hand, the more a form comes to be used by the children, the more it will appear as being inherent to speech patterns, and by extension the more the children will reproduce it. Regularization is thus reinforced.

b) Increase in speed and fluency. Speed and fluency are characteristic of the way urban children speak their variety of Pijin. The parental generation, and the rural speakers in particular, speak the language much more slowly. The musical technical terms of 'allegro' and 'lento', as used by Valdman (1983:225), aptly describe the differences between the adults' and the children’s speech. Speed increases the force of phonological processes which are, as a result, more important in creole than they are in pidgin. Traugott (1977:87) argues that:

Since pidgins tend to be spoken slowly and somewhat
unrhythmically, the force of the phonological processes cannot be expected to be very great in pidgins. In creoles, however, they can have considerably greater importance since, like other native languages, creoles are spoken with speed and fluency.

As I argued earlier in this chapter, some adults use Pijin as a creole. In that respect, some members of the parental generation in Honiara have acquired speed and fluency when they speak Pijin. This, however, varies with the speakers, whereas it is generalized in the children's generation, both monolingual or bilingual speakers.

Absence of norm. At the level of the parental generation, Pijin is nobody's language in the sense that it is not the mother tongue of any significant number of speakers. Even though parents recognize the important role played by Pijin in town and adhere to the idea that it is the legitimate language of Honiara, they identify with it very little. Thus they are not likely to control the way their children speak Pijin, even if they acknowledge, and sometimes complain about, the changes taking place in the children's language. Parents therefore do not sanction the performance of their children according to their own performance. The result is that the overgeneralization and the regularization processes appearing in the speech of the children are not controlled and channelled; the children experiment, in relation with what they perceive the system of the language to be, and are free to do so. Traugott (1977:87) notes similarly that:

They (the creoles) develop in situations where there is relatively little identification by adults with the pidgin, because it is not their native language. Therefore, first generation creole speakers are presumably subject to relatively little suppressive judgement by older speakers.

Thus innovations in Pijin, either by adults or by children, have better chances of success than in the vernaculars, because they are not
competing with an established and socially sanctionned norm. As Sankoff (1983:244) stresses it:

The genesis of both pidgins and creoles has taken place under conditions where the innovative strategies do get more of a chance to survive because they are not competing in the same way with existing rules.

Moreover, one has to remember that Pijin is not yet a written language. Efforts of transcription and standardization have been made by the SICA (refer to Chapter 5), but so far this written Pijin is the prerogative of a few people. There are no books in Pijin, no newspaper in Pijin, no written works overall that could serve as standards of reference and comparison. Therefore, the transformation of the language is not limited by the conservative force of the written form of the language as the standard against which spoken varieties are compared.

Because of the regularization taking place in the children's language, and because of the pervasive use Pijin is put to by the children, the variety of Pijin spoken by the young urban population is becoming very homogeneous. The influence of the vernaculars on Pijin is not as important as it seems to have been on the parents' Pijin, for obvious sociological reasons, as described in Chapters 3 and 4. Therefore, the pidgin spoken by the urban children demarcates itself from the most obvious substrate influences and develops in a way that has to do with its own system. What room can we make here for the eventual role played by the superstrate in this development? I shall discuss this problem in the next section.
6.4 Target language

Despite the fact that English is the official language of the country, a legacy, among others of the former colonial ruler; despite the fact that the elite masters English and uses it in official and formal contexts; despite the fact that English can be heard on the radio and read in the newspapers; despite the fact that English is the official medium of education in town, it does not seem, so far, that English plays any significant roles in the morphological and syntactic transformation of Pijin by the children. This is so, probably because there is no Melanesian English speaking community and because English is not perceived, as yet, as the fundamental target language of the urban speech community. People, however, are more and more aware of the social and economic advantages that a command of English can bring, but they dissociate them from the practical advantages that Pijin can bring in Honiara.

If we want to look at the transformations taking place in Pijin from the perspective of the theories of SLA or first language acquisition (Andersen 1983), we have to be aware of two main problems. First, the theories of language acquisition are mainly formulated with the monolingual child in mind (Elliott 1981:173) and therefore could not be applied unmodified to a multilingual context such as Honiara. Second, they are always elaborated in relation with a target language that is different from pidgins or creoles themselves -- usually; the superstrate language.

In the light of the above, I shall discuss the problem of the target language in the acquisition of Pijin (second language or mother tongue) in the context of Honiara.
It is usually admitted that people learning a second language will produce forms that are what they imagine this language to be. This interlanguage (Corder 1969, 1977; Zelinker 1972) changes as the learner processes more input, and comes to resemble more and more the target language. This can be summed up by the old but still useful concept of 'accommodation' developed by Piaget (1926).

In Honiara, we find two kinds of Pijin speakers: those who learned it as adults and those who learned it as children, whether as a sole mother tongue, in conjunction with another language (simultaneous bilingualism), or as a second language but in early childhood (successive bilingualism).

For the first group of speakers, who learned Pijin as a second language, the target language was precisely Pijin, not English. As shown in Chapter 4, Pijin is the language they need to know in order to have a social life in Honiara. The target language is never the superstrate (English in this particular case) and this for two reasons: 1) migrants arriving in town do not need English for social and economic survival, whereas they do need Pijin. 2) They are not in a socioeconomic position giving them exposure to English. My point is that when migrants are in the process of learning Pijin, they are not attempting to learn English. The input is Pijin and never English. Thus the interlanguage they are producing is an interlanguage of Pijin and not an interlanguage of English. The accommodation process will be made in direction of Pijin and not in direction of English.

The second group of speakers learned Pijin as a sole mother
tongue or concurrently with a vernacular in young childhood. As I argued earlier, my view is that the latter children have a native competency in Pijin that approximates that of the monolingual Pijin speakers. However, in both cases, the input and the target language are once more Pijin. These children are learning a first language from people for whom it is a second language, but we have seen that their productions (and thus their areterlanguage) in not very different from the input.

This signifies that urban Pijin speakers have exploited the system of the language very well; they are the best, most fluent speakers of a language that until very recently had virtually no native speakers. It is their speech — not English or the Pijin spoken (badly) by Europeans — that provides the target language for learners of Pijin.

6.5 Summary

I have argued in this chapter that once créolicity was established, the emergence of a creole speech variety and the "acquisition of native speakers" (Sankoff and Laberge 1980) naturally followed. In this process whereby Solomon’s Pijin became the main language of an urban speech community, it seems that the adults have been the main linguistic innovators — although the grammatical system of the expanded pidgin they brought with them already was far richer and more complex than prevailing linguistic theories would lead us to expect. In this situation, the new generation of children acquiring Pijin natively — whether as their sole mother tongue or in conjunction with a native (though usually circumscribed) command of a
vernacular -- have apparently not been significant innovators of new speech forms; but they have been regularizers and systematizers of the language of the parental generation. A number of points can, I think, be drawn from the Solomons evidence.

1) The differences between the variety spoken by the parental generation and the children's generation are not very striking.

2) These differences seem to be matters of degree rather than of essence.

3) Both parents and children contribute to the linguistic change, but in different ways.

4) The "faculte de langage" of the children is not channelled, or controlled by the normative pressures that constrain linguistic change in "natural" languages; we thus can observe an explosion of regularizations and systematizations.

5) The current performance of the children does not represent a good sample of what their language will eventually turn out to be, when they mature. To really understand what role these children play in the transformation of Pijin in Honiara, one would have to make studies of their speech when they are adults.
Despite the political obstacles that forced me to narrow the scope and depth of my study, Mühlhäusler's expectation that Solomons Pijin would provide a fruitful subject for thesis research seem amply borne out. Here we have a creole emerging from a pidgin, a new social world emerging out of an old one.

Because Sankoff's and Mühlhäusler's work on Tok Pisin had shown that children did not have much impact on the changes taking place in Tok Pisin and that the language as spoken by the urban adults showed signs of creolization, I was drawn to propose the following hypothesis. When a stabilized and expanded pidgin becomes the main language of a permanent urban speech community, it can become creolized without being nativized. This, of course, was based on the theoretical premise that a pidgin is above all a social phenomenon and that changes in the language will be linked to changes in the context of use. This hypothesis allowed me to anticipate sociolinguistic changes as creolization took place; but not to anticipate the effects of nativization on the language itself.

The purpose of this thesis was to examine the importance of urbanization in the creolization of Solomon Islands Pijin. The scope and methods of my research were described in Chapter 1.
Chapter 2 sketched the sociohistory of the language, from the days of its presence in Queensland in the 19th century to the beginning of urbanization in contemporary Solomon Islands. That chapter did not aim to document the transformations undergone by the language in the course of its history; but rather to show that the history and position of the language was intrinsically linked to the history of its speakers in a particular frame of sociolinguistic relations: colonialism.

The third chapter explored the socioeconomic conditions of urbanization. This was a fundamental chapter, as it described the new context in which Pijin is being used. It was mandatory in my view to document the characteristics of urbanization in Honiara, to understand the new role that Pijin had to play and the new social pressures to which it was subjected. The evidence I advance shows that the main variables, as far as Pijin usage is concerned, were the permanency of the multilingual situation and the new sociolinguistic relations that the speakers were creating.

The expanded role of Pijin in the lives of Solomon Islanders was illustrated in Chapter 4. I described the position of the agents (children and adults, and on another level, families) that lead them to use one language or another. It became clear that, for the urban population, and for the children particularly, usage of Pijin and vernacular by bilingual speakers tends to be diglossic. Pijin is the language of public life; the vernacular(s) is (are) the language(s) of
private life. I insisted that bilingual and monolingual children belonged in the same sociolinguistic group because their position within the speech community was similar. I showed as well that the nature and scope of Pijin usage was correlated to the degree of participation of the speaker in the urban speech community; in that light, the equation MOTHER TONGUE = MAIN LANGUAGE became weak, from the standpoint of individuals, as in this community, the second language of many speakers becomes their main language.

Chapter 5 was concerned mainly with the description and analysis of a few areas of Solomons Pijin undergoing change. Working with phonology and syntax, I showed that two types of changes (qualitative and quantitative) were taking place in the language. The qualitative changes mainly differentiated rural speech from urban adults' speech, whereas the quantitative changes subsequently mainly differentiated the urban children's speech from the urban adults' speech. By quantitative effects, I mean that the changes appearing in the urban adult speech community were picked up and expanded upon or regularized by the children. Chapter 5 shows that adults are initiating the changes, whereas children are streamlining the language, freeing it of many of its non-productive irregularities.

In Chapter 6, I defined and introduced the concept of "creolicity", to refer to the social conditions and contexts prerequisite to the appearance of creolization. I argued that nativization was not a causal factor of creolization but rather was a side effect of creolization in this particular context. I suggested that creolicity was nothing more than a "natural" context of language
use and thus offered optimal conditions for the development and success of creolization and nativization. The regularization that accompanies nativization, or the impact of the children on the language, seems to be due to the interaction of the children's innate linguistic faculties and strategies of language acquisition, on the one hand, and to the changes in the sociolinguistic conditions of Pijin usage, on the other. To this has to be added the absence of linguistic and social norms linked to Pijin. Parents have no identification with Pijin and therefore do not consciously monitor and control, as they do for their vernaculars, the linguistic production in Pijin of their children. Children, always systematizers, regularizers and corner-cutters in their phonology and grammar, have in the social world of Honiara - where no one has a vested interest in the "purity" or linguistic idiosyncrasies of Pijin - free rein to tidy up the language they have inherited from the parental generation.

The findings of this thesis could be summarized in the following way.

1) When a pidgin becomes the MAIN LANGUAGE of a permanent speech community, it can expand and become a creole without being nativized.

2) Thus the main distinction between a pidgin and a creole does not lie in the opposition between SECOND LANGUAGE vs MOTHER TONGUE, but in the opposition between MAIN LANGUAGE and SECONDARY LANGUAGE.

3) In this light, the main agents of creolization are the adults, as they are the first to have encountered creolicity.

4) When nativization of a pidgin occurs subsequent to creolization, the role of the children in the process of change is different from what it would be if nativization had happened before stabilization and expansion of the language.
5) When an expanded and creolized pidgin becomes nativized, the impact of the children on the language is measured in terms of regularization of variations and systematization of syntactic and discursive functions.

6) However, the full impact of the children on the language could only be measured when their generation has reached maturity.

7.1 The future

I have shown that in the multilingual community of Honiara, Pijin is the only linguistic common denominator, and that it has become the medium of everyday life in homes and public settings. To live in town and participate in urban social relations, Solomon Islanders must use Pijin. Pijin, as I have documented, is both medium and embodiment of an emerging urban culture.

The children represent an interesting case. More and more are born in Honiara, an ever expanding town, socially as well as economically and geo-demographically. As more and more people are marrying into different language groups, and as more and more of the social life in town is being conducted in Pijin, one might imagine that will come a time, mutatis mutandis, when most of the children being born in town will be raised in Pijin only. Through school they will acquire the superstrate language as they do today; they might or might not use it in their adult lives. If education (under its present form) becomes more widely available to the Honiara children, more and more will be exposed to English from an early age. This is already taking place, but as there is no English speaking Melanesian community as such and as English plays no practically significant role
in Honiara beyond its status bearing function, the children do not master it even after six years of primary education, during which they are taught English two hours a day, five days a week. The result of this is that children who are now brought up in Pijin only acquire English as a second language, whereas the old and more generalized pattern in town used to be and still is: vernacular as a first language and Pijin as a second language. Loosening of ties with the village and loosening of ties with the wantok system will only contribute to reinforce the pattern.

Do we have here a case of language shift in which Pijin will be substituted for all vernaculars in town? For the time being, we can only say that there is a convergent tendency towards Pijin in town; a peculiarity in a way, as it was until very recently (with few rare exceptions) no one's first language. By becoming everyone's second language in a community whose survival depended on it, Pijin prepared its way to becoming a first language.

What is the implication of that tendency for Honiara? Does it mean that all bilingual and multilingual contexts of vernacular use will be suppressed? It is difficult to say at this stage. However, if the shift toward Pijin continues, and if more and more urban dwellers have access to English, it might be that the components of bilingualism in Honiara will be Pijin and English and no longer Pijin and the vernaculars. If this happens, the linguistic difference between rural and urban areas will increase. Moreover, if Pijin continues to expand in the rural areas, a process now underway, the

1 To the exclusion of the expatriate community and some members of the elite.
only linguistic link between the town and the village will not be the vernaculars, but will be Pijin. This is already happening in some families.

Urbanization, creolization and nativization give solid social roots to Pijin. They are the first steps to its social development. Political developments could include the creation of a Pidginophony in Melanesia, through unification of Pijin with Tok Pisin and Bislama. But particularly in the Solomons, the old colonial ideology dismissing Pijin as a degenerate and useless abomination and promoting its steady replacement by English through the machinery of the state, remains strong among many political leaders and senior public servants. The contradictions of a creolized Pijin developing and expanding, still the only common medium of communication uniting the country and uniting the towns and the villages, yet officially denigrated and demeaned and still bereft of a widely used accepted orthography, remain large. Recognition by the country's leaders of what Pijin is and what it can be, and formulation of effective national language policies recognizing the complementarity and compatibility of Pijin and English, are crucial challenges for the future of Solomon Islands.
APPENDIX A

LIST OF INFORMANTS IN VURA AND AVUAHU

* Alabino
* Alibua Domenico
* Alibua Oliva
* Anare Anaseto
* Anderson Kathleen
* Anemi Winston
* Anga Mary
* Aotee George
* Aseri Lily
* Aseri Newman
* Atau Daudau
* Beni Margaret
* Bini Gordon
* Bisikete Abraham
* Bosi Esta
* Brock Ethel
* Bula Joyce
* Dora
* Dupu Andrew
* Dupu Miula
* Fanua Madeline
* Fata Barry
* Felicita
* Fifi'i Atuini
* Fomani Henley
* Francita
* Gale Beverley
* Gau Timothy
* Geni Derryck
* Haniel
* Jalamaia
* Kafui Alice
* Katovai Jim
* Kauha Doreen
* Kelesi Mariano
* Kililonga
* Kiri Kristopher
* Kiu Tody
* Kornelius
* Kutinikolo William
* Kuvatia Teresa
* Kwai Jack
* Laulaku
* Litani Michael
* Lore
* Ludawane James
* Maebiru Helen
* Maetia John
* Maetia Margret
* Magati Casper
* Makabo Betty
* Mananae Anisimeri
* Mavutu Andy
* Mekab Sarah
* Mitimi Jenny
* Molea Bob
* Mudu Jeffrey
* Nantara Ereteta
* Nehe Moses
* Neuwa Peter
* Newman
* Ngaig Baddeley
* Orasinq
* Pethopen Paala
* Philip Anna
* Rarava Jean
* Ratu Elisabeth
* Rikmanji Timon
* Roseline
* Rōsi
* Sai Benedicta
* Sāntis Elsa
* Sare Richley
* Semana Noella
* Seron
* Sianama Rebecca
* Simata Padron
* Sipolo Betty
* Sipolo Stephen
* Sitai Henry
* Soni Ryan
* Suruigeni Celina
* Susuta Luke
* Talu John
* Tanalimononi Michael
* Tasia Agnes
* Tohuimononi John
* Toi Steven
* Toitoona Alice
* Toniaku Linette
* Tocai Timon
* Tova Benedict
* Tovake Patterson
* Usqili
* Vaka Philip
* Valeriano
* Wanakana Robert
William Annie
1. Wataem nao iu bon?
2. Waa nao iu bon?
3. Wanem nao waka blong iu?
4. Iu waka long wea?
5. Wataem nao iu garem fas waka blong iu?
6. Long wea?
7. Wanem nao nem bloxmas blong iu?
8. Hem bon long wea?
9. Wanem nao langgus blong hem?
10. Hem laef iet?
11. Mami blong iu waka?
12. Watkaen waka?
13. Wanem nao nem blong da'di blong iua?
14. Hem bon long wea?
15. Wanem nao langgus blong hem?
16. Hem laef iet?
17. Da'di blong iu waka?
18. Iu save wataem maa blong iu hem bon?
19. An waswe long dadi blong iu?
20. Waa nao iu stap taem iu smol?
21. Watkaen langgus iu iusim lodea?
22. Waa nao iu stap taem iu stat fo big?
23. Watkaen langgus iu iusim lodea?
24. Iu skul?
25. Iu skul long taem?
26. Long wea?
27. Watkaen langgus nao otketa tica iusim long iu?
28. Watkaen langgus nao iu save iusim tumas long skul?
29. Wanem nao cids blong iu?
30. Watkaen langgus nao iufala save iusim tumas long cios?
31. Wataem nao iu kam long Honiara?
32. Iu kam long hem fo wanem?
33. Wanem nao iu duim bifoai iu kam long hem?
34. Iu marid?
35. Misis blong iu (or) olo blong iu hem blong wea?
36. Iu garem pikini?
37. Hao mas?
38. Olketa stap long wea?
39. Olketa skul?
40. Olketa bon kam long wea?
41. Watkaen langgus iu iu ase iusim tumas long haos blong iu?
42. Hao iu iu hem oisen?
43. Watkaen langgus naq itufala (husband and wife) save iusim long haos?
44. Watkaen langgus naq itufala save iusim wetem olketa pikini blong itufala?
45. Watkaen langgus iu iu iusim tem iu waka?
46. Hao iu iu hem oisen?
47. Wataem iu iu save iusim langgus blong iu?
48. Long wea?
49. Wat kaen langgus iu iu iusim long mokote?
50. Long stoa?
51. Long Sinataon?
52. Long ban?
53. Long famasi?
54. Wetem olketa vantok blong iu?
55. Wetem olketa fren?
56. Wetem bos blong iu?
57. Wetem olketa iuropian?
58. Wea iu iu lanem Pijin?
59. Wataem iu iu lanem hem?
60. Fo wanem iu iu lanem hem?
61. Wat langgus iu misis (or olo) blong iu hem save taem hem kam long Honiara?
62. Distaem hem save nara langgus moa?
63. Wea iu hem lanem?
64. Hem skul?
65. Long wea?
66. Hem skul long taem?
67. Wataem langgus iu olketa pikini blong iu save?
Vura/questionnaire...

71. Wea nao olketa lanem Pijin?
72. Olketa save Inglis tu?
73. Waswe iu, iu save Inglis?
74. Hao nao iu save (or) no save long hem?
75. Wea nao iu save iusim Inglis?
76. Hu nao iu save iusim Inglis watem?
77. Watkaen langgus na iu laekem tumas?
78. Po-wanem na iu (no) laekem hem?
79. Watkaen langgus iu save iusim tumas Honiara?
80. Hao naa hem olsem?
81. Watkaen langgus iu save iusim tumas long vilej blong iu?
82. Hao naa hem olsem?
83. Olketa pipol long vilej blong iu save Pijin?
84. Watkaen naa Pijin kam long vilej blong iu?
85. Olketa pipol long vilej blong iu save Inglis?
86. Watkaen naa Inglis kam long vilej blong iu?
87. Watkaen langgus na iu save iusim tumas long ples blong iu?
88. Hu naa save iusim Pijin long ples blong iu?
89. Wea naa olketa pipol long ples blong iu lanem Pijin?
90. Wea naa samfala pipol long ples blong iu lanem Inglis?
91. Iu garem radio?
92. Watkaen progran naa iu lisem long hem long SIBC?
93. Watkaen langgus olketa iusim long SIBC?
94. Watkaen langgus naa iu laekem fo olketa iusim long SIBC?
95. Iu lisem long olketa nius long Pijin o long Inglis?
96. Iu kasem nara ples long Solomon Aelan?
97. Iu kasem nara kantre?
98. Iu laekem diiskaen Pijin olketa save iusim long SIBC?
99. Tingting blong iu: riol Pijin hem stap long wea?
100. Hao mas taen naa iu stap long Honiara?
Vura: Census card.

Location:

Date of Census:

Date of Interview:

House no.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>E/W</th>
<th>TIME IN</th>
<th>EDUC.</th>
<th>AGE GROUP</th>
<th>CHILDREN</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
<th>PIJIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional details:
1. Name: ____________________
2. Surname: ____________________
3. Date of birth: ________________
4. Place of birth: ____________________
5. Ethnic origin: ____________________

6. Places of residence | time | activities
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>____________________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>____________________</td>
<td>______</td>
<td>____________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. MARRIED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Places of residence</th>
<th>time</th>
<th>activities</th>
<th>residence of wife and children</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| ____________________ | ______ | ____________________ |

8. MARRIAGES

1st wife's name: ____________________ origin: ____________________
   religion: ____________________ native tongue: ____________________
   No. of children: ____________________ length of marriage: ____________________
   Second language of spouse: ____________________
   where learnt: ____________________ schooling level: ____________________
   why: ____________________

2nd spouse's name: ____________________ origin: ____________________
   religion: ____________________ native tongue: ____________________
   No. of children: ____________________ length of marriage: ____________________
   Second language: ____________________
   where learnt: ____________________
   why: ____________________
date: __________________ Schooling level: __________________

When used: __________________

Religion: __________________

10. Religion: __________________ Language of religion: __________________

11. Role d'identification: __________________

12. Mother tongue: __________________

13. Second language: __________________
   Learnt where: __________________ When: __________________
   Why: __________________
   Used when: __________________
   With whom: __________________

14. Third language: __________________
   Learnt where: __________________ When: __________________
   Why: __________________
   Used when: __________________
   With whom: __________________
   Fluency: __________________

15. Language of work: __________________
   Learnt where: __________________ When: __________________
   Why: __________________
   With whom: __________________
   Fluency: __________________

16. Schooling
   Level started age ended teaching language teacher's language location rel.
   Primary 1-2 ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________
   Standard 3-7 ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________
   Form 1-6 ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________ ___________

17. Language used by informant with children: __________________

18. Language by spouse with children: __________________

19. Language used more often:
   a. at home: __________________
   b. at work: __________________
   c. with neighbours: __________________
   d. with friends: __________________
   e. at the market: __________________
   f. in the European stores: __________________
   g. to a European: __________________
In the home place: _____________________________
With parents: ________________________________

20. Present occupation


22. Reading knowledge of Tamil: ________________

23. Reading knowledge of English: ________________

24. Price price: ____________________________
25. Amount: ____________________________

26. Visits to different places: ____________________________

27. Language used there: ____________________________

28. Father's mother tongue: ____________ 2nd lanr.: _________

29. Mother's mother tongue: ____________ 2nd lanr.: _________

30. Parents' religion: ____________________________

31. Parents' residence: ____________________________

32. Mother's religion learnt where: ____________________________

33. Father's religion learnt where: ____________________________

34. Father's name: ____________________________

35. Mother's name: ____________________________

36. ____________________________

37. ____________________________

38. ____________________________

COMMENTS: ____________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meter No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Information</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Tape follow-up No. 2: INDEX TO INTERVIEW

Name:
Cassette No.:
Date Reg.:
Location:
Date Trans.:
Sample/family/both.
QUESTIONNAIRE NO. II

SECTION A.

1. Your name (optional).
2. Your date of birth.
3. Your place of birth.
4. School level.
5. First language you learned.
7. Third language you learned.
8. Your mother's language.
10. Your residence in Honiara.
11. How long have you lived in Honiara?
12. Your father's occupation.
15. Your father's residence.
16. How many brothers do you have?
17. How many sisters do you have?
18. What church do you belong to?
SECTION B.

1. What language do you usually use with your father?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. His language.
   4. Your mother's language.
   5. Other.

2. What language do you usually use with your mother?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your father's language.
   4. Your mother's language.
   5. Other.

3. What language do you use in your mother's house place?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.

4. What language do you use in your father's house place?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.

5. What language do you use with your older brother and sisters?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.

6. What language do you use with your younger brothers and sisters?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.

7. Do you (1) speak (2) read (3) write
   (1) speak ) Your mother's language?
   (2) read )
   (3) write }

8. Do you (1) speak (2) read (3) write
   (1) speak ) Your father's language?
   (2) read )
   (3) write }

9. What is your main language in your home?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.

10. What is your main language at school?
    1. Pijin.
    2. English.
    3. Your mother's language.
    4. Your father's language.
    5. Other.
11. What is your main language at church?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5.

12. What is the home language of your teacher?

13. What language does your teacher use in the classroom? (You can give several answers).
   1. Only Pijin.
   2. Only English.
   3. Both Pijin and English.
   4. Her/his language.
   5. Your mother's language.
   6. Your father's language.

14. What language do you use with your friends at school?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.

15. What is the main language of the children at school?
   1. Pijin.
   2. English.
   3. Your mother's language.
   4. Your father's language.
   5. Other.
Do you use Pijin to speak with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father (mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother (mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father (father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother (father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the housegirl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the school yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the headmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the church leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the shopkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Lawson, Tana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the nurses at Vura Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your mother's home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your father's home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C.

Do you use English to speak with?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the housegirl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the school yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the headmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the shopkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Lawson Tama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the nurses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Vura Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your mother's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your father's</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION C.

Do you use your mother's language to speak with -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father (mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother (mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father (father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother (father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the housegirl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the school yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the headmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the church leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the shopkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Lawson Tana</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the nurses at Vura Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your mother's home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your father's home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SECTION C.**

Do you use your father's language to speak with -

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Your mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father (mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother (mother's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-father (father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grand-mother (father's side)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>older brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>younger brothers/sisters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the housegirl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the school yard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the teacher outside of school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the headmaster</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the church leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with the shopkeepers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with your neighbours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at Lawson Tama</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the nurses at Vuya Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>on the bus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at the market</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your mother's home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in your father's home place</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION D.

#### 1. What do you think?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>A bit difficult</td>
<td>Not difficult</td>
<td>easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pijin is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Your mother's language is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Your father's language is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. Do you understand:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>G</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Very well</td>
<td>Well</td>
<td>Not too well</td>
<td>badly</td>
<td>Very badly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pijin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Your mother's language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Your father's language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3. Do you speak:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very well</th>
<th>Well</th>
<th>Not too well</th>
<th>badly</th>
<th>Very badly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pijin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Your mother's language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Your father's language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. When the teacher gives an explanation in English, is it usually:

1. Very clear
2. Not very clear
3. Difficult to understand
4. Easy
5. Not clear
Section D (continued)

5. When the teacher gives an explanation in Pijin is it usually:
   1. Very clear
   2. Not very clear
   3. Difficult to understand
   4. Easy
   5. Not clear

6. Where did you learn Pijin?
   1. At school
   2. With your friends
   3. At home
   4. At church

7. How did you learn Pijin?
   1. Your mother taught you
   2. You heard it and learned it that way
   3. Your friends "taught you"
   4. The teacher taught you

8. When you arrived at school, did you know Pijin?
   1. Very well
   2. Well
   3. Not so well
   4. Badly
   5. Not at all

9. When you arrived at school, did you know English?
   1. Very well
   2. Well
   3. Not so well
   4. Badly
   5. Not at all

10. Do you use English out of school?
    1. Yes
    2. No

11. Yes: Explain when, for what reason you do so, and with whom?

12. Do your parents help you with your homework?
    1. Every day
    2. Regularly
    3. Usually
    4. Sometimes
    5. Never
SECTION E.

You speak Pijin because:   (You can choose many answers)

1. It is the main language of the Solomons.
2. Because you can use it to speak to your friends.
3. Because you can use it with all the Solomon Islanders.
4. Because you like it.
5. Because it is easy.
6. Because everybody knows it.
7. Because it is the only language you know.
8. Because it is beautiful.
9. Because you know it well.
10. Because your mother wants you to.
11. Because your father wants you to.
12. Because the teacher wants you to.
SECTION E.

You speak English because: (you can choose many answers)

1. It is the main language of the Solomons.
2. Because you can use it to speak to your friends.
3. Because you can use it with all the Solomon Islanders.
4. Because you like it.
5. Because it is easy.
6. Because everybody knows it.
7. Because it is the only language you know.
8. Because it is beautiful.
9. Because you know it well.
10. Because your mother wants you to.
11. Because your father wants you to.
12. Because the teacher wants you to.
SECTION F.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Uncertain</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. English should be taught in all countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Solomon Islanders should speak their own language and not a foreign language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. English will take you further than Pijin or &quot;langus&quot;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. It's wrong to teach English in the Solomons when Pijin is not taught in England.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. You have considered more important if you are English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. English speakers who do not want to learn Pijin should not come to live in the Solomon Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. English is a beautiful language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. English is better for understanding scientific subjects than Pijin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Pijin is an easy language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Pijin is very clear</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. English is difficult to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. It is more difficult than Pijin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. All educated people should know English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Pijin is the real language of the Solomon Islands.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I should like to read books in Pijin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Pijin has no value in the modern world</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. People in the Solomon Islands should be educated in their own languages.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. These are far more useful things to learn than to learn English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

INDENTURED LABOUR AND COPRA MARKET

Native Indentured Labour in the Solomon Islands in relation with the copra market. Monies represent the export value of copra for the year. (Compiled from BSIP annual reports for the ten year period 1927-1937.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Indentured Labourers</th>
<th>Production of Copra in tons</th>
<th>Copra Export value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>6,115</td>
<td>22,316</td>
<td>411,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>6,016</td>
<td>21,957</td>
<td>348,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td>5,171</td>
<td>23,525</td>
<td>387,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>5,363</td>
<td>21,300</td>
<td>304,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>4,301</td>
<td>23,681</td>
<td>271,828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td>3,927</td>
<td>21,209</td>
<td>137,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td>3,583</td>
<td>22,256</td>
<td>153,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>5,578</td>
<td>21,119</td>
<td>70,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>3,096</td>
<td>18,093</td>
<td>54,013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>20,699</td>
<td>156,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>25,073</td>
<td>293,054</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
INFORMANTS

The following are sociological details on my informants. For their protection, their names are being withheld. The list is numbered in chronological order of interview. The number preceding the sociological details for each informant is the first number appearing in the code following the quotations taken from the corpus.

The information supplied for each informant are: 1) Sex, 2) age, 3) language group of origin, 4) language group of spouse, 5) level of education, 6) religion, 7) main residence, 8) time spent in Honiara, 9) occupation, 10) languages known, 11) main language at home, 12) main language outside of home, 13) date of interview. For the children, 3) refers to language group of mother, 4) refers to language group of father, 9a) refers to occupation of mother and 9b) to occupation of father.

(1) - Woman; 55; Kwaio (Malaita); Kwaio (Malaita); 3 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; 'Kwaio country; 7 years; subsistence gardener; Kwaio and Pijin; Kwaio; Pijin; 23/7/83.

(2) - Man; 55; 'Are'are (Malaita); 'Are'are (Malaita); 5 y. Second. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 20 years; radio announcer; 'Are'are, Pijin and English; 'Are'are; Pijin; 31/7/83.

(3) - Woman; 31; Bellona (Polynesian outlier); Lau (Malaita); 2 y. Second. Educ + technical training; Anglican; Vura; 21 years; secretary; Renellese, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 7/8/83.
(4) - Man; 38; Lau (Malaita); Lau; 1 y. Second. Educ. + techn. train.; SDA; Vura; 13 years; mechanic; Lau and Pijin; Lau; Pijin; 2/8/83.

(5) - Man; 40; Ontong Java (Polynesian outlier); Ontong Java (lost his wife three days after interview); tertiary education; Anglican; Vura; 23 years; ship engineer; Luanguia, Pijin and English; Luanguia; Pijin; 3/8/83.

(6) - Man; 27; Maringe (Isabel); Maringe (Isabel); 4 y. Second. Educ.; SDA.; Vura; 12 years; public servant; Maringe, Pijin and English; Maringe; Pijin; 3/8/83.

(7) - Man; 32; Babatana (Choiseul); Babatana (Choiseul); 5 y. Second. Educ. + tech. training; United Church; Vura; 15 years; bookkeeper; Babatana, Pijin and English; Babatana; Pijin; 4/8/83.

(8) - Man; 62; Kwaio (Malaita); divorced 30 years ago; 2 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 25y; night watchman; Kwaio and Pijin; Kwaio; Pijin; 5/8/83.

(9) - Man; 59; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita); none; Jehovah's witness; Vura; 5 years; night watchman; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Kwara'ae; Pijin; 6/8/83.

(10) - Woman; 21; Marovo (New Georgia); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 1 y. Prim. Educ.; Methodist; Vura; 15 years; former cashier; Marovo, Pijin and little English; Pijin; Pijin; 7/8/83.

(11) - Man; 38; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Fataleka (Malaita); 5 y. Prim. Educ. SSEC; Vura; 23 years; repair shop owner; Kwara'ae, Pijin and little English; Pijin; Pijin; 7/8/83.

(12) - Woman; 65; To'ambaita (Malaita); To'ambaita (widowed 22 years); 2 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC; Vura; 14 years; former catechist; To'ambaita, Pijin and little English; To'ambaita; Pijin; 9/8/83.
(13) - Man; 43; Varisi (Choiseul); Langalanga (Malaita); 5 years Second. Educ. + tech. train.; Anglican; Vura; 22 years; Former ship captain, now owner of the Vura shop; Varisi, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 9/8/83.

(14) - Woman; 59; Baelelela (Malaita); Baelelela (widowed 13 years); no educ.; former SSEC, now SDA; Vura; 13 years; former gardener; Baelelela and Pijin; Baelelela; Pijin; 10/8/83.

(15) - Man; 62; Babatana (Choiseul); Babatana (widowed 5 years); 5 y. Prim. Educ.; United Church; Vura; 10 years; former catechist; Babatana, Pijin and little English; Babatana; Pijin: 11/8/83.

(16) - Man; 36; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 4 y. Prim. Educ.; Remnant church; Vura (since went to Nauru for work); 18 years; former taxi driver; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Kwara'ae; Pijin; 14/8/83.

(17) - Man; 24; Babatana (Choiseul); Ghar i (Guadalcanal) 3 y. Second. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 10 years; public servant; Babatana, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 14/8/83.

(18) - Woman; 33; Lau (Malaita); Lau (now divorced); 2 y. Second. Educ.+ tech. train.; SDA; Vura; 26 years; secretary; Lau, Pijin and English; Lau/Pijin; Pijin; 19/8/83.

(19) - Man; 34; Ranongga (New Georgia Group); Ranongga; 3 y Second. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 5 years; Public servant; Ranongga, Pijin and English; Ranongga; Pijin; 14/8/83.

(20) - Man; 38; Maringe (Isabel); Maringe; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 21 years; heavy equipment operator; none; Maringe and Pijin; Maringe; Pijin; 14/8/83.

(21) - Man; 54; Sa'a (Malaita); Sa'a (widowed for 15 years); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC; Vura; 29 years; taxi driver; Sa'a and Pijin; Sa'a; Pijin; 14/8/83.
(22) - Woman; 31; Vaghua (Choiseul); Savosavo (Savo) 2 y Second.
Educ. + 3 y. Teachers Train. College; United Church; Vura; 12 years; Teacher; Roviana, Vaghua, Babatana, Pijin and English; Pijin and Vaghua; Pijin; 14/8/83.

(23) - Woman; 32; Kiribati (Micronesia); Kiribati; 6 y. Second.
Educ. + Teachers train.; Anglican; Vura; 14y; Teacher; Kiribati, Pijin and English; Kiribati; Pijin; 15/8/83.

(24) - Woman; 30; Ranongga (New Georgia Group); Ranongga; 1 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 5 years; housewife; Ranongga and Pijin; Ranongga; Pijin; 15/8/83.

(25) - Man; 33; Ranongga (New Georgia Group); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 6 y. Prim. Educ. + 4 y. Techn. training; SDA; Vura; 13 years; foreman; Ranongga, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 15/8/83.

(26) - Woman; 35; Kwai (Malaita); Langalanga (Malaita); 2 y. Second. Educ. + Techn. training; SDA; Vura; nurse; Kwai, Pijin and little English; Kwai/Pijin; Pijin; 16/8/83.

(27) - Woman; 21; Bauro (Makira); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 5 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 2 years; none; Bauro and Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 16/8/83.

(28) - Woman; 29; Aiwo (Reef Island); Santa Cruz (Santa Cruz Islands); 2 y. Second. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 7 years; cashier; civil servant; Aiwo, Pijin and English; Aiwo and Pijin; Pijin; 17/8/83.

(29) - Woman; 28; Marovo (New Georgia Group); Longgu (Guadalcanal); 1 y. Second. Educ. + techn. train.; Vura; 10 years; office clerk; carpenter; Marovo, Tok Pisin, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 18/8/83.

(30) - Woman; 18; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwai (Malaita); 4 y. Second. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 18 years; student; Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 18/8/83.
(31) - Man; 28; Tikopia (Polynesian outlier); Tikopia (wife lives on Tikopia); 2 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 6 years; unskilled labourer; Tikopia and Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 18/8/83.

(32) - Man; 45; Talise (Guadalcanal); Babatana (Choiseul); 1 y. Prim. Educ: United Church; Vura; 31 years; taxi driver; Talise and Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 18/8/83.

(33) - Man; 29; Kahua (Makira); Marovo (New Georgia Group); 5 y. Second. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 23 y; airline dispatcher; Kahua, Pijin, English; Pijin; Pijin; 20/8/83.

(34) - Man; 23; Ghari (Guadalcanal); not married; 5 y Second. Educ.; Catholic; Vura; 7 years; public servant; Ghari, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 20/8/83.

(35) - Woman; 21; Kahua (Santa Ana); Kahua (Santa Catalina); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 6 years; former cashier; Kahua, Pijin and English; Kahua and Pijin; Pijin; 21/8/83.

(36) - Man; 38; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Maringe (Isabel); 5 y. Second. Educ + techn. train.; SDA; Vura; 22 years; former agricultural engineer, now business man; Kwara'ae, Pijin and English; Pijin; Pijin; 22/8/83.

(37) - Man; 34; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 2 y. Second. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 11 years; public servant; Kwara'ae, Pijin and English; Kwara'ae; Pijin; 23/8/83.

(38) - Man; 63; Kwai (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita). Wife died in 1984; Tertiary education abroad; Anglican; Vura; 26 years; former head master of National Second. School, now retired; Kwai, Pijin, English; Pijin; Pijin; 25/8/83.

(39) - Woman; 35; Lau (Malaita); Lau (Malaita); 1 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 18 years; none; Lau and Pijin; Lau; Pijin; 27/8/83.
(40) - Man; 48; Lau (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita); No schooling; SSEC.; Vura; 10 years; road foreman; Lau, Kwara'ae and Pijin; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Pijin; 28/8/83.

(41) - Boy; 11; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 4 y. Prim. Educ. Anglican; Vura; 9 years; none; public servant; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Kwara'ae/Pijin; 29/9/83.

(42) - Boy; 11; Ghari (Guadalcanal); Talise (Guadalcanal); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 9 years; aid nurse; skilled labourer in Malaya; Talise and Pijin; Talise and Pijin; Pijin; 29/9/83.

(43) - Boy; 11; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 4y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 11; none; printer; 11 years; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Kwara'ae/Pijin; Pijin; 29/9/83.

(44) - Boy; 11; Vella Lavella (New Georgia Group); Marovo (New Georgia Group); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 11 years; none; timberjack; Marovo and Pijin; Marovo/Pijin; Pijin; 29/9/83.

(45) - Girl; 12; Arosi. (Makira); Arosi; 4 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 6 years; subsistence gardener; deceased; Arosi and Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 30/9/83.

(46) - Boy; 11; Lau (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; 9 years; none; carpenter; Pijin and understands Lau; Pijin; Pijin; 30/9/83.

(47) - Girl; 11; Sikaiiana (Polynesian outlier); Bugotu (Isabel); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; 2 years (9 y. in. Tulagi before that); teacher; high ranking civil servant; Pijin and learning English; Pijin; Pijin; 30/9/83.

(48) - Boy; 12; Aiwo (Reef Island); Aiwo (Reef Island; 4 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; 12 years; none; driver; Pijin, understand a bit of Aiwo, learning English at school; Pijin; Pijin; 30/9/83.
(49) - Girl; 12; Bellona (Polynesian outlier); Bellona; 4 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 8 years; lives with her uncle; parents on Bellona; subsistence gardener; subsistence gardener; Rennellese, Pijin and English (her aunt is English); Rennellese and English; Pijin; 11/10/83.

(50) - Boy; 12; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 5 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; Vura; 12 years; domestic servant; public servant; Kwara'ae, Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 11/10/83.

(51) - Girl; 12; Arosi (Makira); Ghari (Guadalcanal); 5 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 12 years; teacher; ship engineer; Pijin and understand Arosi; Pijin; Pijin; 12/10/83.

(52) - Girl; 9; Langalanga (Malaita); Choiseul (Choiseul); 3 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; Vura; 9 years; shell money maker; store owner; Pijin and understands a little Langa Langa; Pijin; Pijin; 12/10/83.

(53) - Boy; 12; Doori'o (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; Vura; 12 years; none; none; Pijin and understand a little Kwara'ae; Pijin; Pijin 12/10/83.

(54) - Girl; 10; Are'are (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 3 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; 10 years; cashier; electrician; Pijin only; Pijin; Pijin; 12/10/83.

(55) - Girl; 12; Lau (Malaita); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 12; none; office clerk; Lau, Pijin and little English; Lau and Pijin; Pijin; 14/10/83.

(56) - Boy; 9; Fijian (Fiji Islands); Aiwo (Reef Islands); 2 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 9 years; secretary; public servant; Aiwo and Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 14/10/83.

(57) - Girl; 10; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; Vura; 10 years; domestic servant; office cleaner; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Pijin and little Kwara'ae; Pijin; 14/10/83.
(58) - Boy; 10; Talise (Guadalcanal); Talise; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC; Vura (lives with his aunt); 3 years; subsistence gardener; subsistence gardener; Talise and Pijin; Pijin; Pijin; 14/10/83.

(59) - Boy; 9; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Kwara'ae; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; Vura; 9 years; none; former office clerk, now retired; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Pijin; little Kwara'ae; Pijin; 18/10/83.

(60) - Girl; 8; Kwai (Malaita); 'Are'are (Malaita); 2 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 8 years; none; ship crew; Kwai and Pijin; Kwai and Pijin; Pijin; 18/10/83.

(61) - Girl; 8; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Lau (Malaita); 2 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 8 years; none; fisherman; Lau and Pijin; Lau and Pijin; Pijin; 18/10/83.

(62) - Boy; 12; Aiwo (Reef Islands); Cantonese (China); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 12 years; none; mechanic; Pijin and little English, understands little Aiwo; Pijin; Pijin; 19/10/83.

(63) - Boy; 14; Kwaio (Malaita); Kwaio; 6 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura (Kombito, the Kwaio village north of Vura); 6 years; none; mechanic; Kwaio, Pijin and little English; Kwaio; Pijin; 19/10/83.

(64) - Boy; 14; Lau (Malaita); Lau; 6 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 14 years; none; store manager; Pijin and a little English, understands a little Lau; Pijin/Lau; Pijin; 19/10/83.

(65) - Girl; 14; Maringe (Isabel); Kwara'ae (Malaita); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 13 years; former nurse; business man; Pijin and little English, understands very little Maringe and Kwara'ae; Pijin; Pijin; 20/10/83.

(66) - Girl; 13; Lau (Malaita); Langalanga (Malaita); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 13 years; domestic servant; office clerk; Lau; Pijin and little English; Lau and Pijin; Pijin; 24/10/83.
(67) - Girl; 13; Kiribati (Micronesia); Tuvalu (Polynesia); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; United Church; Vura; 6 years; accountant; office clerk; Kiribati, Pijin and little English; Kiribati and Pijin; Pijin; 26/10/83.

(68) - Girl; 13; Luanuia (Ontong Java); Palau (Ontong Java); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 13 years; none; office clerk; Palau, Pijin and little English; Palau and Pijin; Pijin; 26/10/83.

(69) - Girl; 13; Langalanga (Malaita); Vella Lavella (New Georgia) a Group; 6 y. Prim. Educ.; United Church; Vura; 13 years; none; mechanic; Langa Langa, Pijin and little English; Pijin; Pijin; 28/10/83.

(70) - Boy; 13; Choiseul (Choiseul); Sa'a (Malaita); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; Anglican; Vura; 6 years; none; copra inspector; little Choiseul, Pijin and little English; Pijin/Choiseul; Pijin; 28/10/83.

(71) - Boy; 12; Kwara'ae (Malaita); Butanana (Choiseul); 6 y. Prim. Educ.; SSEC.; Vura; 12 years; none; carpenter in Nauru; Kwara'ae, Pijin; Kwara'ae and Pijin; Pijin; 28/10/83.

(72) - Woman; 30; Sa'a (Malaita); To'ambaita (Malaita); 4 y. Prim. Educ. + tech train.; Anglican; Vura; 10 years; none; harbour master; Sa'a, Pijin, English; Pijin; Pijin; 1/11/83.

(73) - Man; 51; Lau (Malaita); Lau; 6 y. Prim. Educ. + techn. train. abroad; Catholic; Vura; 15 years; none; former Minister for Education, now business man and director of Tourist Authority; Lau, Pijin and English; Lau; Pijin and English; 5/11/83.

(74) - Girl; 10; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 2 y. Prim. Educ. Catholic; AvuAvu; 9 years, 1 year in Honiara; subsistence gardener; health inspector based in Honiara; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo; 15/11/83.
(75) - Girl; 12; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 11 years, 1 year in Tenaru; subsistence gardener; cathechist; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 15/11/83.

(76) - Girl; 12; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 11 years, 1 year on Isabel where she learned Pijin; subsistence gardener; local councillor; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 15/11/83.

(77) - Boy; 9; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 2 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 9 years; subsistence gardener; post-office clerk; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 15/11/83.

(78) - Girl; 9; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 2 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 8 years, 1 year in Tenaru; subsistence gardener; cathechist; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 15/11/83.

(79) - Boy; 9; Talise (Guadalcanal); Tolo (Guadalcanal); 2 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 9 years; subsistence gardener; deceased; Talise and Pijin; Talise; Talise + Pijin at school; 15/11/83.

(80) - Boy; 12; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 12 years; subsistence gardener; teacher; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 16/11/83.

(81) - Boy; 9; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 9 years; subsistence gardener; cathechist; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 16/11/83.

(82) - Boy; 12; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 12 years; domestic at the Catholic Mission; subsistence gardener; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 16/11/83.

(83) - Boy; 9; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 2 y. Prim. Educ.;
Catholic; AvuAvu; 9 years; subsistence gardener; subsistence gardener; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo + Pijin at school; 16/11/83.

(84) - Man; 73; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 6 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; all his life except for some trips to Honiara once in a while; village headman and mission headman; wife deceased 15 years ago. Tolo, Pijin and little English; Tolo; Tolo and Pijin with visitors; 16/11/83.

(85) - Man; 40; Talise (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 34 y, the rest on plantation in Yandina and West; subsistence gardener. Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo and Pijin with visitors; 17/11/83.

(86) - Girl; 16; Marau (Guadalcanal); Longgu (Guadalcanal); 3 y. Second. Educ.; Catholic; Provincial Secondary School in AvuAvu; 2 years, before in Marau Sound; deceased; member of the Provincial Assembly; Marau, Pijin and little English; Marau; Pijin; 17/11/83.

(87) - Boy; 18; Longgu (Guadalcanal); Marau (Guadalcanal); 3 y. Second. Educ.; Anglican; Provincial Secondary School in AvuAvu 2 years, before in Longgu, 2 years in Honiara; deceased; catechist; Longgu, Pijin and English; Longgu; Pijin; 17/11/83.

(88) - Girl; 16; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 3 y. Second. Educ; Catholic; lived in Honiara until 1980 and then came to the Prov. Second. School; none; skilled labourer, both in Honiara; Tolo, Pijin and English; Tolo; Pijin; 18/11/83.

(89) - Girl; 14; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Talise (Guadalcanal); 2 y. Second. Educ.; Catholic; 14 years; subsistence gardener; subsistence gardener; Tolo, Pijin and little English; Tolo; Pijin; 18/11/83.

(90) - Girl; 13; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 1 y. Second. Educ.; Catholic; Makaruka; 13 years; subsistence gardener; subsistence gardener; Tolo, Pijin and little English; Tolo; Pijin; 18/11/83.
(91) - Boy; 14; 'Are'are (Malaita); Lau (Malaita); 1 y. Second. Educ.; Anglican; Marau Sound; 8 years; none; former teacher; 'Are'are, Pijin and little English; 'Are'are; Pijin; 18/11/83.

(92) - Man; 39; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Marau (Guadalcanal); 4 y. Prim. Educ.; Catholic; 5 y. in Honiara; 2 y. on plantations in the West; subsistence gardener; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo and Pijin with visitors; 19/11/83.

(93) - Girl; 15; Birao (Guadalcanal); Marau (Guadalcanal); 3 y. Second. Educ.; Catholic; Marau Sound; 12 years; subsistence gardener; head teacher in Marau Sound; Birao, Pijin and little English; Birao; Pijin; 19/11/83.

(94) - Man; 61; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 2 y. of Prim. Educ after he got married; Catholic; Haematua; labour corps during the war where he learned Pijin; Headman of Haematua; Tolo; Tolo and Pijin with visitors; 20/11/83.

(95) - Woman; 32; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Kwara'aë (Malaita); 3 y. Second. Educ. + 2 y. Teachers Training College in Honiara; learned Pijin in Visale, the Catholic mission school on the North coast of Guadalcanal; Teacher; Tolo, Pijin, English and Ghari; Tolo; Tolo and Pijin with visitors; 20/11/83.

(96) - Man; 50; Tolo (Guadalcanal); Tolo; 2 y. of Prim. Educ.; Catholic; AvuAvu; 5 years spent on plantations in Yandina and in the West; many trips to Honiara; subsistence gardener; Tolo and Pijin; Tolo; Tolo and Pijin with visitors; 22/11/83.

(97) - Woman; 31; Lau (Malaita); not married; 6 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 10 years; office clerk; Lau, Pijin and English; Lau; Pijin; 30/11/83.

(98) - Woman; 32; Maringe (Isabel); Maringe; 5 y. Prim. Educ.;
Anglican; Vura; 9 years; none; office clerk; Maringe, Pijin; Maringe; Pijin; 3/12/83.

(99) - Man; 81; Lau (Malaita); Lau; 2 y. Prim. Educ.; SDA; Vura; 14 years; none; former officer in the colonial constabulary; Lau and Pijin; Lau; Pijin; 4/12/83.
APPENDIX E
PIJIN TEXTS

Text 1. Narrator: Informant No. 53

So mam blong hem mekem nomoa.
SEQ mummy Poss OP make STM

Moning nomoa, hem tekem puding.
Morning STM SP take puding

Tu’ala kaekaé finish nomoa, go nao.
3pSP eat ASP STM go STM

Tu’ala gogo folom wata, gogo nomoa,
3pDSP go PREP river, go STM

Tu’ala kam kesem wata ia,
3pDSP DIR reach river DEM

bat tu’ala des lukim ilfish ia.
CON 3pDSP ASP see eel STM

Big ilfish ia hem des ledaon antop lo ston.
ADJ eel DEM 3SP ASP lay down PREP stone

Flat ston nomoa.
ADJ stone STM

Hem ledaon hotem bodi blon hem fo san.
3Sp lay daon warm up body POSS OP PREP sun

So tu’aa kam nomoa, tu’aa lukim nomoa,
SEQ 3pDSP come STM 3pDSP look STM

tu’aa luk go nomoa,
3pDSP look DIR STM

Oh! big ilfish ia mitaa had fo kilim.
Oh! ADJ eel DEM 1pDSP hard PREP kill

Den nomoa, smol brata, smol boe ia se;
SEQ STM, small brother, small boy DEM say

"Kam, mitua go nomoa, mitua go kilim nomoa".
Come, 3PDOP go STM, 3PD3P AUX kill STM

Ilfish smelem tufala nomoa.
Eel smell 3PDOP STM

Ilfis aot kam fo kaekae tufala nao.
Eel open PREP eat 3PDOP STM

Hem aotkam nomoa bat nara boe, febbon ia rahawe.
3SP open STM CONJ other boy, elder DEIC run away

Bat smol boe ia stanap nomoa taem
SEQ small boy DEM stand up STM TD

ilfis ia kom fo openem maot blon hem nomoa.
eel DEM come PREP open mouth POSS OP STM

So his mother makes it. In the morning he takes the pudding.
The two of them finish eating and go. They follow the river,
keep following, the reach this river, but they see a big eel.
This big eel is lying down on a stone, a flat stone; it lays down
and warms up its body in the sun. They get closer, they see it,
they look. Oh!, this eel is too big for us to kill. Then the
young brother, this small boy says: "Come! we are going, we are
going to kill it." The eel smells them. It stands up and looks
at them. The eel opens up to eat them. It opens up but the
older boy runs away. But the small boy stands up when the eel
is ready to open its mouth.

TEXT II.
Informant No.62

Samfala ankol blon Rif, samfala blon Sina.
IA uncle POSS Reef, IA POSS China.

Kos, lo Sina, oketa komunist ia oketa save kilim
SEQ PREP China, PLU communist DEM SP AUX kill

pipol tumas. So oketa kam fo faendim hem nao. Den
people ADJ SEQ SP come PREP find OF STM. SEQ

hem kam wetem brata blon dadi blon hem; tekem kam.
SP come PREP brother POSS daddy POSS OP; take come

Tufala kom lon bus, go kasem lon wanfaa ples nomoa.
3PDSP come PREP bush, AUX reach PREP IA place STM

Den dad blon mi karaq lon wanfaa selin bout nao,
SEQ daddy POSS SP yell PREP IA sail boat STM
Some of my uncles are from the Reefs, some are from China. Because, in China, the communists went around killing people. They came to get him. Then he went with his father's brother. He took him along. They went in the bush and got to a place. Then my father called to a sailing boat, a sailing ship. Plenty of people were on board. Plenty of people who ran away. My father went with them, then this uncle of his went back home.

TEXT III.

Informant no. 58

 wanfala selin sip. Staka pipol tu insaet. IA sail ship. ADJ people ADV

 Staka pipol oketa ranawe. Dad blon mi go wetem ADJ people PSP run away. Daddy POSS OP go PREP

 olketa den ankol blon hem ia go bak lon hom. OP SEQ uncle POSS OP DEM go back PREP home

Some of my uncles are from the Reefs, some are from China. Because, in China, the communists went around killing people. They came to get him. Then he went with his father's brother. He took him along. They went in the bush and got to a place. Then my father called to a sailing boat, a sailing ship. Plenty of people were on board. Plenty of people who ran away. My father went with them, then this uncle of his went back home.
I don't know when he was born. Because he himself does not know when he was born. He lives in our village all the time now. But before, it used to be that people went to work on the plantations. These places in Yandina. These places were called Banika, Tuhu; the plantations that the europeans who came before used for copra [production]. They hired workers for these places. That's how my father went there. To these places.

TEXT IV
Informant No. 84
Olketa i stat wetem machin rulu. Ana olketa i SP PM start CONJ Marching Rule. CON SP PM joenem machin rulu wetem olketa pipol lon hia, join Marching Rule CONJ FLU people PREP ADV, pipol lon Malaita, anda olketa polom machin people PREP Malaita, CON SP follow Marching rul. Gogo, gavman i stopem machin rul. Den, Rule. IT government PM stop Marching Rule. SEQ olketa i statem olsem, nada samtin olketa i SP PM start ADV another thing SP PM Kolem Marau Haumba. Den Moro i statem muvmenti call Marau Haumba. SEQ Moro PM start movement blon hem. Moro i statem muvmenti blon hem, bata POSS OP. Moro PM start movement POSS OP CONJ hem se hemi dae, den hemu i laevim bak, hemu SP say SP die, SEQ SP PM resuscitate, SP i lukim samting. Den hemi tokabaot. Den plande FM look something. SEQ SP tell. SEQ ADJ pipol blon mifala ia, oketa i tink biliv, se people POSS OP DEIC PSP PM think believe, say samting turu. Den olketa i polom Moro muvment. something ADJ SEQ SP PM follow Moro movement.

They started with Marching Rule. They joined Marching Rule with the people from here, the people from Malaita and they joined Marching Rule. Then the government stopped Marching Rule. Then they started another thing which they called Marau Haumba. Then Moro started his movement. Moro started his movement, but he said that he had died and resuscitate, that he had seen something
Then he talked about it. Many of our people started to believe that it was true. Then they joined the Moro movement.
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