EVIDENCE OF A PIDGIN MOTU IN THE EARLIEST WRITTEN MOTU MATERIALS[1]

ANDREW TAYLOR

1. THEORIES ON THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF HIRI MOTU

In the last few years there has been some discussion of the origin and development of Hiri Motu (formerly called Police Motu)[2] in a number of places.

We may begin with Chatterton (1970) who presents the view-point which has been unchallenged until very recently.[3] His account is as follows. A trade language developed in the hiri trading expeditions in which the Motu people sailed to villages in the Gulf of Papua. This language was basically a form of Motu. The grammar was simplified Motu and the vocabulary was predominantly Motu. Gulf languages had only a small influence on the vocabulary and grammar. When the first Europeans arrived, the Motu used the already existing trade language to communicate with them. It was, it seems, the children of the early missionaries and administrators who first learned true Motu, rather than a pidgin form, and who made the adults aware of what was really happening. When the police force was formed in the 1890s, it consisted initially of "a variety of South Sea Islanders with no common mother tongue" (Chatterton 1970:96) and later there were recruits from all over Papua. The police force used the existing trade language as its language of communication and the language became known as 'Police Motu'. This language has continued to be used up to the present.

This view of the origin and development of Hiri Motu is the one presented in the preface to *The Dictionary and Grammar of Hiri Motu* prepared by the Papua New Guinea Government Office of Information (1976). Of the present-day form of the language it is said that it

Taylor, A. "Evidence of a Pidgin Motu in the Earliest Written Motu Materials". In Wurm, S.A. and Carrington, L. editors, *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: Proceedings.* **C-61:1325-1350**. Pacific Linguistics, The Australian National University, 1978. DOI:*10.15144/PL-C61.1325*

> differs only slightly in its grammar (though to a greater extent in its vocabulary) from that used both on Hiri expeditions and for police work. (p.1)

Dutton and Voorhoeve (1974) do not accept this theory, saying that the origin of Hiri Motu is unknown but that

> it is probably based on, if it is not derived from, one of the varieties of trading languages used by the Motu and their trading partners along the southern Papuan coast between the Gulf of Papua in the west and the Aroma Coast just east of Hood Point in the east in pre-European times. (p.x)

They point out that information from the early period of European contact is sketchy, the first definite reference to a pidgin Motu being used by the police being in 1904 (Barton 1904:16). The main point to note about Dutton and Voorhoeve's statement just quoted is that they refer to the existence of a variety of trading languages - not just one.

Dutton and Brown (1977) go into the question of the origin and development of Hiri Motu in rather more detail. The situation at the time of European settlement, as they see it, was that the Motu

> had developed - or at least were using - a range of contact languages which they found suitable for trading with various groups along the Papuan coast. (pp.764f.)

They add that it might instead be a matter of varieties of one language, rather than a number of languages. The range had two extremes. Closest to Motu was a 'simplified Motu' taught to W.G. Lawes and other early missionaries, while furthest from Motu in both grammar and vocabulary (with considerable influence from non-Austronesian languages of the Gulf) was the trade language used on the hiri. In between it is likely that there were varieties used in the trade between the Motu and neighbouring tribes such as the Doura, Gabadi and Hula who speak Austronesian languages.

Dutton and Brown (1977:766) then suggest that as the members of the police force were drawn mostly from outside the Central District the basis of Hiri Motu was some form of the language used in the hiri, with an increase in the proportion of vocabulary drawn from Motu, as Motu was by that time a prestige language, being the language of the administrative centre and of the London Missionary Society work along a considerable part of the south coast.

Dutton (1976:43, but written after Dutton and Brown 1977) observes that there are many gaps in our knowledge at present and reminds us that we are generally dealing with questions to be investigated, not points to be advanced as if they are known. He puts forward a new

theory about the origin and development of Hiri Motu, viz. that it is not a variety of the hiri trading language which has been influenced heavily by Motu but that it is "a kind of pidgin-of-a-pidgin" (ibid: 46) with elements of structure coming from Pidgin English and Motu but with its vocabulary coming mostly from Motu. He bases this on the assumption that the common language of the initial police force was a mixture of varieties of Pidgin English.[4] This may explain, according to Dutton, certain facts about Hiri Motu, such as the similarities between it and Tok Pisin and the virtual absence from it of Gulf area words.

There is one part of the overall problem for which information has begun to appear, i.e. the hiri trading language. Dutton and Kakare (1977) give a preliminary account of the basic grammatical structure and vocabulary of the language.[5] The source languages are Eleman (especially Toaripi) and Motu. The grammar contains instances of simplication of Eleman and/or Motu constructions, while three-quarters of the vocabulary is of Eleman origin, which is very similar to the proportion of Eleman vocabulary in Barton's much earlier brief account of the language used in the hiri (Barton 1910).

2. 'SIMPLIFIED MOTU'

As just mentioned above, some research has already been carried out on one end of the range referred to by Dutton and Brown. This paper is concerned with the other end of the range, the 'simplified Motu' taught to the early missionaries.

The earliest clear statement found so far about the existence of a simplified or pidgin Motu is that of Lawes in the third edition of his Motu grammar (Lawes 1896:30). He mentions two characteristics of this variety of Motu: (i) certain verbal particles are 'often' dropped - the examples he gives are the particles showing the person and number of the subject in the past tense form and those showing the general, i.e. non-immediate, imperative (all these particles precede the verb) and (ii) the use of lasi after the verb as the negative instead of the negative being included in a particle before the verb, usually in the form asi- or s-. According to Lawes, such constructions are "instances of 'pidgin' Motuan that are much to be regretted". Lawes also makes the important observation that these pidgin forms are only used by the Motu in speaking with foreigners, not when speaking among themselves.

This statement is significant as it shows that Lawes did recognise the existence of a pidgin Motu. It is nevertheless unfortunate that he gives only the limited information presented above concerning the

structure and use of this simplified variety of Motu. A little more information is, however, provided by Chatterton (1970, 1971). He notes that while the simplified or pidgin Motu was easier for foreigners to learn than Motu itself, there was another factor involved, viz. a feeling among the Motu that foreigners should not be encouraged to learn their language, and even as late as the 1920s he found old men in Hanuabada who insisted on using the simplified language with him. Chatterton (1971:5) states that it was Frank Lawes, the son of W.G. Lawes, who learned the 'true' Motu in the course of his contact with the children of Hanuabada and who pointed out to his father that he was not being taught 'true' Motu by the adults.

Lawes arrived in Hanuabada, the main Motu village and now part of Port Moresby, in 1874 and immediately set about learning the language and producing a school book (Lawes 1877a) and, together with James Chalmers, Bible translations (British and Foreign Bible Society 1882, 1883, 1885). It was only 11 years before the first edition of his grammar appeared (Lawes 1885).[6] Therefore one might expect to find evidence of simplified or pidgin Motu in these materials. Chatterton (1971:5) records his impression of the first translation of the gospel of Mark into Motu (British and Foreign Bible Society 1882) that it was a very queer mixture of Motu and Hiri Motu. Dutton and Brown (1977: 783), on the other hand, say that a study of Lawes' first grammar shows that by then he was well beyond the 'simplified Motu' stage.

Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to study these early materials to see what evidence they provide for the existence of a simplified or pidgin Motu.

3. THE LANGUAGE OF THE EARLY WRITTEN MATERIALS

3.1. *THE MATERIALS*

These are of two types: (i) articles and books written about Motu and (ii) educational and religious books written in Motu.

The first information on the Motu language, beyond wordlists such as the one in MacGillivray (1852, vol 2:317-330), is provided by Turner (1877-78:496-98). He gives some notes on the area in which Motu is spoken, its relationship to other languages, and on the sounds and grammar, and a translation of a verse of a hymn and of part of a Bible story. As Turner had lived in Papua only six months when he wrote the article, it is probable that he drew heavily on Lawes for his material.

The first edition of Lawes' *Grammar and Vocabulary of Language Spoken by Motu Tribe, New Guinea* appeared in 1885. The grammar section

is short, taking up only 18 of the 108 pages. The second edition (Lawes 1888) differs mainly by the inclusion of a comparative vocabulary of 400 words in seven languages and an expanded vocabulary section. In the preface to the third and enlarged edition (Lawes 1896) Lawes says that the grammar had been almost entirely rewritten. This was due as noted earlier to him at last separating pure[7] Motu forms, especially verbs forms, from pidgin Motu forms.

The first book in Motu was Lawes 1877a. It was for schools and contained reading lessons, some Bible stories, and thirteen hymns. A translation of the gospel of Mark done by Lawes assisted by Chalmers appeared in 1882 (British and Foreign Bible Society 1882), followed the next year by a translation of the gospel of Matthew by Chalmers and revised by Lawes (British and Foreign Bible Society 1883). Two years later a volume containing a translation of all four gospels was published (British and Foreign Bible Society 1885). The translations in it of Matthew and Mark were revisions of the earlier publications. Only six years later the whole New Testament, translated by Lawes assisted by Chalmers, was published (British and Foreign Bible Society 1891). The gospels in it had been further revised.

3.2. *CONSIDERATIONS IN EVALUATING THE MATERIALS*

It is necessary to consider Lawes' situation. He was trying to learn and produce pure Motu and the three editions of his grammar and revisions to the Bible translations show that he reached that stage by the 1890s. Living at Hanuabada he would hear pure Motu speech, even though in speaking to him it seems Motuans mostly used pidgin Motu. Therefore not even the earliest materials available can be considered representative of 'true' pidgin Motu. In fact, the earliest material (Lawes 1877a) shows a mixture of Motu and pidgin Motu. This is one of the problems: it is only possible to identify those features of pidgin Motu which differ from pure Motu. Where pure Motu occurs it is not possible to tell whether it is really pure Motu which Lawes learnt correctly from the beginning or whether it is an instance of the pidgin Motu and the pure Motu having the same form or construction.

A second factor is that most of the early materials are translations. Unless a person is a good translator he will sometimes allow the languages he is translating into to be influenced by the grammar of the language he is translating from. The writer has used his judgment on this matter of distortion through the translation process.[8]

Further, some forms found in these materials may well be simply errors such as anyone makes in the early stages of language learning.

To reduce the likelihood of including such errors, generally only forms and constructions attested by several examples have been included.

There is a possibility that Lawes was influenced in his understanding of Motu by his previous experience with the Niue language and by the Polynesian missionaries who began work among the Motuans a couple of years before he arrived. This remains to be investigated.

3.3. *THE SIGNIFICANT FORMS AND CONSTRUCTIONS*

These generally are forms and constructions which are found in the materials which are different from pure Motu, which appear to be simplifications of pure Motu, and which in most cases are the same or nearly the same as Hiri Motu forms or constructions (see the appendix for illustrative texts). There is no lexical evidence as the vocabulary is all drawn from pure Motu, and presumably so was the vocabulary of pidgin Motu when used by Motuans speaking to Lawes.[9]

3.3.1. Word Order

This is SOV as in M and HM:

ia mero itaia
he boy see
'He saw the boy' (Lawes 1877a:21)

While M and HM may have other word orders, e.g. OSV, such variation is not found in these materials. This can be related to the almost complete absence of **ese** which may be used in M and HM to mark the subject of a transitive verb, as well as of the focus markers **na** and **be**. However, one does wonder whether **ese**, **na** and **be** are missing simply because Lawes and Chalmers did not know how to use them. It is not until Lawes 1896:6, 12, that **ese** is referred to.

3.3.2. The Verb Phrase

As in HM only the basic form of the verb is used, with transitive verbs almost invariably having the third person singular object suffix **-a**. However, in Lawes 1885:12; 1888:11, there are sentences with other object suffixes, rather as one finds in the Central dialect of HM. In this example **-gu** is the first person singular object suffix:

umui lau kirikirilai-gu
you I laugh at
'You laughed at me'

There are no prefixes indicating the person and number of the subject such as are in M. In the earliest material (Lawes 1877a:12, 20)

there are examples of a pronoun being placed immediately before the verb agreeing in person and number with the subject, just as in HM:

Heva ia rogorogo
Eve she conceive
'Eve conceived'

Aria tauna ia hemarai
feast man he be ashamed
'The man giving the feast was ashamed'

However, in the majority of cases in Lawes 1877a, and always in subsequent materials, this pronoun does not occur:

lau umui gwau henia
I you speak to
'I spoke to you' (Mk 3:28)

Perhaps both constructions occurred in pidgin Motu, but only one is found in the literature after Lawes 1877a, because it was chosen as the 'correct' one by Lawes and Chalmers.

Regarding tense and aspect, there is no marking for simple past or the present (see the above examples), though **vada** may be used for a completed action. The future may also be unmarked as in Mark 6:24:

lau dahaka noinoi?
I what ask for
'What shall I ask for?'

However, M future forms also appear in early work such as Mark (1882) and are in general use in Matthew in 1883, although the above example remained unchanged in British and Foreign Bible Society 1885. It was changed to **baina noia** in 1891.

It is of note that no instances of the use of **dohore** for the future or **vadaeni** for the past such as occur in HM have been found as yet.

The negative is on the great majority of occasions expressed by placing **lasi** after the verb as in HM.

idia biru lasi
they garden neg.
'They do not do any gardening' (Mt 6:26)

There are some early instances of the use of the verbal prefix **asi-** indicating the negative as in M, but it is not until Lawes 1896:16, 22 that it is always used as in M.

A use of the negative with adjectives may be mentioned here. Turner (1877-78:497) gives the expression **maraki lasi** *'not small'*. This type of expression is found in HM with **lasi**; in M the negative used is **dia** e.g. **dia maraki**.

The imperative is simply the basic form of the verb as in HM:

oiemu kohu hoia
your goods sell
'Sell your goods' (Mk 10:21)[10]

Intention is stated by Lawes (1896:17,21) to be expressed by the use of gwauraia after the verb:

lau na gini gwauraia
I stand
'I was about to stand'

This type of construction is found in HM, but not in M today.

The construction meaning *'have'* in M does not involve a verb:

ia(na) mai ena ira
he with his axe
'He has an axe'

A similar construction is used for qualities:

ia(na) mai aonega-na
he with wisdom his
'he is wise'

Lawes (1896:29) gives the full form and also a shorter form without the possessive suffix, e.g. ia mai aonega. This is not in M today, nor in HM which has a different construction. Lawes describes it as a 'colloquialism', the same word he uses of instances of pidgin Motu. This too, then, may have been a feature of that pidgin.

3.3.3. Pronouns

The free forms are as in M and HM, and their usage is generally as in M. Two small points to note involve the dual and the reflexive forms.

The instances of the dual so far found involve people and use the M form for two people raruosi, not the HM ruaosi, which in M is used only for things other than people.

The reflexive form in M is sibo-, which takes the pronoun suffixes, while HM is sibona. The earliest occurrence of this in the documents studied is lau sibona in Lawes 1877a:6, which is like HM, but by 1882 in Mark the forms occurring are as in M. (lau sibona means *'myself'*; in M *'myself'* is lau sibogu, -go being the suffix indicating 1st person singular.)

3.3.4. Possessives

The construction in M for alienable possession is possessive pronoun + noun, e.g. **lauegu ruma** *'my house'*, while for inalienable possession the construction is personal pronoun + noun + possessive suffix, e.g. **lau tama-gu** *'my father'* (lit. *I father-my*). In HM these nouns almost invariably take the **-na** suffix, which is the 3rd person singular possessive suffix in M. Thus HM is **lauegu tamana**. (There is an exception in that other suffixes may be used in address.)

In these early materials most possessive constructions are of the HM type and it is not until the New Testament (British and Foreign Bible Society 1891) that the M form is always found.

There is one interesting form found in these early materials in which the personal pronoun, not the possessive pronoun, precedes the possessed noun, e.g. **lau tamana** *'my father'* instead of **lauegu tamana**. It is at this stage an open question as to whether this represents a pidgin form or is simply an error in language learning.

3.3.5. Demonstratives

These are **inai** *'this, these'* and **unai** *'that, those'* as in HM. It is not until Lawes 1896:11 that he records the correct M forms **ina** *'this'*, **ini** *'these'*, **una** *'that'* and **unu** *'those'*.[11]

3.3.6. Adjectives

The only point to note here is that in the early materials, Mark (1882) and Matthew (1883) *'all'* is generally expressed by **ibounai** or **idoinai**, with no change for number or person. E.g. **idia ibounai** *'they all'* (Mk 1:5); **taunimanima idoinai** (Mk 1:37) *'all people, everybody'*. This is the HM construction. However, the M construction appears in the Four Gospels (British and Foreign Bible Society 1885), i.e. **idia iboudiai, taunimanima idoidiai, -dia-** indicating 3rd person plural.

3.3.7. Postpositions

These are used as in M. The frequent use of **dekenai** in current HM is not found in this early material. It is possible that the compound postpositions did not change for the person and number of the noun they governed, but examples are few so far. One is **idia vairanai** *'in front of them'* (Mk 2:12) for which M would say **idia vairadiai**.

3.3.8. Coordinating Conjunctions

There is some use of **vadaeni** *'and then, next'*, which is more common in HM than M, where it tends to be used only at major breaks in a discourse such as at the end of the introduction to a story.

Lawes (1885:16; 1888:14, 1896:26) gives **ma** meaning *'and'*,[12] and only in the third edition of his grammar (1896:26) does he list **bona** *'and'* under conjunctions. **ma** is used in HM for *'and'* joining clauses, and is used sometimes this way in these early materials. In M, however, it nearly always means *'again'*.

3.3.9. Subordinating Conjunctions

Here would be included the equivalent of *'when'*, *'until'*, *'if'*, etc. However, they are rare in these early materials. Normally the translators have simply strung clauses together without conjunctions. It may be a feature of this pidgin Motu, or it could be simply due to inadequate knowledge of even the pidgin Motu in the early stage. For example:

Iesu kamonai, ia idia gwau henia
hear he them say to
'When Jesus heard it, he said to them...' (Mk 2:17)

3.4. *COMMENTS*

The similarity of a number of forms and constructions found in these materials to Hiri Motu forms and constructions, together with Lawes' own acknowledgement of the existence of a pidgin Motu and the examples he gives, is strong evidence that these early materials are written partly in a pidgin Motu. This is especially true of Lawes 1877a and British and Foreign Bible Society 1882, and to a slightly less extent of British and Foreign Bible Society 1883. By the time of British and Foreign Bible Society 1885 and Lawes 1885 the influence of the pidgin is slight, though still present.

This pidgin Motu is not identical with Hiri Motu, but it is very interesting that it differs noticeably from pure Motu at most of the same points as Wurm (1964) points out for Hiri Motu, viz. the verb phrase, including indication of tense, aspect, mood, etc., and indication of possession.

It is also interesting to note Brown's list of points where Hiri Motu resembles Toaripi (and differs from Motu) (Brown 1973:291f). These are, using Brown's numbering:

(1) Use of personal pronouns instead of pronominal particles and suffixes. This is found sometimes in Lawes 1877a, though usually not even the personal pronoun is included immediately before the verb (see section 3.3.2.).

(2) Negation of the verb. Pidgin Motu is like Hiri Motu and Toaripi.

(3) Tenses of the verb: (a) future, (b) present, and (c) continuous. The early pidgin Motu differs here from Hiri Motu and Toaripi. Regarding (d) completed action, pidgin Motu **vada** is more like Motu **vada** than Hiri Motu **vadaeni**, which has a Toaripi parallel.

(4) Use of **vadaeni** as a conjunction. This occurs sometimes in this pidgin Motu (and it does occasionally in pure Motu too).

So there is similarity or even identity with (1), (2) and (4), but not (3).

Another comparison to be made is with the **hiri** trading language. A detailed study remains to be done but a preliminary examination indicates that the **hiri** trading language differs more from pure Motu than does this pidgin Motu.

4. INFORMATION FROM OTHER SOURCES

Having considered the linguistic materials available, one might expect that other materials from the early period of mission work - journals, letters, articles and books - would contain references to the existence of, at least, a simplified variety of Motu in addition to the pure Motu. The writer has not been in a position to look at all existing materials, but he has been able to look at quite a number and unfortunately they give no clear statement on this language question.

Lawes (1879, 1880) refers to other languages spoken along the Papuan coast and to some languages spoken inland of the Motu coastal area. He comments on language relationships, noting, for example, that Hula is related to Motu, and that Koiari is related to Koita. On 12 August 1877 he preached in the Hula language at Kerepuna (Lawes 1876-84). In his journal for 4 April 1876 he said that most of the Kerepuna people knew a little of the "Port Moresby dialect" (i.e. Motu), while of the Hula people he said (25 June 1876) that most understood "more or less" of the Motu language and again, on 7 January 1877, he said that many of the Hula understood Motu "pretty well". He referred to a chief of the Ikolu people (situated geographically between the Motu and the Hula and speaking a dialect of the Sinaugoro language which is related to Hula and Motu) using a mixture of Motu and other dialects (3 November 1877).[13] To the west of the Motu area he noted (24 July 1881)

that one side of Delena village then spoke Motu and the other half Roro, but that while the Motu-speakers knew Roro too, the Roro-speakers understood "very little" Motu. On 25 September 1881 he noted that the Gabadi people understood "a good deal" of Motu and on the previous day he recorded a Gabadi chief as saying **Lau patu pata**, which would now be spelled **Lau badu bada** and means *'I am very angry'*, lit. *'I angry very'*. This is not pure Motu, which would be **lau na - badu - dikadika-mu** with a more complex verb structure and a different morpheme meaning *'very'*, but is a pidgin Motu construction. On 14 May 1882 Lawes wrote that "a good many of the Maiva natives understand Motu", the Maiva being the western Roro-speakers. Thus Lawes mentions groups speaking Austronesian languages both east and west of the Motu as understanding Motu, but he makes no specific mention of there being a simplified form involved.

Of speakers of non-Austronesian languages Lawes mentioned in his journal (26 August 1882) some Koiari who did not understand much of the Motu language. On another occasion (29 August 1877) he referred to an old Koiari man who knew nothing of the Motu language, although Lawes also wrote of a Koiari chief who visited him sometimes who did speak Motu (27 August 1877, 8 December 1877). There are many references in the journal to talking with Koiari people, but no reference to the language used.

Dutton and Brown (1977:761) refer to a letter by Lawes (1877b:197) in which he spoke of preaching to people of Hood Point (presumably speakers of Hula) in Motu and said they understood Motu "pretty well", which corresponds to his journal entry for 7 January 1877, mentioned above.

So it can be seen that in these early writings Lawes implies that the Hula, Gabadi and Maiva in general could understand Motu, not just a few individuals. It is most likely that the Motu they understood was the pidgin which Lawes himself later commented on (Lawes 1896:30). It would be surprising if such large numbers of people understood pure Motu (unless Lawes overestimated the degree of understanding). Further, the brief sentence Lawes quoted from the Gabadi man is not pure Motu, but is a pidgin construction.

Dutton and Brown (1977:761) interpret Lawes' account of communication with the Hula described above as meaning that 'simplified Motu' or something between it and pure Motu was used. It seems to the present writer that there was probably not a separate 'simplified Motu' used with Lawes. It is more likely that the 'halfway' nature of his early materials is due to the Motu communicating with him in pidgin Motu while he was also able to learn some pure Motu by listening to Motuans speak to each other.

While there are records indicating the use of a pidgin Motu with speakers of Austronesian languages, the question of the use of pidgin Motu with speakers of non-Austronesian languages is unsettled. No clear statement on communication between the Motu and the neighbouring Koitabu and Koiari tribes in pre-contact times has been located as yet. The other, more interesting, question is whether this pidgin Motu was used in communication with the Elema and other Gulf tribes in the hiri and other contacts. In reference to the Elema Lawes (1877b:199) noted that "for any satisfactory communication we want a Port Moresby chief as introducer and interpreter". This seems to indicate that his mixture of Motu and pidgin Motu was not adequate for communication with the Elema, though it was with the Hula, Gabadi and Maiva. The Motu and the Elema could communicate in the hiri but no reference by Lawes to the language of this communication has yet been found by the writer. However, Lawes' colleague, Chalmers, did say of that language that it was "a trading dialect understood well by both parties, but neither can tell whence it came, nor who first used it and it is only used by the Motuans and themselves" (i.e. the Elema) (Chalmers 1895:94). This seems to be rather more different from pure Motu than is the pidgin Motu of which Lawes gave examples. In fact, Lawes opened his statement about the pidgin by simply saying "A good many colloquialisms are not correct grammatically, but are sanctioned by usage." (Lawes 1896:30). Chalmers' comment would fit the hiri trading language as described by Dutton and Kakare (1977) better than the pidgin Motu described in this paper, as the hiri trading language shows more influence of Gulf area languages.

Nevertheless, as shown in section 3.4., the pidgin Motu evidenced in the early written materials shares some of the important features where Hiri Motu resembles Toaripi and differs from pure Motu. It seems unlikely that such simplifications would be made if the pidgin was for use only with the speakers of neighbouring Austronesian languages, all of which belong to the same family and are quite similar in phonology, morphology and syntax (a point noted by Chatterton and Chowning, personal communications).[14] Any explanation at this stage is only speculative, but a probable explanation is that the hiri trading language influenced the pidgin Motu described in this paper. Many Motu men at least would have used both languages, the hiri trading language on the hiri, the other pidgin in other contexts. It should be added that we may not be dealing with a simple situation consisting of two distinct pidgins with fixed forms. It may be that they were only two of the varieties of trading language used by the Motu and their partners, in a situation such as that suggested by Dutton and Voorhoeve

(1974:x) and Dutton and Brown (1977:746f), with variation within both varieties as well.

Other materials consulted are less helpful than the ones already mentioned. They do mention language matters, such as the use of, and arguments over the use of, Motu as the London Missionary Society lingua franca (King 1909:280; Prendergast 1968:317-25), but no reference has yet been found discussing any variety of pidgin or simplified Motu. This is in spite of the fact that there were opportunities to do so, e.g. when King noted that people from Eastern Papua and the Gulf attending the theological college at Vatorata, which was established in 1894 (it was moved there from Port Moresby) had to learn Motu, and when Prendergast referred to the mission's disapproval of the use of Pidgin English.

It seems that the existence of a pidgin form of Motu used by the Motu in communication with neighbouring tribes was either not considered worthy of comment or perhaps so obvious as not to require comment. Nevertheless in view of the extensive revisions of the Bible translations required because they initially contained so much pidgin Motu, one would expect to find some statement on the matter somewhere more than just a minor paragraph at the end of the grammar section of Lawes 1896. However, there is a lot of material yet to be examined - for example, a large quantity of reports, correspondence, log books, etc., presented to the New Guinea Collection of the University of Papua New Guinea Library in April 1977 - which may shed more light on the situation.

5. CONCLUSION

It is fairly clear that the earliest written Motu materials provide evidence of a pidgin Motu existing at the time of the first European settlement in 1874. This pidgin is similar in a number of important ways to present-day Hiri Motu, but there are also some differences between the two. This pidgin was probably one of a range of trading languages involving Motu to a greater or lesser extent as a source, one of the other major languages being the hiri trading language.

More work is needed in a number of directions. Further study is required of (i) the early documents for information on the language situation in general and on the structure of the pidgin Motu identified in this paper; (ii) the relationship between this pidgin and the hiri trading language; and (iii) the relationship between this pidgin and present-day Hiri Motu, which involves consideration of various possible influences, including Pidgin English and further influence from the hiri trading language.

N O T E S

1. This paper is a revised version of the one presented at the Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics held at the Australian National University, Canberra, January 4-12, 1978. I wish to thank Percy Chatterton, Bert Brown, Tom Dutton and Geoff Smith for comments on the earlier version of this paper and Kidu Taylor for supplying information regarding Motu and Hiri Motu usage.

2. In this paper the current name 'Hiri Motu' is used instead of the name 'Police Motu', except where the historical context requires the name 'Police Motu'.

3. Chatterton 1970 is a longer account than the one presented in the various editions of his primer of Police Motu. See e.g. Chatterton *ca.* 1959, and also the tourist-oriented Chatterton 1975.

4. Dutton (1976:44) states that the initial police force consisted of a dozen Solomon Islanders, two Fijians and eight Papuans, seven of whom came from the Kiwai area, and that these men were all from areas where varieties of Pidgin English were then spoken.

5. See also Dutton 1978 and Kakare 1976.

6. Lawes had already learnt the Polynesian language of Niue and written a grammar of it and translated some parts of the Bible.

7. The expression 'pure Motu' will be used to indicate the vernacular is being referred to, not a pidgin form. The writer is not altogether happy with this use of the word 'pure', but it is the English expression which the Motuans themselves use in this context.

8. The hymns in Lawes 1877a are translations of English hymns. In view of the added problems that involves, they have not been used as evidence for pidgin Motu. However, they contain forms and constructions very similar to the prose materials, and many of them which appear to be pidgin Motu are changed to pure Motu in a later revision (London Missionary Society 1948). Hymn 1 in Lawes 1877a = hymn 5 in the revision, 3 = 31, 7 = 131, 8 = 2, 11 = 7 and 12 = 85.

9. Wurm 1964 and Dutton and Voorhoeve 1974 have been used as the main guides to the structure of Hiri Motu. In the examples which follow the spelling has been changed to that used today. Also some abbreviations are used for convenience: M = pure Motu, HM = Hiri Motu, Mk = British and Foreign Bible Society 1882, and Mt = British and Foreign Bible Society 1883.

10. In M today the basic form of the verb may be used as an imperative, e.g. in speaking to children or if the speaker is angry. However, the normal form is the prefix **ba**, or **a** for an immediate imperative. In British and Foreign Bible Society 1891 at Mk 10:21 the M form is used: **ba hoia**.

11. And he includes for the first time **ena**, but not the plural **ene**, giving the meaning as *'that, close to'*. It really means close to the person addressed. This word, or an equivalent, is not in HM.

12. It is spelled **mai** in both the grammars and the translations. It might be taken as **mai** *'with'*, but it seems more likely to be a case of wrong spelling.

13. It is possible that Ikolu speech may have sounded like this to Lawes, as it is fairly closely related to Motu and some words are the same or very similar.

14. If these Austronesian languages are all quite similar, then it might be asked why a pidgin form of Motu was used instead of pure Motu. The speakers of the other languages could have learned pure Motu or each person could have used his own vernacular, e.g. a Motuan could have spoken Motu to a Hula who then replied in Hula. Both these approaches are used today by some people. Regarding the first approach, one may presume that it would have still been harder to learn pure Motu than a pidgin form. Moreover, it appears that the Motuans did not

encourage the learning of pure Motu by others. As for the second approach, the Motu area was a centre of trade and the Motuans dealt with people from quite a number of languages. Use of a pidgin Motu would have made communication in these various trading contacts easier than trying to learn something of several vernaculars.

APPENDIX
Illustrative Texts

The following texts illustrate the mixture of Motu and pidgin Motu in early materials. The spelling has been changed to the modern system for ease of understanding. M indicates pure Motu and HM indicates Hiri Motu.

TEXT 1: Some sentences from Lawes 1877a:4. They are very simple and, even if they are translations, are not likely to have been distorted by the translation process.

(a) Oi ede lao?
you(sg.) *where go*
'Where did you go?' (possibly: *'Where are you going?'*)
M uses ede; HM edeseni. M would have ola, the second person singular subject past tense of lao *'go'*; HM would have the basic form lao immediately preceded by oi (in addition to the oi at the start of the sentence).

(b) Umui ede bou he laoumu?
you(pl.) *where* future *go*
'Where are you going to go?'
This is M with the verb form incorrect. It should be bo laomu.

(c) Ai ranu utua
we(excl.) *water draw*
'We drew water' or *'We are drawing water'*
This is close to HM (ai be) ranu ai utua. (noho would be placed after utua if one wants to make it clear the action is continuing.) M would be (ai) ranu a utu(mu), a indicating first person exclusive subject past or present tense, and -mu indicating present continuous.

(d) Idia noho kava, biru lasi
they stay nothing garden neg.
'They are doing nothing, they aren't gardening.'

This is very close to HM, which would insert idia in front of biru. The verb forms in M would be more complex, e indicating third person subject, -mu present continuous and asie third person plural subject and negative: Idia e noho kavamu, asie birumu.

(e) Hanua asi tauna
village neg. *man*
'There is nobody in the village'

This is almost identical with M, which would usually put na after hanua; HM would be something like:

Inai hanua dekenai be tau ta ia noho lasi
this village in man a he live neg.

TEXT 2: Part of a Bible story from Lawes 1877a:13. It is not a translation of Biblical text, though it might be a translation from a Bible story book.

Kaino dika bada, iena tadina[1] alaia mase. Iehova ia itaia[2]
Cain sin big his younger brother kill die Jehovah him see
ia lalo dika, ia Kaino gwau henia, Oi tadina[1] edeseni? Kaino
he get-angry he say to you younger brother where
gwau, Sedira, daika dibana?[3] lauegu tadina[1] ia bada, lau
say I don't know who know my younger brother he big I
ia itaia lasi.[4] Iehova gwau, Oi dahaka kara? Oi tadina
him see neg. *say you what do you younger brother*
rara tano ai hebubu ia vada tai,[5] lau taia kamonai. Iehova ini
blood ground on spill he cry I ear hear that
gwau toma.[6] Iehova Kaino alaia lasi,[4] ia lulua gabuna daudau ia noho.
say like kill neg. *him drive place distant he live*
'Cain sinned greatly, he killed his younger brother. Jehovah saw him and got angry and said to Cain, "Where is your brother?" Cain said, "I don't know. Who knows! My brother is grown up. I don't look after him." Jehovah said, "What have you done? Your brother's blood which has been spilt on the ground has cried out. My ears have heard it." That is what Jehovah said. Jehovah did not kill Cain, he drove him out (i.e. of Eden) and he lived in a distant place.'

1. iena tadina *'his younger brother'*, lauegu tadina *'my younger brother'*, oi tadina *'your*(sg.) *younger brother'*. The first two of these are the same construction as is found in HM while the third is an example where only the personal pronoun is used (oi), not the full possessive form (oiemu).

2. Iehova ia itaia: an example of the SOV word order in this pidgin Motu as in M and HM. The verb form is used as in HM, but there is no full pronoun indicating the subject immediately preceding the verb as there would be in HM.

3. daika dibana? *'who knows?'*: good conversational M, with the -na suffix on diba. The full form would be daika mai dibana?

4. lasi: the negative construction is to place lasi after the verb as in HM.

5. ia vada tai *'it has cried out'*: this is the 'present' tense form according to Lawes (1885:10) used when an action is finished and complete; it might be called 'perfect' (though Lawes uses that of another tense form). HM would say ia tai vadaeni, while M would say ia vada e tai, e being the third person subject marker in the past and present tenses.

6. ini e gwau toma: this is a pure Motu expression, lit. *'he said like that'*. HM is inai bamona ia hereva.

TEXT 3: This is a translation of Mark 2:11-12, in British and Foreign Bible Society 1882:7.

Lau oi gwau henia,[1] Toreisi, oiemu pata[2] abiaisi, oiemu ruma
I you(sg.) *say to stand up your bed pick up your house*
lao.[3] Ia vada[4] toreisi pata abia, idia ibounai[5] vairanai[6] raka
go he stand up bed get they all in front of walk
lao; idia ibounai hoa ma[7] Dirava hanamoa idia gwau, Hari kara
go they all surprise and God praise they say this event
inai, ita idaunegai diba lasi.[8]
this we(incl.) *a long time know* neg.

'I say to you, "Stand up, pick up your bed, and go to your house." He stood up, took his bed, and he walked off in front of them all; they were all surprised and praised God, they said, "We have not known anything like this before (lit. *for a long time).'*

1. lau oi gwau henia: an example of the SOV word order, the absence of a subject pronoun immediately preceding the verb, and the use of a basic verb form with no tense, aspect, subject or object affixes. henia is used to make transitive forms of some verbs in both M and HM.

2. oiemu pata: this possessive construction occurs in both M and HM - in M for nouns in the alienable possession category, which is the great majority, and in HM for all nouns.

3. lao *'go'*: the imperative, the same form as in HM. In British and Foreign Bible Society 1885, it is changed to the M form baola (an irregular verb form).

4. vada: used here to indicate a completed action. HM would be ia toreisi vadaeni; M ia (vada) e toreisi.

5. ibounai *'all'*: the use of this form only without change according to the person of the noun or pronoun it qualifies. This is the same as HM; M would be iboudiai here, -dia- indicating third person plural.

6. vairanai *'in front of'*: an example of a compound postposition. As in HM it does not change according to the person and number of the noun or pronoun it governs. M here would be vairadiai, -dia- indicating third person plural.

7. ma *'and'*: often used to join clauses in HM, but not in M, where it is nearly always used meaning *'again'*.

8. lasi: an example of the negative construction, putting lasi after the verb as in HM.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BARTON, F.R.

1904 *British New Guinea Annual Report for 1903-04.* Melbourne: Government Printer.

1910 'The Annual Trading Expedition to the Papuan Gulf'. In: C.G. Seligman *The Melanesians of British New Guinea*, 96-120. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

BRETT, R., R. BROWN, R. BROWN and V. FOREMAN

1962 *A Survey of Motu and Police Motu.* Port Moresby: Department of Information and Extension Services.

BRITISH AND FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY

1882 *Mareko* (a translation of the gospel of Mark into Motu by W.G. Lawes assisted by J. Chalmers). Sydney: New South Wales Auxiliary to the Britisn and Foreign Bible Society.

1883 *Mataio* (a translation of the gospel of Matthew into Motu by J. Chalmers, revised by W.G. Lawes). Sydney: New South Wales Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

1885 *Iesu Keriso ena Evanelia* (a translation of the four gospels. Matthew and Mark are revisions of earlier versions, while Luke and John are new translations by J. Chalmers and W.G. Lawes). Sydney: New South Wales Auxiliary to the British and Foreign Bible Society.

1891 *Taravatu Matamata* (a translation of the New Testament into Motu by W.G. Lawes assisted by J. Chalmers). London: British and Foreign Bible Society.

BRITISH NEW GUINEA
1904 See BARTON

BROWN, H.A.
1973 'The Eleman Language Family'. In: K.J. Franklin, ed. *The Linguistic Situation in the Gulf District and Adjacent Areas, Papua New Guinea*. *PL*, C-26:280-376, 579-85.

CHALMERS, J.
1895 *Pioneer Life and Work in New Guinea 1877-1894*. London: Religious Tract Society.

CHATTERTON, Percy
ca.1959 *A Primer of Police Motu*. (A revised and enlarged edition.) Sydney: Pacific Publications.

1970 'The Origin and Development of Police Motu'. *Kivung* 3: 95-8.

1971 'Opening Remarks'. In: *Report on the Study Conference on Police Motu, 24-25 May, 1971*, 5-7. Port Moresby: Department of Information and Extension Services.

1975 *Say it in Motu*. Sydney: Pacific Publications.

DUTTON, T.E.
1976 Review Article: *The Dictionary and Grammar of Hiri Motu*. The Office of Information, Konedobu, Port Moresby, 1976. *Kivung* 9/1:39-56.

1978 'Language and Trade in Central and South-East Papua'. *Mankind* 11:341-53.

DUTTON, T.E. and H.A. BROWN
1977 'Hiri Motu: The Language Itself'. In: S.A. Wurm, ed. *New Guinea Area Languages and Language Study*, vol.3: *Language, Culture, Society, and the Modern World*. *PL*, C-40:759-93.

DUTTON, T.E. and Iru KAKARE
1977 *The Hiri Trading Language of Central Papua: A First Survey.* *DLOP* 15.

DUTTON, T.E. and C.L. VOORHOEVE
1974 *Beginning Hiri Motu.* *PL*, D-24.

KAKARE, Iru
1976 Hiri Motu. Paper presented to the tenth annual congress of the Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea, Port Moresby. Mimeographed.

KING, Joseph
1909 *W.G. Lawes of Savage Island and New Guinea.* London: The Religious Tract Society.

LAWES, William G.
1876-84 Journal. Vol.1 January 10th 1876 to March 10th 1878; Vol.2 March 17th 1881 to July 24th 1882; and Vol.3 July 25th 1882 to February 14th 1884. Microfilm held in the Papua New Guinea Collection, University of Papua New Guinea Library, Port Moresby.

1877a *Buka Kunana: Levaleva Tuahia Adipaia.* Sydney: Reading and Foster.

1877b 'Section III: New Guinea'. In: *The Chronicle of the London Missionary Society.* London: John Snow.

1879 'Ethnological Notes on the Motu, Koitapu and Koiari Tribes of New Guinea'. *JRAI* 8:369-77.

1880 'Notes on New Guinea and its Inhabitants'. *Proceedings of the Royal Geographical Society* 2 (new series):602-16.

1885 *Grammar and Vocabulary of Language Spoken by Motu Tribe, New Guinea.* Sydney: Government Printer.

1888 *Grammar and Vocabulary of Language Spoken by Motu Tribe, New Guinea.* Second and revised edition. Sydney: Government Printer.

1896 *Grammar and Vocabulary of the Language Spoken by the Motu Tribe, New Guinea.* Third and enlarged edition. Sydney: Government Printer.

LISTER-TURNER, R. AND J.B. CLARK

1930 *Revised Motu Grammar and Vocabulary.* Port Moresby: Government Printer.

n.d.a [*ca.*1954] *A Grammar of the Motu Language of Papua.* Second edition, [of *Revised Motu Grammar and Dictionary*] edited by Percy Chatterton. Sydney: Government Printer.

n.d.b [*ca.*1954] *A Dictionary of the Motu Language of Papua.* Second edition, edited by Percy Chatterton. Sydney: Government Printer.

LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY

1948 *Ane: Hymn Book in the Motu Language of Papua.* Issued by authority of Papua District Committee. Sydney: Australia and New Zealand Committee, London Missionary Society.

MacGILLIVRAY, John

1852 *Narrative of the Voyage of H.M.S. 'Rattlesnake' ....* 2 vols. London: Boone.

PAPUA NEW GUINEA: OFFICE OF INFORMATION

1976 *The Dictionary and Grammar of Hiri Motu.* Konedobu, Port Moresby.

PRENDERGAST, Patricia Ann

1968 A History of the London Missionary Society in British New Guinea, 1871-1901. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii, Honolulu.

TAYLOR, Andrew

1970 Syntax and Phonology of Motu (Papua): A Transformational Approach. Ph.D. thesis, Australian National University, Canberra.

TURNER, W.Y.

1877-78 'The Ethnology of the Motu'. *JRAI* 7:470-98.

WURM, S.A.

1964 'Motu and Police Motu, a Study in Typological Contrasts'. *PL*, A-4:19-41.