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ABSTRACT
In the lexicon of pidgin and creole languages we can see an important part of these languages’ history of origin and of language contact. The current paper deals with the lexical sources of Tok Pisin and, more specifically, with words of German origin found in this language. During the period of German colonial domination of New Guinea and a number of insular territories in the Pacific (ca. 1885–1915), German words entered the emerging Tok Pisin lexicon. Based on a broad range of lexical and lexicographic data from the early 20th century up until today, we investigate the actual or presumed German origin of a number of Tok Pisin words and trace different lexical processes of integration that are linked to various, often though not always colonially determined, contact settings and sociocultural interactions.
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1 INTRODUCTION
German loanwords are a feature found in various languages in the South Pacific. Their existence can be explained by language contact of varying intensity during the German colonial period (cf. Mühlhäusler 2001, Engelberg to appear). The language contact was connected to trading interactions, schooling, missionary activities, and colonial administration.
During a relatively short period of about 30 years (ca. 1885–1915), many local languages in the South Pacific came in contact with German. This language encounter resulted in several contact phenomena, not least the development of a pidgin (in northeastern New Guinea) (Mühlhäusler 1977) and a creole language (Rabaul Creole German/Unserdeutsch) (Volker 1991, Maitz & Volker 2017), but also in lexical borrowing into the existing regional and local languages. A considerable number of Pacific languages integrated German loanwords during this period (Engelberg 2006, 2008; Stolberg 2015).

Somewhat surprisingly, however, German loanwords can also be found in languages of the South Pacific region that were never in direct contact with German. In many cases, Tok Pisin seems to have functioned as a transmitter language through which borrowings from German were introduced and, ultimately, integrated in other languages. Except for Mühlhäusler’s work on German words in Tok Pisin, the systematic documentation of German loanwords in the languages of the South Pacific has been neglected in lexical research and contact linguistics so far.

In order to be able to identify what German words may have spread through contact with Tok Pisin, it is necessary first to establish what words of German origin were (and, to some degree, still are) commonly used in Tok Pisin. This paper thus takes a closer look at the contributions of German to the Tok Pisin lexicon during the late 19th and the early 20th centuries when Tok Pisin began to stabilize during the period of German colonization in the South Pacific. The considerations in this paper are embedded in a lexicographic project at the Institut für Deutsche Sprache (‘Institute for the German Language’) in Mannheim (Germany), where a dictionary of words of German origin in Tok Pisin (Wortschatz deutschen Ursprungs im Tok Pisin; Engelberg, Möhrs & Stolberg 2017ff) is currently being compiled. The project is motivated by different considerations:

(i) Those dictionaries of Tok Pisin that provide etymological information (for example, Mihalic 1957, 1971; Steinbauer 1969; Burton 2001–2005, Garnier 2006) contain doubtful or erroneous etymological attributions to a certain extent.

(ii) Mühlhäusler has done comprehensive work on the German influence on Tok Pisin in the 1970s and 1980s. However, this work is distributed over
numerous publications and has not found its way into Tok Pisin lexicography.

(iii) Since the time of Mühlhäusler’s (1979b, 1985a, etc.) studies, work on pidgin and creole languages in the Pacific as well as work on German colonialism has proceeded, such that new evidence complements the seminal work by Mühlhäusler.

(iv) The Institute for the German Language in Mannheim hosts a long-term project that aims at an online documentation of lexical borrowings from German into other languages. In this project, (mostly bilingual) loanword dictionaries with German as the donor language are integrated into a dictionary net, the *Lehnwortportal Deutsch*, and inverted in a way that allows the net to be searched via German metalemmata (Meyer & Engelberg 2012ff; cf. also Section 6). The dictionary of words of German origin in Tok Pisin will complement the loanword portal.

(v) A dictionary of German loanwords in the languages of the South Pacific is in preparation at the Institute for the German Language. As has been pointed out above, a prerequisite for such a dictionary is having insights into the etymology of the lexicon of Tok Pisin, since Tok Pisin acted as a mediating language in borrowing processes in the area.

The paper will proceed as follows: In Section 2, we will sketch the history of Tok Pisin as far as it is necessary for the understanding of etymological considerations, and we will give an account of the language contact situation. The history of Tok Pisin lexicography and problems with the use of Tok Pisin dictionaries for etymological research will be described in Section 3. Section 4 will be devoted to general considerations about etymological reasoning with respect to Tok Pisin. In Section 5, we will present new evidence for the influence of German on Tok Pisin that goes beyond Mühlhäusler’s early studies. Finally, in Section 6, the dictionary being compiled will be briefly described with respect to its empirical basis and its structure.

2 THE HISTORY AND CONTACT SITUATION OF EARLY TOK PISIN

During the second half of the 19th century, the German empire took colonial dominance over a number of regions in the South Pacific. Between 1884 and
1900, the following areas were declared German colonies: north-eastern New Guinea ("Kaiser-Wilhelmsland"), the Bismarck Archipelago, and the Northern Solomon Islands (1884); the Marshall Islands (1885); Nauru (1888); the Marianas (except for Guam) (1899); the Caroline and Palau Islands (1899); and Western Samoa (1900). Administratively, the colonies were divided into two government units, the Gouvernement German New Guinea (including all parts except for Samoa) and the Gouvernement Samoa.

By that time, English-based jargons and pidgins had already been present in the South Pacific for about one hundred years. They started to spread in the Pacific from the late 18th century on. Depending on the particular location of shipping routes, and of whaling, sandalwood, and trepang (sea cucumber) trade, English-based contact varieties were used to different degrees in different locations in the Pacific. New Guinea and the Bismarck Archipelago were less affected by these linguistic developments. Even in the 1870s, relatively few people in the Bismarck Archipelago knew some basic pidgin.

An important step for the development and stabilization of Pacific pidgins was the establishment of plantations, which started in the 1860s in Queensland, Fiji, New Caledonia, and Samoa. The plantations required the recruitment of indentured laborers (‘blackbirding’) from different places in the Pacific. The complex movement patterns of laborers across the Pacific led to the diffusion of English-lexified pidgins and the development of different varieties (cf., for example, Tryon & Charpentier 2004: 173ff). The main labor force on the Queensland plantations until the early 1880s was recruited from the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands. In 1883 and 1884, larger numbers of workers were hired from the Bismarck Archipelago. On the Samoan plantations, the majority of the workers came from the Gilbert Islands in the early plantation years. Only in 1878 and 1880 did Samoa start to recruit from the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands, respectively. Thus, a number of the laborers from these islands had probably worked on the plantations in Queensland before and brought the pidgin acquired in Australia to Samoa, where it encountered the pidgin already spoken there. Around 1880, the Bismarck Archipelago became a major recruiting ground for the Samoan plantation owners (Mühlhäusler 1979b: 70–71). After their three-year contract had expired, most laborers returned to the Bismarck Archipelago and brought with them the pidgin they had acquired in Samoa.

The migration patterns in the Pacific and the observed differences between the pidgin varieties have generated different theories about the
origin of Tok Pisin. Mühlhäusler (1978) and Mosel & Mühlhäusler (1982) point to the role of Samoan Plantation Pidgin and assume that Tok Pisin developed out of the pidgin spoken in Samoa after the return of the laborers to the Bismarck Archipelago. Baker (1993), by contrast, assigns a stronger role to Queensland Canefield English and other Australian pidgins for the development of Tok Pisin. Keesing (1988), finally, emphasizes the presumed homogeneity of Pacific pidgins in the 19th century and attributes the peculiarities of Tok Pisin to German relexification and the Austronesian substrate in the Bismarck Archipelago. In a reassessment of available data, Neuhof (2015: 60–61) concludes that Tok Pisin shows a slightly stronger similarity to Queensland Canefield English. However, lexical features point more strongly to Samoan Plantation Pidgin as a precursor of Tok Pisin. We do not take a particular stance with respect to the debate about the origin of Tok Pisin here. We will assume that in particular the pidgins spoken in Queensland and Samoa will have to be taken into account for etymological reasoning with respect to Tok Pisin.

With the developments following the return of the workers to the Bismarck Archipelago, Tok Pisin reached the second of the four stages that, according to Mühlhäusler, Dutton & Romaine (2003: 9–11), characterize its history. During the earliest stage, it was a jargon rather than a pidgin. It was considered by its speakers to be the ‘white man’s speech’, not a variety in its own right. Lexicon and morphology were strongly influenced by English, while specific features can be noted such as multifunctionality of grammatical elements, no use of a copula, and a restricted sentence length. Around 1890, shortly after German colonization of New Guinea started, Tok Pisin began to stabilize, that is, it was now recognizably different from English with respect to pronunciation and grammatical features. This was also the period of actual contact with German and the phase during which German words became integrated into the Tok Pisin lexicon. After approximately 1930, Tok Pisin expanded into regions close to the coast; in the inner parts of New Guinea, the development proceeded more slowly. This is what Mühlhäusler, Dutton & Romaine (2003: 11) refer to as classical Tok Pisin, a variety that shows lexical and grammatical autonomy with respect to English. The fourth and most recent stage is that of creolization, where Tok Pisin, at least in some regions and especially in urban areas, is undergoing an extensive restructuring, and is spoken with an increased speech tempo.
Today, Tok Pisin is one of the official national languages besides English and Hiri Motu and the most important lingua franca of Papua New Guinea. Nowadays, it is spoken by about 3 to 5 million speakers, with probably about 500,000 first language speakers (Smith & Siegel 2013: 214), most of them multilingual.

In the course of the history of Tok Pisin, a number of languages have contributed to its lexicon (cf., for example, Mühlhäusler 1985a). English is by far the most influential source. This is, on the one hand, explained by the fact that Tok Pisin is an offspring of English-based South Pacific pidgins and, on the other hand, by the fact that the language area of Tok Pisin was under Australian administration from WWI on until the independence of Papua New Guinea in 1975. The global role of English after WWII is of course also a constant influential factor. Further sources of the Tok Pisin lexicon are local Austronesian languages from the Bismarck Archipelago, in particular Kuanua (Tolai), but also, among others, Ramoaaina, Siar-Lak, and Label (Mosel 1980: 23ff). Since the Bismarck Archipelago and in particular the Gazelle Peninsulara on New Britain played an important role in the early development of Tok Pisin, languages from that area had a greater influence on Tok Pisin than languages from mainland New Guinea. Only single words have been contributed by languages from the New Guinea mainland and its off-shore islands such as Tumleo, Monumbo, Yakamul, and Abelam (Mühlhäusler 1985a: 207–208). A number of words have been borrowed from Malay, in particular from the pidginized variety that went under the name of Küstenmalaiisch (‘Coastal Malay’/‘Bazaar Malay’) in German colonial times (cf. Section 5). Apart from these source languages, a handful of words have also been taken from Chinese Pidgin English, Fijian, Samoan, and Hiri Motu. Words from Portuguese and Spanish came via pre-Tok Pisin pidgins, Latin words via German- or English-speaking missionaries.

Besides these languages, due to German colonialism and the mission work of German mission societies, numerous words of German origin entered Tok Pisin between the late 19th century and WWII (Mühlhäusler 1979b). It seems that the integration of German words into Tok Pisin was eased by the coincidence that Tok Pisin was not yet a fully established variety at the time when German colonial rule in New Guinea began.

---

1 The language names follow Ethnologue (Lewis et al. 2016).
Estimations of the amount of contributions by the different donor languages differ, on the one hand, due to the changing composition of the Tok Pisin vocabulary over time and, on the other hand, due to growing knowledge about the etymology of Tok Pisin words. According to Laycock (1970: 115), in the late 1960s, English as the primary lexifier accounted for about three quarter of the Tok Pisin lexicon, with varying lexical contributions from other languages, namely Kuanua (11%), other New Guinean languages (6%), German (4%), Latin (3%), and Malay (1%).

The proportion of German-based vocabulary in Tok Pisin depends on regional and temporal factors. In areas of German colonial and missionary activities, in particular in the central Bismarck Archipelago and the northeastern shore of New Guinea, words from German have always been more prevalent than in the highlands or southern Papua. Also, many words of German origin have become obsolete and have been replaced by words from English or by the results of word formation within Tok Pisin. However, Mühlhäusler (1985a: 179) estimates that in the early 20th century, when contact with German took place and Tok Pisin stabilized, the contribution of German to the vocabulary of Tok Pisin amounted to up to 20%. Romaine (2005: 1092) assumes that during this period 150 to 200 Tok Pisin words had a German origin. This corresponds to Mühlhäusler’s (1985a: 179) estimate that is based on a lexicon size of roughly 750–800 words in early Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler 1985a: 183). Differences between these and later counts depend partly on different assumptions about the total number of lexemes in Tok Pisin. Estimates for later times attributed 1% (Hall 1943b: 193), 3% (Salisbury 1967: 46), 4% (Laycock 1970: 115), or 5% (Wurm 1985: 65) of the Tok Pisin lexicon to German. In Garnier’s (2006) fairly recent Dictionnaire Français/Tok Pisin only 13 of approximately 1200 headwords (i.e. 1%) are marked as stemming from German.

3 TOK PISIN LEXICOGRAPHY

Compared to other contact languages, Tok Pisin has a fairly extensive lexicographic record. However, lexicography of Tok Pisin began relatively late, with the first dictionary being compiled, mimeographed, and distributed in the 1920s, more than 30 years after Tok Pisin began to stabilize in the Bismarck Archipelago.
Travel reports and other contemporary records of linguistic interactions from the late 19th century onward are the earliest pre-lexicographic records of the developing Tok Pisin and its immediate forerunners. All early descriptions of Tok Pisin were carried out by expatriates (usually of European origin), many of whom were anglophone and often judged Tok Pisin by the linguistic measure of (Standard) English. Having been produced by speakers of various European mother tongues (mainly English, German, and French), these records reflect colonial interpretations of lexical and structural processes in Tok Pisin. They nevertheless make up an important portion of the few available written sources of earlier stages of Tok Pisin. The first larger wordlist of Tok Pisin was compiled by Otto Dempwolff probably in the years before WWI (Dempwolff [not dated a]; cf. Mühlhäusler 1985c: 30). The manuscript consists of 24 pages of Tok Pisin words with phonetic information and translations into German. There is also a fragment of another, slightly different dictionary manuscript by Dempwolff, only covering the letters A to B (Dempwolff [not dated b]). For the time following these first attempts, the lexicography of Tok Pisin can be divided into five stages:

Stage 1
In the 1920s to 1940s, dictionaries of Tok Pisin were compiled by missionaries from German Catholic mission societies. A lexicographic collection of Tok Pisin items was presented by Leo Brenninkmeyer (1924), missionary of the Catholic Mission of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, in his introduction into Pidgin English. Brenninkmeyer worked among the Baining on the Gazelle peninsula of New Britain. The lexical items in his typescript are grouped into semantic and grammatical classes. The work was complemented in 1925 by an alphabetically organized dictionary (Tok Pisin to German/English) (Brenninkmeyer 1925; cf. Mühlhäusler 1985c: 30). In the following year, Karl Borchardt (1926), who missionized for the same society as Brenninkmeyer on Manus, the main island of the Admiralty Islands, finished a dictionary with a German-to-Tok-Pisin part and a Tok-

---

2 We do not consider two early published dictionaries of Melanesian Pidgin here: Churchill (1911) – though he also includes material from the New Guinea area – does not distinguish between different varieties of Melanesian Pidgin, and Pionnier (1913) reflects an early stage of Bislama.
Pisin-to-English/German part. Another dictionary from the islands was Kutscher’s (1940) *Wörterbuch deutsch-pidgin-english*, with an appendix in which religious terms in Latin are given with their equivalent in Tok Pisin.

William van Baar was a Dutch missionary of the Society of the Divine Word (SVD). He wrote his German-to-Tok-Pisin dictionary in Mugil, on the northeastern shore of New Guinea, west of Madang. It was the first dictionary from the New Guinea mainland. The dating of the dictionary is difficult. There seem to have been two varieties of the dictionary under the name of *Pitschen-Wörterbuch* and *German-Pidgin English dictionary*; Mühlhäusler (1985c: 31) gives 1930 as a probable date for both. The version used here, *Pitshen-Wörterbuch*, (van Baar [not dated]) might be an enlarged version of the former ones (Mühlhäusler 1985c: 31). John A. Z’graggen, in his foreword to the microfilm edition of this dictionary, assumes that the dictionary was compiled before 1938.

One of the main contributors to early Tok Pisin lexicography was Joseph Schebesta from the Society of the Divine Word. Missionizing in the Bogia area (Madang province) of the New Guinea mainland, he had been working on a dictionary that became the main source of the *Wörterbuch mit Redewendungen Pidgin-Englisch-Deutsch* ([anonymous] 1935), a dictionary that constituted a joint effort of the missionaries of the Society of the Divine Word (Mühlhäusler 1985c: 31). Because of WWII, Schebesta’s lexicographic work never went to print; it was later revised by Leo Meiser (Schebesta & Meier 1945) and mimeographed. Another dictionary from the missionaries in Alexishafen that survived from the 1930s is an anonymous Tok-Pisin-to-German dictionary (Anonymous [not dated]).

**Stage 2**

With WWII and the temporary occupation of New Guinea by Japanese troops, an increased interest in Tok Pisin outside the domain of the missions could be observed, driven by “the pressures for effective communication and propaganda during the war” (Mühlhäusler 1985c: 19). The most influential publication was *The Book of Pidgin English* by John J. Murphy (1943), an Australian patrol officer. The book saw numerous editions during the following decades. Its lexicographic part contains a kind of thesaurus organized according to semantic fields, a Tok-Pisin-to-English dictionary, and an English-to-Tok-Pisin dictionary. Another contribution was the dictionary in the *Booklet of Pidgin English* by E. C. H. Helton (1943), a
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former soldier of the Australian troops. Numerous important contributions to
the research of Tok Pisin were made by Robert A. Hall, for example, a
monograph on ‘Melanesian Pidgin English’ (Hall 1943a) that also contains a
Tok Pisin dictionary used for language guides for the American forces in the
Pacific. Another post-war lexicographic enterprise was Smythe’s ([not
dated]) Tok Pisin dictionary, based on data from the Admiralty Islands and
the New Guinea highlands (Mühlhäuser 1985c: 31). The dictionary
remained unfinished.

Stage 3
After this intermezzo, it is again the missionaries that dominate Tok Pisin
lexicography in the 1950s and 1960s. J. Dahmen (1957), a Sacred Heart
missionary on the Gazelle peninsula, compiled a Tok-Pisin-to-English
dictionary that is based on earlier manuscripts from 1949. His dictionary also
remained unpublished, so that the Grammar and dictionary of Neo-
Melanesian by Francis Mihalic (1957) from the Society of the Divine Word
became the first published lexicographic effort on Tok Pisin by a missionary.
The dictionary eventually turned into The Jacaranda dictionary and
grammar of Melanesian Pidgin (Mihalic 1971), the most respected
lexicographic work on Tok Pisin. It overshadowed Steinbauer’s (1969)
Concise Dictionary of New Guinea Pidgin that had appeared briefly before.

Stage 4
From the 1970s on, the landscape of print lexicography of Tok Pisin
diversified considerably. More bilingual dictionaries of Tok Pisin were
compiled; three of the more recent ones are Garnier’s (2006) Dictionnaire
Français/Tok Pisin”, Oxford University Press Papua New Guinea Tok Pisin
English Dictionary (Volker, Baing, Deutrom & Jackson 2008), and Parkers’
(2008) Tok Pisin – English Thesaurus. There are also multilingual
dictionaries involving Tok Pisin, such as Feldpausch’s (2003, 2006) Namia,
Tok Pisin, and English Dictionary, Lloyd’s (1992) Baruya – Tok Pisin –
English Dictionary, or the Trilingual dictionary Tokpisin – English – Bahasa
have been complemented by works on specialized lexicography like Balint’s
Dictionary in New Guinea Pidgin. In addition to mere dictionaries, language
courses such as Dutton & Thomas (1985) and Pernet & Wendt (2007) also include fairly comprehensive dictionaries.

Stage 5
The most recent stage of Tok Pisin lexicography is characterized by internet lexicography. A number of Tok Pisin dictionaries and word lists have appeared on the net in the last two decades. Among the larger internet dictionaries are Newlin’s (2001ff) ‘Words and Phrases’ and the ‘Pidgin/English Dictionary’ by Barhorst & O’Dell-Barhorst (1996) that reflects the variety spoken in Port Moresby. ‘Revising the Mihalic project’ is an internet initiative by Burton & Gesch (2001–2005). Up to 2005, when the site was last updated, it contained 776 ‘revised’ articles based on the Jacaranda dictionary (Mihalic 1971).

When working with dictionaries and comparable data from the colonial period (and even later), it has to be taken into consideration that these are not purely descriptive records. They have to be interpreted considering the setting of their origin. It is thus important to be aware of the authors’ perspectives, including their first language; especially if it is English, the description of Tok Pisin tends to be biased in the older documents. Furthermore, the goal to be achieved with a dictionary or word list influences the way the data is presented. One noteworthy example is Balint (1969) whose dictionary is an example of vocabulary planning rather than vocabulary documentation. His explicit goal was to provide a sports dictionary, in which he developed a considerable amount of sports terminology in Tok Pisin. Crucially, these lexemes were in large part never used by Tok Pisin speakers, so the dictionary has no particular documentary value with respect to the actual Tok Pisin lexicon of the time.

Not all authors seem to have been aware of lexical variation within Tok Pisin and across Melanesian Pidgin English varieties. Information on the region of the documented variety is often but not always included. Indicating diachronic variation, that is, marking an item as ‘archaic’ or ‘obsolete’, is not frequent, either. Due to this underspecification, it is sometimes difficult to judge how reliable a dictionary source is. Therefore, it is crucial to understand the available data as being nested in their specific time and context of origin. Especially the older sources are not only linguistic documents but also historical documents that need to be interpreted. They record and judge Tok Pisin at the same time, and therefore they cannot be taken at face value in all
cases. At the same time, however, they are valuable historical and linguistic sources. They can be read as ‘pointers’ to extralinguistic context, such as the authors’ presuppositions, language attitudes, and backgrounds (as typical of their time), and they offer a time-specific record of the variety at one given point. Especially the earliest sources do not always provide objective linguistic information; for example, a standardized English orthography, as found with native speakers of English, may be misleading with respect to the pronunciation of Tok Pisin. This impression can be counterbalanced where documents by native speakers of other languages, for example, French, are available. Pionnier (1913) offers one such example; he describes Bislama and uses a French-based orthography, rendering the actual pronunciation of lexemes much more accurately than the English-based orthography of Churchill (1911). It is important, however, to draw on additional historical and cultural background information to balance and enrich the language data.

Only some of the dictionaries give information with respect to etymology, in particular Mihalic (1957, 1971), Steinbauer (1969), and Garnier (2006). However, etymology is certainly not the main focus of any of the consulted dictionaries. Quite a number of errors or superficial assignments of word origins blur the historical picture. A more extensively discussed example is *maski*. In our lexicographic sources, *maski* is recorded as a word of Tok Pisin from 1926 on (Borchardt 1926) and up until today. According to Neuhof (2015: XXXI), it was documented as early as in 1911 for Tok Pisin (but not for other plantation pidgins in the South Pacific). *Maski* is an established lexeme in Tok Pisin today, with a concessive or downtoning meaning, such as ‘never mind’, ‘ignore’, ‘forget about’, ‘nevertheless’, ‘in spite of’, ‘although’.

A German etymology is first tentatively proposed by Steinbauer (1969). Mihalic (1971: 131), in his ground-breaking Jacaranda dictionary, assumes the German phrase *macht nichts* ‘never mind’ to be the etymological source of *maski*. Slone (1996: 91) refers to Mihalic’s (1971) proposal, pointing out, however, that Baker (1987: 177) suggests ‘other possible origins’. None of these sources mention the difficulty in explaining the phonology of *maski* if it were derived from German *macht nichts*. While German *ch* [ç] can be rendered as [s] in Tok Pisin (cf. Tok Pisin *tais* < German *Teich* ‘pond’), it seems puzzling why [t] should be turned into [k], as [t] is perfectly common in Tok Pisin. The apparent reduction of *nichts* to *(k)ji* would also be at least unusual, compared to the phonological adaptation of other German-based
items in Tok Pisin. Mühlhäusler (1985a: 200), similarly to Baker (1987), mentions his doubts regarding a German etymology of *maski*. More recently, Franklin (2015) discusses the etymology of *maski* in the light of evidence from 19th century Chinese Pidgin English and concludes that this must be the source of Tok Pisin *maski*. Much earlier Nevermann (1929: 252) pointed out that *maski* is a shared lexical item between Chinese Pidgin English and Tok Pisin, offering as a German translation *das macht nichts* ‘that doesn’t matter’. The assumption of the connection of *maski* to Chinese Pidgin English is further supported by the fact that it also occurred in Kiautschou Pidgin German, which was spoken in the German colony Kiautschou on the coast of China in the early 20th century (Mühlhäusler 2011: 194). Interestingly, *maski* has been discussed independently in the realm of Spanish and Portuguese based pidgins and creoles where it is widespread (Veiga & Fernández 2012). Here, the central question is whether a Spanish or a Portuguese origin of the item has to be assumed, whereas a German origin is not discussed or even considered as plausible (Veiga & Fernández 2012: 197). While both languages have similar forms (Spanish *másque/masque*, Portuguese *maisque*), Portuguese provides the concessive meaning more strongly than Spanish does, even though some Spanish varieties have it, too. Veiga & Fernández (2012) note that *maski* (and its closely-related variants) can be found in a considerable number of languages, pidgin, creole, and other languages (as an established loanword, for example in Malay and Tagalog), in South America, Oceania, and South Asia, and can thus be referred to as a “circumpacific isogloss” (Veiga & Fernández 2012: 198, with reference to Stolz 1996). Not all of these languages were in contact with Portuguese, which complicates the derivation of the item’s concessive meaning. There seems to be evidence, however, that in some languages *maski* is derived from (contact with) Spanish (Veiga & Fernández 2012: 191).

In sum, it can be said that *maski*, while being assigned a German etymology in several sources, is highly unlikely to be of German origin. It was a well-established item in various pidgin languages (for example, Chinese Pidgin English) as well as in Malay (Veiga & Fernández 2012: 197), that is, varieties with which Melanesian Pidgin English and, later, Tok Pisin were in contact. While it cannot be fully excluded that German *macht nichts* had some supporting effect on the use of *maski* in Tok Pisin (and also in Rabaul Creole German, in the Bismarck Archipelago), it seems much more likely, based on the available evidence, that it is derived from Spanish and/or
Portuguese and entered Tok Pisin via contact with other pidgin and creole languages and with Malay.

4 TOK PISIN ETYMOLOGY

The case of maski and many other cases pose the question with what degree of confidence it is possible to determine which Tok Pisin words are derived from German. Regarding this question, three categories of lexemes can be distinguished: (i) The first category consists of words clearly of German origin; these are words that are recognizably derived from German, have no cognates in other languages that contributed to Tok Pisin, and show no influence from other source languages of Tok Pisin, for example raus(im) ‘get out’ (< German raus), kele ‘ladle’ (< German Kelle), baisange ‘pincers’ (< German Beißzange), or tais ‘pond’ (< German Teich). (ii) The second category contains words that show a possible influence from more than one language, among them many words that are cognates in German and English, for example Tok Pisin rais (English rice, German Reis) or Tok Pisin Septemba (English September, German September). (iii) A third category of Tok Pisin words are those that are clearly of non-German origin. These are items that bear no form similarity to any (semantically related) German word and/or that are clearly derived from other source languages, such as diwai ‘tree’ (from Kuanua or Ramoaaina; Mosel 1980: 27; German: Baum) or plaua ‘flour’ (from English; German: Mehl). Mühlhäusler (1985a: 215) points out that

[…] etymologising in Tok Pisin cannot reasonably be carried out unless sociohistorical and, above all, temporal factors are taken into consideration. A mere analysis of present-day Tok Pisin vocabulary in terms of the origins of its lexical inventory is bound to be quite misleading.

In the following section, we will show which particular types of borrowing processes have to be considered, focusing in particular on those that involve multiple etymologies. Pidgin and creole languages by nature comprise influences from many sources. When undertaking a lexical analysis and trying to identify the respective sources of lexemes, one is faced with the fact that many lexemes can have multiple ‘ancestors’. This is also true of Tok Pisin.
As a contact language, the lexicon of Tok Pisin started from scratch. No inherited vocabulary in the traditional sense characterizes the early lexicon of Tok Pisin unless one wants to call the items from Pacific pidgins that were the immediate forerunners of Tok Pisin as inherited items. Thus, all the vocabulary items are, in a sense, borrowed. This and the different linguistic backgrounds of the speakers explain the frequent occurrence of multiple etymologies, that is, cases where a particular lexical item and its properties can be traced back to more than one source language. We will distinguish two basic types of multiple etymology, lexical conflation (cf. also Mühlhäusler 1985a) and multilevel syncretism (Edwards 1974).3

Lexical conflation occurs when a borrowed item can be traced back to the lexicon of two or more possible source languages where the etyma are cognates. Tok Pisin ais can claim English ice as well as German Eis as its source. According to Mühlhäusler (1985a: 183), “around 75 items, or 10% of the lexicon at the time of German-English contact (1884–1920) are English-German conflations.” In some cases, extralinguistic factors can help to determine the language of origin, for example, if a lexeme refers to an object that was introduced during, before, or after the German colonial period. In some cases, an English origin is more plausible, for example, for reasons of sound correspondence, as in kela ‘bald’, which is more likely to be derived from English callow than from German kahl. Lexical items that had been in frequent use in Pacific pidgins before the rise of Tok Pisin are probably better attributed to English. However, even here, the presence of a German cognate might have had a strengthening effect. Thus, in many cases, it is most reasonable to assume a multiple etymology in the sense that both languages contributed to the integration of this item into Tok Pisin.

We talk about etymological syncretism when the (phonological, semantic, syntactic, etc.) properties of a word in the target language of a borrowing process go back to more than one source language. Edwards (1974: 4f) distinguishes two types, simple syncretisms and multi-level syncretisms. In the case of a simple syncretism, a lexical item in the target language results from the formal and semantic merge of lexical items from different source languages. Typically, two near homonyms with vaguely

3 Multiple etymologies are, of course, not exclusive to pidgin languages (cf. Durkin 2009: 132ff). However, they seem to occur here particularly often.
related meanings merge. A typical case is Tok Pisin \(b(u)lut\) that shows traces from German, English, and languages from the Bismarck Archipelago. The lexicographical sources book this item in a number of variants, such as \textit{bulut} (Borchardt 1926: 15) or \textit{blut/blud} (van Baar 1930: 14). Variation can be observed in the vowel quality and in the final consonant, a voiced or devoiced stop. In addition, a vowel ([u]) can be inserted within the complex onset. \textit{Bulut} can be considered as a case of German-English conflation with German probably having a stronger influence. In addition, there is a third source evident, in form as well as in meaning. This is the impact from Kuanua and Ramoaaina, which both have the lexeme \textit{bulit} meaning ‘sap, glue’ (Mosel 1980: 26; Mühlhäusler 1985a: 185; Franklin 1998: 21; Mühlhäusler, Dutton & Romaine 2003: 26). The common denominator seems to be ‘liquid life source’ (blood, sap), with the extended meaning ‘glue’, obviously derived from the stickiness of sap. This form, \textit{bulit}, is likely to be a source for the inserted vowel in the first syllable of Tok Pisin \textit{bulut}. Assimilation with the European lexeme as well as between the two vowels can explain the newly derived form \textit{bulut}. Its meaning combines the different semantic concepts of its source items, ‘blood, sap, glue’. This lexeme demonstrates processes of blending different lexical sources, phonetically and semantically, into a lexical item that combines features from all of its origins.

In the case of multilevel syncretisms, some of the lexical properties of an item can be traced back to one source language and others to another source language. There are quite a few items where the form of a Tok Pisin word (and often its basic meaning) come from a European language while the polysemic spectrum of the word is inspired by a related word in a local language. The Tok Pisin word \textit{as} is an example of a partial semantic overlap that led to a transfer of concept. It resulted in the semantic merger of vernacular concepts with English/German concepts. The word form is derived from English \textit{arse} and German \textit{Arsch}. The meaning of \textit{as}, however, resorts to the Kuanua word \textit{vuna} which means ‘cause’ and is also used to express ‘ancestral line, clan’ and ‘bottom’ (Franklin, Kerr & Beaumont 1974: 80, 86f). The basic meaning of Kuanua \textit{vuna} is borrowed into Tok Pisin and integrated into the meaning spectrum of \textit{as} which expresses ‘origin, cause, source, reason; bottom, base, foundation; anus, buttocks’ (Schebesta & Meiser 1945: 10; Hall 1943b: 89; Volker et al. 2008: 4).

Apart from multiple etymologies, other etymological peculiarities have to be observed in Tok Pisin (cf. Mühlhäusler 1975: 109, 1985a: 187ff):
a) Semantic change: The borrowing process is accompanied by a change of meaning; Tok Pisin *siluk* ‘whirlpool, eddy’ stems from German *Schluck* ‘gulp’.

b) Categorical change: The borrowing process is accompanied by a change in syntactic category; the Tok Pisin verb *surik* ‘to move back, to flinch from’ is borrowed from the German adverb *zurück* ‘back’.

c) Univerbation: A multi-word unit of the source language is borrowed as a single word into the target language; Tok Pisin *sisan* ‘stand still, keep quiet’ goes back to German *Still gestanden!* ‘Attention!’ (lit. ‘stand still’; military command).

d) Folk etymology: A loanword is reanalyzed based on words known to the speaker; Tok Pisin *sutman* ‘policeman’ from German *Schutzmann*, literally ‘protection man’, is reanalyzed as ‘shooting man’ in dependence on Tok Pisin *sut* ‘to shoot; a shot’.

e) Double borrowing: A word is borrowed twice and splits into two words in the target language that differ in form or meaning; German *Hobel* ‘plane’ enters Tok Pisin as *hobel* ‘carpenter’s plane’ and *hoben* ‘screwdriver’.

f) Reborrowing: A word is borrowed twice, at different times; before 1900, Tok Pisin *bi* as a borrowing from English *bee* was used; between 1900 and 1960 *binen* from German *Bienen* ‘bees’ was in use, and after that *bi* was again borrowed from English *bee*.

5 RECENT FINDINGS

Since Mühlhäusler’s groundbreaking efforts on Tok Pisin etymology, more than 30 years have passed. In the meantime, new evidence has become available that increases our knowledge about the influence of German on the lexicon of Tok Pisin. This concerns primarily the following resources: (i) dictionaries and word lists of early pidgin varieties in the Pacific and of other varieties of Melanesian pidgin (Bislama, Solomon Pijin), (ii) historical documents of German colonialism, (iii) lexical resources of Malay languages documenting the Dutch influence on these languages, (iv) records of early Tok Pisin texts and utterances, and (v) etymological studies on single Tok Pisin words.
Regarding (i), Troy (1994) has compiled a list of words that were used in New South Wales and Victoria Pidgin, and Baker & Mühlhäusler (1996) provide lists of words that are widespread in different older pidgin varieties in the Pacific (cf. also Tryon & Charpentier 2004: 115ff). Crowley (1998) presents a vocabulary list for early Bislama, and new dictionaries of contemporary Bislama (Crowley 2002) and Solomon Pijin (Jourdan 2003) were compiled. A comparison shows that, for example, Tok Pisin *tausen* ‘thousand’, a likely candidate for a loan from German *tausend*, can be found in various other Pacific pidgins. It is, for example, already attested in New South Wales pidgin in the 1820s (*taosen*, Troy 1994), in early Bislama (*tause*, Crowley 1998: 100), and in modern Solomon Pijin (*taosen*, *tasen*; Jourdan 2003: 240). This distribution supports the assumption that the word was already present in the pidgins from which Tok Pisin arose. Of course, a strengthening effect from German *tausend* cannot be excluded. In general, it can be said: The more widespread a Tok Pisin word with a corresponding German-English cognate is in pre-Tok Pisin pidgin varieties and in Bislama and Solomon Pijin, the less likely it is borrowed from German and the less likely it is that an influence from German was needed to strengthen the establishment of the word in Tok Pisin.

However, each case has to be treated in its own right. Sometimes, German influence can be seen even with words that were present in many Pacific pidgins. English *milk* and German *Milch* are cognates. Correspondences can be found in several pidgin varieties, for example, in the pidgin spoken in Victoria (Australia) in the middle of the 19th century (*melek*, Troy 1994), in early Bislama (*melek*; Crowley 1998: 87), and in modern Solomon Pijin (*milk*/*milik*/*melek*/*melik* referring to milk or coconut milk; Jourdan 2003: 138). However, the phonology of the Tok Pisin variant *milis* (‘coconut milk’) shows a clear influence from German: the final sound [ç] from German *Milch* fairly regularly becomes [s] in Tok Pisin. On the other side, the distribution of correspondences of Tok Pisin *kranki*/*krangi*/*krangki* (‘wrong; stupid’), which is sometimes attributed to German *krank* ‘sick’ (Mosel 1980: 19) and sometimes to English *cranky* (Mihalic 1957: 65), has most certainly an English origin: It occurs in many varieties in Australia, the Torres Strait Islands, and Melanesia that were not in contact with German (Baker & Mühlhäusler 1996: 590).

Regarding (ii), research on German colonialism had long played a minor role in historical research. This has changed during the last two decades. Not
only have more historical studies been published and public awareness of Germany’s colonial history has increased, linguistics in Germany has also started to study the relationship between language and colonialism (cf. Dewein et al. 2012). The increase in colonial and postcolonial studies and the better availability of historical documents facilitate the reconstruction of the specific sociohistorical context of lexical borrowings.

One of the Tok Pisin words of German origin whose borrowing context seems somewhat mysterious at first sight is *akas* ‘acacia’. Generally, Tok Pisin dictionaries ascribe the word to German *Akazie* (Schebesta & Meiser 1945: 7; Mihalic 1957: 5; 1971: 59). This is phonologically plausible: [ts], the affricate in the onset of the third syllable is usually adapted to [s] in Tok Pisin (Mosel 1980: 16). However, words for plants that occur naturally in New Guinea, as several species of acacias do, are not likely to be borrowed from German, and the question arises why the word for this tree (or rather genus of trees) was borrowed from German. A closer look at the annual reports of the government of German New Guinea provides a possible explanation (Imperial Government 1900/1979). In 1899, the seat of the government of German New Guinea moved from Friedrich-Wilhelmshafen (Madang) on the New Guinea mainland to Herbertshöhe on the Gazelle peninsula in the Bismarck Archipelago. In Herbertshöhe, the German government started to develop the local infrastructure. One of the measures was to plant trees along the major roads. These trees (acacias, tamarinds, kanari trees) were grown in several small tree nurseries close to Herbertshöhe. Thus, *akas* did probably originate in an agricultural context, that is, a work context that is typical for the use and development of pidgins.

Regarding (iii), the influence of Malay on the lexicon of Tok Pisin has long been recognized. Since Reed (1943: 277), words such as *savor* ‘leaf vegetable’, *kapok* ‘kapok tree (fibers)’, and *mambu* ‘bamboo’ have been attributed a Malay origin. The extent of the influence from Malay varieties, in particular from Coastal Malay, was the subject of a brief debate between Roosman (1975), Seiler (1982, 1983, 1985), and Mühlhäusler (1979b, 1982). According to Mühlhäusler (1982: 104f), quite a few of the lexemes for which Roosman (1975) postulates a Malay origin could as well or better be traced back to Melanesian languages.

What has not been discussed was a possible influence of Malay on Tok Pisin by Dutch loan words in Malay. Due to Dutch colonialism in Southeast Asia, many languages in what is now Indonesia integrated loanwords from
Dutch (cf. the data in van der Sijs 2015). There are about 70 items in Tok Pisin that correspond to German-Dutch cognates where the Dutch cognate is mediated either by Coastal Malay or by Ambonese Malay. A large part of them also have cognates in English. Thus Tok Pisin sup corresponds not only to English soup and German Suppe, but also to sup (< Dutch soep) in Ambonese Malay and Coastal Malay; and Tok Pisin anka as well has cognates in German (Anker), English (anchor), Ambonese Malay (angkar), and Coastal Malay (djangkar). The sociohistorical background of the Malay influence in eastern New Guinea is manifold:

(a) Malay traders from the Moluccas regularly visited the western part of what came to be Kaiser-Wilhelmsland from the border of Dutch New Guinea down to the mouth of the Sepik and the Schouten Islands (Le Maire Islands) before the arrival of the Europeans, probably from the 1870s on. Some of them eventually settled there and married into the local population. In some of these areas, Malay was known and used as a second language by parts of the local population (Seiler 1982: 68f). However, the linguistic influence the Malay traders exerted on the local languages was probably only slight and Tok Pisin was present in the western part of Kaiser-Wilhelmsland only later (Seiler 1982: 71; 1985: 146).

(b) Apart from traders, Malay-speaking bird-of-paradise hunters entered the western part of German New Guinea. They hunted further inland in the area north of the Sepik. As a consequence, some Malay was spoken as a second language by the population in an area between the Yellow River and the border to Dutch New Guinea (Seiler 1982: 76; 1983: 65ff; 1985: 148f).

(c) A small area in the western inland of former Kaiser-Wilhelmsland came under Dutch control after WWII for about 15 years. Since the

---

4 It is not quite clear which varieties of Malay played a role in language contact in eastern New Guinea (Seiler 1983). Besides the pidginized Coastal Malay, Ambonese Malay was quite widespread in western New Guinea, for example, as a mission language (Roosman 1975: 229). For our argumentation in this section we consider in particular Dutch loanwords in Coastal Malay and in Ambonese Malay without knowing exactly which of these words were used by the Malay traders and laborers that went to German New Guinea. The data for Ambonese Malay are based on van der Sijs (2015), those for Coastal Malay on Hindorf (1913).
The administrative and educational system of the Dutch colonial government was based on Malay, the people who lived in this area were exposed to the Malay language intensively. Many loanwords from Malay were therefore found in the Waris language and neighboring languages such as Imonda (Seiler 1983: 69f).

(d) The most important influence of Malay in the German colony was an effect of the labor recruiting policy of the ‘Neuguinea-Compagnie’, a German trading company that also administered the colony on behalf of the German Empire until 1899. In the late 19th century, many workers from the Dutch East Indies were hired for the German plantations on the northeastern coast of New Guinea, in particular Javanese and Chinese who formerly worked on plantations in Sumatra and who all spoke Malay as a lingua franca. This labor policy extended approximately from 1885 to 1900; in the early 1890s, the Malay-speaking laborers formed the majority of the work force on the plantations in north-eastern New Guinea (Seiler 1982: 77f, 1985: 149f). At that time, on the plantations of Stephensort, Erima, Hatzfeldhafen, and Finschhafen, Javanese and Chinese worked side by side with Melanesian workers from the Bismarck Archipelago who spoke an early form of Tok Pisin. It is known that at least on the large plantation in Stephensort, the pidginized variety of Malay known as Coastal Malay became the lingua franca (cf. Wendland 1939: 76). It was acquired by the Europeans, and the Melanesians also used it in the work context. Coastal Malay was tolerated by the German government (Mühlhäusler 1979a: 65); there were even plans to promote it to an official lingua franca in German New Guinea (Hahl 1904: 1, Mühlhäusler 1975: 102). However, due to the rising influence of Tok Pisin, its use lessened from the end of the 19th century on.

As we have seen, traders from the Dutch East Indies, Malay bird-of-paradise hunters, and the Dutch colonial government had a certain influence on the linguistic landscape of German New Guinea and, later, on the Australian Territory of Papua and New Guinea. However, if there has been any direct influence on Tok Pisin or influence mediated by local Austronesian and Papuan languages, this must have been very slight. The most important sociohistorical context for Malay influence on Tok Pisin was certainly the labor migration from the Dutch East Indies to the plantations in German New Guinea. Whatever Malay influence made itself present in Tok Pisin was
spread when the Melanesian plantation workers returned to the Bismarck Archipelago from the plantations on the north shore of New Guinea (Seiler 1982: 79f, Mühlhäusler 1985a: 206).

Mühlhäusler (1985b: 71) estimates the number of speakers of Tok Pisin in 1914 at no more than 15,000. In the late 19th century, the number must have been considerably smaller. Thus, at a time when Tok Pisin was still gaining ground, and with up to 1800 speakers of Malay varieties on German plantations (Blum 1900, cited after Seiler 1982: 81) who interacted with Tok Pisin speakers on a daily basis, lexical influence from Malay on Tok Pisin is likely. As a result, up to 20 loanwords from Malay that were not inherited from Dutch can be found in Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler 1979b, Seiler 1982). Therefore, the question of whether Dutch loans in Malay had an influence on Tok Pisin, at least in the sense of lexical conflation with cognate words from German, is worthy of consideration. We will have a look at ananas, the only item of this kind that already has been discussed briefly in the literature. Mühlhäusler (1982: 104, 1985b: 105) assumes a multiple origin while Roosman (1975: 231) strongly emphasizes the influence from Malay. He argues that the Tok Pisin variant nanis, listed in Murphy (1966: 84), reflects the form nanas or nenas in Coastal Malay. In the following, we will try to gather some arguments that might help to uncover the origin of ananas.

The word ananas has its origin in the Tupi-Guarani languages in South America. In the course of the early overseas colonialism, the word spread via Portuguese (ananás) into many European languages (Dutch ananas, French ananas, German Ananas). In Tok Pisin, the word ananas has been recorded in dictionaries since the beginning of the 20th century. Since it cannot have been borrowed from English (pineapple), it has been attributed to German in Tok Pisin lexicography (Steinbauer 1969: 12–13; Mihalic 1971: 59; Garnier 2006: 14). As the first lexicographic recordings of ananas were made by Dempwolff ([not dated b]), who spent most of the time of his lengthy stays in German New Guinea on the mainland, and by van Baar (1930), who compiled his dictionary west of Madang, the word seems to have originated in the pidgin variety spoken on the New Guinea coast. Kutscher (1940) is the first dictionary from the Bismarck Archipelago that lists ananas, here in addition to painap from English pineapple. The older dictionaries from the islands (Brenninkmeyer 1924, Borchardt 1926) do not record ananas; Borchardt (1926: 74) lists painap. The word also has cognates in Ambonese Malay (anananas) and Coastal Malay (nanas; Hindorf 1913: 26, 91). This raises
the question whether Tok Pisin *ananas* has a Malay instead of a German origin.

The cultivation of pineapple did not play a major role in the German colonies of the South Pacific. It was mainly planted for local consumption (Voigt 1920) and only to a small extent also on the plantations of the Neuguneina-Compagnie (Neuguneina Compagnie [1895] 1979: 113). In addition to the fruit, the fibers of the pineapple plant can also be used. They are a substitute for hemp or flax, and for a short time in the late 1880s, the Neuguneina-Compagnie planned to exploit the fibers of wild-growing pineapples commercially (Neuguneina Compagnie [1890] 1979: 50). In summary, pineapples played a certain role in precisely those places where many Malay laborers were employed.

In Samoa, the commercial cultivation of pineapples began only in 1913. They did not play a local role, even as a local food staple (Krauß 1920). Thus, it is unlikely that Tok Pisin inherited the word from Samoan Plantation Pidgin, and it was not been noticed by Mühlhäusler (1978) in his investigation on the pidgin in Samoa. In addition, had *ananas* been in use in Samoan Plantation Pidgin, the word should have shown up in Tok Pisin dictionaries from the Bismarck Archipelago first.

Thus, a number of arguments support the assumption of an influence of Malay on the establishment of *ananas* in Tok Pisin. As in many cases where cognates in source languages are involved, an unambiguous decision about the origin cannot be made and would probably rather obscure than enlighten the complex borrowing situation in the pidgin lexicon. As we have seen, there is some evidence for a Malay origin of *ananas* in Tok Pisin, certainly with a strengthening influence from German in a situation of lexical conflation.

Regarding (iv), early records of Tok Pisin utterances shed light on the question of when particular words were used in early Melanesian Pidgin. However, the scarcity of documents of this sort makes them a rather occasional addition to what we know from wordlists and dictionaries. Mühlhäusler, Dutton & Romaine (2003) have collected texts of older Tok Pisin and its forerunners. Words of German origin are occasionally found in these documents as in *Raus him dog* (in modern spelling: *Rausim dok!* ‘Chase away the dog’) in a source from 1911 (Mühlhäusler, Dutton & Romaine 2003: 48). The texts also allow some insight into what words with cognates in German and English were found in pre-Tok Pisin variants, for example *bia* ‘beer’, *gras* ‘hair’, or *bus* ‘bush’ that had already been present in early
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Samoan Plantation Pidgin before 1883 (Mühlhäusler, Dutton & Romaine 2003: 40ff). An important source for early Tok Pisin is the “Database of Early Pidgin and Creole Texts” (DEPiCT). It is an electronic archive, assembling early attestations and descriptions of contact languages and making them searchable online. By taking a wide historical focus and by not being restricted to one or few contact languages, DEPiCT is able to provide a more complete overview and more comprehensive documentation of the development and history of individual contact languages (cf. Huber & Velupillai 2017). While this resource is still being built up, it already offers information that is hard to come by otherwise. Data from DEPiCT add to the picture, since a lot of sources have been mined that are written in German. Neuhof (2015), in her thesis, shows how these data can be used to investigate the early history of Tok Pisin. In DEPiCT, a number of words of putative German origin can be found with their dates of occurrence as, for example, rausim in a source from 1907, me cross long woman, me rauss him! ‘I am cross with the woman, I throw her out!’ (Neuhof 2015: XXIV) and words like salad ‘stinging nettle; salad’ (1902), hauman ‘captain’ (1907), or Schwein ‘pig’ (as an insult; 1911) (in the appendix of Neuhof 2015).

Regarding (v), apart from the availability of new resources, there has also been some new work done on etymologies for single words. Sometimes, a proposed German origin of a Tok Pisin word had to be discarded, as was the case, for example, with maski (cf. Section 3). In other cases, words that had not been assigned a German origin are discussed with respect to German influence. The etymology of three Tok Pisin lexemes, abrusim, stiabor, and subim, shall conclude this section.

The item abrus/abrusim, with the variant aberis/aberisim, is an established lexeme in Tok Pisin. Among our lexical sources, Dahmen (1957: 1) and Newlin (2001) record it, but none of them indicates or suggests a German origin. Grant (1997) points out, however, that there is a German lexeme that seems well suited to provide the etymological origin of abrus(im); it is the verb abrütschen, meaning ‘slide off, slip down, slip by’. This fits the meanings documented for abrus(im), for example: ‘to be apart from, pass without touching, (by extension) elude, avoid, get out of doing, bypass’ (Grant 1997: 4); ‘err while standing; avoid; pass through, surpass;

dodge’ (Feldpausch 2006: 15f, 18, 31); ‘avoid, pass, overtake’ (Newlin 2001); ‘evade, keep away, avoid [intransitive]; dodge evade, avoid, go around [transitive]’ (Dahmen 1957: 1). As can be expected in lexical language contact, not all of these meanings correspond closely to that of abrutschen, but it is possible to derive them from its basic meaning. Grant (1997) furthermore notes that the phonetic correspondence between abrus and abrutschen is unproblematic. The postalveolar fricative [ʃ] is regularly changed to [s] in Tok Pisin, and the affricate [tʃ] follows this pattern as well, including a reduction from an affricate to a fricative. Comparable examples for [ts] > [s] would be suruk (<German zurück ‘back, returning’), and for [ʃ] > [s], slo (German Schloss ‘lock’), and suppka(r) (<German Schubkarre ‘wheelbarrow’). The variant aberis(im) follows a pattern also found in other cases, that is, inserting an epenthetic vowel to break up the consonant cluster [br]. Similar examples of vowel insertion are found in milis ‘coconut milk’ (<German Milch ‘milk’), and in sarang (<German Schrank ‘cabinet, locker, cupboard’).

The Tok Pisin lexeme stiabot ‘starboard’ has not been attributed to German in any of the lexicographic sources for Tok Pisin – in contrast to bakbot ‘portside’ (with several variants like bakabor, bakador, etc.), which is derived from German Backbord according to Steinbauer (1969: 18f) and Mihalic (1971: 83). However, the implicit assumption that stiabot goes back to English starboard is unlikely for two reasons. Firstly, both words, stiabot (in its variant sitiabot) and bakbot, are listed in one of the oldest dictionaries of Tok Pisin (Borchardt 1926: 5, 109) and it seems very unlikely that two antonyms whose knowledge and use in maritime work contexts requires the availability of both terms go back to different borrowing situations. Secondly, the phonological adaptation that took place in Tok Pisin does not point to an English origin. The adaptation of starboard had most certainly resulted in stabot or sta(r)bor, analogously to English star > Tok Pisin sta, English car > Tok Pisin ka, and English garden > Tok Pisin gaden. The diphthong in German Steuerbord consists of a middle back vowel and a high front vowel, [ɔy], and the following sequence er is usually vocalized as [ɐ]. Thus, Steuer is pronounced [ʃtɔyɐ] in German. If we assume a reduction of this complex vowel sequence by the first vowel and the expected adaptation of [ʃ] to [s], Steuer ends up as stia in Tok Pisin. However, the existence of Tok Pisin stia ‘rudder, to steer’ (<English steer) from the same semantic domain might have strengthened the vocalism in stiabot. This English verb
may have also been an important reason for assigning an English origin to *stiabot*, and it could have been a source for re-interpretation of the first part of the compound, similar to that of *sutman* (cf. section 4).

Finally, the Tok Pisin lexeme *subim*, recorded in Feldpausch (2006: 15) and so far without mention of a German origin, seems to go back to German *schubsen*, with a similar phonetic derivation as for *abrus(im)*. Feldpausch gives the English translation ‘push’ for *subim* which coincides precisely with the meaning of the German item, *schubsen*. It is less likely that *subim* is derived from *supka(r)*, also containing the stem *schub-* (in the phonologically adapted spelling variant *sup-*) , since *supka(r)* seems to be no longer semantically transparent to speakers of Tok Pisin. A possible alternative origin is the English lexeme *shove* where the same change of the initial sound would be expected. In addition, a replacement of the fricative [v] by the homorganic stop [b] could have occurred. This possibility is supported by evidence going back to Vogel (1911) cited in Neuhof (2015: XXIV): *alle boys raus, schuv him boat* (Vogel 1911: 159). These two options are certainly not mutually exclusive; rather, it is likely that – in the sense of a multiple etymology – they worked to support each other to result in a genuine Tok Pisin lexeme.

6 INSTEAD OF A CONCLUSION: THE DICTIONARY ‘WORDS OF GERMAN ORIGIN IN TOK PISIN’

Instead of a conclusion of what has been laid out in this article about the etymology of Tok Pisin words, we would like to present briefly the dictionary that will document the results of our research. The internet dictionary *Wortschatz deutschen Ursprungs im Tok Pisin* (‘Words of German Origin in Tok Pisin’ (Engelberg, Möhrs, Stolberg 2017ff)) will appear as an integral part of the German Loanword Portal (*Lehnwortportal Deutsch* (Meyer & Engelberg 2012ff.)). The *Lehnwortportal Deutsch* at the *Institut für Deutsche Sprache* (“Institute for the German Language”) in Mannheim is an internet portal for loanword dictionaries. It collects dictionaries that document German loanwords in other languages (Meyer & Engelberg 2011; Engelberg & Meyer 2015). By turning these dictionaries into a dictionary net and by inverting the access direction of the dictionaries, the *Lehnwortportal Deutsch* can be used for looking up German lexemes in order to find out about the
processes and results of these words having been borrowed into other languages. That is to say, the integrated dictionaries can be consulted as stand-alone works and as a virtual inverted dictionary of German loans in other languages. The portal will also allow the display of borrowing chains from German into other languages via intermediate languages. As has been mentioned in the introduction to this article, two of the dictionaries that are currently being prepared for the German Loanword Portal are the *Dictionary of German Loanwords in the Languages of the South Pacific* and the dictionary of *Words of German Origin in Tok Pisin*.

The dictionary basis, that is, the sources that are used for the compilation of the dictionary of *Words of German Origin in Tok Pisin* and for the etymological reasoning are the following:

a. about 40 dictionaries documenting the lexicon of Tok Pisin from the early 20th century until today (as presented in Section 3)\(^6\),

b. lexicological studies, in particular by Mühlhäusler, but also work by Hall, Mihalic, and others,

c. dictionaries and wordlists on early and contemporary pidgin varieties in the Pacific (as discussed in Section 5),

d. lexical resources documenting the languages in contact (for example, Malay) in order to trace the donor languages for Tok Pisin words as well the sources for multilevel syncretisms (cf. Section 5),

e. non-linguistic historical sources about German New Guinea that provide hints about the contexts in which words might have entered Tok Pisin and that reflect colonial cultural contact (crafts, religion, school, administration, food, transportation, etc.),

f. work on Tok Pisin phonology, in particular on typical contact-induced adaptation processes (for example, Laycock 1985, Mosel 1980),

g. sources documenting early utterances and texts in Tok Pisin (cf. Section 5),

h. as yet unpublished results of a survey on the use and knowledge about words of German origin in Papua New Guinea, carried out by Craig Volker (2015),

---

\(^{6}\) We are grateful to Peter Mühlhäusler, Alexis von Poser, and Craig Volker for providing us with some of the older lexicographic resources.
The influence of German on the lexicon of Tok Pisin

i. results of data discussions on pidgin languages in general and Tok Pisin in particular, with Magnus Huber, Patricia Iha-Breithaupt, Péter Maitz, Viveka Velupillai, Craig Volker, Janna Zimmermann.\(^7\)

The microstructure of the dictionary provides the following information on each lemma: a sound file representing the pronunciation of the word, a translation into German, the German etymon with basic grammatical information, and a list of spelling variants. This basic information is complemented by four more extensive information positions: (i) A complete lexicographic recording history is provided, i.e. all instances of the item in lexical resources of Tok Pisin are listed with the information given in these resources. (ii) This section is followed by example sentences containing the word; they are given in written form and for some a sound file is added. (iii) Compounds and multiword units containing the head word are listed and related to the lexicographic sources. (iv) An etymological commentary contains the etymological argumentation and a description of the sociohistorical background of the borrowing (cf. Engelberg & Möhrs 2016).

In the lexicon of pidgin and creole languages, we can see an important part of their history of origin and of language contact. The goal of the dictionary of *Words of German Origin in Tok Pisin* is to collect and document information that is spread out and is contained in various sources. The advantage of this kind of resource is that a broad range of data on the Tok Pisin lexicon becomes more easily accessible. By comparing different sources and etymologies of Tok Pisin, general tendencies and patterns of lexical processes in this language can be noticed. Thus, the dictionary as well as the present study contribute to gaining insights and a better understanding of the historical development and the current status of the Tok Pisin lexicon.
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