

## ON PREPOSITIONS IN SOLOMON ISLANDS PIJIN

ERNEST W. LEE

### 1. INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

Forms in a language can be categorised in various ways. Fox (1950:144-169) organises his treatment of particles (including prepositions) in the Nggela language of the Solomon Islands according to form. He begins with the single vowel (V) forms (both particles and affixes) and proceeds through single consonant (C) forms (affixes) and consonant plus vowel (CV) forms. Each subgroup is listed alphabetically and the various uses of each are detailed. This, like a dictionary, has the advantage of helping the reader to see the various uses of homophonous forms without having to search throughout the grammar, but has the disadvantage of not showing the semantic or syntactic structure of the language without searching for it. I have chosen to organise Solomon Islands Pijin (hereafter Pijin) prepositions and phrases with preposition-like functions according to function, form and distribution.

Most earlier works on Melanesian pidgins and creoles<sup>2</sup> had very little on prepositions and much of what was in sources available to me cannot be found under the category of prepositions. Guy (1974:12) lists prepositions as a part of speech in Bislama, but discusses them as introducers of complements under the heading of subordination (pp.32-38). He does, fortunately, cross-reference the appropriate sections under the heading of prepositions in an index (p.54). Although not intended as a grammar, Scorza and Franklin (1989:21-40) in their chapter on grammatical features in *An advanced course in Tok Pisin* do not even mention prepositions as such, although a little on *long* and *bilong* does show up in the text. Todd's (1984:195) section on Tok Pisin has a few lines on prepositions. Heubner and Horoi (1979a:172-175) do not include a section on prepositions but some of the relevant information is subsumed in the chapter on relative clauses and elsewhere. Some recent works

---

<sup>1</sup> I am grateful to Brenda Boerger for comments on an earlier draft of this paper, and to participants in a special forum at the Honiara Centre of the University of the South Pacific at which a version of this paper was presented in August 1993.

<sup>2</sup> It is not my intent here to discuss the question of whether Torres Strait Creole is a Melanesian creole. The term 'Melanesian pidgin' is frequently used to refer only to Tok Pisin, Solomon Islands Pijin and Bislama. Keesing (1988:8), however, clearly includes Torres Strait Creole along with these three in such statements as "...other [besides Tok Pisin] Melanesian Pidgin dialects--Bislama, Solomons Pidgin, Torres Strait Creole...". Harris (e.g. 1986:286, 292) clearly rejects any connection between Aboriginal Kriol (via its precursor Northern Territory Pidgin) and Early Melanesian Pidgin of the Queensland plantations, but he gives no indication of rejecting Early Melanesian Pidgin as the antecedent of Torres Strait Creole (p.7) and clearly accepts it as at least an antecedent of Torres Strait Creole (pp.36, 292). Clark (1979:48) in his tree diagram actually shows a closer historical connection of Bislama, Pijin and Torres Strait Creole to each other than any of these with Tok Pisin. For the purposes of this paper, Torres Strait Creole is included as a Melanesian creole.

now available to me give more attention to prepositions. Crowley (1990b:12f.) gives only one paragraph on prepositions in the introduction to his Bislama dictionary, but treats them extensively elsewhere (1990c:75-87). For Broken (Torres Strait Creole), Shnukal (1988:55-61) has a reasonably detailed description of prepositions.

As in other Pacific pidgins and creoles, as well as in the substrate languages of the Solomon Islands, ordinary prepositions in Pijin are quite limited in number especially compared to languages like English. Some of the pidgins and creoles (e.g. Tok Pisin of Papua New Guinea) have even fewer prepositions than Pijin. Some of the more common prepositions in Pijin listed alphabetically are: *abaot/abaotem* 'about', *antap* 'on top of', *blong* 'of', *fo* 'for', *from* 'from', *insaet* 'inside', *kasem* 'until', *long* 'at', *olsem* 'like' and *wetem* 'with'.

The prepositions of Pijin are of three types which I label *simple*, *verbal* and *nominal*. Codrington, as early as 1885 (see p.552), distinguished prepositions for some of the Solomon Islands languages as "1. Simple, 2. Nouns, 3. Verbs". Lichtenberk<sup>3</sup> (1984:57) classifies To'aba'ita prepositions as true, nominal and verbal. Codrington's 'nouns' correlate with one of the two subclasses of Lichtenberk's 'nominal prepositions'. Pijin has no equivalent to Codrington's 'nouns'; my 'nominal prepositions' correlate rather with Lichtenberk's other subclass of 'nominal prepositions'. Crowley labels the parallel classes in Bislama as 'full' (1990c:81f.), 'verbal' (1990c:83ff.) and 'adverbial' (1990a:13). Of the specific Pijin prepositions listed above, *blong*, *fo* and *long* are simple; *insaet* and *antap* are nominal; the others including *from* and *olsem*, I will argue, are all verbal.

The simple prepositions are all one syllable and the two with a final consonant (-ng) often drop the consonant in normal speech. The three prepositions in this class are further characterised by having a very general semantic content and primarily showing case relationships. The preposition *fo* 'to, for' does not have a comparable parallel in either Tok Pisin or Bislama, but Broken has a parallel *po*. The source and function of *fo* are examined below in light of substrate languages, a sister language Broken, the superstrate language English and universal tendencies.

The verbal prepositions are characterised by requiring the transitive verb suffix {- (V)m} (optional in the case of *abaotem* 'about'). Many of them involve motion or action and can also function as verbs. These are examined in light of substrate languages, verb serialisation and Bislama.

The nominal prepositions are characterised by having the potential of standing alone or being preceded and/or followed by *long*. Most of them are locational in nature.

The following abbreviations for grammatical terms are used, some of them following Keesing (1988):

CON	continuative	PL	plural marker
DAT	dative preposition	POSS	possessive preposition
DEI	deictic	SG	singular
DIR	directional marker	SRP	subject referencing pronoun (only in examples from Keesing) <sup>4</sup>
DU	dual	TOP	topicalisation marker
EXC	exclusive		

<sup>3</sup> Material from Lichtenberk is to be considered as tentative and preliminary.

<sup>4</sup> Although I basically concur with Keesing in his analysis of subject referencing pronouns, they are not indicated in my Pijin examples since it is not relevant to this paper.

INC	inclusive	TRI	trial
LOC	locative preposition	TRS	transitive suffix

The following abbreviations are used for referencing examples from texts:

GHB	<i>Solomon Islands Pijin: grammar handbook</i> (Heubner & Horoi 1979a)
RR1	<i>Buk fo Ridim an Raetem Pijin: Buk 1</i> (Lee, ed. 1981a)
RR2	<i>Buk fo Ridim an Raetem Pijin: Buk 2</i> (Lee, ed. 1981b)
SKS	<i>Samfala Kastom Stori...</i> (1982)
SSH	<i>Solomon Islands Pijin: special skills handbook</i> (Heubner & Horoi 1979b)
TBD	<i>Bikfala Faet:...</i> [ <i>The Big Death:...</i> ] (White et al., ed. 1988)

## 2. PREPOSITIONS

Semantically, the three simple prepositions, *blong*, *long* and *fo* are much more generic than either the verbal or nominal prepositions. Formally, the simple prepositions are normally unstressed and, as already noted, the *-ng* of *long* and *blong* are frequently dropped in speech, becoming *lo* and *blo* respectively. Distributionally, they always (unlike English) have an obligatory overt object immediately following them even when there is one in the preceding context.

### 2.1 SEMANTICS AND FUNCTION OF SIMPLE PREPOSITIONS

The primary function of the three simple prepositions is to show a case relationship between the immediately preceding word(s) and the immediately following word(s) within a sentence rather than to convey specific meaning themselves. How these prepositions are translated into English is largely dependent on the meanings of the words which they relate. Each preposition is given a designation, but the designation does not cover the whole range of relationships into which the specific preposition enters.

The preposition *long* is the most general. It can variously be translated in English as 'in, at, to (destination), from (source), on, by, with' etc. This does not mean that *long* changes its meaning; it is simply almost devoid of meaning. More often than not it refers to some kind of locational relationship so it is glossed as LOC. With certain verbs it may relate the action to a substance out of which something is constructed or an instrument with which the action is carried out.

The preposition *blong* can be thought of as basically possessive, that is, whatever follows *blong* in some way 'possesses' that which precedes it and therefore glossed POSS. More frequently than not, however, it does not strictly show possession. For example, in *akis blong mi* 'my axe' it likely shows clear possession whereas in *dadi blong mi* 'my father' it shows a kinship relation and in *bele blong mi* 'my belly' it shows a part/whole relationship. In the above examples, *blong* is combined with the following pronoun and translated into English as a possessive pronoun. If the following word is a noun, *blong* is often translated as an apostrophe plus 's'. Otherwise, *blong* is normally translated as 'of'.

The preposition *fo* can be thought of as a dative (glossed DAT) pronoun. Dative is a term often used in languages to cover a relationship which shows that someone or something is the recipient or beneficiary of something or of some action. Neither of the Pijin dictionaries available (Simons & Young 1978; Guyer-Miller 1989) give word classes for dictionary entries but both include *fo* with the meanings of 'to' and 'for'.

As noted earlier, the other Melanesian Pijins all have cognate forms of *long* and *blong*, but only Broken has a cognate form (*po*) of Pijin *fo*.

## 2.2 DISTRIBUTION OF THE SIMPLE PREPOSITIONS

Examples (1) and (2) illustrate objects following the prepositions but no objects preceding them (example (1) illustrates both *long* and *blong*):

- (1) *Hemi kanduit go insaet long haos blong olketa waetman.*  
 he cannot go inside LOC house POSS PL white.man  
 He couldn't go into the white men's house. (TBD:98)
- (2) *An ami olketa givim kam fo mifala.*  
 and army they give DIR DAT us.EXC  
 And the army gave them to us. (TBD:102)

Examples (3) - (6) have an object in the preceding context, but an overt pronominal object is also required following the preposition. In this respect Pijin differs from English. Note that in example (3) the free rendering in English also requires an overt object after 'to', but does not require one in examples (4) - (6) after 'about', 'to' and 'for'. Example (7) has no equivalent of the preposition *blong* in the English rendering; to translate it showing possession would require something like '...man whose name was...'. Whether a preposition in English can be stranded, that is, be used without a following object, depends largely on the type of context in which it occurs, whereas none of the simple prepositions of Pijin can ever be stranded.

- (3) *Pipol olsem, mifala no save duim enisaming long olketa.*  
 people like.that we.EXC not able do anything LOC them  
 People like that, we can't do anything to them. (TBD:103)
- (4) *Samting wea olketa lanem mifala long hem...*  
 something which they taught us LOC it  
 Something which they taught us about... (TBD:103)
- (5) *Tri wea olketa Japan taemap hem long hem brek.*  
 tree which PL Japan tie.up him LOC it break  
 The tree which the Japanese tied him to broke. (TBD:91)
- (6) *Hu nao olketa wakem gaden fo hem?*  
 who TOP they make garden DAT him/her  
 Who are they making a garden for? (GHB:102)
- (7) *Olketa Japan kasholem wanfala man nem blong hem Maelangi.*  
 PL Japan capture one man name POSS him Maelangi  
 The Japanese captured a man named Maelangi. (TBD:90f.)

In Pijin, it is normal for phrases with *long* or *fo* to occur in their expected slot in a clause even though a complete parallel phrase (e.g. *fo wanem* in (8)) or an adequate equivalent (e.g. *wea* in (9)) occur in a fronted or other preceding construction:

- (8) *Fo wanem nao olketa i katem plande hevenat fo hem?*  
 DAT what TOP they they cut plenty heavy.nut DAT it  
 What are they cutting so many heavy nuts for? (GHB:112)

- (9) *Mifala go-go-go kasem disfala hol ia wea olketa*  
 we.EXC CON-CON-go arrive this cave DEI where PL  
*flaeng fokis i stap long hem.*  
 flying fox they stay LOC it.  
 We kept on going until we got to this cave where flying foxes stay. (RR1:13)

In these examples the final *fo hem* and *long hem* could be deleted, but it is more natural *with* them whereas in the English gloss it would be unnaturally redundant to have 'for' at both the beginning and the end of the first example or to add 'in it' to the second example.

### 2.3 *fo* IN PIJIN – OLD OR NEW?

Although neither Bislama nor Tok Pisin have a cognate of *fo*, it is very common in Pijin. In one text of 277 words (Todd 1984:270) I counted 17 instances of *fo*. Its use as a preposition signals a dative or beneficiary relationship and can normally be translated by English 'to' or 'for' even though many of the instances would be equivalent to English 'to' in infinitive constructions and often with a sense of purpose.

- (10) *An hemi baebae baem samfala tul fo waka long hem.*  
 and he will buy some tool to work LOC it  
 And he'll buy some tools to work with. (Todd 1984:270)
- (11) *Olketa jes stat fo kam long taem ia.*  
 they just start to come LOC time DEI  
 They just began to come at that time. (TBD:101)

Examples showing a beneficiary relationship:

- (12) *Mitufala tekem kam samfala sugaken fo iu.*  
 we.DU.EXC take DIR some sugarcane DAT you.SG  
 We brought you some sugarcane. (RR2:44)
- (13) *Mi kanduit ansarem fo iutufala.*  
 I can't answer DAT you.DU  
 I can't answer them for you. (Follows 'Don't ask me any questions.')(TBD:58)
- (14) *...olketa givim kam fo mifala.*  
 they give DIR DAT us.EXC  
 ...they gave them to us. (TBD:102)

In some contexts *fo* and *long* are mutually substitutable. Compare the previous example with this one:

- (15) *...olketa givim nomoa long mifala.*  
 they give only LOC us.EXC  
 ...and they gave them to us. (TBD:102)

What is the source of Pijin *fo*? Is it recent or old in Pijin? Is it something taken from the superstrate English since the divergence of Pijin from the earlier plantation Melanesian Pidgin or is it something which Bislama and Tok Pisin have lost? As noted above, to my knowledge, the only other Melanesian pidgin/creole that has a productive cognate form (*po*) is Broken. Shnukal (1988:61) describes *po* as showing a relationship of benefit or reason. Because of their form it is evident that *po* and *fo* derive lexically from English 'for'. Did

Broken and Pijin independently borrow this preposition from English or do they reflect a common history of Melanesian Pidgin? Or is there something common to pidgins and creoles that would lead us to expect this development?

As a preposition *fo* and *po* occur where *long* is normally used in Tok Pisin and Bislama. The two languages also share a common use of *fo/po*, however, for which neither Bislama nor Tok Pisin use *long*. This is in purpose constructions which are translated into English as infinitives. Bislama uses *blong* for these constructions and Tok Pisin uses the cognate *bilong*. The following examples are all taken from the Gospel of Mark 1:24.

Pijin:

- (16) *Ating iu kam fo spoelem mifala ia!*  
Probably you've come to destroy us!

Broken:

- (17) *Yu bin kam po tere mipla, a?*  
Have you come to tear us?

Bislama:

- (18) *Ating yu kam blong spoelem mifala!*  
Probably you've come to destroy us!

Tok Pisin:

- (19) *Ating yu kam bilong bagarapim mipela?*  
Probably you've come to destroy us?

For this passage from Mark's Gospel, Hawaiian Creole also has *fo* parallel to Pijin and Broken, whereas Aboriginal Kriol has *blanga* which is parallel to the Bislama and Tok Pisin forms.

The comparable use of the cognate forms in Broken and Pijin would seem to reflect the fact that either they share a common history or they have both dropped *b(i)long* in favour of *fo/po* because of substrate influence or universal tendencies in pidgins and creoles. It is easy to see how both Pijin and Broken could have borrowed the English *for* in the cases where there is a benefactive or recipient relationship. It is less easy to see why both languages would have extended it to the infinitival use thus replacing both *blong* and *long* for some uses.

One possible line of borrowing is from the now archaic (according to the *American heritage dictionary*, p.512) use of the sequence *for to* to express purpose in English. English also uses *for* when asking about the purpose of an action although the response will have *to* before a verb as in 'What did you do that for? I did it to...'. Evidence from earlier stages of Melanesian Pidgin is not readily available to me, but Dutton's (1980) interview with two New Hebridean kanakas in North Queensland does reveal the use by one speaker of *fə* as a benefactive preposition (p.15) and of *po* both as a benefactive preposition (...*onli wan lili pi:si po yu, lili pi:si po mi*... 'only one little piece for you, a little piece for me...', p.52) and in purpose constructions with a following verb (...*po wokabaut* 'to walk about', p.29, 30) and with a following nominal (*wat ... fo?* 'what...for' and *po nating* 'for nothing', p.30). With the exception of the purpose constructions with a following verb, all of these uses translate into English with 'for'. Considering the fact that this man had come to Queensland in the latter part of the nineteenth century and did not have a lot of contact with

other pidgin speakers during the latter part of his life, it is not possible to determine how much of his use of *po* was due to later English influence. The use in the purpose construction *po wokabaut* 'to walk about' is less likely from later English influence unless English *for to* was in general use around him.<sup>5</sup>

A more likely possibility is that both Pijin and Broken independently borrowed English 'for' as a dative preposition partially replacing *long* and extended its use to purpose constructions partially replacing *blong*. Evidence for this comes from the widespread tendency of pidgins and creoles throughout the world to use the same particle for both uses. Bickerton (1981) has a number of examples from several of the creoles which use derivatives of English 'for' or French 'pour' with both clear prepositional uses and purposive or related uses which he refers to as complementisers. The notions of purposive and benefactive are semantically related, with the complement of the one normally verbal and the complement of the other nominal. This line of reasoning supports the independent origin of *fo* in Pijin and *po* in Broken being due to the general tendencies of pidgins and creoles to acquire a dative-type preposition and for its use to be extended to that of complementiser (see Bickerton 1981:30-33).<sup>6</sup>

Pijin *fo* is not a recent, that is, post-World War II development. Keesing (1988:224) cites a speaker from Simbo from the Western Solomons who learned Pijin on Malaita as a policeman in the 1920s. In a short text of 32 words, this speaker used *fo* three times in infinitive constructions. The speakers who told their stories for *Bikfala faet* were all men who had been involved in World War II and had presumably all learned Pijin not later than the 1930s. Their stories are replete with instances of *fo* in all of its functions. There are some instances of alternation of *fo* and *long* as noted above, but in infinitive constructions, I observed only *fo* in those stories.

As to the substrate languages, there is ample evidence for a form with dative relationship for a good number of languages. Kwaio has *fa-* which Keesing (e.g. 1988:220) translates as 'for' following the verb for 'give' and 'carry' and as 'to' following the verb for 'run away'. In each of these cases the parallel sentences for Pijin all have *fo*. To'aba'ita (Lichtenberk 1984:61f.) also uses *fa* (recipient/benefactive) but Lichtenberk treats it as a nominal preposition obligatorily preceded by the true preposition 'i and, like Kwaio, obligatorily followed by the inalienable possessive construction. Many, if not all, of the Oceanic languages of the Solomons have similar prepositions with many of them reflecting a common origin.<sup>7</sup> It may also be significant that for at least Kwaio and To'aba'ita speakers (both from the northern half of Malaita) who contributed heavily to the development of Pijin, the form of their preposition *fa* is very close phonologically to Pijin *fo*. It is conceivable that the phonological similarity has contributed to the adoption of *fo* in Pijin.<sup>8</sup>

5 Suggested as a possibility by David Walsh (pers.comm.) for all of the instances of pidgin derivatives from 'for' with a notion of purpose.

6 I have heard comments that Broken is more like Pijin than any of the other Melanesian pidgins. It is likely that a few transparent parallel uses such as that of *po* and *fo* in the two languages are the source of such comments.

7 For example: Longgu on the south-east coast of Guadalcanal (Ivens 1935:618), Inakona (=Koo) on the south-west coast of Guadalcanal (Capell 1930:127), Cheke Holo (=Maringe) on Santa Isabel (White et al., ed. 1988:xxxii).

8 Simons (1986) uses a similar argument for Pijin *nao* as topic marker, perfect marker and sentence connector. To'aba'ita has *na*, *na'a* and *ma*, respectively, for these functions and other Malaitan languages have similar forms including *na* instead of *ma* as a sentence connector. Although Pijin *nao* corresponds in function with 'now' only as a sentence connector (not in all dialects of English), its extension to the

The evidence from the substrate languages supports the presence of *fo* in Pijin as a dative whether or not its origin is in any way dependent on the substrate languages. Of the languages cited, however, apart from Kwaio and To'aba'ita, the forms suggest that they are verbal prepositions. For Proto Oceanic Pawley (1973:143f.) lists \**pani* as a verbal preposition whose function is most commonly dative.<sup>9</sup> It would appear that for languages like Kwaio and To'aba'ita, the verbal preposition has changed its status. This would be a natural progression and To'aba'ita has three verbal prepositions which have deverbalised variants in some contexts (Lichtenberk 1984:66) showing the process at work.

As to the infinitive/purpose constructions, Kwaio normally uses a different particle 'a- followed by a subject referencing pronoun (Keesing 1988:240) although one example (p.244) uses *fa* (see above) without a subject referencing pronoun for a very similar function:

- (20) ...leka *fā*-na kwaikwailo-ngari.  
       go for-it hunt-canarium.nuts  
       ...go to gather canarium nuts.

This construction with *fa* appears to be very close to the Pijin use of *fo* for purpose. Lichtenberk (1984:62) also cites To'aba'ita *fa* with a purpose function following two words meaning 'time'. Otherwise, the purpose/infinitive type constructions in To'aba'ita are normally introduced by the true preposition *ni* 'purpose/instrumental' (Lichtenberk 1984:34, 59). In light of the very uncommon use of the dative-type preposition as a complementiser in the substrate languages, it would appear that the extension of the use of *fo* to the purposive use in Pijin is likely not related to the substrate languages.

Hence, it appears that the strongest weight of evidence is that Pijin and Broken independently borrowed a dative form from English and extended its use to purpose/infinitive constructions as part of a universal tendency which both Bislama and Tok Pisin have resisted in the retention of *long* for dative uses and *blong* for the purposive use. Its origin in Broken could have been from other Pacific pidgin sources but this could hardly be the case for Pijin. The English purposive 'for to' and 'for' in questions about purpose may give some support to the uses, but are less likely the source. The substrate languages of the Solomons support both a dative form and a purposive form, but only weakly support the same form for both since the dative preposition is extended to purpose in very limited situations. In conclusion, however, I cite Keesing's (1988:111) observation:

Once more we see why...substrate influence, superstrate influence, diffusion, and universals of grammar must all be seen as mutually complementary and interactive, not mutually exclusive, processes. The intersection of universal logics and faculties, language-learning strategies, and both substrate and superstrate models opens up particular paths for simplification, borrowing, and grammatical reanalysis.

In the next section we will see some of the same processes but with a different mix where substrate influence carries a greater weight.

---

other uses appears to be connected to the similarity of form between English 'now' and the Malaitan particles.

<sup>9</sup> Given the predictable line of development Durie (1988:21) suggests that the verbal prepositions reconstructed by Pawley may actually represent shared innovations rather than shared retentions.

### 3. VERBAL PREPOSITIONS

Perhaps the most obvious and also a very significant distinction in Pijin prepositions is that some take a suffix  $\{-(V)m\}$ . For those acquainted with Melanesian pidgins, it will be apparent that the suffix is identical in form to the transitive suffix. Before considering the identification of these with the transitive suffix as prepositions, a look at the transitive suffix itself will be helpful.

#### 3.1 ALLOMORPHS OF TRANSITIVE SUFFIX AND THEIR DISTRIBUTION

The allomorphs of the Pijin transitive suffix are: *-em*, *-im*, *-um* and *-m*. The allomorph *-m* normally follows stems ending with a vowel (e.g. *daevam* 'to dive for' (intransitive: *daeva* 'to dive') although some speakers use *-em* following the non-high vowels *a* and *o* (e.g. *troem* 'to throw' instead of *trom*) and a majority of speakers use *-im* in *duim* 'to do' in preference to *dum*.<sup>10</sup> For consonant-final stems, *-em* normally follows a preceding non-high vowel (*e*, *a*, *o*, e.g. *kolem* 'to call') and *-im* normally follows a preceding high vowel (*i*, *u*, e.g. *kilim* 'to hit'). In some cases a preceding *u* is followed by *-um* for many speakers. These are mostly words with an *h* or a bilabial consonant preceding the *u* of the stem (*hukum* 'to hook'; *pulum* 'to pull').<sup>11</sup> There are, however, conflicting phonological pressures such that most speakers use *-im* after a verb-final *s* following both high and non-high vowels (*blesim* 'to bless'). For some speakers this is also true of the verb-final alveolar consonants *t*- and *n*- (e.g. *hatim* rather than *hatem* 'to scold'). Finally, polysyllabic verb stems ending in *ar*- may optionally have *-em* or drop the *r*- and use only *-m* (*hamarem*, *hamam* 'to pound'). Although the prepositions in Pijin taking the transitive suffix are few in number, the same patterns of distribution of the suffix hold for them as well as for verbs.<sup>12</sup>

#### 3.2 SUBSTRATE INFLUENCE AND FUNCTION OF THE TRANSITIVE SUFFIX

The function of the transitive suffix very closely parallels that of the substrate languages. The first item on Keesing's (1988:98) list of what we might expect to find in a hypothetical Pacific pidgin created in an Eastern Oceanic situation, but which we would not otherwise find in a pidgin, is "a transitive suffix to mark agent-object relations". Keesing elaborates on this point in his chapter on structures and sources of pidgin syntax. He notes (p.119) that the "form '-him' suffixed to verbs was undoubtedly brought to the Pacific as part of the European repertoire for 'talking to natives'", but he also argues (p.119f.) that the way in which speakers of Oceanic languages analysed the form was equivalent to the transitive suffixes in their own language which derive from Proto Oceanic *\*-i*. He observes (p.21) that a "morphologically unmarked form of the transitive suffix embodies an implicit third-person singular pronominal object marker" in both Melanesian Pidgin and Eastern Oceanic languages.<sup>13</sup>

<sup>10</sup> The form *du-* cannot occur independently although it does occur as part of a few other lexical items: *kanduit* 'to be unable to', *durong* 'to commit an offence (normally of a sexual nature)', and *dugud* 'to perform a righteous act'.

<sup>11</sup> In Bislama *-um* is the norm following *u* in the root.

<sup>12</sup> A few transitive verbs do not take the object suffix (e.g. *save* 'understand': *mi no save enisamting* 'I don't know anything') and some others can take it but normally don't (e.g. *torowe(m)* 'throw away, discard').

<sup>13</sup> According to Keesing (1988:120), Proto Oceanic also had a small class of verbs marked as transitive by a suffixed object pronoun which some of the daughter languages (including Kwaio which Keesing

He gives examples (p.121) from Pijin ((21) and (23)) and Kwaio ((22) and (24)). Note that the second Pijin example (23) has an implicit (presumably explicit in the preceding context) third person object in the absence of an overt object.<sup>14</sup>

- (21) *Mi no luk-im pigpig blong iu.*  
 I not see-TRS pig POSS you.SG  
 I didn't see your pig(s).
- (22) *Ku 'ame aga-si-a boo a-mu.*  
 I.SRP not see-TRS-it pig POSS-you.SG  
 I didn't see your pig(s).
- (23) *Mi no luk-im.*  
 I not see-TRS  
 I didn't see them.
- (24) *Ku 'ame aga-si-a.*  
 I.SRP not see-TRS-it  
 I didn't see them.

Examples could be cited from other Solomon Islands languages, but this is not necessary. Keesing has adequately treated the Oceanic influence in the development of the Melanesian Pidgin transitive suffix.

### 3.3 FORMS WITH THE TRANSITIVE SUFFIX AS PREPOSITIONS

The forms in Pijin which clearly have the transitive suffix and serve as prepositions in at least some contexts are *wetem* 'with', *agensim* 'against', *raonem* 'around', *falom* 'along, according to', *winim* 'beyond (for comparison)', *(go/kam) kasem* 'until', *krosim* 'across' and *abaot(em)* 'about'. Semantically most of these are somewhat specific and most of them also function as transitive verbs. To my knowledge, apart from *abaot(em)* for which the suffix is optional, none of these occur as prepositions without the suffix in any speech that would be considered as acceptable Pijin. Keesing (1988:122,181) refers to some of these as prepositional verbs noting that they are used as prepositions. Camden (1977:133), for Bislama, lists *wetem* as a preposition (and also as a stative verb) but none of the others are listed as prepositions. Crowley (1990c:82ff.) calls the cognate forms which occur in Bislama verbal prepositions. This includes all of them except *abaot(em)* for which Bislama apparently has no comparable preposition and *winim* for which Bislama normally uses *bitim* (but cf. Camden (1977:134) who also lists *winim* for comparisons). Apparently neither Tok Pisin nor Broken have verbal prepositions like Pijin and Bislama.

Do the verbal prepositions of Bislama and Pijin stem directly from the grammaticalisation of serial verbs into verbal prepositions as Crowley (1990c:76, 85f.) suggests for Bislama or do they directly reflect such verbal prepositions in the substrate languages without an intermediate serial verb state? There is also the further question as to whether *from* 'from' and *olsem* 'like' which have a final *-m* also belong to the same class. Before examining these

---

describes) generalise for all transitive verbs. Could it be that Pijin *[-(V)m]* more closely parallels the third singular object pronoun of the substrate languages than the Proto Oceanic transitive suffix?

<sup>14</sup> Keesing's spelling of some Pijin words has been adjusted and his glosses (including abbreviations) and punctuation have been modified to agree with those used in this paper.

questions, examples of some of the verbal prepositions in Pijin showing their function and distribution are given here. One of the most common of these in Pijin is *wetem*:

- (25) *Olketa kam wetem olketa waetman hu i bringim kam sios.*  
 they come with PL white.man who they brought DIR church  
 They came with the white men who brought the church. (TBD:97)

Of the others *agensim* and *abaotem* occur frequently with verbs of speaking:

- (26) *Hemi tekem Jisas... an toktok strong agensim tingting blong hem ia.*  
 he take Jesus and talk strong against thinking POSS him DEI  
 He took Jesus...and talked strong against his thinking. (Mark 8:32)
- (27) *Hem ia nao wanfala stori abaotem wankaen ,smolfala pipol..*  
 it DEI TOP one story about one.kind small people  
 This is a story about a kind of dwarf... (SKS:11)
- (28) *Evri waetman stat fo toktok abaot wo.*  
 every white.man begin to talk about war  
 Every white man began to talk about war (coming to the Solomons). (TBD:13)

*Raonem* and *falom* are less common but both occur in (28):

- (29) *Hemi talem olketa... fo sidaon falom sanbis raonem aelan ia.*  
 he tell them to sit along beach around island DEI  
 He told them...to sit down along the beach around the island. (SKS:21)

*Kasem* as a preposition usually combines with a continuative to form a complex preposition:

- (30) *...mifala no lukim olketa go-go kasem distaem.*  
 we.EXC not see them CON-CON until now  
 ...we haven't seen them until now (and not now). (TBD:58)
- (31) *Go from ivining go kasem moning.*  
 go from evening CON until morning  
 (They) went on from evening till morning. (TBD:60)

Like transitive verbs, these prepositions may also occur without a following overt object, that is, they may be stranded or orphaned. The object may be fronted for discourse connection or as part of a normal question order or the object may be part of an earlier context implied or overt. Crowley (1990c:83) reports for Bislama that an overt following object (of either verb or preposition) is uncommon if the referent is inanimate, optional if animate but non-human, and almost obligatory if human. Although there may be a tendency in this direction in Pijin, there seems to be greater flexibility than in Bislama. Some Pijin examples with stranded verbs (two in (32)) and prepositions (including one with a human referent (33)) are:

- (32) *Evrisamting mifala sev-em olketa bon-em.*  
 everything we.EXC save-TRS they burn-TRS  
 Everything we saved they burned. (TBD:102)
- (33) *Sajen meja an wanfala koprol wet-em tufala lukaoatem mifala.*  
 sergeant major and one corporal with-TRS they.DU look.after us.EXC  
 A sergeant major and one corporal with him looked after us. (TBD:103)

- (34) *Disfala loa nao hemi toktok strong agens-im.*  
 this law TOP he talk strong against-TRS  
 This is the law he talked strong against.
- (35) *Wanem nao bae iu stori long mifala abaot-em?*  
 what TOP will you story LOC us.EXC about-TRS  
 What will you tell us a story about?
- (36) *Olketa kam from tufala taon ia an evri ples wea stap*  
 they come from two town DEI and every place which stay  
*raon-em.*  
 around-TRS  
 They came from those two towns and every village around them.

### 3.4 *from* AND *olsem* AS PREPOSITIONS WITH TRANSITIVE SUFFIX

Formally, *from* and *olsem* look like words with a final transitive suffix, although the *-m* of *from* and *-m* or *-em* of *olsem* are not from the same historical source as the forms occurring with transitive verbs and the other prepositions. Camden (1977:25,78) and Crowley (1990b:83,173) concur that one function of both *from* and *olsem* in Bislama is that of preposition. Is it possible that Pijin *from* and *olsem* have been reanalysed by analogy as having the transitive suffix? Although there is no independent *\*\*fro* or *\*\*ols* (or *\*\*olse*)<sup>15</sup> they may be viewed as roots. The *wet-* of *wetem*, the *kas-* of *kasem*, and the *agens-* of *agensim* cannot occur independently either, but because of their parallel with English, it is easier to think of them as roots. There are also many verbs which cannot occur without the transitive suffix as, for example, *tal-* in *talem* 'to tell'.

There is, furthermore, at least one verb where a final *-m* has apparently been reanalysed in Pijin. Pijin takes the verb *klaem(ap)* 'to climb' with a root final *-m* for which the English source 'climb' can be either transitive or intransitive and reanalyses the final *-m* as a transitive suffix and drops it to create an intransitive counterpart *klae*:<sup>16</sup>

- (37) *Kuiktaem trifala stat fo klae-m-ap tri ia nao.*  
 quickly they.TRI begin to climb-TRS-up tree DEI TOP  
 The three of them began to climb up the tree immediately. (SKS:13)
- (38) *Taem olketa go-gohed fo klae...*  
 when they CON-proceed to climb  
 When they proceeded to climb.../While they were climbing... (SKS:13)

The normally intransitive verb *kam* 'to come' may also have acquired a transitive sense that appears mainly as a request form as in (39) - (40):

- (39) *Kam wanfala tin taio.*  
 come one tin Taiyo  
 Give me (or hand me) a tin of *Taiyo* (tuna).

<sup>15</sup> Broken, however, optionally drops the *-m* of the transitive suffix from verbs and also from *olsem* resulting in *olse* (Shnukal 1988:174). This suggests the possibility that *olsem* may at one time have been a verbal preposition in Broken.

<sup>16</sup> Some speakers also use *klaem* as an intransitive.

- (40) *Kam moa!*  
 come more  
 Kick it to me again! (overheard in soccer game)

It is possible that *kam* in such examples is an ellipsis rather than a transitive verb. Would, however, this use of *kam* have come about had it not had a final *-m* making it look like a transitive verb? Whether or not the *-m* of *kam* has been reanalysed as a transitive suffix, it is clear that the *-m* of *klaem* has been so reanalysed.

It is interesting to note that all of the Melanesian pidgins/creoles drop the final *-ng* of *long* and *blong* either optionally or regularly. As noted above, the *-ng* is frequently dropped in normal speech in Pijin and, according to Camden (1977) and Crowley (1990b) this is also true of Bislama. The evidence for Broken (Todd (1984:70) and a translation of Mark's Gospel would indicate that the loss of *-ng* is regular for both of the prepositions although Shnukal (1988) does list *long* and *blong* as variants. The loss of *-ng* is not unexpected in light of it being in unstressed particles, but it does differ from the *-m* final prepositions which do not lose the *-m*.<sup>17</sup>

Crowley (1990c:84f.) also notes that the final *-m* and *-em* of Bislama *from*, *wetem* and *olsem* are identical in form with the transitive suffix. He concludes that these three prepositions join with the five forms *kasem*, *bitim*, *agensem*, *raonem* and *folem* to form a subclass of prepositions. He does this on the basis that any of them can be orphaned and all of them end with either *-m* or *-em*.

The evidence presented above shows that from the perspective of form in Pijin, it is probable that *from* and *olsem* have been reanalysed as having the final transitive suffix. Neither of these are used as verbs in Pijin, but neither are *wetem* and *abaot(em)*. In fact, in light of Solomon Islands Pijin being the only Melanesian pidgin with *abaot* as a preposition,<sup>18</sup> it is likely a relatively recent (post-Queensland era)<sup>19</sup> preposition in Pijin to which speakers optionally suffix the *-em* by analogy with the other verbal prepositions. The parallel preposition in some of the substrate languages is also a verbal preposition (e.g. Tolo *hinia* 'about', Crowley, S. 1986:14). Interestingly, Terry Crowley (1990c:85) notes that some speakers of anglicised Bislama occasionally borrow 'without' and frequently add the transitive suffix to form *wetaotem* on the basis of analogy.

Distributionally, and consequently functionally in respect to their object, *from* and *olsem* also behave like transitive verbs and the other prepositions with the transitive suffix. Unlike the prepositions without the transitive suffix, they may occur with a following object or may have it in the preceding context or even implied with no overt following object. The first of each set of the examples has an overt following object and the second no following object.

Examples with *from*:

- (41) *Mi kam from ples ia go-go mi kasem iu tude.*  
 I come from.TRS place DEI CON-go I arrive you today  
 I came from there and kept coming until I got to you today. (SSH:94)

<sup>17</sup> The exception of Broken *olse(m)* has already been noted.

<sup>18</sup> The others use *-baot* (Bislama) or *-baut* (Tok Pisin and Broken) as a verbal suffix.

<sup>19</sup> Keesing (1988, taken from Young (1926:207)) cites one example from 1910 "...he tell-'im altogether heathen people about Jesus...". Examples like this written by an English speaker, however, may not reliably represent the pidgin.

- (42) *Iu goaot from!*  
 you.SG go.out from.TRS  
 Get out of here! / Go out from him! (exorcising a demon)

Examples with *olsem*:

- (43) *An aelan ia tu olsem kastom aelan.*  
 and island DEI too like.TRS custom island  
 And that island also was like a traditional island. (SSH:94)
- (44) *Tufala... kaikaim puding an olketa samting olsem.*  
 they.DU eat pudding and PL thing like.TRS  
 The two of them...ate pudding and things like that. (SSH:98)

There is also some evidence from the substrate languages for *from*. The grammatical sketch given by Keesing in his *Kwaio dictionary* (1975:xxix) lists eight quasi-verbs (prepositional verbs in Keesing (1985, 1988)). One of these is *fa'asia* 'away from' which would equate with Pijin *from*. The *-si* of *fa'asia* is from the same source as other *-Ci* forms used as the transitive suffix in Kwaio, and the *-a* is the third singular object pronoun. Also the prepositions in Kwaio which do not take the transitive suffix use a different series of pronouns (Keesing 1975:xxvii). To'aba'ita also has *fasi* 'away from' as a verbal preposition (Lichtenberk 1984:66). It, like two of the other To'aba'ita verbal prepositions, also has a deverbalised form which can occur before a noun phrase. The verbal form must be used if there is either no overt following object or a following independent pronoun.

Semantically, *from* and *olsem* tend to be more specific in meaning, patterning with the prepositions which take the transitive suffix. As a preposition, *from* is used for source, including direction from (e.g. *goaot from* 'go out from') and cause (e.g. *dae from* 'die because of'), and *olsem* means 'like' (e.g. *luk olsem wanem* 'look like what?'). This is in contrast to the non-suffixed prepositions which are quite generic semantically.

With the additional evidence regarding the distribution of *from* and *olsem*, the substrate evidence from Kwaio and other languages for *from*, and the somewhat specific semantic connotation of these two prepositions, along with their form, it appears that they have been reanalysed and are best considered as taking the transitive suffix and belonging to the subclass of verbal prepositions which take this suffix.

### 3.5 ORIGIN OF VERBAL PREPOSITIONS

The question was raised in §2.3 as to whether the verbal prepositions of Bislama and Pijin stem from the grammaticalisation of serial verbs into verbal prepositions as Crowley (1990c:76, 85f.) suggests for five of them in Bislama which function both as verbs and prepositions, or whether they all directly reflect verbal prepositions in the substrate languages without an intermediate serial verb state. Crowley (1990c:76) argues that the verbal prepositions *kasem*, *bitim*, *agensem*, *raonem* and *folem* in Bislama relatively recently acquired prepositional functions in addition to verbal functions and that "this synchronic bifunctionalism could be most easily explained by assuming that the prepositional constructions have arisen out of earlier serial verb constructions".

Bickerton (1981:119) argues that languages with only serial verbs to mark case would likely develop prepositions since serial verbs are a more marked means of expressing case relationships than are prepositions. Discounting substrate influence as providing the source

for the original appearance of these serial verbs in pidgins and creoles, he claims (p.120f.) that:

...the problem...of unambiguously identifying case roles while...change is under way--must have been a problem in creolization too, if we assume what must almost certainly have been the case in at least some pidgins, i.e., that the latter did not contain (or at least did not contain a full range of) prepositions. Without prepositions and without inflectional morphology, how else could oblique cases be distinguished if not by serial verbs?

In concluding his discussion of serial verbs and prepositions, Bickerton (p.130f.) observes:

With regard to the types of complementation featuring serial verbs, it would seem that the strongest constraint on such developments was the availability of superstrate prepositions for case marking purposes. Where prepositions were available...they would be chosen over serial models. In the absence of superstrate prepositions, serialization would always be chosen. I suspect that it was reinvented, rather than selected in most if not all cases; but if not, if it was indeed selected out of a range of substrate alternatives, the present theory would remain unaffected. This theory claims that verb serialization is the only answer to the problem of marking cases in languages which have only N and V as major categories. Thus, if such structures were selected from a substratum, they were selected because they offered the only answer, not merely because they happened to be present in the substratum...

Applied to Bislama and Pijin, Bickerton's claim would mean that the English superstrate influence was not strong enough to supply the range of prepositions needed, so serialised verbs were developed to mark cases not already marked by *long* and *blong*. Some of the serialised verbs in turn would have later become prepositions.

I turn now to the Oceanic substrate. Durie (1988) examines verb serialisation and "verbal prepositions" in Oceanic languages. He discusses (p.1) the small word class or classes which many Oceanic languages have which morphologically and syntactically "fall somewhere between verbs and prepositions" and which are usually referred to with "double-barrelled terms...such as *prepositional verb* or *verbal preposition*". He notes (p.1f.) that these "classes typically include some forms which bear no relation to any independently occurring verbs, and others which can occur independently as verbs". This is precisely the status of the verbal prepositions of both Bislama and Pijin assuming that Durie is not including the transitive suffix in his "no relation to independently occurring verbs". Durie's primary focus is on presenting a typology of verbal-preposition phenomena in Oceanic languages by appealing to the diachronic interpretation, and although he deals with how the classes of words intermediate between verbs and prepositions relate to serial verb constructions, he does not intend to convey that every such intermediate word has derived from a serial verb. Following Bickerton's reasoning above would lead one to conclude that for pidgins and creoles, any such intermediate word would always be a temporary step from serial verbs towards fully fledged prepositions.

What I understand from Crowley's (1990c:76) conclusions on Bislama is that the verbal prepositions in current usage have "relatively recently" developed from serial verbs in "modern Bislama". Crowley (1990c:64-75) carefully treats verb-verb sequences in Bislama which he concludes are not cases of verb serialisation, as well as those which are genuine

cases of verb-serialisation, and follows this with evidence from verb serialisation in Paamese, one of the substrate languages, which is very similar to that of Bislama. By one of Crowley's criteria for genuine serialised verbs in Bislama, namely the obligatory use of the predicate marker in directional serialisation (1990c:69) and its optional although syntactically conditioned absence in stative serialisation (1990c:71f.), Pijin would now be devoid of serial verb constructions. The predicate marker, or subject referencing pronoun (SRP) à la Keesing, never occurs preceding either the directional particles nor parallel 'stative' particles (e.g. *haed in talem haed* 'tell secretly') in Pijin. Although other words may intervene between the verb and a following directional or stative particle, they appear to have been grammaticalised in Pijin.

Crowley does not indicate what he means by either "relatively recently" or by "modern Bislama", but I would assume that he means more recently than the Queensland plantation era. If not, the term modern Bislama would seem to me to be a misnomer. The point of this is that the parallels and overlap of the verbal prepositions of Pijin and Bislama are so close that I find it difficult to think of them as independent developments; and if they were part of a common development, this would almost certainly have been during the Queensland plantation era. The form, function, distribution and lexical items are all identical or nearly so, including those which to my knowledge bear no evidence of ever having had a separate verbal function in either language (*wetem*, *from* and *olsem*). The evidence of verbal prepositions throughout the Oceanic languages of both Vanuatu and the Solomon Islands including the possibility of some reconstructed for Proto Oceanic (Pawley 1973:142-147) leads me to suggest that it seems more likely that, rather than transitive verb serialisation arising and this developing into verbal prepositions, there was a general common availability of verbal prepositions in the substrate languages as pointed out by Keesing (1988:180ff.) and that these available categories were adopted using English lexical items (both verbal and prepositional) in Melanesian Pidgin before the repatriation of the Melanesians in 1906.

#### 4. NOMINAL PREPOSITIONS

Much of what is expressed in English by specific prepositions alone (e.g. 'behind') or by complex prepositions (e.g. 'in back of') is expressed in Pijin by locational prepositions either alone or as part of a phrase. The term 'locational' is used broadly here to include location in space or time. These locational words could be viewed as a subclass of nouns or perhaps adverbials. For To'aba'ita, Lichtenberk (1984:63ff.) treats such words as 'spatial prepositions', a subclass of his 'nominal prepositions'. Crowley (1990b), for Bislama, refers to them as 'adverbial prepositions'. Pijin includes at least the following: *antap* 'on top', *andanit* 'underneath', *aotsaet* 'outside', *bihaen* 'behind', *botom* 'bottom', *franda* 'front', *insaet* 'inside', *mamana* (widespread from Malaitan languages but not used in all areas) 'front', *melewan* 'between', *narasaet* 'other side' and *saet* 'side'.

These words are usually preceded *or* followed by *long*, but may occur alone or preceded *and* followed by *long*. Huebner and Horoi (1979a:66) list the following as all having the same meaning:

- (45) a. *Baero i stap long antap long tebol.*  
 b. *Baero i stap antap long tebol.*  
 c. *Baero i stap long antap tebol.*  
 d. *Baero i stap antap tebol.*

pen it remain LOC on.top LOC table  
The ballpoint pen is on the table.

They also list *baero i stap long tebol* as equivalent, but if we substitute another location word such as *andanit* 'underneath' or *botom* 'bottom', the *long* alone is not substitutable with either of those meanings; it would still mean 'on the table'. Below are examples from natural texts.

*Insaet* alone:

- (46) *Tufala digim hol an berem devol ia insaet hol ia.*  
they.DU dig hole and bury devil DEI inside hole DEI  
The two of them dug a hole and buried the devil inside the hole. (SSH:104)

*Long insaet*:

- (47) *Hemi jes go stret daon nao long insaet bele blong mi.*  
he just go straight down TOP LOC inside belly POSS me  
He just went straight down into my belly. (RR1:54)

*Insaet long*:

- (48) *Oo, wanfala fis hemi insaet long bele blong mi ia.*  
oh one fish he inside LOC belly POSS me DEI  
Oh, a fish was inside my belly. (RR1:54)

*Long insaet long*:

- (49) *Disfala jaeen hemi dae long insaet long haos blong hem.*  
this giant he die LOC inside LOC house POSS him  
This giant died in his house. (SSH:46)

I have made no rigorous study, but my impression is that programs aired on the Solomon Islands Broadcasting Corporation (SIBC) using these locational words without any *long* is much more common than in ordinary speech. The SIBC register often reflects considerable English influence.

On the other hand, the vernacular languages seem to have similar locational words which often require an equivalent to a preceding *long* and a following noun or pronoun signalling possession of the locational word. If the substrate languages have any influence, the possessive use would lead one to expect *blong* in Pijin rather than *long* following a locational preposition, but the evidence of the other Melanesian pidgins would indicate that the use of *long* in such contexts was very early. Concerning these locational words, Keesing (1988:119) notes:

...that in dealing with spatial relationships, Melanesian Pidgin dialects (especially as used by older speakers who learned them on plantations) reveal their Oceanic roots. Particularly in EO languages, terms for spatial locations ("in front", "behind", "inside", "underneath") are morphologically nouns, treated as inalienably possessed by the following noun, and often marked with a preceding locative particle...Older speakers of Solomons Pidgin characteristically use English-derived spatial terms (*andanit long kiniu* or *fastaem long haos*) as if they were nouns.

I have not specifically studied the speech of older versus younger speakers and am not familiar with the second example Keesing cites, but I have observed that most Pijin speakers commonly use constructions of this type. The languages below are samples of Solomon Islands vernaculars with constructions similar to *long* preceding a locational word. To'aba'ita (Simons & Simons 1981:13) uses the locative-marker 'i plus one of eleven locational-prepositions: 'i *maana* 'in front of'.<sup>20</sup> Kwaio (Keesing 1985:68) optionally uses *i* in similar constructions. Cheke Holo of Santa Isabel (White et al., ed. 1988:xxxii) has a particle *ke* which must precede the locationals: *ke lamna* 'inside'.

The prevailing pattern in the written Pijin texts available is locational plus *long*. This is also true of Bislama and Tok Pisin.

## 5. EPILOGUE

Much remains to be done on the prepositions of Pijin (to say nothing of the overall grammar of Pijin), but hopefully this paper will provide a basis for further studies. It is also hoped that this paper will be available to Solomon Islanders and help them to have a greater appreciation of the origins and complexities of the grammar of Pijin. Even among the well-educated there is a general conception that Pijin does not have a grammar. Although too technically oriented for most speakers of the language, there are a good number who should be able to profit from reading it and I hope that it will stimulate some of them to do research and publish on the language which has become a major unifying factor in the Solomon Islands culture.

## REFERENCES

- Bickerton, Derek, 1981, *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers.
- Bowden, John, 1992, *Behind the preposition: grammaticalisation of locatives in Oceanic languages*. PL, B-107.
- Camden, William G. [Pastor Bill Camden], 1977, *A descriptive dictionary: Bislama to English*. Vila, New Hebrides [Vanuatu]: Maropa Bookshop.
- 1979, Parallels in structure of lexicon and syntax between New Hebrides Bislama and the South Santo language as spoken at Tangoa. *Papers in pidgin and creole linguistics* No.2:51-117. PL, A-57.
- Capell, A., 1930, The language of Inakona, Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 39:113-136.
- Clark, Ross, 1979, In search of Beach-la-mar: towards a history of Pacific Pidgin English. *Te Reo* 22:3-64.
- Codrington, R.H., 1885, *The Melanesian languages*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Crowley, Susan Smith, 1986, *Tolo dictionary*. Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands: Guadalcanal Culture Centre.
- Crowley, Terry, 1990a, *Beach-la-Mar to Bislama: the emergence of a national language in Vanuatu*. Oxford Studies in Language Contact. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1990b, *An illustrated Bislama-English and English-Bislama dictionary*. Vila, Vanuatu: The Pacific Languages Unit and the Vanuatu Extension Centre of the University of the South Pacific.
- 1990c, Serial verbs and prepositions in Bislama. In John W. M. Verhaar, ed. *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin: proceedings of the First International Conference of Pidgins and Creoles in Melanesia*. Studies in Language Companion Series 20:57-89. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Durie, Mark, 1988, Verb serialization and "verbal-prepositions" in Oceanic languages. *Oceanic Linguistics* 27:1-23.

<sup>20</sup> English has very close parallels for some of these and some of the English prepositions have derivations which include simpler prepositions plus nouns such as 'inside', 'outside', 'underneath (-neath from OE *neothan* 'below')'.

- Dutton, Tom**, 1980, *Queensland Canefields English of the late nineteenth century (a record of interview with two of the last surviving kanakas in North Queensland, 1964)*. PL, D-29.
- Fox, C.E.**, 1950, Some notes on Nggela grammar. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 59:135-169.
- Gudnius: Matiu, Mak, Luk, Jon** (The Four Gospels in Solomon Islands Pijin). Suva, Fiji: The Bible Society in the South Pacific.
- Guy, J.B.M.**, 1974, *Handbook of Bichelamar: Manuel de Bichelamar*. PL, C-34.
- Guyer-Miller, Laura**, 1989, *Peace Corps Solomon Islands Pijin - English dictionary*. [Honiara, Solomon Islands: Peace Corps.]
- Harris, John W.**, 1986, *Northern Territory pidgins and the origin of Kriol*. PL, C-89.
- Heubner, Thom and Stephen Rex Horoi**, 1979a, *Solomon Islands Pijin: grammar handbook*. Peace Corps Language Handbook Series. Brattleboro, Vermont: ACTION/Peace Corps.
- 1979b, *Solomon Islands Pijin: special skills handbook*. Peace Corps Language Handbook Series. Brattleboro, Vermont: ACTION/Peace Corps.
- Ivens, W.G.**, 1935, Grammar of the language of Longgu, Guadalcanal, British Solomon Islands. *Bulletin of the London School of Oriental and African Studies* 7:601-621.
- Keesing, Roger M.**, 1975, *Kwaio dictionary*. PL, C-35.
- 1985, *Kwaio grammar*. PL, B-88.
- 1988, *Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic substrate*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press.
- Lee, Ernest W.**, [1981], *Solomon Islands Pijin: a spelling survey*. [Honiara, Solomon Islands]: Solomon Islands Christian Association and Solomon Islands Translation Advisory Group.
- Lee, Ernest W.**, ed., 1981a, *Buk fo Ridim an Raetem Pijin: Buk 1*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Pijin Literacy Project of the Solomon Islands Christian Association.
- 1981b, *Buk fo Ridim an Raetem Pijin: Buk 2*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Pijin Literacy Project of the Solomon Islands Christian Association.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek**, 1984, *language of Malaita, Solomon Islands. Working Papers in Anthropology, Archaeology, Linguistics, Maori Studies* No.65. Auckland: University of Auckland, Department of Anthropology.
- Mark 1:16-18**. [Compilation of short portion of the Gospel of Mark in 6 Pacific pidgins and creoles.] Xerox.
- Morris, William**, ed., 1971, *The American heritage dictionary of the English language*. Boston: American Heritage Publishing Co. and Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Pawley, Andrew**, 1973, Some problems in Proto-Oceanic grammar. *Oceanic Linguistics* 12:103-188.
- Sanfala Kastom Stori and Kastom Wei from Solomon Aelan an Narafala Kandre**, 1982. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Pijin Literacy Project of the Solomon Islands Christian Association.
- Scorza, David and Karl J. Franklin**, 1989, *An advanced course in Tok Pisin*. Ukarumpa, Papua New Guinea: Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Shnukal, Anna**, 1988, *Broken: an introduction to the creole language of Torres Strait*. PL, C-107.
- Simons, Gary and Linda Simons**, 1981, *A sketch grammar of To'abaita language, Malaita, Solomon Islands*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Solomon Islands Translation Advisory Group and Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- Simons, Linda**, 1986, Malaitan influence on two grammatical particles in Solomon Islands Pijin. *Papers in pidgin and creole linguistics* No.4:53-65. PL, A-72.
- Simons, Linda and Hugh Young**, 1978, *Pijin Blong Yumi: a guide to Solomon Islands Pijin*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Solomon Islands Christian Association.
- Todd, Loreto**, 1984, *Modern Englishes: pidgins and creoles*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- White, Geoffrey M.**, 1988, *Cheke Holo (Maringe/Hograno) dictionary*. PL, C-97.
- White, Geoffrey M. et al.**, ed., 1988, *Bikfala faet: olketa Solomon Aelanda rimembarem Wol Wo Tu [The big death: Solomon Islanders remember World War II]*. Honiara, Solomon Islands: Institute of Pacific Studies and the Solomon Islands Extension Centre of the University of the South Pacific, and the Solomon Islands College of Higher Education.

