CHINESE PIDGIN ENGLISH

AND

THEORIES OF PIDGINIZATION

© by

Peggy Wang

Department of Linguistics

McGill University

1979

Presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for
the Master Degree of Arts in the Faculty of Graduate
Studies and Research of McGill University

ABSTRACT

Chinese Pidgin English (CPE) is analyzed in the light
of current hypotheses about pidginization processes. It is
argued that these hypotheses are not in fact incompatible
in explaining the pidginization process of which CPE was a
result.

The lexical source of CPE is English but its morphology
and syntax reflect the basic structures of Chinese as pre-
dicted by the "lexical replacement" hypothesis. The syntac-
tic structures of CPE are also analyzed as various kinds
of common denominators (shared structures of Chinese and
English) which have selective advantage to be retained in
pidgins as predicted by the "universalist" hypothesis.
The "simplification model" is also useful in accounting for
the morphology of CPE. As a result of this analysis, the
pidginization process evidenced in CPE can best be account-
ed for by a synthetic model.

Greenberg's implicational universals tend to be con-
firmed in CPE and thus the structures of CPE are shown to
be more harmonic than those of Chinese.

RÉSUMÉ

Le pidgin chinois-anglais (CPE dans le texte) est étudié
à la lumière des hypothèses actuelles sur les processus de
pidginisation.

Ce travail veut démontrer que ces hypothèses ne sont pas
nécessairement contradictoires mais que plusieurs contribuent
à expliquer le processus de pidginisation dont est issu le
CPE.

Tel que prévu par l'hypothèse du "remplacement lexical",
le CPE tire son vocabulaire de l'anglais, mais sa morphologie
et sa syntaxe du chinois. Les structures syntaxiques du CPE
sont aussi analysées en tant que divers types de "dénominateurs
communs" (structures communes au chinois et à l'anglais) qui
ont l'avantage particulier de se retrouver dans les pidgins
de la facon prévue par l'hypothèse "universaliste". Le "modèle
de simplification" est aussi utile pour rendre compte de la
morphologie du CPE. Cette analyse montre que le processus de
pidginisation dont est issu le CPE serait mieux expliqué
par un modèle synthétique.

Les universaux implicationnels de Greenberg tendent à
être confirmés par l'étude du CPE. Ainsi, les structures du
CPE sont présentées comme étant plus harmoniques que celles
du chinois.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I.1. PIDGINS AND PIDGINIZATION :

It is generally agreed that a pidgin is a contact ver-
nacular which is no one's native language and "arises to
fulfill certain restricted communication needs among people
who have no common language" (Todd, 1974: 1), for example,
the Russo-Norsk used at the beginning of the century by the
Russian tradesmen and the Norwegians along the Norwegian
coast for the purpose of carrying on the fishing-trade and
also the Chinese Pidgin English (CPE) used by the British
merchants and Chinese in the Chinese coastal areas. Neither
Russo-Norsk nor CPE is the native language of its speakers.
These kinds of linguistic compromise arise only to meet
the urgent need to communicate for the groups of people in-
volved. A "restricted pidgin"[1] lasts just as long as the
situation that called it into being and then goes quickly
out of use, this is why pidgins are said to have "life-cycles"
(Hall, 1966: 126-130).

It has been observed that pidgins show certain charac-
teristics of the languages from which they develop. In most
cases, the lexicon of a pidgin can be identified with that
of one language (usually an Indo-European language), which

1

is referred to as the base language, dominant language, source language or the superstratum language. Other languages which also contribute to the formation of a pidgin are referred to as the native language, local language, or the substratum language, e.g. Chinese is the substratum language and English the superstratum language in the case of CPE. (In this paper, the term "parent language" is also adopted to refer to either the substratum or the superstratum language.)

The process of pidginization (How is a pidgin formed?) or the relation between the parent languages and the resultant pidgin have been the subject of theoretical discussions in linguistics. Researchers have tried to explain how a pidgin comes into being from both linguistic and socio-historical perspectives and varied hypotheses and considerable debates have been presented in the literature. Since pidgins are characterized by a limited lexicon [2] and the lack of inflectional and derivational morphology as a result of "the elimination of many grammatical devices such as number and gender, and a drastic reduction of redundant features" (Decamp, 1968: 15), some linguists (Hall) argue that a pidgin is just a simplified Indo-European language. Thus CPE (as the name suggests) is simply a simplified version of English with heavy carry-overs from Chinese. Others (Taylor) think that a pidgin is a "genetic orphan"

with two "foster parents", one providing the lexicon

and the other providing the morphological and syntactic

structure. A few pidginists (Bickerton) argue that pidgini-

zation is just a special type of second language learning

with restricted input. Bickerton (1977) claims that there

is nothing at all mysterious or unique about its process;

however, some other pidginists (Kay and Sankoff) have pro-

posed that universals are involved in pidginization and

that pidgins are somehow closer to language universals

because pidgins have little transformational depth. Another

group of researchers (Todd, Samarin, Alder) stress the

innovative power of pidgin, Todd(1974: 10) claims that "the

grammar of the pidgin which emerges is not just a simplified

grammar of English or a simplified version of the grammar

of the other languages. It is not even a common denominator

grammar of the contact languages. Rather, ...a restructuring

of the grammars that interacted". Thus a pidgin is the birth

of a new language with its unique features. [3]

In an attempt to explain the striking similarities

existing among the world's pidgins, scholars also have

tried to search for a common origin of pidgin languages.

The monogenetic theory claims that all European-language

based pidgins derive from a fifteen century Portuguese

pidgin with a vocabulary expansion from the superstratum

language, which may have been French, English, Spanish or

Dutch. The monogenetic theory is rejected by Hall and his supporters who believe that pidgins arise independently (polygenetic theory) and develop along parallel lines. The similarities among pidgins can be accounted for by the fact that they all derive from the Indo-European stock.

I.2. OBJECTIVE OF THIS THESIS:

The aim of this thesis is to analyze CPE in the light of some of the different hypotheses about the processes of pidginization which have been proposed in the literature.

The thesis consists of three parts. The first part is a brief review of the main hythotheses concerning pidginization. The second part deals with the morphology of CPE and the third part the syntax of CPE. Data of CPE will be analyzed in order to show that:

(1) The seemingly contradicting proposals are, in fact not incompatible: they explain pidginization by focusing on different levels of linguistic structures. In the case of CPE it will be shown that the notion of "common denominator" is useful to describe the origins of the syntactic structures of CPE, while other proposals can account for only some of the structures of CPE.

(2) Consequently, Hall's explanation of the structures of CPE as closer to the grammar of English is not

empirically supported. On the contrary, structures which cannot be explained by the "common denominator" proposal often reflect the equivalent Chinese structures, though there is no doubt that the lexical source of CPE is English.

The analysis of CPE will be concerned with the syntactic and morphological structures only. Phonology will not be discussed as the texts available show great discrepancies in the transcription used by various writers.

I.3. THE CORPUS :

The data for CPE can be found in various journals and newspapers from early 19th century to the middle of the 20th century. (See the last section of bibliography) Most of the descriptions of CPE are short, dealing mainly with word etymologies. However, the examples mentioned in these articicles do provide a source of information for the syntactic analysis of CPE.

Most of the data for my analysis of CPE come from Hall's Chinese Pidgin English: Grammar and Texts (1944). The text consists of a brief description of the phonology of CPE, parts of speech, and sentence structures. Data are recorded from English speakers of CPE; there are 144 sentences and 12 short dialogues. Some of the old texts are also transcribed by Hall and a translation of Longfellow's Excelsior in CPE

is also included in addition to a few conversations in
different social situations.

I.4. PREVIOUS STUDIES OF CPE :

The early observations on CPE represent the model proposed
later by Taylor (1956), i.e. English providing the lexicon
and Chinese providing the structure. This view can be seen
from one of the articles in Chinese Repository (1837, Oct.)

> " Canton English was the mixed result of Cantonese
> and English attempts at intercommunication,.. The
> English arrange all his English words according
> to Chinese idioms. On the Chinese side, they me-
> morize the vocabularies from the local compiled
> dictionary and spoke according to their own grammar."

Dennys (1878:171), who wrote the only useful linguistic article
analyzing the spoken 19th century CPE, made a similar obser-
vation:

> " ..As regards grammatical structure, 'pidgin' is
> in the main an imperfect adaptation of our own
> rules. But the general construction of sentences
> is essentially Chinese."

Bland makes the same claim as he (1929: 711) writes:

> " As British trade became predominant, this 'pidgin'
> English gradually developed into a fairly compre-

...hensive dialect, in which an increasing vocabulary
of English words were adapted to the Chinese method
of constructing sentences."

Some authors (Scriber 15,1878: 373) also hold the po-
sition that learning CPE will help one to learn Chinese
owing to the similarities between the structures of CPE and
Chinese.

> " I assert that it is a great mistake to suppose this
> dialect to be simply bad or childish English. It is
> really a language. And a good knowledge of it is of
> much assistance in the difficult task of learning
> Chinese. The structure of the sentences is in exact
> accordance with Chinese idiom, and many of the seeming-
> ly useless expressions are literal translations."

The unfavorable learning environment is said to be
the cause of the birth of CPE (Chinese Repository, 1837: 279).

> " These are enough to show why the Chinese speak
> barbarous English as they do. If the teachers and
> books are so defective, how can we expect the scho-
> lars to be accomplished? A Chinese commits one of
> these vocabularies to memory, and then construct his
> sentences according to the idioms of his own
> language."

The situation in China is exactly what Bickerton
(1977:55) claims to be the main factor of the formation
of a pidgin; he says:

7

"...The difference between arriving at a pidgin and
arriving at a reasonably accurate version of a
standard language lies mainly in the availability
of target models and the amount of interaction with
speakers of the target language....If, however, tar-
get model are scarce, and if he or she speaks mainly
to non-native speakers who suffer a similar res-
triction of access to the target, the end product will
be a pidgin."

The recent analysis of CPE done by Bauer (1974) also
supports these earlier positions and he argues that the
"X-component(substratum: Chinese) serves as a model of CPE".

So far, the most complete linguistic analysis of CPE
was done by Hall. Hall rejects the claim that a pidgin is
a reflection of the substratum language, in all but vocabulary
and the notion that English-based pidgins are nothing but
English words spoken with Chinese (Melanesian, African, etc.)
syntax. He (1952: 140) argues that "pidgin is structurally
closer to the base language than it is to the native lan-
guage". His argument is based on his classification of CPE
structures according to their origins (1952: 141).

Exclusively Chinese	3
Closer to Chinese than to English	4
Common to both Chinese and English	29
Closer to English than to Chinese	9
Exclusively English	10

Unfortunately, Hall's analysis is not very reliable, because
the few examples he provides for the identification of the
Englishness or the Chineseness of a structure show bias.
For instance, he (p.141) concludes that the interrogative
element of WH-question in CPE reflect the English structure
and he states:

> " ...the resemblance of pidgin forms and constructions
> to Chinese and to English is very varied. It ranges
> along a scale, all the way from those features which
> have a parallel in Chinese but not in English.......
> through those which have parallels in both English
> and Chinese, to those which have a parallel in
> English but not in Chinese (like the position of the
> interrogative elements in / hwat ples ju hæv puti maj
> hæmər ?/ 'Where did you put my hammer?') "

However, a careful observation of his own data shows that
the WH-question structure is often found in CPE according
to the Chinese structure. Therefore, we simply cannot
accept his conclusion that the grammatical structure of
CPE is "definitely closer to English than to Chinese" (p.142).

I.5. SOME SOCIAL AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF CPE :

As Hymes (1971) points out in the study of pidgins
and creole languages, it is impossible to separate the
linguistic from the socio-cultural, the synchronic from

9

the diachronic. It is then helpful to take a look at the
peculiar social and political background which brought
CPE into its being.

CPE had a life cycle of about 150 years, from the
early 18th century to the late 19th century. The development
of CPE is generally divided into four major periods (Hall,1944
1944: 95):

1715-48	:	Origin at Canton and Macao
1748-1842	:	Classical period, use at Canton
1842-90	:	Period of expansion and greatest use,
		in Hong Kong, Treaty Ports and Yangtze
		valley.
1890-present	:	Decline period.

The rise and decline of CPE are closely related to the
development of the modern Chinese history, particularly
to the attitude of the Chinese intellectuals toward the
Western culture. As we can see, the dividing lines of the
four major periods all bear some historical significance,
for instance, 1715 was the year when English factory was
established in Canton. In 1842, the Treaty of Nanking was
signed and Hong Kong was declared as a free port. The Reform
Movement started around 1890 when China began to accept
the Western culture.

In the early 18th century in China, normal second language learning from either side (Chinese or English) was impossible. "The Chinese held the English, like all foreign devils, in extremely low esteem,[5] and they would not stoop to learning the foreigner's language in its full term(Hall, 1966: 8); on the other hand, the local government placed serious obstacles in preventing "foreign devils" learning Chinese, to the point of "beheading a Chinese teacher for giving lessons". (Hunter,1882:61) Moreover, most foreigners did not bother to learn Chinese language either because of their feelings of superiority or the presumed difficulty of the language. Under such circumstance, a linguistic compromise came into being to meet the communicative needs between Chinese and Westerners. The social situations in which CPE was used, as pointed out by Hall (1944:95), are "primarily those of master (foreigner) and servant (Chinese), and of business relations, especially in retail shops catering to foreigners". The reduction in function of language is generally considered as one of the main factors of the formation of pidgin languages. This has been pointed by Samarin (1971: 127):

"Pidginization should be seen as any consistent reduction of the functions of language both in its grammar and its use.....a language is used to talk about less topics, or in fewer contexts, to indicate fewer social relations. .... Reduction in language use probably always has some

11

repercussions on language output."

With the gradual westernization of China, standard English plays an increasingly important role in the modernization program in China and the younger generation begin to possess a good command of English. CPE, a pidgin with limited lexicon and used in restricted social contexts, had long been regarded as a language of "foreign slaves", a relic of colonialism, therefore it was bound to almost die out at the turn of this century.

CHAPTER II

SOME HYPOTHESES OF PIDGINIZATION

In this section, a brief review of various hypotheses presented in the literature to explain the processes of pidginization will be given. These hypotheses have been chosen because they seem to be most promising as explanations for the formation of pidgins.

II.1. THE SIMPLIFICATION HYPOTHESIS :

II.1.1. Superstratum vs. Substratum:

The processes of pidginization are explained in terms of the dominance of the "language of culture" which is simplified to accomodate situations where perfect language learning seems to be impossible: a mingling of a superstratum, prestigious (usually an Indo-European) language with elements of a substratum, non-prestigious one, e.g. a West African language or Chinese. Hall (1966:25) says: [6]

> " We must not think of a pidgin as representing a
> simply bilateral function: it is rather, a develop-
> ment of a single language (usually a European lánguage
> in modern times) with strong influences from one or
> more others, sometimes a great many, and ususally
> non-European."

This view can be expressed by the following (Traugott,1977: 74):

13

$$\frac{\text{superstrate A}}{\text{substrate B}} \longrightarrow \text{modified A}$$

It is important to note that the simplification hypothesis is argued mainly from the point of view of the superstratum language. It implies that one of the parent languages has a greater role in the formation of a pidgin.

Ferguson (1971) relates pidginization to the general ability which human beings all have to simplify their languages in various ways in talking to foreigners and babies. He claims not only that there is a general tendency to save effort in such situations, but also that human beings have some kind of intuition about what is simple in their language. Ferguson and DeBose (1977: 117) compare three types of simplified languages: foreigner talk, broken language and pidgin. They propose an interaction model to explain the formation of a pidgin:

> "We see pidginization as a process that accepts normal
> languages as input and produces a reduced, hybridized,
> and unstable variety of language as output, identified
> as broken language when used by non-native speakers
> and foreigner talk when used by native-speakers, and
> identified as a pidgin when viewed as the linguistic
> output of verbal interaction between native speakers
> and foreigners in some particular contact situations."

Ferguson and DeBose stress the distinctiveness of foreigner talk and broken language components from one another and

14

their influence on one another, though they state that "the detailed facts of how this influence operated remain to be established through empirical studies". (p.116) Their position is different from Hall's who neglects the importance of the interactive aspect of foreigner talk and broken language in the simplification process of languages.

Empirical tests on learnability have been devised to show that pidgins are simpler than normal languages and hence pidgins are easier to learn. Bold (1968:7, cited in Mühlhäusler, 1974: 71) claims that Fanagalo can be "more easily and speedily learned than any other language in the world". Mühlhäusler and Hymes seem to be concerned with the question of overall simplicity as opposed to simplicity of one of the components of a language, as simplification can take place at the cost of greater complexity in another component.

Following are the various topics which are generally discussed in the literature in terms of simplification, though most of them are still debated and need to be justified by larger data from pidgin languages on a world wide base.

II.1.2. Dominance of the Unmarked Features and Morphological Simplification:

According to Jacobson, the unmarked features are those

that are more widespread among languages in the world,
that are acquired earlier in the child's language acquisi-
tion and lost later under pathological conditions. Greenberg
(1966:29) discusses the predominance of unmarked features
as the result of linguistic neutralization. Since pidgins
are languages resulting from language interaction and neu-
tralization, the notion of markedness has been used by
many pidginists in their explanation of various types of
pidgins (Nagara,1972, in his analysis of Japanese Pidgin
English in Hawaii; Silverstein, 1972, in his analysis of
Chinook jargon).

Mühlhäusler(p.76) lists the unmarked categories which
have most often been put forward and following are the ones
which are pertinent to our present discussion:

(1) Loss of the Passive:

The Passive structure is considered by Mühlhäusler
as a morpho-syntactic category. In pidgins, examples are
found where the forms of verb are neutral between active
and passive, yet the morphologically marked category
(passive) can be expressed by the unmarked category (ac-
tive). In fact, many pidgins (Pidgin German, New Guinea,
Pidgin, Caribbean Creole) do have passive constructions
without agent that correspond to agentless passives in
European languages, and which are expressed by word order
only. In such cases the text will help one identify

16

the meaning of the sentence:

Examples: (from Decamp 1971, cited in Mühlhäusler,1974: 79)

di bota sel aaf	'the butter has been sold.'
the tree cut up	'the tree has been cut up.'
the ground can plant	'can be planted'

(2) <u>Uninflected present form as the favoured form of a verb</u>:

This may be a salient feature for a number of Euro-
pean-based pidgins but exceptions have been found in various
pidgins. Both Japanese Pidgin English and CPE have some past
participle and present participle forms from English used as
the base form of a verb. Bold (1968) shows that in Fanagalo,
a non-European -based pidgin, past tense and present passive
are morphologically signalled and the verb form used there
is different from the infinitive.

(3) <u>Preference for continuous constituents</u>:

Discontinuous elements tend to disappear in pidgins.
In New Guinea Pidgin, for instance, the positionally con-
ditioned discontinuity of verbal compounds has become an
inseparable unit: hangimapim 'to hang up' (Mühlhäusler,1974:
81) and other examples can also be found in CPE.

(4) <u>Use of masculine for all genders</u> :

It is generally agreed that "masculine is the
unmarked state of   a human noun" (Chafe,1971:111).
Pidgins based on French, Spanish and Portuguese all show

17

this dominance of masculine gender forms.

(5) <u>Use of singular in all cases</u>:

The singular is assumed less marked than the plural therefore in pidgins singular is used in all cases.

(6) <u>Relational words</u>:

Pidgins use less prepositions than their parent languages and, sometimes, there is a total absence of prepositions. The specific prepositions in European languages become "all purpose prepositions" in pidgins (Voorhoeve, 1962: 239; Taylor, 1960: 156).

The above items (1), (2), (4) and (5) are directly related to the drastic reduction of morphological complexity of pidgins which has long been noticed by most researchers as the characteristics of pidgins as simplified language. The claim of universality for this phenomenon is supported by data from many often unrelated pidgins in the world, such as Portuguese Pidgin (Whinnom 1965), the French based pidgins (Reinecke 1971), Spanish contact vernacular of the Philippine Islands (Whinnom 1965), the pidgin Sango of the Central African Republic (Berry 1971), and Kituba in the lower Congo area (Nida 1970). Le Page (1967:86) further explains that the reduction of linguistic elements is due to the fact that "the inflectional structures of two languages in contact situation rarely coincides, inflection is the commonest

18

casualty in a contact situation".

As the consequence of the loss of the inflectional categories in pidgins, word order becomes rather rigid. Normally there is one fixed sequence for all sentences, question, statement and subordinate sentence. Hymes(1971: 70) points out that "the use of word order rather than inflection, of syntax rather than morphology is a kind of simplification in outer form common to pidgins".

II.1.3. Simplification in the lexicon:

It has been observed that both imperfectly acquired second languages and pidgins make use of compounding, reduplication and periphrastic expressions to extend the lexicon, consequently, the number of lexical items is reduced. For example, one tends to say <u>no good</u> instead of <u>bad</u> in pidgins. Mühlhäusler (1974: 98) provides the following examples to show how the mechanism of making periphrastic expressions works in various pidgins:

Beach-la-mer (Churchill 1911)

He all bone got no meat	'He is thin.'
Big fellow master too much	'governor'
coconut belong him grass not stop	'He is bald, (There is no grass on his coconut)'

New Guinea:

no gut	'bad'
no kamap.	'be absent'
no gat	'lack'
no planti	'few'
fellow belong make open bottle	'corkscrew'

Fanagalo:

hayi muhle	'bad' (no good)
hayi bona	'blind' (not see)
hayi saba	'brave' (not fear)

Pidgin English: (Rogge 1957)

sit down go ahead chair	'bicycle'

Neo-Melanesian: (Hall 1964)

grass belong head,	'hair'
grass belong face	'beard'
grass belong mouth	'mustache'

Reduplication has also been found in many pidgins as a way to show emphasis, and also as a means to extend the vocabulary. Todd(1974: 19) provides some examples to show how reduplication is used in many pidgins:

(1) to extend vocabulary: In Pitcairnese, drai from dry closely parallels English in usage but draidrai means 'unpalatable'.

20

(2) <u>to distinguish homophony</u>: In Krio, <u>san</u> means 'sun'
   and <u>sansan</u> means 'sand'.

(3) <u>to express intensification, continuity, repetition</u>:
   Jamaican: <u>smal</u> 'small' but <u>smalsmal</u> 'very small'
   Neo Melanesian: <u>tɔk</u> 'talk' but <u>tɔktɔk</u> 'chat'

Another kind of simplification occurs in the lexicon
and results from the lack of derivational morphology.
In the lexicon of various pidgins, one may observe that the
same lexical item is used with different functions. The
phenomenon has been pointed out by many pidginists as con-
fusion of parts of speech or mixing of word classes. This
multifunctionality of lexical items in pidgins has been re-
ferred to as "universal bases".

> " A characteristic feature of pidgin is the presence
> of many universal bases, i.e. words which can function
> as nouns, noun and verb adjuncts, intransitive verbs
> and transitive verbs." (Wurm, 1971: 8).

> " Surface sequence is used to indicate grammatical
> function and obligatory semantic information carried
> by certain parts of speech is absent,...These features
> are not salient but most probably universal of pidgins."
> (Mühlhäusler, 1974: 103).

Examples are from Krio(Jones, 1971: 78):

| a go sing | 'I will sing.' |
| a lek dis sing. | 'I like this song.' |

21

dis sing bizness   'this singing business'

II.1.4. Weaknesses of the Simplification Hypothesis:

(1) The suggestion that pidgins are simplified languages
is possible only when it is based on the prerequisite that
one of the parent languages has a complex morphological
system which can be simplified in a contact situation.
Consequently, pidgins are defined in purely negative terms,
i.e. they are described as lacking many features of the Indo-
European languages. The simplification model will prove
little if neither of the parent languages has a complicated
morphological structure, in such cases there will be nothing
to be simplified.

Some researchers have recently cast doubt on the impor-
tance of morphological simplification as the characteris-
tics of pidgins. This view can be seen in Samarin (1971:
125):

> " Both Le Page and Hall are thinking too much about
> pidgins they are most familiar with, the ones that are
> closely linked to European languages. This view
> ignores the possibility that pidginization could occur
> without the drastic reduction of an inflectional system.
> Moreover, pidginization can certainly occur when the
> source language has very little inflection."

So far, most of the pidgins which have been analyzed
have an Indo-European language as a parent language,

therefore the simplification hypothesis does capture the
general tendency of the better known pidginization process-
es. However, any theory of pidginization which is mainly
based on the analysis of Indo-European language based data
will be rather inadequate. John Reinecke (1977: IX) points
out:

> "I am strongly of the opinion - based, I admit,
> only on a hunch - that theoretical treatment of
> pidginization and creolization will remain seriously
> incomplete as long as it is based almost wholly
> on languages of European lexicon. But only a few
> non-European-based pidgins and creoles have been
> described with anything approaching adequacy, and
> those few are seldom drawn upon for comparative
> purposes."

(2) A few linguists have cast doubts on the notion of sim-
plification in pidgins and they point out that pidgins are
not simple at all. "It is now considered debatable whether
the less redundant pidgin is simpler or more complex than
standard language " (Decamp 1971). It seems that the notion
of simplification is difficult to be applied satisfactorily
in explaining the syntactic structures of pidgins. In judging
whether one structure is simpler than a corresponding struc-
ture, one has to set up certain criteria of simplicity which
are universally accepted. (It is, for example, debatable
which order, SVO or SOV is simpler.) The lack of Passive

construction is said to be an indication of simplification
in the syntactic structure, yet it could also be considered
as a case of stylistic impoverishment rather than simplifi-
cation. Besides, simplicity of language should be concerned
with the overall simplicity rather than one of the components
of the grammar.

(3) The concept of superstratum and substratum dichotomy
held by some simplificationists is rather questionable. It
seems in some cases (like CPE), it is rather difficult to
apply this concept. From a social point of view, the English
speakers of CPE are supposed to be on a higher plane than the
Chinese speakers. However, the latter often held English
language and its speakers in low esteem, as mentioned above.

Most of the pidginists in the seventies would hold the
view that "the two or more languages that functioned as input
to the pidginization process were equal partners linguis-
tically". (Traugott, 1977: 75). Ferguson's interactive model
is a step forward because it recognizes the importance of the
roles of all the languages involved in the formation of a
pidgin.

II.2. THE UNIVERSAL HYPOTHESIS :

Some researchers tackle the problem of pidginization
from a different perspective: they try to show that pidgin

structures are closer to some kind of universal deep
structure, others try to explain pidginization by using
Greenberg's implicational universals. (If X exists, then
Y is expected also to exist in a language.)

II.2.1. Kay and Sankoff's proposal:

Kay and Sankoff (1974) make the following hypotheses:
(1) In a contact situation, the shared structures of both
languages will be the first and perhaps the only ones that
speakers learn to produce and interpret correctly in the
other's language, and they are closer to universal structures.
(2) If a is closer to the universal deep structure than b,
then a resultant pidgin may be more likely to adopt a than b,
since it may be easier for speakers to learn a than b.
(3) The syntactic derivations of pidgins are shallower than
those of natural languages and they reflect universal deep
(semantic) structure in their surface more directly than do
natural languages.

We can see that Kay and Sankoff's proposal consists of
two notions: common denominator and universal deep structure.
It has long been observed (Hall, Richardson, Cassidy, Silver-
stein, etc.) that the structure of a pidgin is "drawn chiefly
from those features which are common " to both parent lan-
guages (Hall, 1952: 142). Bickerton (1977: 50), however,
argues strongly against this assumption based   on his obser-

.25

vation of Hawaiian pidgin; he says:

> " The first assumption (shared feature) is false because
> any underlying structure both broad enough to be uni-
> versal and rich enough to escape the triviality of the
> 'all-language-have-oral vowels type of universality'
> must be abstract, at least enough to reconcile English
> and Japanese (which have NO 'shared surface structure'),
> and thus can have little in common with the surface
> structures of the so-called natural languages, be they
> ever so simple."

However, Bickerton's argument does not invalidate the
notion of common denominator, since it is obvious that such
a notion applies only to a situation where there are "shared
features" at the surface.

Kay and Sankoff go further and they claim that the shared
features represent universal deep structures. (It should be
noted that what constitutes the universal deep structures
has not been made clear.) Silverstein (1972: 620) also supports
the universal tendencies as he writes:

> " If each speaker retains in his grammar for Chinook
> Jargon sentence production essentially these more
> basic and expectable features of his primary language,
> then of course we expect the surface forms to merge as
> the result of universal tendencies."

Kay and Sankoff's claim about the shallowness in syn-
tactic derivation of pidgins is a rather strong claim which

predicts that when two distinct structures are in conflict, the one existing in the resultant pidgin will be the one with a shallower derivation. The hypothesis will not hold if evidence can show:

a) that structures in pidgin do not necessarily have a shallowness in their syntactic derivation

or b) that structures from the two parent languages co-exist in the resultant pidgin; one structure corresponds to a non-terminal string in one of the parent language while another structure corresponds to a terminal string of derivation.

We will see that both (a) and (b) can be found from the CPE data (See IV.3.2.).

Mühlhäusler (1974: 94) also makes a similar proposal regarding the syntactic structures of pidgins. He claims that the sequence of pidgin sentences may be directly related to some meaningful deep structures order, and that permutation and deletion transformations will be much less common in pidgins. Less embedding is expected and pidgins show a definite predilection for short "kernel"-like sentences.

The universalist's proposal does not explain the innovative structures in pidgins, which cannot be described in terms of shallowness of derivation. Furthermore, the universalist's hypothesis only deals with the syntactic

structures of a pidgin and it does not account for other
linguistic levels of pidgins, such as the lexicon and the
word formation mechanism and therefore it is not sufficient
to be used to describe the whole linguistic system of a
pidgin.

II.2.2. Greenberg's implicational universals:

Various linguists have used the implicational universals
to test the pidginization process. Silverstein (1972) shows
that the structures of Chinook Jargon supports Greenberg's
implicational universals in many cases, and he states that
the evidence from Chinook Jargon is an "important contribu-
tion to establishing and confirming universals in languages".
He further points out (p.619) :

> "Greenberg's universals (1963) may be construed as
> predictions about what form this Jargon result of
> convergence will take, since they should be applied
> to both our base languages simultaneously."

Naro (1975), however, provides some counter-examples to
Greenberg's implicational universals (examples are from
CPE) to argue that pidginization is not a natural language
change but, rather, a result of "conscious attempts of
adults". He (p.14) says :

> "Natural change is caused by unconscious modifications
> of the rules of the innovating grammar, which, however

remains a natural grammar. Pidginization, and thus
creolization, on the other hand, is caused, in part,
by conscious attempts at simplification by adult
speakers and in part, by conscious attempts at learning
by such speakers. The pidgin that results from this
process is not necessarily of the same forms as a
natural language."

II.3. THE LEXICAL REPLACEMENT HYPOTHESIS:

(SECOND LANGUAGE ACQUISITION MODEL)

The more conventional formula of treating pidgins as
made of the vocabulary of one language and the grammar of
another is now used by some researchers (Bateson, Baron,
Silverstein, Bickerton, Naro) as the starting point of their
argument. They claim that in a contact situation, native
speakers speak with the structures of their mother tongue
but introduce items of the target language in varying degrees.
Bateson (1943) shows that Neo-Melanesian pidgin is a sys-
tematic fitting of English vocabulary to Melanesian grammar.
Silverstein (1972) states that the speakers of the Chinook
Jargon retain the basics of their native grammars and from
that generate surface structures superficially similar to
those of English.

Bickerton (1975: 126) argues strongly that:
(1) Pidginization is a special case of second language
acquisition, as he says:

"In the early stages, a pidgin is communication by
any means and at any cost; at a rather later stage,
it becomes an exercise in second-language learning
under extremely adverse condition."

(2) Inconsistency and instability are characteristics of
pidgins, as he says:

" In neither of these stages is a pidgin stabilized or
consistent; it is indeed something akin to the macaro-
nic blends or interlingual corruptions which Decamp
(1971) denied that pidgins were."

Naro (1978) supports Bickerton in stressing the irregu-
larity of pidgin structures and refers to the cause of this
state of affairs as "selective adoption".

(3) The idea proposed by universalists that the pidgin
speakers have some kind of access to underlying structures
and relation is invalid. If the surface structures of
pidgins were closer to the universal deep structures, the
speakers of Japanese Pidgin English in Hawaii would have
consistently acquired the SVO order. (If we assume that
the SVO word order is the universal deep structure, though
this has have never been demonstrated by Kay and Sankoff.)

The whole process of pidginization is pictured by
Bickerton (1977: 54) as follows:

First: At the earliest stages, the speaker uses his native
        tongue and relexifies only a few key words which

30

are thoroughly rephonologized to accord with the
substratum sound system.

Later: "more superstrate lexicon will be acquired, but
may still be rephonologized and slotted into syntac-
tic structures drawn from the substrate."

Finally: "When relexification is complete down to gramma-
tical items, substrate syntax will be partially
retained, and will alternate, apparently unpredic-
tably, with structures imported from the superstrate."

The lexical replacement theory is markedly different
from those of the simplificationists and the universalists.
It stresses the important role of the speakers of the sub-
stratum language. It is they who initiate the whole process
of pidginization and the grammar of the substratum language
serves as the basic structures of pidgins. (They are not
necessarily the shared structures of the parent languages
or closer to the universal deep structure as claimed by the
universalists.)

Bickerton's proposal does not make the following
points clear:

(1) Which lexical items from the superstratum language
have the priority to be adopted in pidgin, i.e. are
the lexical items adopted by the substratum speakers in
their inflected forms or is there some kind of sim-

31

plification process involved at the same time?

(2) At the later stage, after rephonologized words from the superstratum language are slotted into the syntactic structures "drawn from the substratum language", is there some principle involved in the selection of the syntactic structures?

(3) It is by no means clear that the pidgin speakers of the superstratum language at the initial stage retain their own syntactic structures to communicate with the speakers of the substratum language or modify them to some extent or select those which are acceptable to the speakers of the substratum language. The model provides little explanation to the similarities among the morphological and syntactic similarities among world's pidgins.

Consequently, it seems more plausible to presume that the syntactic structures of a pidgin stem from all languages involved. It is a convergence of all the systems, with modifications and a kind of compromise on every one's part.

II.4. A SYNTHETIC MODEL :

The model on which my analysis of CPE will be based

is a synthetic one. The morphology of CPE will be analysed
in the light of the simplification hypothesis, as this
hypothesis will be supported by much of the evidence from
the data of CPE. This is because the superstratum language
of CPE is one of the Indo-European languages with complex
derivational and inflectional morphology. However, the
word formation rules can be analysed more satisfactorily
according to the lexical replacement hypothesis.

The syntactic structures of CPE will be mainly explain-
ed in terms of Common Denominator - a notion mentioned by
most researchers, and yet it has not been formally formu-
lated and used in the explanation of the formation of pidgin
structures. We will find that the structures of CPE are
often a convergence of English and Chinese.

CHAPTER III

MORPHOLOGY OF CPE

Chapter III and IV will be concerned with the analysis of some CPE structures viewed in the light of the three hypotheses mentioned above. The main approach in this thesis is to analyze CPE by comparing it to Chinese and English. The parent languages will be treated as equal partners linguistically.

III.1. DOMINANCE OF UNMARKED FEATURES:

Data from CPE provide convincing examples to show the dominance of the unmarked features proposed by the simplificationists. For instance, one finds not only the elimination of number and gender markers, but also the non-existence of verbs in their inflected forms. Occasionally, some verbs do occur in other forms instead of their uninflected forms, such as the appearence of _ing_ in CPE; however, this by no means will imply that the Chinese pidgin speakers acquired the syntactic function of these inflected forms. Hall's treatment of _ing_ in his analysis as gerundive suffix seems rather questionable. Hall (1944: 98) analyses the function of _ing_ as :

"making forms which may be used as verbs, adjectives, or nouns". As verbs, they have "durative"meaning;

as adjectives, they have "present participial meaning";
as nouns, they indicate "the action of the verb".

EX: <u>Verb (durative meaning)</u>:

    gəsnaw reniŋ   'Now it is raining.'

    gardən-man wetiŋ   'The gardener is waiting.'

    <u>Adjective (P.P. meaning)</u> :

    sofər biloŋ wetiŋ   ' The chauffeur is wait-
                                 ing.'

    <u>Noun (action of the verb)</u> :

    Hav gat blidiŋ kem dawn.   'There is bleeding
                              coming down.'

    Plenti bambiŋ   'Much bombing'

Hall's treatment of -<u>ing</u> in CPE seems to be a
counterexample to the markedness theory which predicts
only uninflected forms will occur as a result of neutra-
lization in contact situations.

The use of inflected verb forms should by no means
imply that the CPE speakers are using these verb forms
according to their original functions. If we take another
look at the only four verbs appearing in their participial
forms, <u>reniŋ</u>, <u>bomiŋ</u>, <u>wetiŋ</u>, <u>blidiŋ</u>, we will notice that
they are probably acquired by the Chinese CPE speakers as a
whole unit since these words never appear in other forms
in the data. The few occurrences of verbs in their in-
flected forms are probably the consequence of the heavy
functional load of these forms. Evidence has shown that

35

lexical items often are picked up in their inflected forms by pidgin speakers as well as other second language learners.[7] Unless the data shows the consistent use of both bound and unbound forms, it is dangerous to conclude that the pidgin speakers have actually acquired the function of these inflected forms.

III.2. WORD-FORMATION (COMPOUNDING & REDUPLICATION) :

Compounding, reduplication and periphrastic expressions are the most common mechanism to form new expressions in pidgins. In CPE, only compounding and reduplication are used, periphrastic expressions are scarce. This seems to be a direct influence from Chinese.

The basic type of word construction in Chinese is compounding. Generally speaking, there are five basic kinds of compound, i.e. coordinate compounds (CC), subordinative compounds (SC), verb-object compounds (VO), verb-complement compounds(VC), and subject-predicate compounds (SP) (Ching, 1977). CPE and Chinese look very much alike in this respect. The following data will show that the word formation rules of CPE mostly correspond to those of Chinese:

	CPE	Chinese [8]	Gloss
CC:	moto-kar tikət	chē-zhào	license
	gardən-men	yuán-dǐng	gardener
	caw-watər	shí-shuǐ	drinking water

36

SC:	bifor-taim	yǐqián-shíhǒu	before
	propar-tɔk	kèqide-shǔo	polite
	hu-man	hé-rén	who
VO:	lərn-pigin	xué-yì	apprentice
	sin-song	chàng-gē	sing
	wɔk-rud	zǒu-lù	walk
VC:	luk-si	kàn-jiàn	see
	du-finis	zuò-wán	finish
	sendi-kəm	sòng-lai	send (here)
	sendi-go	sòng-qù	send (there)
SP:	small chils-play pigeon	ér-xì	not serious

Reduplication is also used in CPE to show either inten-
sification or casualness as they are used in Chinese.

	CPE	Chinese	Gloss
Intensification:	kɔf-kɔf	kē-kē	cough a lot
	fajti-fajti	dǎ-dǎ	fight a lot
Casualness:	go ple ple	qù wán wán	go and play
	go wɔki wɔki	qù zǒu zǒu	take a walk

III. 3. REDUCTION OF FORMS:

If simplification is defined as a process aiming at
introducing more regularity into the language as proposed
by the simplificationists, we can see evidence for this
process in the structure of adverbial phrases of place

and manner, and in the use of measure words.

III.3.1. Adverbial phrases of Place:

The basic structure of an adverbial phrase of place in
Chinese constitutes four elements:

zài 'at'   noun   locality   biān 'side'

                  lǐ   'in'

                  wài   'out'

                  shàng   'on'

                  xià   'down'

                   .
                   .
                  etc.

EX:

(1) zài   fángzi   wài biān wár   'play at outside house'
    | | | | | (play outside the
    at   house   out side play   the house)

(2) zài   lǐ   biān xíuxi   'take a rest at inside'
    | | | | (take a rest inside'
    at   in   side rest

(3) zài yín-háng lǐ biān gōngzuò   'work at inside bank'
    | | | | | (Work at the bank)
    at   bank   in side work

(4) zài dìbǎn   shàng biān tiàowǔ   'dance on topside of
    | | | | | floor'
    at   floor   top   side dance   (dance on the floor)

In CPE, as they are shown below, only sajd 'side'
is retained to indicate locality. Compare the use of sajd
with the equivalent structures of Chinese and English, we
can say the use of adverbial phrase of locality is much

38

simplified in CPE. For instance, one has to use <u>zài...lǐbian</u> 'at...inside' in Chinese, <u>at</u>(or <u>on</u>,<u>in</u>) in English. Besides, the choice of <u>sajd</u> is by no means random, <u>sajd</u> is the only feature which are shared by both speakers of Chinese and English in their structures of adverbial phrase of locality.

CPE	Chinese	English
ðis-sajd	zài zhè-biān (at this-side)	here
aw-sajd	zài wài-biān (at out-side)	outside
haws-sajd	zài jiā-lǐbian) (at house-inside)	in the house
kičən-sajd	zài chúfáng-lǐbian (at kitchen-inside)	in the kitchen
ofis-sajd	zài bàngōngshì-lǐbian (at office-inside)	in the office
soŋhaj-sajd	zài Shànghǎi-nà bian (at Shanghai that side)	in Shanghai
telər-sajd	zài cáifeng-nà bian (at tailor that side)	at the tailor's
bank-sajd	zài yínhāng-lǐbian (at bank in side)	in the bank

III.3.2. Adverbial phrase of manner:

The use of the word <u>faṣən</u> 'fashion' also shows this kind of levelling when it is compared with the equivalent structure of English.

CPE	Chinese	English

39

ðis-fašən	zhège-yàngsi (this-fasion)	in this way
hwa-fašən	shénma-yàngzi (what-fasion)	in what way
sem-fašən	yíge-yàngzi (one-fashion)	same kind
merikən-fašən	meǐguo-yàngzi (America-fashion)	American style

III.3.3. The use of classifier pisi:

One of the characteristics of the Chinese language is
the obligatory use of a classifier between a numeral
(or a specifier) and a noun. In most cases, the classifier
is a redundant feature which carries no semantic con-
tent. These classifiers are many in kind and different
nouns require the use of different classifiers. Among
them, the most commonly used is the classifier ge which
can be used before most of the nouns. The Chinese classifiers
usually do not have equivalents in English, as in English
only a few classifiers are used.

Chinese	English
yì zhāng zhǐ	a piece of paper
liǎng ge rén	two (heads of) persons
sān tiáo niú	three heads of cattle
sì kuài táng	four pieces of candies
wǔ ke cai	five heads of cabbages
zhei zhǐ fénbǐ	this piece of chalk

nei kuai bù	that piece of cloth
nei běn shū	which (volume) of book
zhei bǎ dao	this (piece?) of knife

'As we can see from above, the use of a classifier in English is rather inconsistent, e.g. one uses <u>a piece of chalk</u> but a pencil, <u>a head of cattle</u> but a dog, <u>a piece of candy</u> but a marble. In any case, the most commonly used classifier in English is undoubtedly <u>piece</u> which is, equivalent to the Chinese <u>ge</u> and the CPE <u>pisi</u>. The use of <u>pisi</u> as a classifier in CPE is a reflection of the fact that such a use is a shared feature of both Chinese and English. However, the complicated system of using different classifiers for different nouns in Chinese is reduced to the use of only one classifier <u>pisi</u> for all occasions in CPE.

Hall's description of the occurence of CPE <u>pisi</u> has been widely quoted by various writers; however, his observation definitely needs to be modified in order to account for the facts of CPE. He states: (1964: 377)

> " This was the case with the Chinese Pidgin English
> numeral suffixes /-pisi/ and /-felɔ/, e.g. in such
> numerals as /wenpisi/'one (inanimate)' and /wenfelɔ/
> 'one (animate)': in the classical nineteenth century
> form of Chinese Pidgin English, 'one house' was
> /wenpisi haws/, 'one man' was /wenfelɔ man/. In
> Chinese Pidgin English these forms were bound, occur-
> ing only suffixed to numerals; but they developed

out of the English nouns piece and fellow, respec-
tively, on the model of the Chinese use of numeral
classifiers,e.g... In the twentieth century CPE,
the suffix /-felɔ/ went out of use, and with it
went the syntactical contrast between animate nouns
and inanimate...Derivational patterns, in general, are
those of the source."

Hall's statement needs to be modified in the follow-
ing ways:

(1) pisi as a measure word occurs, like its equivalent in
Chinese, not only after numerals but also after specifiers
and quantifiers, such as 'this', 'that','which','many' etc.
as well.

     EX: me bilon plenty piecee boy

             Any piecee news have got?

             Dat piece wifoo

(2) Hall seems to think that the use of pisi developed
only on the model of Chinese, and he ignores the fact that
in English classifiers are also used (though not as fre-
quently as it is used in Chinese). The appearence of pisi
in CPE can be more satisfactorily accounted for in terms
of common denominator rather than as a pure substratum
influence.

(3) There is no record of felɔ in any of the sources from
the nineteenth century. This point has been brought up by
Bauer (1974) who argues that Hall's theory is "based rather

on grammatical, theoretical considerations than on critical
scrutinizing of the sources".

(4) The fact that there are some evidence from the nineteenth
century data where no classifier is used [9] is not pointed
out by Hall. The inconsistency in the use of classifiers
can be explained as one of the characteristics of the process
of pidginization claimed by Bickerton.

III.4. LEXICAL EXTENSION :

A wide phenomenon in pidgins is that the semantic contents
of lexical items are usually extended. "There is a very strong
tendency in pidgins to subsume under one sign with fairly wide
valeurs what in the target languages were two or more signs".
(Mühlhäusler, 1974:109). He observes that "a pidgin that is
lexically related to English would not be expected to differ-
entiate between mutton and sheep or pork and pig (such as in
New Guinea pidgin)."

The data from CPE provides many examples of lexical ex-
tension. As we can see from the following data, the forms
of words are definitely English but there is a clear corres-
pondence with Chinese meaning and function of the corresponding
verbs. [10]

(1) wončī : Wončī 'want' in CPE means 'want', 'take', 'bound to',
             'going to', or 'should' which reflect the meanings
             of yaò in Chinese.

43

CPE	Chinese	English
Hawmač ju wonči ?	Nǐ yaò duōshao ?	How much do you want ?
Mas wonči ten de mor.	Yaò shí tián.	It takes more ehan ten days.
Mas wonči meki daj.	Yaò sǐ le.	He is bound to die.
Gardən wonci spojləm.	Yuánzi yaò huaì le.	The garden will be ruined.
Hi wonči spit.	Tā yaò tù le.	He is going to vomit.
Ju mas wonči puti kloz.	Nǐ yaò chuān yīfu.	You should put on clothes.

(2) Luk-si: It means 'watch', 'take a look', 'look like', and 'see'.

CPE	Chinese	English
luk-si hors	kàn mǎ.	Watch the horse.
Luk-si solgər kəm nokəm ?	Kàn bīng laíle meiyou?	Take a look if the soldiers are coming ?
Luk-si olsem cikən.	Kàn zhe xiàng jī.	Looks like chicken,
Luk-si movi.	Kàn diànyǐng.	See a movie.

(3) Pe : It means 'give', 'pay', 'let', 'take'.

CPE	Chinese	English
Pe mi ðat pensil.	Geǐ wǒ neìge qīanbǐ.	Give me that pencil.
Dinər can pay one piecee sirlon.	Wǎnfàn geǐ wǒ niúpaí.	Give me one piece sirloin for dinner.
my too much olo fatar pay that sheep he chaw.	Fùqin geǐ yáng chī caò.	My old father let the sheep eat there.
Pe bebi go gardən.	Peí haízi qù huāyuán,	Take the baby to the garden.

Whoman raidi whoman **pay**.	Shei qí shei **gei** qián.	Whoever rides pays it.
Pay they go home.	**Gei** tāmen huíjiā.	**Let** them go home.

Similarly, the use of **tɔki** meaning 'say', 'tell', 'call' or 'talk' in CPE, though it has no correspondence in Chinese, it may be viewed as an example of simplification.

CPE	English
Misi **tɔki** twelv dolər tuməči.	Madame says $12.00 being too much.
Tɔki kuk, ama, evi man go.	**Tell** the cook, amah, and every one may go.
Tu pici šip **tɔki** Don Juan.	Two ships **called** Don and Juan.
Tɔki məstər what time hi wanči chawchaw.	**Ask** the master what time he wants to eat.

The evidence from the CPE lexicon seems to support both the hypotheses of simplification and lexical replacement. From the point of view of the superstratum language, the process can be considered as simplification; however, from the point of view of the substratum language, the pidginization process in the lexicon confirms the claim of the lexical replacement theory which says that "the speakers retain the basics of their native grammar" (Silverstein, 1972), "slotting newly-acquired vocabulary into surface structures characteristic of (their) own language" (Bickerton, 1976).

The CPE speakers, in this case, acquire the lexical

45

items from English and restructure them according to the semantic and morphological rules of Chinese. In fact, the earlier observation on CPE as "English words arranged according to Chinese words" (Chinese Repository 1837) reveals certain facts about its pidginization process.

CHAPTER IV

SYNTAX OF CPE

This chapter will include analyses of some syntactic
structures of CPE. The CPE structures will be viewed as
the convergence of English and Chinese. In all cases, a
contrastive analysis of the corresponding structures of
English and Chinese will be presented to prepare for an
analysis of their convergence in CPE.

The data will be organized and presented in such a
way as to show that the syntactic structures of CPE are
drawn from the underlying shared structures of both English
and Chinese in a rather systematic fashion.

IV.1. OBVIOUS CASES OF COMMON DENOMINATOR:

IV.1.1. The use of copula:

It is generally agreed that a copula tends to be absent
in pidgins more so than in normal languages. (Ferguson 1971)
The absence of copula is listed by Hall (1966) as the first
characteristic of all pidginized English.[11] Hall's obser-
vation on copula deletion is disconfirmed by evidence from
the CPE data which shows the frequent use of the copula
<u>bilon</u>. The presence of a copula in CPE can best be explained
by the notion of common denominator.

First, let us take a look at the function of the copula shi in Chinese. Unlike be used in English equational sentence, shi in Chinese is used only when the equational sentence has a noun or pronoun in its predicate; shi is not used whenever an adjective appears as the predicate of the sentence, unless it is for the purpose of emphasis.

Chinese	English

(1) Tā hǎo.
    | |
   he good
	He (or she) is (or was) good.

(2) Tā shi xuésheng.
    | | |
   he be   student
	He (or she) is (or was) a student.

(3) Tā shì hǎo.
    | | |
   he be good
	He (or she) is (or was) good.
	(For sure he is good.)

In Chinese, shi is neutral in tense, tense is expressed by other markers or time words, a copula is redundant in (1), unless it is used for the purpose of emphasis, as in (3). In (2), shi is used as the main verb. Its appearence is obligatory, otherwise the sentence will become a phrase with the meaning 'his student', since de of tade 'his' is frequently deleted in Chinese. [12]

(4) tā (de) xuésheng   'his student'
    \| \| \|
   he poss.suff. student

In English, the use of copula is obligatory in all cases, It also has the function of indicating tense. When Chinese

is compared with English regarding the use of the copula,
it seems that there is no reason why a copula should be
absent in CPE, as it is a shared feature of both parent
languages. We can see from our data that the CPE copula
bilon is used, like be in English, when the predicate con-
tains an adjective or a noun, the only difference being
that bilon does not carry tense as it is not inflected.

CPE	Gloss
Maj buk bilon tu ole.	'My book is too old.'
Twelv dolər bilon tuməči.	'Twelve dollars is too much.'
Thiseə day b'long too muchee hot.	'It is too hot these days.'
Ðat bilon veri gud.	'That is very good.'
Maj hed bilon veri sor.	'My head is very sore.'
Ten de mor bilon tu lon tajm.	'More than ten days is too long.'
That no belong my pidgin.	'That is not my business.'

Bilon, however, does not appear in all cases where be
would occur in English. It is absent when the predicate
is a locative (where zai, not shì, is used in Chinese.).

CPE	Gloss
Tuməči dəst tebel tapsajd.	'There is too much dust on the table.'
Hwasajd misi dor-ki ?	'Where is madame's key ?'

When be is used as an auxiliary with a present participle

in English to indicate the progressive aspect (where zal is used in Chinese), biloŋ is sometimes present and sometimes absent.

Gardən-man wetiŋ.	'The gardener is waiting.'
Gəs naw reniŋ.	'It is raining now.'

but:

Maj biloŋ polisiŋ ðis flo.	'I am polishing the floor.'
Sofər biloŋ wetiŋ.	'The chauffeur is waiting.'

The data seems to show that the copula biloŋ is used more than shi is used in Chinese and less than be is used in English. In any case, CPE provides a counter example to the claim that the absence of copula is a substantive feature of all pidgins. [13]

IV.1.2. Subordination:

According to Hall, true subordinating conjunctions are rather rare in pidgins.

> "True subordinating conjunctions- that is, forms
> functioning exclusively as introductory elements in
> clauses, like Neo-Melanesian spos 'if' - are re-
> latively rare; it is only at a later stage, when the
> pidgin or the creole has been exposed to learned
> influence from an European language, then the sophis-
> ticated habit of using extensive subordination be-
> comes widespread."

50

However, the subordinating conjunction _spos_ 'if' is used frequently in CPE. This can be explained by the fact that Chinese and English share one subordinating structure. We can see that there is a one-to-one correspondence between the structures of English, Chinese and CPE.

Chinese: <u>Yàoshi</u> tā chī jīgǔtou , tā hèi gěngzhu.

English: <u>If</u> he eats chickenbone, he will be choked.

CPE : <u>Spos</u> hi čaw čikən-bon, hi čokən.

Chinese: <u>Yàoshi</u> nǐ bù néng laí, nǐ dǎ diànhuà.

English: <u>If</u> you can't come, you telephone.

CPE : <u>Spos</u> ju no kan kəm, ju tɔk telefon.

It is interesting to note that another type of subordinating conjunction is non-existent in CPE: the <u>when</u> subordinator; this may be due to the fact that the corresponding structures of English and Chinese are quite different.

Chinese: Wo xiao <u>de shishou</u>, hen pang.
    I be small when very fat

English: <u>When</u> I was small, was fat.

<u>When</u> is used at the beginning of the clause in English, while in Chinese <u>de shishou</u> is placed at the end of the clause. In CPE, the clause appears without a subordinator.

EX: He go this side, stap haw long time?
 ' When he went there, how long did he stay?'

51

He hav go this side, he hav stap three day.

'When he went there, he stayed for three days.'

Ju, come this sajd, hav catch train come, hav come busside?'

'When you came here, did you take a train to come
or did you come by bus?'

IV.2.   OPAQUE CASES OF COMMON DENOMINATOR:

This section will deal with another case of common deno-
minator which is not as straight-forward as the one discussed
above. The following cases involve the convergence of struc-
tures which are existent in both Chinese and English; however,
the involved structure may correspond to more than one struc-
tures in one of the parent languages or in both languages.

The mechanism involved can be shown as follows:

Chinese: structure X and X'

                                        CPE: X

English: structure X

  or

Chinese: structure X

                                        CPE: X

English: structures X and X'

  or

Chinese: structures X and Y

                                        CPE: X

English: structures X and Z

IV.2.1.   Chinese has more than one structure :

(1)   The SVO word order:

52

Chinese is a SVO language but it has been undergoing
a word order change from SVO to SOV during the past two
millennia (Li and Thompson, 1973). Evidence is also given
by Li and Thompson (1974) which demonstrates the continuous
and the gradual elimination of the SVO sentences in modern
Mandarin. Thus, if the verb is a lexical compound or the
verb phrase is modified by an adverb, the SOV construction
is always preferred and in some cases obligatory. Consequently,
modern Chinese syntax shows the distinctive two types of
word order - SVO and SOV. Li(1975) offers the following
examples:

(1) Zhāng-sān bǎ fángzi shōushi-gānjing le   (SOV)
    Zhang-san part. house arrange-clean asp.

    'Zhang-san cleaned the house.'

(2) Zhāng-sān shōushi-gānjing fángzi le   (SVO)
    Zhang-san arrange-clean   house asp.

    'Zhang-san cleaned the house.'

(1) is preferred, however, over (2) because the verb
shōushi-gāngjing 'arrange-clean' is a compound.
(ba is a particle used before the object which is transposed
from a post verbal to a preverbal position.)

If the verb is modified by an adverbial phrase such as
yí-dùn 'once', the SOV order is often the only acceptable
one, such as (3):

53

(3) Zhāng-āan bǎ Lǐ-sì dǎ le yí-dùn.   (SOV)

    Zhang-san part. Li-si hit asp. once

'Zhang-san hit Li-si once.'

(4) * Zhāng-sān dǎ le yí-dùn Lǐ-sì.   (SVO)

    Zhang-san hit asp. once Li-si

However, since the SOV order is non-existent in English
we would expect the shared structure - SVO to be the one
used in CPE. The data confirms our assumption, there is no
trace of the SOV order in CPE. The word order is unexcep-
tionally SVO.

EX: Mastər wonči car.   'The master wants the car.'

        He čaw čiken-bon.   'He eats chicken-bone.'

(2) Post-verbal position of prepositional phrases:

Accompanying the emergence and the spread of the new
SOV and the ba-construction just discussed, the Chinese
syntax shows a shift of prepositional phrases from post-
verbal position to pre-verbal position. In modern Chinese,
PPs are mostly in preverbal positions, but also appear in
the post-verbal position.

There are two prepositional phrases, those introduced
by gei 'to,for' and zai 'at', which can occur in both pre-
and post-verbal positions (Liand Thompson, 1975), though
there are some semantic distinctions between the two positions.[14]

In English, the position of the prepositional phrase is distinctively post verbal, though it can undergo a PP preposing transformation, by which the PPs are preposed to a sentence initial position; however, it can not occupy the pre-verbal position as it does in Chinese (Jackendoff, 1972)[15].

> EX: John will lose his wallet <u>in the garden</u>.
>
> <u>In the garden</u>, John will lose his wallet.
>
> * John will <u>in the garden</u> lose his wallet.

Since the post-verbal position is the shared position of Chinese and English, it is expected to occur in CPE. The data provides us with numerous examples in which a post-verbal prepositional phrase is found.

<u>CPE</u>	<u>Gloss</u>
Maj meki veri popa fo ju.	'I will make it properly for you.'
You got any pidgin for my?	'Do you have any business for me?'
Ju kan kači fo maj?	'Can you get it for me?'
Maj go šapsajd.	'I am going to the shop.'
Maj hav kəm Inglensajd.	'I came from England.'

IV.2.2. English has more than one structure:

Possessive Construction:

In the possessive construction of English, both orders

NG and GN exist (Greenberg, 1966:76). In English, for ins-
tance, one could say <u>John's house</u> or <u>the house of John</u>. In
Chinese., however, only the GN order is acceptable.

EX: fùqin   de   maòzi   'father's hat'
    | | |
    father G.part. hat

In CPE, the shared structure GN is adopted, though
there is no morphological marker to indicate possession,
the word order alone indicates possession, i.e. :

<u>possessor</u> precedes <u>possessed</u>

ju buk   'your book'

maj mother grev 'my mother's grave'

hi haus   'his house'

It is interesting to note that the order of the
possessive construction in Neo-Melanesian is just the oppo-
site (<u>possessed</u> preceeds <u>possessor</u>) despite the fact that
both Neo-Melanesian and CPE have English as their supers-
tratum language.

EX: House bilong papa bilong misi   'the house of the
                                      father of the mis-
                                      tress'

    haws bilong mi   'house of me,
                                      my house'

It seems that the only plausible explanation to the occurrence
of the possessive construction in different orders in CPE
and Neo-Melanesian is due to the fact that there are two

orders in English : <u>GN</u> and <u>NG</u>, one is the shared structure with Chinese and the other one with Melanesian.

IV.2.3. Both English and Chinese have more than one structure:

When both Chinese and English have more than one structure, it can be shown that only the structure which is shared by both Chinese and English will be retained in CPE.

(1) <u>Have as past tense marker</u>:

<u>Yŏu</u> 'have' is used with a similar function as <u>have</u> is used in English. Past tense in both Chinese and English can be indicated by <u>yŏu</u> 'have'. However, in English past tense [16] can also be expressed by inflected verbs while in Chinese a particle <u>le</u> can occur. [17]

<u>Chinese</u>		<u>English</u>
yŏu chī fàn	or	have eaten
chī fàn le		ate
meiyou chi fan	or	have not eaten
		didnot eat

Not surprisingly, <u>hav</u> will be chosen as the past tense marker in CPE.

EX: hi hav go awt.   'he went out.'

    haw fašən ju hav kem?   'How did you come?'

    Maj hav kači bəs.   ' I took the bus.'

57

Tude maj hav go tawnsajd.	'Today I went downtown.'
Maj hav tɔki.	'I said.'
Maj hav go se wen futdoktər.	'I went to see a foot doctor.'

Besides its function as a past tense marker, the word
yǒu in Chinese has two other meanings: 'there is (or there
are)' and 'have'. In CPE, these two meanings are expressed
by the phrase hav gat.

EX: CPE   Chinese

Hav gat plenti bomiŋ.   Yǒu hěnduō hōngzhà.

                                'There is much bombing.'

Hav gat wən ledi kəm   Yǒu yíge nyǔren laí diànhuà.
telefon.   ' There is a lady telephoning.'

(2) Adverbs of time:

The adverbs of punctual time appear in two positions
in Chinese: sentence initially and preverbally. In English,
the adverbs of punctual time can occur sentence initially
and sentence finally. In CPE, punctual time words occur
most frequently sentence initially as it is the shared feature
of the parent languages. The preverbal position is an idio-
syncratic feature of Chinese and it is non-existent in CPE.
However, the sentence final position of English occur occa-
tionally in CPE. [18]

CPE	Chinese	English
tudé maj hav go tawnsajd.	Jīntian wǒ jìn chéng qu le.	Today I went downtown.
tunajt hav gat fajv man caw dinər.	Jīnwǎn yǒu wǔge rén lai chīfàn.	Tonight there will be five people to eat dinner.
jestərde najt maj hav fo dawn.	Zuótian yèli wǒ shuāi jiǎo le.	Last night I fell down.
tude maj no kon du propər ?	Jīntian wǒ zuòde bù haǒ.	Today I can't do it very well.
tumolo maj no kon kəm.	Míngtian wǒ bù néng lai.	Tomorrow I can't come.

(3) **Relative order of the direct and indirect objects:**

In both parent languages, there are two possible sequences of the direct and indirect objects. One order, ind.O - dir.O. is shared by the two languages:

	V.	ind.O.	dir.O.	
(1)	geǐ	wǒ	shū	(Chinese)
	'give	me	the book'	

However, in Chinese, the direct object can be preposed to a preverbal position after undergoing a "ba-transformation" rule. Therefore sentence (1) can appear as sentence (2). In English, the direct object can also be placed before the indirect one as shown in sentence (3).

(2) Chinese:	V.	ind.O.	dir.O.
	geǐ	wǒ	shū

(Apply the ba-transformation rule)

ba	dir.O.	V.	ind.O.
bǎ	shū	gei	wǒ
|	|	|	|
part.	book	give	me

(3) English:

V..	dir.Q.	to	Ind.O.
give	the book	to	me

Compare the Chinese (2) and the English (3), one notices that the Chinese dir.O. shū 'book' in (2) occurs preverbally (before verb gei) while the English dir.O. book in (3) occurs still postverbally (after verb give) despite the fact they both appear before the ind. O. wo and mé. Therefore, one would expect that the order V. ind.O. dir.O. in (1) will be retained in the resultant CPE.

The data seems to confirm our prediction.

CPE	Gloss
ju no pemi məni,	You don't pay me money.
Human hav pe hi that pencil ?	' Who gave him that pencil?'
Maj pe ju caw.	'I gave you food.'
Maj kon pe ju wən čit,	'I can give you a note,'
Maj kɔči hi tu handsəm kok-fezənt.	'I got him two fine cock-pheasants.'

It is important to point out that the non- existence of the ba-construction in CPE might result in some kind

of impoverishment as the function of the ba-construction
is to indicate definiteness of the direct object.[19]
A possible way to indicate definiteness in CPE would pro-
bably be through some extra linguistic mechanism as men-
tioned by many linguists (Goodman 1964; Hall 1963; Sil-
verstein 1972).

Hall (p.39) states:.

"Nonlinguistic devices are often used to furnish
further explanatory practical context for an utter-
ence, e.g. pointing (with the chin), descriptive
gesture with the hand, shrugging the shoulder, etc."

IV.3. CONFLICTING STRUCTURES:

This section will deal with the cases of conflicting
structures where a common denominator cannot be formed.
In such cases, three kinds of possible solutions can be
found in the data.

(1) Elimination of the structure involved.

    Chinese: X
                        CPE: ϕ
    English: Y

(2) Co-existence of both structures:

    Chinese: X
                        CPE: X and Y
    English: Y

61

(3) Dominance of the Chinese structure:

Chinese:　X

English:　Y

CPE:　X

IV.3.1.　Elimination of the structure:

(1) Lack of relative clause:

The non-existence of a relative clause construction in CPE can be explained as the result of the totally different positions in which a relative clause occurs in the parent languages.　In Chinese, a modifier always precedes its head, be it an adjective or a modifying clause; but in English, a modifying clause must follow the head which it modifies.

Chinese				English
wo	mai	de	shu	the book which I bought
I	bought	part.	book	

de has the similar function as the English relative pronoun, who, which, etc.; de is placed after the modifying clause.

As we can see, the modifying clause in English which I bought and its corresponding structure in Chinese wo mai de are different not only in their structures but also in their locations in the sentence.　The non-existence of a relative clause in CPE is quite understandable. [20]

(2) <u>Lack of the passive</u>:

Similarly, the non-existence of a full(with agent) passive construction in CPE may be explained by the fact that the surface structures of Chinese and English passives are quite different.

Chinese:

receiver of the action - bei - agent- (gei) - V. le

rang
jiao

English:

receiver of the action - be - V. - by - agent
(p.p.)

EX:

Chinese:

Táng	ràng	haízi	geǐ	chī	le
candy	by	child	be	eat	past

English: The candy was eaten by the child.

The agentless passive construction discussed on p.16 is very common in Chinese. In such cases, even the particle <u>geǐ</u> (equivalent to the function of <u>be</u> in English) is not needed. For instance:

Shū	fàng	zai	zhuōzi	shang	le
book	put	on	table	top	past

'The book was put on the table.'

In CPE, one can find that the agentless passive is also

frequently used. The construction of passive, in this case, is marked by a suffix əm and Hall calls words with a əm ending passive transitive, such as:

CPE	Gloss
apojləm	'spoiled'
cokəm	'choked'
fiksəm	'fixed'
bojləm	'boiled'
brokəm	'broken'

EX: lait gəsnaw fiksəm. 'The light is now fixed.'

bebi cokəm. 'The baby is choked.'

IV.3.2. Co-existence of both structures in CPE:

WH-question:

It has been observed (Sasse 1977) that the world languages can be divided into two types with respect to the behavior of their question words. One group of languages such as English, have their question words moved to a fixed, preferably sentence initial position, while other languages have their question words appearing in exactly those places where their declarative counterparts would normally occur. (i.e. who is in the normal subject position, and whom is in the normal object position.) Chinese belongs to the second type of language.

The surface structure of WH-question in English is said
to be the result of the application of a WH-movement rule
which is not used in the Chinese syntax. Let us consider
that this underlying structure is represented as such:

	English:	Chinese:

underlying structure :	S
	NP VP
	    V NP
	you want what
		S
		NP VP
		    V NP
		ni yaò shénma
		'you want what '

transformation:	WH-movement DO-support	(none)
surface structure:	What do you want?	Nǐ yaò shénma ? 'You want what ?'

If we accept the universalist's hypothesis that pidgins
are shallower in their syntactic derivations than natural
languages (i.e. undergo fewer transformational rules),
we would expect that the Chinese structure appears in CPE.

On the other hand, Hall claims that the WH-questions of
CPE are formed like those of English.

The data (most of it is recorded by Hall himself) neither
support Hall's observation nor the universalist's assumption.
As shown below, both structures, with or without WH-movement,

occur in CPE:

With WH-movement:

CPE	Gloss
What thing hi do make so much bobery?	'What did he do that caused so much trouble ?'
What thing wantchee ?	'What do you want ?'
Hwat ðin kɔn fiksi ?	'What can you fix ?'
Hwičsajd ju partnər hav go ?	'Where did your partner go'
Hwasajd ju gəsnaw kəm ?	'Where have you now come from ?'

Without WH-movement:

Ju pe hi hawmači ?	'How much will you pay him ?'
ðis hav hwat θin ?	'What is this ?'
Hi hav go hwasajd ?	'Where did he go ?'
Ju koci tren hwatajm ?	'When did you take the train?'
Ois biloŋ hu-bodi ?	'Who is this ?'
Ju haws hav gat hawmani rum ?	'How many rooms has your house got ?'
Maj dog hav go hwasajd ?	'Where has my dog gone ?'
Ju fren du hwat pidgin ?	'What is your friend's business.'
Ju stap ðissajd haw loŋ ?	'How long will you be here ?'
ðis kɑt biloŋ hu-man ?	'Whose cat is this?'

The co-existence of two types of WH-question structures in CPE results from a lack of similarity in the WH-question constructions in the two parent languages: since no common denominator can be found, both patterns are used.

66

According to Bickerton, pidgin is never a stabilized or consistent language.

IV.3.3. Dominance of the Chinese structure:

The comparative construction

According to Greenberg (1966: 88), there are two common orders of comparison structure in the world's languages:

(1) Adjective-marker-standard

(2) Standard-marker-adjective

English uses (1), such as larger than Y (adjective -marker-standard); the Chinese comparative structure is similar to (2) except that the marker is placed before the standard, marker - standard - adjective.

Thus;   <u>Chinese</u>   <u>English</u>

Tā bǐ nǐ gaō.   He is taller than you.
│   │   │   │
he than you tall

For the purpose of our present discussion, we will include the Chinese structure in type (2), as it also has the standard - adjective order which is different from the English adjective - standard order.

* Just like the case of WH-question, no common denominator can be possibly formed out of the totally conflicting structures of Chinese and English; but unlike the case of

WH-question, only the Chinese order is retained in CPE.
The comparative construction of CPE is clearly a direct
borrowing from the Chinese construction. The one-to-one
correspondence of the comparative construction in CPE and
Chinese can be seen below:

```
Chinese:  Jèige  hwǒche  bǐ   nǐde  qìche  jiào  man.
CPE:      ðis    trek    biloŋ ju   moto-kar mor  slo .
          this   truck   than  your  car    more  slow
```

'This truck is slower than your car.'

```
Chinese:  Yīngguo      bǐ   Yìndu  jiào yuǎn.
CPE:      Inglen  biloŋ  India   mor  far.
          England than   India   more far
```

' England is farther than India.'

Another type of comparative structure   in CPE also
reflects exactly a Chinese construction.

Chinese:

```
  Wǒ níng-bō nàlide chǎng mei you     Wúhúnàlide 'chǎng dà
CPE:
  Maj nin-po sajd kampawn  no hav gat Wuhusajd kampawn big
  my  Nin-po said compound no   have  Wuhu side compound big
```

'My compound at Ning-po is not as big as the one in Wu-hu.'

In this chapter, the syntactic structures of CPE have been analysed and compared with those of English and Chinese. It has been shown that the structural features of CPE are, in most cases, relatable to those of the corresponding structures of both English and Chinese in a systematic way, i.e., the CPE structures are, in fact, various kinds of common denominators resulting from the convergence of English and Chinese. The data have provided us with convincing evidence which shows that the shared structures of parent languages have selective advantages in a contact situation and they are retained in the resultant pidgin. In cases of conflicting structures of Chinese and English, evidence from the data seems to show some dominance of the Chinese structures.

CONCLUSION

The data presented above leads one to consider CPE as the product of two parent languages which contributed differently to its formation.

The relation between CPE and its parent languages can be summarized as below:

Lexicon : The source is overwhelmingly English, though the semantic contents of lexical items show a clear influence from those of Chinese.

Morphology : Word-formation rules are the same as those of Chinese.

Syntax : Since the syntactic structures of CPE include those shared structures of both English and Chinese in addition to some structures specific to Chinese, it seems reasonable to conclude that the syntactic structures of CPE reflect mainly those of Chinese.

Generally speaking, the whole process of pidginization as reflected in CPE seems to support the claim made by the earlier authors that the general construction of sentences in CPE is essentially Chinese. Hall's claim that "the struc-

70

ture of CPE is closer to the grammar of English" is not

empirically supported. Hall seems to confuse the domain

of grammar with that of etymology of morphological materials;

for instance, we simply cannot claim that the CPE speakers

acquired the syntactic function of the English -ing based on

only a few occurrences of -ing in the data (see above, p.34).

Following are some discussions of the hypotheses presented

in Chapter II as to their usefulness as explanations for the

formation of CPE.

A. Simplification model:

The claim that pidgins are simplified languages seems to

be justified in the case of CPE. This is because CPE has a

parent language, English, which has a complex morphological

system. The data show the dominance of the unmarked features

and a reduced lexicon as predicted by the simplificationists.

However, the question whether simplification is a substantive

feature of pidgin languages has to be tested from data gathered

on a world wide basis, especially those of pidgins which result

from parent languages with simple morphological structures.

As far as the syntactic structures of CPE are concerned,

the simplification model only predicts the elimination of the

passive construction and it does not provide a plausible

explanation as to why certain structures of one parent

language have a selective advantage over the corresponding structures of the other parent language. We simply cannot say that the comparative structure of Chinese is simpler than that of English and therefore retained in CPE. Here, it seems that the selection of the Chinese structure is either totally arbitrary or that Chinese is dominant in the formation of CPE.

The superstratum and the substratum dichotomy proposed by some simplificationists in the identification of the role which a parent language plays in the pidginization process is difficult to be justified in the case of CPE. On all levels of the linguistic structures of CPE, it has been clearly shown that both Chinese and English contributed in the formation of CPE. In my analysis, it seems impossible to view CPE as a reduced structure of a single source, English, as claimed by Hall.

B. The universal model:

Kay and Sankoff's claim that the shared feature has a selective advantage in a language contact situation can account for the majority of the structures in CPE.

In the case where the parent languages have different surface structures, Kay and Sankoff claim that the structure

which is closer to the "universal deep structure" and hence shallower in derivation will more likely be retained in pidgin. Our data seem to contradict their claim as evidence has shown that:

a) the structure which is retained in CPE cannot be explained satisfactorily as shallower in derivation when it is compared with the corresponding structure in the other parent language. For instance, the comparative construction of Chinese which is retained in CPE cannot meaningfully be explained as shallower than that of English (see above, p.68).

b) distinct structures of Chinese and English either both disappear (non-existence of relative construction, p.62) or co-exist (occurrence of both types of WH-questions in CPE, p.64) in CPE. According to Kay and Sankoff, one of the structures should be retained, that which shows the shallower derivation.

Greenberg's implicational universals have been used both successfully and unsuccessfully to explain the pidginization process. Silverstein (1972) provides examples from Chinook Jargon to confirm universals in languages; on the other other hand, Naró provides examples from CPE which disconfirm them. Naro further uses evidence from CPE to argue that

73

pidgins are not natural languages and thus that pidginization
is not a natural language change. Naro says (1975 : 5):

> "...We may conclude tentatively that the synchronic
> grammatical rules of pidgins are not of the same form
> as the synchronic rules of natural human languages.
> Although the empirical evidence is not extensive, the
> conclusion itself is hardly surprising given the fact
> that pidgins are based on conscious inventions of adults
> ...Pidgins have provided results that are in conflict with
> Greenberg's careful investigations of a much larger
> sample of natural languages. "

The CPE examples chosen by Naro which disconfirm the
implicational universals are :

a) The CPE comparative construction   "standard-
adjective" is disharmonic with prepositional language.
He states (1975 : 4a) :

> "The clearest example in this regard is the compa-
> rative construction of CPE. Greenberg has shown that
> it is universally true that if a language has the
> order standard-adjective as a possible realization
> of a comparison of superiority, then the language
> has postpositions rather than prepositions. China
> pidgin has the order standard-adjective..... but like
> standard English, is prepositional, rather than
> postpositional as would be the case if the pidgin
> were to conform to the formal constraints universally
> characteristic of natural languages."

b) the GN order is disharmonic with prepositional languages.
Naro points out (1975: 5) :

> "Greenberg has shown that in prepositional languages,
> the genitive almost always follows the governing noun.
> Here too CPE is exceptional - It is prepositional but
> the genitive precedes."

Naro's argument can be summarized as :

(1) Chinese is a postpositional language, harmonic with
   GN order and standard-adjective structures.

(2) As the consequence of pidginization, CPE is prepo-
   sitional (following English), thus disharmonic with
   its GN and standard-adjective structures.

(3) The pidginization process changes harmonic into dis-
   harmonic relations, therefore it is not a natural
   change and thus pidgins are not natural languages.

There are two serious problems with Naro's claim:

a) Greenberg's implicational universals are formulated to
   characterize the general tendency of world languages.
   In each of his careful study of universals based on
   natural languages, there are always some counter-
   examples. For instance, Greenberg lists at least four
   languages which are prepositional but with a GN order
   (Greenberg, 1963 : 109) and no plausible explanations

have been given as to why some languages have certain disharmonic features while others do not. A language simply cannot be considered as less natural than another just for having certain disharmonic features.

b) The crucial point of Naro's argument is the classification of Chinese as a postpositional language and CPE as pre-positional. As we will see below, his classification de-finitely show bias :

Chinese has been classified by Greenberg as a preposi-tional language (1963 : 90). This is because all the Chinese prepositions appear before the noun phrase except in one case (the use of *zai* 'in, on, at') where the prepositon consists of two parts, one before the noun and one after the noun (see above, p.38).

zai   chufang (li)   'in the kitchen'
at   kitchen (in)

Even in the case of *zai*, the final part *li* can be deleted.

There are only two types of words introducing adverbial phrases in CPE: one type appears postpositionally, as *said* and *fasan* (see above, p.39); the other type occurs preposition-ally, as *fo* 'for' in *I can do fo ju* 'I can do it for you.'. Under these circumstancs, one can treat CPE either as prepo-

sitional or postpositional. If CPE is classified as postpo-
sitional, then Naro's argument is totally wrong, as CPE would
have harmonic structures (postpositional, GN, standard-adjec-
tive). If we compare the CPE harmonic features with the
disharmonic features of Chinese (prepositional, GN, standard-
adjective), one can also argue that the pidginization process
confirms, rather than disconfirms, the implicational univer-
sals. The pidgin, thus, would be more "natural" than its
parent language. However, if CPE is classified as prepositional
as Naro does, his argument is still invalid, as we have shown
that the disharmonic features are not the result of the
pidginization process, but rather, they are the direct re-
flection of the Chinese structures which also show the same
disharmonic features. In either case, the use of CPE to
support the claim that pidgins are not natural languages is
not empirically supported.

C. Lexical Replacement hypothesis :

The Lexical Replacement hypothesis so far can account for
much of the structures, both morphological and syntactic, of
CPE. It has been shown that the morphological and syntactic
structures of CPE show clear influence from those of Chinese.
Bickerton claims that the "substrate syntax will be partially
retained, and will alternate, apparently unpredictably
with structures imported from the superstrate" seems to

77

explain well the co-existence of both types of WH-questions in CPE. The statement does not contradict the hypothesis that shared features have a selective advantage in the pidgin, since, by definition, the shared structures are a subset of the set of Chinese structures.

The whole process of pidginization of CPE thus can be best explained in a synthetic model. The dominance of the unmarked features in CPE can be explained in terms of simplification. The occurrence of shared features and the selection of Chinese structures can be explained in terms of the Lexical Replacement hypothesis.

FOOTNOTES :

1. Todd (1974: 5) divides pidgins into "restricted" and
    "extended". "A restricted pidgin is one which arises
    as a result of marginal contact such as for minimal
    trading, which serves only this limited purpose and which
    tends to die out as soon as the contact which gave rise
    to it is withdrawn...An extended pidgin is one which,
    because of its usefulness, is extended and used beyond
    the original limited function which caused it to come
    into being." Examples of such extended pidgins are the
    many West African pidgins. CPE would be considered as
    a restricted pidgin according to these definitions.

2. Hall (1964: 64) states that a normal or full-sized langu-
    age has, at least, some 25,000 lexical items and Chinese
    Pidgin English has only around 700 words.

3. Samarin(1971: 125) also claims the importance of the
    innovative power of a pidgin. He points out that two
    things are wrong with Hall's characterization of pidgins:
    the notions of common denominator and reduction.
    "It is possible for the pidgin to have a category which
    was absent in the two languages in contact."
         In fact, Hall also notices the innovative power of a
    pidgin in his analysis of CPE, however , in most cases
    innovations are scarce and hence it is difficult to accept
    innovation as a main characteristic of pidgins.
    Hall(1952: 141) states that " in a few instances, Chinese
    Pidgin has struck out along new paths, and has evolved
    constructions which are developments of its own struc-
    ture, without analogues in either English or Chinese".

4. Todd argues the theory cannot cope with the fact that the Atlantic and Pacific pidgins Englishes have common features which do not occur in standard English.

5. A English interpreter Thomas Meadows, writing in 1852, described the attitude of the Chinese to foreigners as : (cited by Franke, 1967:100, China and the West)

    "Those Chinese who have direct opportunities of learning something of our customs and culture...consider us beneath their nation in moral and intellectual cultivation. As to those who have had no such opportunities, whose previous notions of us were analogous to those we entertain of savages. They are always surprised, not to say astonished, to learn that we have surnames, and understand the family distinctions of father, brother, wife, sister, etc; in short that we live otherwise than as a herd of cattle."

6. This superstratum model is a bit difficult to justify socially in the case of CPE, because of the importance of Chinese and the feelings of its speakers toward their language; feeling of superiority vis à vis speakers of English for instance.

7. Nagara (1974 : 220) explains that the appearance of born, tired, and gone in Japanese Pidgin English rather than their infinitive forms is due to the heavy functional load of the past participles in English in comparison with present forms of these verbs. This explanation seems to hold for some of the past participle and present participle forms in CPE.

8. The transcription used in this column is the Pin-Yin (spell-sound) system, which is the official system to romanize Chinese characters. The transcription of CPE are kept the same way as they appear in various sources.

9. Bauer also points out that the use of _pisi_ was always optional. The 1836 text of CPE shows that numbers are used immediately before both animated and inanimated nouns.

10. Lexical items borrowed form other languages than English are few. Words of Portuguese origin are : _mandarin_ (mandar), _comprado_ (compra), _joss_ (deos), _pa-tele_ (padre), maskei (masque). Of Indian origin, we have basaar, shroff, tiffin, coolie, bungalow, etc. Of the Chinese origin, Hunter gives only two: chopchop, chowchow. others are manman (slowly) and mafu (horseman).

11. Other characteristics include: absence of time and aspect markers, number and gender markers, inflectional endings, articles, do-support and passive transformation; the juxtaposition of two nouns without a possessive marker.

12. The possessive marker _de_ can be deleted when the following noun is animate. Thus in Chinese, one can use either _wǒde fùqin_ or _wǒ fùqin_ 'my father'.

13. Evidence from the native language is needed before any generalization about the use of copula can be made. The absence of copula may be due to the influence from the native language as it has been pointed out by Alleyne (1971) in some African-based pidgins.

14. The pre-verbal _zài_ phrase has a locational interpretation while the post-verbal construction is highly constrained and it has a directional interpretation as shown below:

Zhāng-sān <u>zài</u> dì-shang tiào.   (locational)

Zhang-san at ground-on jump

'Zhang-san jumps (up and down) on the ground.'

Zhāng-sān tiào <u>zai</u> dì-shang.   (directional)

Zhang-san jump onto ground-on

'Zhang-san jumps onto the ground (from somewhere else).'

and and also:

Qǐng nǐ xiě xin <u>gěi wǒ</u>.   'Please (you) write letter <u>to me.</u>'

Qǐng nǐ <u>gěi wǒ</u> xiě xìn.   'Please write a letter for me.'

(or the same meaning as above)

15. This does not include the PP that functions as sentential adverb which can occur in the pre-verbal position. (Jackendoff, 1972: 94)

EX: John, <u>in my opinion,</u> has lost his race.

16. The subtle difference between the past and the present perfect may not be noticed by the Chinese pidgin speakers. As a matter of fact, both are related to the past.

17. <u>You</u> is used in some dialects in the southern part of China where CPE originated.

18. There are a few cases in CPE where a time word occurs sentence-finally. This probably can be viewed as a case of after thought which is also acceptable in Chinese.

EX: Outsajd plenti cold tode.   'It is very cold outside today.'

19. Chao (1968: 77) says:

" An object is moved farther ahead and is made sugges-
tive of a definite reference."

Compare:　　Geǐ wǒ qián　　　　Bǎ qián geǐ wǒ.
　　　　　　　|　　|　　|　　　　|　　|　　|　　|
　　　　　　give me money　　　part. money give wo
　　　　'Give me some money.'　　'Give me the money.'

20. I would like to hypothesize that if a relative clause
ever appeared in CPE, it probably would show the dominance
of the Chinese structure, i.e. the modifier precedes
the head, because the sequence modifier-modified is
not a new structure of English, since it is the order
adjective-noun. Thus, it would be easier for the
English pidgin speakers to acquire the modifier-modified
word order than for the Chinese pidgin speakers to accept
the modified-modifier order.

　　　　Tsou (1975, cited in Bickerton 1977: 55) has
shown that the Chinese-type prenominal relative clauses
are retained by isolated Chinese speakers of English
in California.

EX:　the live-down-the street lady　'the lady who
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　lives down the
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　　street'

He is make-shoes man.　　　'He is a man who
　　　　　　　　　　　　　　makes shoes.'

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baron, N.S. 1977. "Trade Jargons and Pidgins: A Functionalist
         Approach". Journal of Creole Studies, Vol. I, No.1.
         5-28.

Bateson, G. 1943. "Pidgin English and Cross-cultural Communi-
         cation". Transactions of the New York Academy of
         Sciences II, No.6, 137-141

Bauer, A. 1974. Melanesian and Chinese Pidgin English.
         Hans Carl Regensberg. Germany

Berry, J. 1971. "Pidgins and Creoles in Africa".Current
         Trends in Linguistics, Vol. 7, 510-536

Bickerton, D. 1975. "Creolization, Linguistic Universals,
         Natural Semantax and the Brain". International
         Conference on Pidgins and Creoles. University
         of Hawaii.

         1977. "Pidginization and Creolization: Language
         Acquisition and Language Universals. Pidgins and
         Creole Linguistics. edited by Albert Valdman,
         IndianaUniversity Press.

Bickerton and Givon. 1976 . "Pidginization and Syntactic Change
         from SXV and VSX to SVX", The Twelve Regional
         Meeting Parasession. CLS. Chicago.

Ching, E. & N. 1977. 201 Chinese Verbs: Compounds and Phrases
         in Everyday Usage. Baron's Educational Series, Inc.

DeCamp,D. 1968. "The Study of Pidgin and Creole Language".
         in Hymes.

Ferguson, C. 1971. "Absence of Copula and the Notion of
         Simplicity". in Hymes.

Ferguson & DeBose. 1977. "Simplified Registers, Broken
         Language, and Pidginization". in Valdman.

Greenberg,J. 1966. "Some Universals of Grammar with Particu-
         lar Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements".
         Universals of Language. ed. by Greenberg

Hall, R.A. 1944. "Chinese Pidgin English : Grammar and Text".
J. of the American Oriental Society, Vol.64:
95-113

.1952. "Pidgin English and Linguistic Change".
Lingua III: 139-146

1964. "Pidgin Languages". Introductory Linguistics.
376-381

1966. Pidgins and Creole Languages. Cornell Uni-
versity Press.

Huebner, T.G. 1976. "Second Language Acquisition and the
Pidgin-Creole-Decreolization Cycle : A Compari-
son of Some Linguistic Processes". Working Papers
in Linguistics. Vol.8, No.4.

Hunter, W. 1882. Fan Kwae at Canton. Kegan Paul, Tranch & Co.
Paragon Book Gallery, Ltd.

Hymes, D. 1971. Pidginization and Creolization of languages.
Preface and Introduction. Cambridge University
Press.

Jackendoff, R. 1972. Semantic Interpretation in Generative
Grammar. The MIT Press.

P. Kay &G.Sankoff. 1974. "A Language-Universals Approach to
Pidgins and Creoles". Pidgins and Creoles:
Current Trends and Prospects. ed. by DeCamp
and Hancock, Georgetown University.

Knowlton, E. 1967. "Pidgin English & Portuguese".
Historical, Archaeological and Linguistic Studies
in S.E. Asia. Hong Kong University Press.

Koefoed, G. 1975. "A note on pidgins, creoles and language
universals". International Conference on Pidgins
and Creoles. University of Hawaii.

Le Page, R. 1967. "Review of Pidgin and Creole Languages, by
R.A. Hall". J. of African Language 6:83-6

C.Li &S.Thompson. 1973. "Historical Change of Word Order: A Case
study of Chinese and its implications". Selected
Papers from the First International Conference
on Historical Linguistics.
1974. "The Issue of Word Order in a Synchronic
Grammar". Paper presented at the Fourth Annual
California Linguistic Association Conference,
University of Southern California, Los Angeles.

1975. "The semantic function of word order: A case study in Mandarin". Word Order and Word Order Change. The University of Texas Press

Mintz, S. 1971. "The socio-historical background to pidginization". in Hymes.

Muhlhausler, P. 1974. Pidginization and Simplification of Language. The Australian National University.

Naro, A. 1975. "Pidginization, creolization, and natural change" (Available from author).

1978. "A study in the origins of pidginization". Language, Vol.54, No.2: 314-347.

Reinecke, J. 1938. "Trade jargons and creole dialects as marginal languages". Social Forces, Vol.17 : 107-118.

1977. Pidgins & Creole Linguistics, Preface. ed. by Valdman.

Samarin, W. 1965. "The origin of the European-based creoles and pidgins". Orbis, Vol.14, No.2. :509-527

1971. "Salient and substantive pidginization". in Hymes.

Sasse, H. 1977. "A note on WH-movement". Lingua 41: 343-354

Silverstein, M. 1972. "Chinook Jargon: Language contact and the ploblem of muti-level generative system". Language, Vol.48, No.2: 378-405 & No.3: 596-625.

Taylor,D. 1956. "Language contacts in the West Indies". Word 12: 399-414.

Todd,L. 1974. Pidgins and Creoles. Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Traugott, E. 1973. "Some thought on natural syntactic processes". New Ways of Analyzing Variations in English. ed. by Bailey & Shyu.

1977. "Pidginization, creolization, and language change". in Valdman.

Wang, W. 1965. "Two aspect markers in Mandarin", <u>Linguistics</u>
        41: 457-470.

White,L. 1976. "Evidence of language learning strategies in
        Pidgins and creoles". Mcgill University.

Data sources :

Bland,J. 1929. "English as she is wrote in the Far East".
        <u>The English Review</u> 48: 711-719.

Chinese Repository. Jan.1836: 428-435
                Oct.1837: 275-279

Dennys,N. 1878. "Pidgin English". RAS. <u>J. of the Strait Branch</u>
        169-174.

Dickens,D. 1857. "Canton English". <u>Household Words</u> 15: 450-53

Green, O.1934. "Pidgin English". Fortnightly n.s. 136,142:
        331-340.

Hall,R. 1944. "Chinese pidgin English: Grammar and texts".

Hunter,W. 1822. <u>Fan Kwae at Canton.</u>

The Literary Digest. 1915. V.51
                1928. V.96

Scriber 1878, V.15: 372-276