English and Melanesian Pidgin in the Admiralty Islands

Geoffrey Smith
The English Centre
University of Hong Kong

Abstract

This paper looks at the language of adolescents in the Admiralty Islands, who are educated through the medium of English but are fluent in Melanesian Pidgin English (Tok Pisin). It was found that lexical innovation in Manus included massive borrowing of English lexical items, especially verbs, into Tok Pisin. However, in most cases the borrowings are integrated rather than forming obvious code switches. The introduced words and phrases have the potential to influence the evolving grammar of Tok Pisin, and it seems that English and Tok Pisin are moving closer together, but descriptions of the phenomenon as a post-creole continuum appear to be premature.

Key words: Papua New Guinea, Admiralty Islands, Language Contact, Tok Pisin, English.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction

In the south-west Pacific nation of Papua New Guinea, English is widely used as the medium of instruction at all levels of education. There is also a multitude of other languages spoken, no fewer than 860 distinct indigenous languages according to a recent survey. A pidgin language with English as the source of its vocabulary is also widely spoken, mainly in informal contexts, but increasingly in other domains as well. This is often referred to as Melanesian Pidgin English, but its speakers call it Tok Pisin (from 'talk pidgin'). Its present status in Papua New Guinea compares favourably with other pidgins

Map 1. The Admiralty Islands.

world-wide: it has a standardised orthography[1], and it is widely used not only informally but also in the media and government. Tok Pisin has received considerable attention from linguists recently as part of the general interest in pidgin and creole languages which has emerged in the past two or three decades. Contradicting earlier ideas that such pidgins are just debased or corrupted forms of the language from which the vocabulary is drawn (the lexifier language), studies have demonstrated the unique nature of pidgins and creoles, and generated considerable debate about their origins and development. Competing theories assign critical roles to the lexifier ('superstrate') language, the other languages spoken by pidgin speakers (the substrate languages) or to universal tendencies determined by the nature of the human language faculty (for a review of different theories, see Mühlhäusler 1986).

This paper looks at the language of some adolescents in the Admiralty Islands, which now constitute the isolated island province of Manus in Papua New Guinea. With some 25,000 people and a land area of around 1,000

---

1. The orthography of TP (standardised by Hall between 1942 and 1955), like representations of many other varieties, is basically phonemic. The distance from standard English orthography obscures the lexical relations between the two to the inexperienced eye.

square kilometres, Manus is the smallest of Papua New Guinea's provinces, both in terms of land area and population. It lies some 350 km from the New Guinea mainland, approximately north of Madang, and consists of a main island with a large number of outlying islands (see Map 1). In 1991 I collected a corpus of recorded speech of fluent first language Tok Pisin speakers in Manus. The investigation examines the large number of innovations, especially verbs, which appear in the Tok Pisin speech samples. While some internal word formation processes are in operation, the most striking feature is the large number of words borrowed from English. An attempt is made to consider the significance of this borrowing to the relationship between Tok Pisin and English and the possible development of what is often described as a post-creole or post-pidgin continuum.[2]

2. Language choice in Manus society

Inhabitants of Manus speak Tok Pisin, English and a number of local languages. As in many other parts of Papua New Guinea, Manus traditionally had a number of language groups, each with a relatively small number of speakers. All 27 or so indigenous Manus languages are Austronesian, and are divided into four families. Most have less than a thousand speakers. According to the latest classification (Ross 1988), together they constitute the 'Admiralties cluster' of the Western Melanesian Oceanic group.

Tok Pisin has a long history on Manus, as in other parts of the Bismarck Archipelago (i.e. New Britain, New Ireland and smaller islands in the Bismarck Sea to the north-east of the New Guinea mainland). It was established by labourers returning from plantation labour schemes in Queensland or the central Pacific around the turn of the century, and primary schooling through the medium of Tok Pisin is reported as early as 1923. Considering the isolation of Manus, it might be expected that a distinctive variety of the language would emerge, and although there is evidence of this in earlier decades (Mülhäusler 1985), in the corpus described here the only vocabulary items peculiar to Manus encountered were *kau*, a fragrant herb used in magic; *peu*, a local variety of plant; and *mapo*, a magical small person or leprechaun.

Today, fluency in Tok Pisin appears to be almost universal on Manus. In the 1971 census, 93.1% of the population claimed to speak the language, which, along with New Ireland, was the highest percentage of any province (Laycock 1985:228). Later censuses failed to record accurate language data, and exact figures for today are difficult to establish. My own observations in November 1991 certainly indicated that the language is very widely spoken.

2. This concept attempts to account for continued contact between creoles/pidgins (the basilect) and the lexifier language (here English) in terms of decreolization/depidginization in the direction of the 'prestigious' English variety (the acrolect). The intermediate forms along the post-creole continuum are known as the mesolect(s).

Tok Pisin could be heard in the streets, school yards, offices and villages, and was used almost exclusively during the public funeral ceremonies observing the recent death of the famous local leader Paliau. An old woman in one of the inland villages who was unable to speak Tok Pisin was pointed out to me as a curiosity.

English language education is also available to a very large majority of Manus children. Manusians have something of a reputation as educated members of the Papua New Guinea work force, and as early as 1970, Education Department figures showed over 90% of Manus children in primary education, while the percentage of those occupying university places in the early years was one thousand times greater than in some other provinces (G. Smith 1975: 71). Today, education from grade 1 onwards is conducted exclusively in English. Primary education is almost universal, with over fifty government and mission run primary schools (Schooling and Schooling 1980:4). In addition, there are four high schools in the province, three with boarding facilities, ensuring that most adolescents in Manus have access to secondary education.

3. The Manus speech samples

The samples on which this analysis is based were recorded in and around Lorengau, the main town and administrative centre of Manus Province. A selection of students at primary or secondary schools were asked to talk in Tok Pisin for a few minutes into a small portable tape recorder. All the informants claimed to have used Tok Pisin from an early age, and although an independent check on this was not possible, there was no doubt that all the informants were extremely fluent and comfortable with the language. The students were normally recorded in groups of two or three, and talked of a variety of personal experiences or retold traditional or modern stories. A total of approximately four hours of speech samples were recorded from 74 informants. Of these, 33 had lived in Manus all their life or from an early age. The tape recordings were transcribed to give a corpus of just under 40,000 words.

4. Lexical borrowing and innovation

Even an initial impression of the data at the time of recording indicated that there were many new or borrowed lexical items, including the incorporation of a large number of features from English. In particular, verbal forms seemed to predominate. After transcription, a search of the texts was made to locate and categorize lexis. The work used as a basis for comparison was Father Frank Mihalic's *Jacaranda Dictionary and Grammar of Melanesian Pidgin* published in 1971 (hereafter *Mihalic*). Although now twenty years old, this is still the standard Tok Pisin dictionary. It should be noted that Mihalic was most familiar with the language used around Madang, which later became adopted as the basis of the Tok Pisin weekly *Wantok Niuspepa*'s

standard style. The dictionary does nevertheless appear to be quite comprehensive in its scope, and includes examples from all over the country, but it should be kept in mind that regional variation may be a factor in considering the occurrence of new forms.

When the new items were categorized, it was found that out of 277 forms not in the standard dictionary, 169 (61%) were verbs, compared with 78 (28%) nouns, 22 (8%) adjectives and 8 (3%) other categories. It is not always easy to assign a 'part of speech' unequivocally, but the above figures reflect broad patterns. This was somewhat surprising, as a large majority of the innovations were borrowed forms, and Weinreich (1968) considers that nouns are the category most likely to be borrowed in contact situations. However, in the Manus data it can be seen that verbs, including stative verbs, constitute the largest category, and new verbs are the main focus of attention in this study. The reason for the preponderance of verbal forms is not immediately apparent. The best clue appears to be related to Capell's (1969:35) typological characterization of the Austronesian languages of New Guinea in general as 'event-dominated' as opposed to 'object-dominated' languages, although the languages of Manus were considered by Capell to be less so than Austronesian languages of other parts of New Guinea.

5. Types of innovation

These new verbs are classified according to a number of criteria, which will form the basis of the following discussion. A full list appears in the appendix organised in five categories (A, B, C, D, E). (A) Some of the items are similar to *Mihalic* items, but show phonological differences. (B) Others are words which appear in the dictionary, but are used in the corpus with a new meaning, usually due to homonymic borrowings, or with an extended semantic range. (C) Those that may be formed by the internal derivational resources of Tok Pisin are included in the next category, although many of these examples can also be accounted for as direct borrowings, or as a mixture of both processes. (D) The bulk of the innovations are direct adoptions from English which appear to have a referential advantage over existing alternatives. (E) The final group are those where there appears to be no referential advantage, and it is probable that they are adopted as stylistic variants. Some of the borders between categories are somewhat fuzzy, and a word could appear simultaneously in more than one category.

5.1. Phonological variation

In standard accounts of Tok Pisin phonology, a number of transformations of English forms take place, such as $f > p$ (*forgive > pogivim*[3]), $t\int/\int/d\textyogh > s$

---

3.   In TP the morpheme *im* indicates the transitivity of the verbs to which it is attached.

(*chalk > sok; shock > sok; change > sens*), devoicing of voiced stops in final position (*rub > rap, bed > bet*) and so on. In the corpus, however, a great deal of phonological variation was noticed. There was, for example, much variability in the use of voiced and unvoiced stops, such as *lukim* and *lugim* 'to look' or *litim* and *lidim* 'to lead', and such alternative forms were not recorded as separate items. Some other phonological variants encountered but not listed include the optional use of *h-* preceding initial vowels (*evim, hevim* 'have'); insertion of vowels to separate consonant clusters[4] (eg. *change > senis*); and free alternation of *s-* and *sh* (eg. *autsaid/autshaid < outside*). Two examples were included for comment, however. One is the term *wishil* 'whistle', which appears to be an over-generalization of the equivalence of the Tok Pisin /s/ and English /ʃ/. The other is *tiring* 'drink', which is the commonest form of the word, and sufficiently unlike the dictionary form *dring* to warrant a mention. The presence of consonant clusters is noted in such cases as *faindaut* 'to find out' and *cheinjim* 'to change', where the standard Tok Pisin forms would be *pain(im)aut* and *senisim* respectively.[5]

The phoneme /f/ does not normally appear in accounts of Tok Pisin. It is, however, fairly commonly heard, either as an allophone of /p/ or as a distinct phoneme. Two examples here are *fairim* 'to fire' and *fogivim* 'forgive', where the *Mihalic* equivalents are *paiarim* and *pogivim* respectively. In these and most other instances, the phonological variants of standard forms show an increasing influence from English phonology, (particularly Australian English), e.g. *ketshim* for *kisim* (< *catch*) 'to get', *shut* for *sut* 'to shoot', or *cheinjim* for *senisim* 'to change'. There are other cases, however, where the change appears to be independent of English influence, e.g. *havrisim* 'to go past' as an alternative of the standard *abrisim* (of Melanesian origin) and *suwim* for *subim* (< *shove*) 'to push'.

5.2. Homonyms and existing words with a new semantic range

The words in this group indicate a shift of meaning, or an addition of meanings, often due to borrowing of what are already homonyms in English or what become homonyms when adapted to Tok Pisin phonology. For example, in *Mihalic*, *sok* means 'chalk', but the same form appears here with the meaning 'to get a shock' .This is due to the convergence of both English *shock* and *chalk* to the same form according to standard transformations. Similarly, the form *liv,* which appears in *Mihalic* as a noun equivalent to 'leave, vacation' (< *leave* (N)), in the present sample has developed the meanings 'to leave, depart' and 'to live'(< *leave* (V), *live* (V)). Likewise the word

---

4. Otherwise known as epenthesis, this is a common feature of speakers whose substrate or mother language does not contain consonant clusters as in English or follows a basic CV syllable structure (West African languages, Japanese, etc.).
5. These examples show some of the typical phonological features mentioned above.

pasim 'to close' (< *fasten*) is now also used to mean 'to pass' (an exam) (< *pass*). Mihalic lists *plenim* as 'to plane', but it appears here with the meaning 'to plan' (possibly influenced by the raised Aus.Eng pronunciation of *plan*). Finally, *trautim* (< *throw out*) shows semantic extension: it normally means 'to vomit', but is here used with English semantics as in 'to throw out'.

5.3. Tok Pisin's internal developmental resources

The next group shows a number of possible internal developments. Firstly, existing words may extend their functional range by derivation of new grammatical categories. For example, *vot* occurs as a noun ('vote') in *Mihalic*, but *votim* is not recorded. Similarly, *driman* (poss. < *dreaming*), *drop, susu* (of Melanesian origin) and *ring* occur as nouns meaning 'dream', 'drop', 'breast, milk' and 'ring' and *drai* as an adjective 'dry'. The verbs *drimanim*, 'to dream of', *susuim* 'to breast-feed' appear to have been formed by derivational processes, although it is not clear if derivation or analogy are involved in the formation of *dropim* 'to drop', *ringim* 'to ring, telephone' and *draim* 'to dry'. Straight borrowing from the English verb forms may be more likely in the cases of *dropim, ringim, draim, votim*, as well as *daiv* (below). *Gohetim* is a transitive verb derived from the phrase *go het* meaning 'to go ahead, progress'. The noun *daiva* 'diver', appears in *Mihalic*, while here the verb *daiv* 'to dive' appears. Secondly, other productive derivational processes may be at work, for example, reduplication in the case of *seksekim* 'to shake (transitive)', *ron-ron* 'to run continuously' and *sutsut* 'to shoot continuously'. The use of *aftarim* 'to follow, go after' is interesting as an example of grammatical shift which appears to have come via the Papua New Guinean English expression 'to after' meaning 'to go after, chase', which is not used in the standard language. The final internal development is the coining of novel idiomatic expressions. These include *saitim ai* (< *side*, *eye*), literally 'to move the eye sideways' meaning 'to look around', and the euphemism *kisim balus* (< *catch, balus* - Melanesian for 'pigeon'), literally 'to get the plane' which has taken on the metaphorical meaning 'to die'.

5.4. New words offering a referential advantage

The factor which appears to motivate most of the borrowing is some referential advantage over existing forms. This could be manifested in a number of ways. A single word may replace a somewhat more unwieldy phrase or circumlocution. Alternatively, the introduced term could be more specific than existing generic terms, or there could be a number of meanings for an existing term which the innovation helps to disambiguate.

   An example of the first category, economy, is seen in the case of *interviu-wim*, 'to interview'. There is no doubt that the meaning could be adequately communicated, but in a more roundabout way using phrases such as *toktok wantaim em bilong save long tingting bilong em* ('talk with him to find out

what he thinks'). The use of *interviuwim* is clearly more economical. Similarly replacing what would otherwise be whole phrases or even longer circumlocutions are many other terms including *blid* 'to bleed', *fidim* 'to feed' *eskotim* 'to escort', *othoraizim* 'to authorize', *komperim* ' to compare', *nomineitim* 'to nominate', *ovatenim* 'to overturn', etc.

One should not under-estimate the usefulness of generic terms, which may be remarkably effective in communicating specific meanings, if the context and full details of the discourse are taken into consideration. However, when more specific terms are available and widely understood, there is a great temptation to use them to avoid ambiguity. For example, the meaning of *distroyim*, 'to destroy' could be expressed using the word *bagarapim* (< *bugger up*), but the latter is more generic, and includes 'to spoil' in a sense which does not imply permanent destruction. Other examples of specific concepts encoded in words with more generic alternatives in common use include *bildim* 'to build', *dresim (sua)* 'to dress (a sore), *fraim* 'to fry' and *priperim* 'to prepare'. Sometimes it is not easy to decide whether or not the referent is different from that of existing words, for example the meaning of *saplaim*, 'to supply' is very close to that of *givim*, 'to give', but there is perhaps a greater specificity of meaning. Similarly, *ripitim* 'to repeat', *risiv* 'to receive', *shain* 'to shine', *stebim* 'to stab', and *alauim* 'to allow' are similar, but somewhat more specific, than the alternative Tok Pisin forms *wokim gen* (< *work again)*, *kisim* (< *catch*), *i lait* (< *light*), *sutim* (< *shoot*) and *larim* (< *let*).

In other cases, normally adequate alternatives may have more than one meaning, and may thus be ambiguous in certain contexts. For example, there is an existing term for 'to record' (as on a tape recorder), which is *katim* (< *cut)*, but this term can also mean 'to cut'. In contextualized utterances, it is unlikely that ambiguity would ever arise. However, the use of *rikodim* avoids potential confusion with the other meaning of *katim*. Similarly, the standard term *lukaut* can mean 'to look out, be careful' but also 'to look after', and use of the innovation *watsaut* (< *watch out*) may again help to disambiguate the meaning. The use of *bonim* and *boinim* points to a complex series of language choices. The use of *bonim* (< *born*) to mean 'to give birth to' may have arisen due to the fact that the alternative, *karim* can also mean 'to carry'. However, *bonim* (< *burn*) also means 'to heat', and this could have motivated the use of the alternative *boinim* (< a possible conflation of *burn* and *boil*) which occurs here. *Boinim* as a term for 'to heat' avoids the possible ambiguity of the various meanings of the existing alternative *kukim*, 'to burn' 'to cook' or 'to heat' and is distinct from *bonim* 'to give birth to'. What seems to be happening is that a greater range of choices is leading to a reduction in the need to rely on homonyms or words with multiple meanings.

5.5. Stylistic variants

In certain cases, innovations appear to be adopted where perfectly adequate alternatives exist, and in such cases the motivation for their use appears to be

stylistic flexibility. For example, the meaning of *dekoreitim*, 'to decorate' is adequately expressed by the existing term *bilasim* (possibly from *flash*), but the new expression offers the choice of an alternative rather than greater specificity of meaning. The adoption of a repertoire of such variants appears to be associated with the needs of first language creole speakers as opposed to the more restricted communicative needs of speakers of a pidgin as a second language (Smith 1990a: 205, 1990b: 284). Other cases of the use of innovations where adequate alternatives exist include the use of *saprais* 'to be surprised', *fidim* 'to feed', *mitim* 'to meet', *werim* 'to wear' and *mederim* 'to murder'. The existing alternatives are *kalap nogut* (< lit. *gallop nogood*, 'jump badly'), *givim kaikai* (*give* + Melanesian *kaikai* 'food'), *bungim* (Melanesian 'meet'), *putim* and *kilim* respectively. In the case of *klaimim* (*diwai*), 'to climb (a tree)', existing alternatives may be unsatisfactory for other reasons, as the regional variants *go antap* (< *go on top*) 'climb, go up', *kalapim* (< *gallop*) 'climb, jump', and *goapim* (< *go up*) 'climb, have sexual intercourse', may be considered unsuitable, inaccurate or even obscene to speakers of varieties from other parts of Papua New Guinea. It may not be possible to say definitely that an innovation is for stylistic as opposed to referential needs. Both factors may be operating, or one or the other in different situations.

Also worth mentioning here are a number of cases of the calquing of English phrasal verbs or idiomatic expressions or the adoption of English polymorphemic expressions in an apparently unanalyzed form. In the former category, the English phrase *take revenge on* is half-calqued as *tek rivenj long*, while the idiomatic English phrasal verb *to deal with* is converted in a similar way to *dil wantaim*. Unanalyzed phrases adopted as single words include *aptudeit*, 'to be up to date, fashionable', *brekenenta* 'to break and enter', *slo-daun* 'to slow down' and *tekpat* 'to take part', while the unanalyzed participle *training* is adopted as the intransitive verb *trening*, 'to train, practice'. Motivation for these introductions may similarly be referential or stylistic or both.

6. The inter-relationship between Tok Pisin and English

The most dramatic finding above is the large number of words used by these Tok Pisin speakers which originate from English. This is in line with the recent findings of Romaine (1992: 145) for young people in Morobe and Madang Provinces. As an expanded and still-developing English lexifier pidgin, it is not surprising that further lexical expansion from English is taking place, just as other words are becoming obsolete (Mihalic 1990). What does seem unusual is the relative lack of innovation using the highly developed internal productive resources of the language (Mühlhäusler 1979) in favour of English borrowing.

The subjects in this sample were all school pupils educated through the medium of English, and the researcher was an English-speaking expatriate. As a result, it might be considered that this is sufficient to account for the

influx of English expressions. However, this does not adequately account for the data. Firstly, in the school situation, although the official language of instruction was English, in fact there was a great deal of Tok Pisin spoken. It was observed that outside formal lessons, as in many other secondary and tertiary institutions (Swan and Lewis 1990), there was a rapid and virtually total reversion to the *de facto* standard, Tok Pisin. It is true that the students share common learning experiences taught in English, and this undoubtedly influences the way that they think and speak. Linguistic choice may involve a negotiation of identity, in this case an identity as elite English-educated young people, and it is possible that a somewhat self-conscious shared knowledge of semantic distinctions from English unavailable to less educated Tok Pisin speakers could have influenced lexical choice. Nevertheless, the language of choice in most domains was Tok Pisin.

Secondly, words borrowed from English were generally fully integrated into Tok Pisin morphological and syntactic structures, although the amount of morphology in Tok Pisin is small, and this can be a less than ideal criterion. The extent of integration of introduced items has been used to determine whether the phenomenon can be considered to be borrowing or code-switching (Poplack et al. 1985), although there is still not general agreement on this point, and some theorists such as Myers-Scotton (1993) consider even morphologically integrated items to be 'mixed constituents'. Code-switching, where there is a distinct change from one language to another, is well-known in Papua New Guinea (Kulick 1992), and there are various stylistic and pragmatic reasons for its use. An example by ex-Chief Minister Michael Somare speaking in Papua New Guinea's parliament, the House of Assembly, illustrates how switching can be used to emphasise a point:

(1) Husat bai karimaut dispela wok? Dispela *same public servants you are now accusing!*

Who is going to carry out this work? These…

Note that the switch is abrupt and total, but a suitable switching point exists in the form of 'same' (*seim*), which has identical pronunciation in both languages.

Code-mixing, involving a liberal sprinkling of English phrases has often been commented on in the speech of politicians (Nekitel 1990), usually with the assumption that the main purpose is the demonstration of knowledge to gain prestige. However, in contexts such as the House of Assembly, or even in schools, there may be considerable dependence on specialized concepts introduced through the medium of English such as 'standing orders', 'budgets', 'timetables', 'elections' and 'interviews'. In such a situation it is hardly surprising that there is a good deal of lexical and semantic overlap.

However, neither of the above patterns is typical of the Manus data. Virtually no occurrences of extended code-switching were encountered. Code-mixing, where smaller chunks of English were used in Tok Pisin discourse,

did occur occasionally, especially involving linking expressions at clause boundaries. This phenomenon was also commented upon by Schooling and Schooling (1980:9) describing public talks in Manus. When code-mixing consists of only single words, this can be considered borrowing, and this was characteristic of the majority of new words found in these samples. In (2)

(2)   man bilongen i *fosim* em lo kaikai disla pikinini

      'her husband forced her to eat the child'

the English verb *force* has been borrowed and adapted to Tok Pisin morphology by adding the transitive suffix -*im*.

Where borrowing takes place, it may be difficult to determine whether the use of a word is an *ad hoc* adoption ('nonce borrowing'), or is an established addition to the language. One criterion for determining that a word has become established in a language is its use by monolingual speakers; but monolingual Tok Pisin speakers are so few in Manus that this is not likely to be a productive line of investigation. An alternative would be observation and recording of the frequency of the various items to determine the extent of establishment. A longer term study would be needed to achieve this, but even so, the distinction between what is established and what is not is by no means clear-cut.

This poses a problem for dictionary makers, as discussed by Healey (1975). Which of these words should be included as integrated adoptions, and which should be excluded as nonce or irregular borrowing? As noted above, Mihalic's 1971 dictionary is now showing its age, and a replacement is now needed. Considerations of dictionary making (e.g. Mühlhäusler 1985) have not given much prominence to the question of English loans, although Thomas (1987) does claim that one of the reasons that Tok Pisin speakers tend to use so many English adoptions is because no good monolingual Tok Pisin dictionary for use in schools is available. It will be interesting to see how the question of English borrowing is addressed when a monolingual dictionary is produced.

The effect of borrowing may be more than a simple replacement of one word by another. Romaine (1992) deals in some detail with the consequences of lexical borrowing, and concludes that its influence will extend far beyond filling referential slots and will have profound consequences for the morpho-syntax and especially the semantics of the language. However, Jourdan (1989:34), describing the situation in Solomons Pijin, notes that while there is much lexical borrowing from English, there is little morpho-syntactic influence apart from greater frequency of -s plurals, and syntactic change is currently being determined largely by the internal resources of the language. The Manus data do indicate some morpho-syntactic influence, for example the -s plurals which have been commented upon elsewhere. Siegel (1994:7) shows that many -s plurals described in other studies may in fact be unanalyzed adoptions of English plurals rather than an alternative system of

pluralizing. However, the use of -s plurals in the Manus data is widespread and often redundant, and this does appear to be one area where morphological change is taking place.

In other respects, morphological change appears consistent with the kind of changes that have been going on for some time described in Lynch (1979), such as phonological reduction and cliticization eg. *bai ol* (future + they) > *bol*, *tok olsem* ('say that') > *to se*, suffixes -*pela* > -*pla* and -*im* > -*i*, and so on. In most of the samples, there appears to be very little evidence of syntactic adaptation to English patterns. One or two cases, however, can be observed, as in (3):

(3) *narapela brata bilong mi i stap bek long Not Solomon na kraisis i stil kontiniu*

   'my other brother stayed back in North Solomons and the crisis is still continuing'

Note here the use of *stap bek* (< *stop back*), mirroring the English phrase 'stay back', while the phrase *stil kontiniu*, could be considered either Tok Pisin or English. *Stil* is normally used as the verb 'to steal' in Tok Pisin, not as the adverb *still*, suggesting that the phrase is English. However the appropriate English verb morphology has not been used with *continue*, implying that it should not be considered a code switch.

7. Is a post-creole continuum emerging?

If Tok Pisin follows the 'classic' life-cycle of pidgins and creoles, close contact between an expanded or creolized pidgin and the lexifier language is likely to result in decreolization and the establishment of a post-creole or post-pidgin continuum. A typical example would be the continuum from basilectal varieties of Jamaican Creole to standard English described by Decamp (1971: 351). The extent to which this sequence of events is unfolding in Papua New Guinea is open to question. Siegel (1994) deals at some length with the question of whether such continua can be found in Melanesia, looking at the sister dialects of Melanesian Pidgin, Pijin in the Solomon Islands and Bislama in Vanuatu as well as Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea. He critically examines the claims by a number of writers indicating that the development of a continuum is likely to happen or has already happened. Based on a close scrutiny of the data supporting such views, he concludes that the evidence currently available does not justify the claim that such continua exist.

The Manus data indicate that lexical innovations lead to a certain amount of phonological and semantic convergence, but the adopted lexical items are generally fully integrated. Although some English phonemes may be adopted unchanged, they appear to be optional allophones (eg. *fogivim/pogivim*), and no examples of minimal pairs involving introduced English phonemes could be demonstrated. Morphological and syntactic patterns generally conformed to those of standard Tok Pisin, indicating that the new terms should be considered

as borrowings rather than code-switches (Poplack et al. 1988). A few cases of awkward accommodation did occur but these were uncommon and idiosyncratic. There were some morpho-syntactic developments in the direction of English. Plural marking with -*s* appears to be increasingly obligatory and redundant. Verbal phrase structure tended in some cases to follow more typically English patterns, and English words or phrases tended to be used as cohesive devices in longer pieces of discourse. However, it was nearly always clear that the language being spoken was unequivocally Tok Pisin, and obvious switching from one code to another did not appear to be taking place. In Myers-Scotton's terminology (1993), Tok Pisin is the undisputed 'matrix language'.

Such a convergence would not appear to justify the term post-creole continuum, as there is still an enormous discontinuity between the two systems. Although studies by Yarupawa (1986), Barron (1986) and A-M Smith (1988) have shown that some expressions used in Papua New Guinea English have their origin in Tok Pisin, there is no evidence to show that the syntax of PNG English is changing radically in the direction of Tok Pisin or that English and Tok Pisin are converging to the extent that significant intermediate varieties exist.

Anglicization of Tok Pisin has frequently been expressed in terms of a rural-urban dichotomy. However, on Manus, the distinction between rural and urban does not appear to be clear-cut or very useful. What might be considered Manus's 'urban' area, the township of Lorengau, is very limited, consisting of a few stores, a couple of hotels and some government facilities as well as residential areas. The population is estimated at 'nearly 3,000' (Schooling and Schooling 1980: 3). More significantly, it is hard to pin down a distinctly 'urban' population. There is a good deal of movement between traditional settlements and the town, by sea in motorized canoes, or up and down the main highway in motor vehicles. Thus the exact resident population is difficult to determine, and many people from out-of-town areas visit temporarily to go to the market, the hospital or for other specific purposes. There do not appear to be distinct 'urban' and 'rural' cultures at all. This is not unique to Manus, and it may be that the urban/rural distinction has generally been overstated with regard to linguistic change in Papua New Guinea.

A more critical factor in Manus, as well as in some other provinces such as New Ireland, appears to be the combination of the widespread primary use of Tok Pisin and the high degree of English-medium education, whether in an 'urban' or 'rural' context. Among such a population, familiarity with institutions, procedures and fine distinctions of meaning appears to be leading to a shared common knowledge which is the pre-requisite for large-scale adoption of new lexis from English into Tok Pisin. Among language planners, such adoptions tend to be rather frowned upon, and the use of the internal resources of the language are preferred as a source of innovation, although this is perhaps paradoxical considering the history of Tok Pisin. Nevertheless, it seems that in the absence of vigorous official language planning initiatives, the trend of extensive borrowing from English is likely to continue. Balanced

against these innovative trends are conservative factors, such as the need to communicate with second language Tok Pisin speakers, which have the effect of keeping more drastic changes in check.

In the future, lexical, phonological and semantic convergence could lead to a position where significant structural borrowing of the type described by Thomason and Kaufman (1988) is facilitated. If a post-pidgin continuum is going to be found in Papua New Guinea, the most promising place to look is not necessarily in urban settlements alone, but anywhere in provinces such as Manus and New Ireland where there are large proportions of the population fluent in Tok Pisin and well educated through the medium of English. Careful documentation of the incipient changes currently occurring could provide some interesting data on how such a situation develops.

8. Conclusion

This investigation has shown that the lexicon of Tok Pisin as spoken by a sample of adolescents on Manus is undergoing considerable expansion due to an influx of items, especially verbs, from English. These words of English origin are for the most part fully integrated into the morpho-syntax of Tok Pisin, although phonology may tend towards that of English in some cases. It is suggested that the factors leading to this situation are widespread English-medium secondary education and the use of Tok Pisin as a primary language by virtually the whole population. The urban/rural distinction does not appear to be particularly useful in this context. While the changes taking place may predispose the language to convergence, PNG English and Tok Pisin as currently spoken are generally quite distinct from one another, and it would be premature to describe the situation as a post-creole or post-pidgin continuum.

Appendix

New verbs from a sample of adolescent first language Tok Pisin speech in Manus, November 1991.

(Bold = Tok Pisin, normal = English. The English lexical origin of the TP form is given in brackets whenever there is a change in grammatical function from English to TP, or whenever the TP and English equivalents are not cognate forms)

A. Phonological variant of *Mihalic* form

cheinj : change (intrans.); **cheinjim** : change (trans); **dens** : dance; **faiarim (gan)** : fire (gun); **fainaut/faindaut** : find out; **halpim** : help; **havrisim** : variant of **abrisim**, to go past; **houp** : hope ; **kechim (bas)** : catch (bus); **openim** : open ; **ouldim** : hold; **shut** : shoot; **stop** : stop (intrans.); **stopim** : stop (trans.); **suwim** : var. of **subim**, to push (<shove); **tiring** : drink; **titsh** : teach (**tis** in *Mihalic*); **troautim (pis i sting)** : throw out (rotten fish); **wishil** : whistle.

B. In *Mihalic* but with different meaning

boinim : heat (<boil, burn); **bonim** : give birth to (<born Adj); **pasim (eksam)** : pass (exam).

C. Innovations due to internal development

aftarim : to look for, pursue; **daiv** : dive; **draim** : dry; **drimanim** : dream of; **dropim** : drop; **gohetim** : make go ahead; **kisim balus** : die (lit. catch plane); **muvim** : move; **ringim** : ring up (on phone); **ronron** : run continuously; **saitim (ai)** : look round; **seksekim** : shake.

D. Referentially advantageous alternatives

afektim : affect; **alauim** : allow; **anserim** : answer; **aptudeit** : be up-to-date; **atekim** : attack; **bendaun** : bend down; **bildim** : build; **bit** : beat (heart); **blid** : bleed; **blowim** : blow; **brith** : breathe; **chekim** : check; **digim** : dig; **disapia** : disappear; **dismisim** : dismiss; **distroyim** : destroy; **diuti** (<duty N) : be on duty; **divaidim** : divide; **divelop** : develop; **dregim** : drag; **dres** : dress up; **eimim** : to aim for; **enjoyim** : enjoy; **eskotim** : escort; **feivarim** : favour; **fletim (taia)** : flatten (tyre); **fosim** : force; **fraim** : fry; **gadim/gaidim** (<guard/guide) : guard; **grebim** : grab; **gredueit** : graduate; **grou** : grow; **instolim (tivi)** : install (TV); **interviuwim** : interview; **introdiusim** : introduce; **involv** : be involved; **kanselim** : cancel; **klaimim (buai)** : climb (tree); **klinap** : clean up; **kolektim** : collect; **komperim** : compare; **kontektim** : contact; **kontrolim** : control; **koup** : cope; **kouopereit** : co-operate; **krol** : crawl; **lendim** : land; **lidim** : lead; **liv** : to leave, depart; **liv** : live; **loud** : load; **loudim** : load; **misim** : miss (someone's presence); **nok** : knock; **nomineitim** : nominate; **onim** (<on, Prep.): turn on; **opereitim** : operate; **othoraizim** : authorize; **ovatenim** : overturn; **patrolim** : patrol; **pekap** : pack up, get ready to go; **pekim** : pack; **pikim** : pick up; **piknik** : go for a picnic; **plenim** : plan; **prektis** : practise; **priperim** : prepare; **prodyusim** : produce; **raidim (elefan)** : ride (elephants); **reid** : raid; **reprisentim** : represent; **rikodim** : record; **riprodyusim** : reproduce; **rispektim** : respect; **saplayim** : supply; **sapotim** : support; **saspekt** : suspect; **saspektim** : suspect; **saspendim (long wok)** : suspend (from work); **shain** : shine; **silim (rot)** : seal (road); **sink (+go)** : sink; **skwisim** : squeeze; **sloudaun** : slow down; **snik** : sneak (out); **sok** (<shock N) : get a shock; **spai** : spy; **spaim** : spy (on); **straik** : go on strike; **threatenim** : threaten; **transfe** : be transferred; **transferim** : transfer (trans.); **trening** (<training N) : train (for sports); **visitim** : visit; **waipim** : wipe; **watsaut** : watch out; **widim** : weed.

E. Stylistic alternatives

blowim daun : blow down; **brekenenta** : break and enter; **dekoreitim** : decorate; **dil wantaim** : deal with; **dresim (sua)** : dress (sore); **evim** : have; **feisim (trabel)** : face (trouble); **fidim** : feed; **hendelim** : handle; **hepen** : happen;

hevim : have; **kompit** : compete; **kontinyu** : continue; **kosim (trabel)** : cause (trouble); **mederim** : murder; **mitim** : meet; **nil** : kneel; **panisim** : punish; **pesbai** : pass by; **pleyim (teip)** : play (a tape); **ripitim** : repeat; **risiv** : receive; **saprais** (<surprise N) : get a surprise; **saraundim** : surround; **setolim** : settle (a dispute); **sherim** : share; **stebim** : stab; **tek pat long** : take part in; **tek rivenj long** : take revenge on; **tekim (longpla taim)** : take (a long time); **telim** : tell (= know, recognize); **wanda** : wonder; **wachim** : watch; **werim** : wear.

References

BALDAUF, R.B. Jr.; LUKE, A. (eds.) (1990). *Language planning and education in Australasia and the South Pacific.* Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

BARRON, C. (1986). «Lexical nativization in Papua New Guinea English». *Department of Language and Communication Studies Research.* Report, no. 7, University of Technology, Lae: PNG.

CAPELL, A. (1969). *A survey of New Guinea languages.* Sydney University Press.

DECAMP, D. (1971). «Towards a generative analysis of a post-creole continuum». In HYMES (ed.), 349-370.

HEALEY, L.R. (1975). «When is a word not a pidgin word». In MCELHANON (ed.), 36-42.

HYMES, D. (ed.) (1971). *Pidginization and creolization of languages: proceedings of a conference held at the University of the West Indies.* Mona, Jamaica, April 1968. Cambridge University Press.

JOURDAN, C. (1989). «Nativization and anglicization in Solomon Islands Pijin». *World Englishes,* 8(1): 25-35.

KULICK, D. (1992). *Language shift and cultural reproduction: socialization, self and syncretism in a Papua New Guinea village.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

LAYCOCK, D. (1985). «Tok Pisin and the census». In WURM; MÜHLHÄUSLER (eds.), 223-231.

LYNCH, J. (1979). «Changes in Tok Pisin morphology». Paper presented at 13th PNG Linguistic Society Congress, Port Moresby.

MCELHANON, K.A. (ed.) (1976). *Tok Pisin i go we? Kivung* special publication no. 1. Port Moresby: Linguistic Society of PNG.

MIHALIC, F. (1971). *The Jacaranda dictionary and grammar of Melanesian Pidgin,* Milton, Qld.: Jacaranda.

— (1990). «Obsolescence in the Tok Pisin vocabulary». In VERHAAR (ed.), 263-273.

MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. (1979). *Growth and structure of the lexicon of New Guinea Pidgin.* Pacific Linguistics C52. Canberra: ANU.

— (1985). «The scientific study of Tok Pisin: Tok Pisin dictionary making: theoretic considerations and practical experiences». In WURM; MÜHLHÄUSLER (eds.), 577-593.

— (1986). *Pidgin and creole linguistics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

MYERS-SCOTTON, C. (1993). *Duelling languages: grammatical structures in code-switching.* Oxford: Clarendon.

NEKITEL, Otto M. (1990). «The role and use of language in Papua New Guinea's trilingual parliament: a synopsis of success and constraints». Unpublished paper, Dept. Language and Literature, UPNG.

POPLACK, S.; SANKOFF, D.; MILLER, C. (1988). «The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation». *Linguistics,* 26: 47-104.

ROMAINE, S. (1992). *Language, education and Development: urban and rural Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea.* Oxford: Oxford UP.

ROSS, M.D. (1988). *Proto-Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia.* Pacific Linguistics C-98. Canberra: Australian National University.

SCHOOLING, S.; J. (1980). «A preliminary sociolinguistic and linguistic survey of Manus Province, Papua New Guinea». Ukarumpa: Summer Institute of Linguistics, ms.

SIEGEL, J. (1994). «Pidgins and English in Melanesia: is there a continuum?». Paper presented to the First Conference of the International Association for World Englishes, University of Illinois.

SMITH, A.-M. (1988). «English in Papua New Guinea». *World Englishes* 7(3): 299-308.

SMITH, G. (1975). *Education in Papua New Guinea.* Melbourne University Press.

SMITH, G.P. (1990a). «Creolized Tok Pisin: uniformity and variation». In BALDAUF; LUKE (eds.), 197-209.

— (1990b). «Idiomatic Tok Pisin and referential adequacy». In VERHAAR (ed.), 275-287.

— (1994). «Husat i bin othoraizim?: new verbs in Manus Tok Pisin». Paper presented to Seventh International Conference of the Society for Pidgin and Creole Linguistics, Georgetown, Guyana, August 1994.

SWAN, J.; LEWIS, D.J. (1990). «Tok Pisin at university: an educational and language planning dilemma in Papua New Guinea». In BALDAUF; LUKE (eds.), 210-233.

THOMAS, D. (1987). *«Diksinare bilong* Tok Pisin». Dept of Language, University of Papua New Guinea, ms.

THOMASON, S.G.; KAUFMAN, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

VERHAAR, J.W.M. (ed.) (1990). *Melanesian Pidgin and Tok Pisin.* Studies in Language Companion Series vol. 20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

WEINREICH, U. (1968). *Languages in contact: findings and problems.* The Hague: Mouton.

WURM, S.A.; MÜHLHÄUSLER, P. (eds.) (1985). *Handbook of Tok Pisin* (*New Guinea Pidgin*). Pacific Linguistics, C70. Canberra: ANU.

YARUPAWA, Shem (1986). «Milne Bay informal variety of English». *Department of Language and Communication Studies Research,* Report no. 9. Lae: University of Technology.