In the past, Pidgins were given scant linguistic attention. They were considered to be linguistic aberrations, sports, bastardized lingos, worth little more than a passing reference. Significantly, those who knew them well, who had learnt to use them efficiently, were aware of their linguistic adequacy. Thomas (1869: 105) argued the viability of Trinidadian creole, but cautioned that, to use it well, a francophone must:

"... forget his French and believe (for it is a fact) that he is using a dialect fully capable of expressing all ordinary thoughts, provided the speaker is master of, and understands how to manage, its resources."

De Saint-Quentin (1872), struck by the structural simplicity of creoles, by their regularity of patterning, and their avoidance of redundancy, went even further and suggested that if a group of individuals needed a language which could be acquired quickly, but one which would permit a systematic exchange of ideas, they could not:

"... adopter des bases plus logiques et plus fécondes que celles de la syntax creole."

None of the pro-Pidgin voices were very influential in the last century, but the tide against these languages has turned and since the 1940s there has been a steady stream of material on them, first description (cf. Reinecke 1937), then muted acceptance
(Hall's "good little languages"), and finally recognition of how useful they are as vehicles of communication and how illuminating they may be in the search for linguistic universals. The turn of the tide has had the sociological side-effect of helping to raise the status of pidgins in the eyes of their speakers; the implications for the study of language, though potentially considerable, have not yet been fully assessed. It would be true to say that before 1940 not more than 30 different pidgins were recognised. Now the number is approaching 100—and shows no signs of stopping there. In addition, many linguists have come to realise that the process of pidginisation—the process whereby languages shed linguistic irregularities, reduce inflection, thus putting a premium on word order and analytic structures—can be seen in the Romance Languages, in English, in Swahili, in colloquial Arabic—in short, in all languages which have been in relatively close contact with others. Pidgins have thus, in the course of the past 40 years, developed from being either ignored, derided or patronised, through acceptance, to their present role of helping account for universal processes of change in languages.

Acknowledgment of the linguistic viability of pidgins and recognition of the potential service they may give in the establishment of linguistic universals has not, however, altered the fact that very little is known either about the relationship between Pidgins and their lexical source languages or about the relationship between the various Pidgins. These two questions formed the starting point for the present investigation which led to the formulation of a tentative new hypothesis concerning the origin of Pidgins.

In comparing two English-based Pidgins, an Atlantic one, Cameroon Pidgin (C.P.), and a Pacific one, Tok Pisin (T.P.), a number of apparently basic and pervasive structural similarities were discovered, which are illustrated below.
1. The Verb Phrase

1.1. In both Pidgins the VP can be described as consisting of an unchanging verb, which can be preceded or followed by one or more auxiliaries, when temporal or aspectual or negative distinctions need to be made overt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>English</th>
<th>C.P.</th>
<th>T.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>eat</td>
<td>(yu) chop</td>
<td>yu kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>don't eat</td>
<td>no chop</td>
<td>yu no kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>he/she/it eats</td>
<td>i* chop</td>
<td>em* i kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>he/she/it doesn't eat</td>
<td>i no chop</td>
<td>em i no kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>he is eating</td>
<td>i di chop</td>
<td>em i kaikai yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>he is not eating</td>
<td>i no di chop</td>
<td>em i no kaikai yet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>he has eaten</td>
<td>i don chop</td>
<td>em i bin kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>he ate</td>
<td>i bin chop</td>
<td>em i kaikai pinis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>he will eat</td>
<td>i go chop</td>
<td>bai em i kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>he can eat (is able to)</td>
<td>i fit chop</td>
<td>em i inap kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>he must eat</td>
<td>i get fo chop</td>
<td>em i mas kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>he is about to eat</td>
<td>i wan chop</td>
<td>em i laik kaikai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*There is no 3rd person distinction according to sex in either pidgin.*
1.2. In both Pidgins the occurrence of "analytic group expressions" (Liefrink 1973), where English would have a so-called "synthetic verb", is common.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>C.P.</th>
<th>T.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>feed</td>
<td>gif chop</td>
<td>givim kaikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inject</td>
<td>gif chuk</td>
<td>givim sut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dress</td>
<td>put klos fo man i skin</td>
<td>putim klos long</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confess</td>
<td>tok man i bad</td>
<td>telimautim ol sin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bleed</td>
<td>blod i komot</td>
<td>blut i kamap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>suffer</td>
<td>si trabul</td>
<td>karim pen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quarrel</td>
<td>fain palava</td>
<td>pait long toktok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impregnate</td>
<td>gif bele</td>
<td>givim bel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smell</td>
<td>hia smel</td>
<td>harim smel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frown</td>
<td>tai fes</td>
<td>pes i tudak</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. The Noun Phrase

2.1. In both Pidgins the noun is not overtly marked for either number of sex, though 'man' and 'woman'/'meri' are marked for natural gender and can be used in combination with other nouns when one wishes to make a sex distinction overt. In the following table, 'dog' is taken as a nuclear noun around which a set of related forms can be built. In this, it is representative of a large group of other animate nouns. Both pidgins have borrowed the word from English and both de-voice the final consonant so that, phonomically, they could both be transcribed as /dog/. We shall follow the orthographic conventions most frequently used with these languages, however, using 'dog' for Cameroon Pidgin and 'dok' for Tok Pisin.
(3) C.P. T.P.
    dog       dok
    mandog    dok man
    womandog  dok meri
    dog pikin pikinini dok
    man pikin dog dok pikinini man
    bush dog  wel dok
    man bush dog wel dok man

Plurality is often implied by the context, but it can be made overt by the use of a marker which is identical in form to the third person plural pronoun. Thus, for example:

(4) Eng.: A dog ran off into the forest
        C.P.: som dog bin ran go fo bush
        T.P.: wanele dok i bin ran i go long bus.

        Eng.: The dogs ran off into the forest.
        C.P.: di dog dem bin ran go fo bush
        T.P.: olo dok i bin ran i go long bus.

One can compare the plural marker in the above examples with the third person plural pronoun in (5):

(5) Eng.: They brought the food to the house.
        C.P.: dem bin bring di chop kam fo haus.
        T.P.: olo i bin bringim kaikai i kam long haus.
2.2.(i) In both pidgins 'man' frequently combines with another form to produce a related noun. T.P. utilises 2 structural patterns, namely 'X+man' and 'man bilong X' whereas C.P. uses only the former:

(6) Eng.       C.P.           T.P.
corpse      daiman      dai man
hunter   hɔntaman   sutman
liar      laiman    man bilong giaman
thief      tifman    stilman
trickster kɔniman    trikman
            (cunning man)

2.2.(ii) C.P. has a general purpose preposition 'fo' which occasionally parallels T.P. 'long/bilong' and which is often used in the combination of nouns:

(7) Eng.       C.P.           T.P.
bedroom    rum fo slip  rumslip
garage    ples fo motu  haus ka
bark       nkanda fo stik  skin diwai
toe        finga (fo ) fut  finga bilong lek
moustache/beard  biabia (fo ) mot    maus gras

3. C.P. & T.P. have both been exposed to ever-increasing pressure from standard English, a pressure which has affected the language at all levels but especially at the level of lexis. It seems likely that, at an earlier stage, C.P. and T. P. made extensive use of 'negative' adjective to imply the adjective's converse. This technique is still apparent in such pairs as (8):
but, this device—a relic of the time when the pidgins had 'sharply reduced vocabulary' (Hall 1966: xii) is less apparent in the speech of the younger generation and so may well disappear.

How can we explain such pervasive similarities in C.P. and T.P.—languages which have never been in contact? One answer to the question is that offered by Hall (1966: 58):

"No matter how much they [pidgins] have been changed and have been brusquely restructured near the surface, they still maintain a basically Indo-European pattern."

If we substitute 'English' for 'Indo-European' we have a possible explanation, but it seems difficult to reconcile this explanation with the views of Africanists, who have claimed a relationship between Atlantic Pidgins and African vernaculars. The most extreme position was that espoused by Sylvain (1936: 178) who described Haitian Creole as "une langue éwe, à vocabulaire français." More recently too, scholars like Hancock (1972) and Gilman (1972) have drawn attention to the phonological and syntactic similarities that exist between African languages and Atlantic Pidgins. The bulk of the vocabulary of such languages is European, but even there an African influence can often be seen in the combination of words:

(cry & die) krai dai - a wake
(day & clean) dei klin - dawn
(long & throat) langa tru - desire, extreme desire
In the case of Tok Pisin, too, a claim has been made for a Melanesian substratum influence in its syntax. As Wurm (1971: 3) expresses it:

"Throughout its history, New Guinea Pidgin has been used very predominantly as a means of intercommunication between indigenous people speaking different languages, and as a result of this, Pidgin has developed into a highly complex language showing much of the intricacies and subleties of the native languages of Melanesia."

However, the two features which are supposed to show most clearly a Melanesian substratum influence, viz.

1. The verbal marker 'i'
2. The transitivity marker '-im'

have clear analogues OUTSIDE the Melanesian area.

1. In W. Africa, the 'i', thought to derive from 'he', is frequently recapitulated after a subject e.g.

   'den god i bigin'
   'dat woman, i no get no pikin'.

Such sentences are not uncommon in colloquial English, cf:

   'my father, he's a butcher'
   'And God he created heaven and earth'

though the 'i' may well have been reinterpreted by later speakers of Melanesian Pidgin and equated with an indigenous verbal marker. If a form had a dual source, i.e. an indigenous and a non-indigenous one, then it had a greater chance of survival. The idea of multiple etymologies is fairly well established in Atlantic areolistics (cf. Cassidy 1966).
If one compares:

C.P. : yu no fainam? Have you not looked for it?
T.P. : yu no painim em?

or

C.P. : putam fo kwa Put it into the bag
T.P. : yu putim em long bilum

one sees how the English: 'Take 'em and put 'em away' - type construction could have influenced both pidgins, the '-am' becoming a 3rd person object pronoun in Cameroon Pidgin and an overt marker of transitivity in Tok Pisin.

In order to help us determine whether the formal patternings of English-based pidgins which we have described reflect Indo-European or indigenous influence or a combination of both - or neither - we will turn our attention to two other pidgins, Ewondo Populaire, an indigenous Cameroon Pidgin, and Hiri Motu, a pidginised version of Motu. Neither has any relationship with the Indo-European family of languages and neither until recently, were in contact with any variety of (pidgin) English. Yet, in both these Pidgins, the occurrence of the analytic type patterns we have discussed in Cameroon Pidgin and Tok Pisin is attested. With regard to Ewondo Populaire (E.P.), Pierre Alexandre (1962:253-54) writes that it has a limited vocabulary, and that there has been considerable reduction in the inflection and syntactic contrasts which occur in full Ewondo. The Verb Phrase in particular is much simpler than the VP in standard Ewondo, tending to indicate verbal distinctions by means of separate auxiliaries rather than by affixation and, in addition, E.P. has only one negator 'ke' which has a fixed position in the sentence (whereas the negator is both variable and mobile in Ewondo).
These features occur also in Hiri Motu:

(9) English | Hiri Motu
---|---
eat | aniani
don't eat | aniani lasi
he has eaten | ia aniani vadaeni
he is eating | ia aniani noho
he will eat | do ia aniani

In Hiri Motu we also find the type of analytic group expressions illustrated in 2.2. above for C.P. and T.P.:

(10) English | Hiri Motu
---|---
bleed | rara ia diho (blood it goes down)
dress | dabua atoa (clothes put on)
frown | vaira haukaia (face harden)
hew | iira dekenai utua (axe with cut)
mend | turia lou (sew again)
sharpen | matana karaia (tip make)
smoke | kuku ania (tobacco eat)

Such analytic group expressions often correspond to a single synthetic verb in standard Motu:

(11) English | Motu | Hiri Motu
---|---|---
adorn | haherahera | herahera atoa
| | | (decorations put on)
bow | igodiho | kwaraana atoa diho
| | | (head put down)
itner | toia | doria ia laa laalonai
| | | (put it it go inside)

Again, the Noun Phrase and Adjective Phrase patterns that were so similar in the two English based Pidgins, can also be found in Hiri Motu.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hiri Motu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pig</td>
<td>boroma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sow</td>
<td>boroma hahine (woman)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boar</td>
<td>boroma tau (man)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>piglet</td>
<td>boroma maragina (little)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male piglet</td>
<td>boroma tau maragina</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hiri Motu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sailor</td>
<td>sisima tauna (ship man its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td>hadibaia tauna (teach man its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>author</td>
<td>buka tore a tauna (book write man its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disciple</td>
<td>murinai raka tauna (behind its at walk man its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>enemy</td>
<td>kerere henia tauna (trouble give man its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chair</td>
<td>helai gauna (sit thing its)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clock</td>
<td>dina gauna (time thing its)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Hiri Motu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>heavy</td>
<td>metau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>light</td>
<td>metau lasi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>strong</td>
<td>goada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>weak</td>
<td>goada lasi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structures to which we have drawn attention are of fundamental importance in these languages. Without them they would lack flexibility and subtlety. Those listed under 1.2 and 2 are typically used when Pidgin speakers need an expression for a new concept, and writers on Tok Pisin advocating the use of the syntactic processes inherent
in the language in the creation of new words, in preference to borrowing, include these constructions in their discussion (Mühlhäuser 1973).

The feature uniting all the constructions we have exemplified, in all four pidgins, is that of analitycity. In Liefrink (1973) it was argued that in a full language like English, which provides its speakers with a choice of using either analytic or synthetic constructions, the surface structure of analytic sentences is more clearly indicative of underlying semantics, than that of their synthetic counterparts. In the former, more components of meaning are overtly manifested in the surface structure than in the latter.

Much of the literature dealing with the linguistics of West Africa and Melanesia suggests that the natural languages of these areas tend to show an inclination towards analytic rather than synthetic structures: In Yoruba, for example, we find that

1) The noun is invariable, plurality being (often optionally) marked by the prefixing of a separate morpheme, the emphatic 3rd person plural pronoun 'awon', 'they' (Rowlands 1969:40).

2) In the verb phrase, temporal and aspectual distinctions are carried by a set of auxiliaries (Rowlands 1969:92ff.).

and the following table suggests certain interesting ways in which Cameroon Pidgin, Tok Pisin and Yoruba all differ from English:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>C.P.</th>
<th>Yoruba</th>
<th>T.P.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>he is small</td>
<td>i smol</td>
<td>Ṽ kéré</td>
<td>em i liklik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>she is small</td>
<td>i smol</td>
<td>Ṽ kéré</td>
<td>em i liklik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>it is small</td>
<td>i smol</td>
<td>Ṽ kéré</td>
<td>em i liklik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he is extremely small</td>
<td>i smol tumas</td>
<td>Ṽ kéré púpò (púpò=much)</td>
<td>em i liklik tumas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is he small or not?</td>
<td>i smol i no</td>
<td>Ṽ kéré ìbi kò</td>
<td>em i liklik o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is he smaller than I</td>
<td>i smol pas mi</td>
<td>Ṽ kéré jù mi lo (he small surpass me go)</td>
<td>liklik long mi or liklik i win long mi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Austronesian languages we find, according to Capell (1969:50), that the verb 'normally does not carry in itself any mark of tense or mood; such features are expressed by particles set between the person or subject marker and the verb'.

Thus in Kuanua:

- yau gire = I see it
- yau ga gire = I saw it
- yau tar gire = I have seen it
- yau ina gire = I shall see it

It would seem then, that there is a predilection for analytic structures in pidgins, in West African languages like Yoruba and Melanesian languages like Kuanua. All of these languages have one other feature in common. They are used by people who tend to be multi-lingual. One might well argue that multi-linguals find it more economical to master one grammar, several vocabularies and several sets of items for indicating plurality, temporality aspects, negation (see Todd 1974), items which differ in form not in function. Such 'economy of effort' is well known in phonology and there is no reason why it should not occur also in syntax. Multi-linguals who use two or more languages daily - as opposed to those who know about them or have mastered standard versions - do seem to use either the same grammar for both or all of their languages or very similar grammars.

Gumperz (1967) found this to be the case among the illiterates along the Mysore - Maharashtra border. Capell (1969:47) suggests a similar pattern in Austronesian languages. As he puts it:

'Certain features are common to verbs in AN [=Austronesian] languages ... but the actual morphemes involved are quite different.'

and Dalby (1970:6) writing about the West African situation claimed:
Divergences in their structures, i.e. in their grammatical, phonological and semantic systems, are frequently less extensive than their divergences of vocabulary, and, relative to the structures of European languages, West African languages are found to share many widespread structural features.

An analysis of all the areas of the world where elaborated pidgins have arisen shows multi-lingualism to be a criterial factor. We have demonstrated that a characteristic of pidgins is the favoured use of analytic constructions and we hypothesise that this is connected with a similar predilection for analytic structures on the part of multilinguals. Such an hypothesis, we hope, will gain support when more information is available on the structures used by other multilinguals in their everyday linguistic behaviour. The analytic-type structures so frequently commented on in pidgins are, indeed, a marked characteristic of these languages, but they occur widely in other linguistic contexts where effective communication is of more importance than style.

NOTES

1. Reference will not be made to marginal, unstable pidgins, nor will a distinction be drawn between extended pidgins and creoles, such languages being distinguished mainly by the sociological criterion of mother tongue status (Todd 1974).

2. It may be noticed from the tables that the ordering (occasionally) differs in the two pidgins. There seems to be a pattern to these differences but, as yet, we have not formulated an explanation which is sufficiently comprehensive.
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