SUBJECT PRONOUNS AND TENSE-MARKING IN
SOUTHEAST SOLOMONIC LANGUAGES AND SOLOMONS PIJIN:
GROUNDS FOR SUBSTRATOMANIA?

Roger M. Keesing

INTRODUCTION[1]

I will take as my text constructions in Solomon Islands Pijin where what appear to be subject pronouns are preceded by the particle bae:

    bae mi luk-im

    bae mifala go etc.

I will argue that such constructions in Melanesian Pidgin dialects can be the outcome of (at least) three different grammars. I will provide evidence that suggests that older speakers of bush dialects of Solomons Pijin — that is, men who learned Pijin as a second language when they worked on plantations — use a grammar, in such constructions, which follows the patterns of substrate languages of the south-eastern Solomons.

The pattern of pronominal anaphora in Oceanic Austronesian languages, including Southeast Solomonic languages, is very different from that in English (although it has parallels in many other language families). I examine the Oceanic pattern of marking subject-object relations with pronominal clitics within the verb phrase, and associated marking of temporal relationships with tense-marking particles, in comparative perspective. Coming back to the Solomons, I examine the manifestation of these patterns in the languages of the south-eastern Solomons, the area which has provided the bulk of plantation labourers during the nineteenth century Labour Trade and twentieth century internal plantation system.

Having surveyed the patterns of subject-marking and tense-marking in Southeast Solomonic languages, I will examine the Pijin used by older speakers, to suggest that their use of baebae as future-marker, and their use of the (English-derived) subject pronouns of Pijin, show a close calquing on their native languages. For speakers who acquired Pijin as young adults, such calquing is perhaps not theoretically surprising. But in the context of Melanesian Pidgin it has, I will suggest, three interesting implications:

(1) The incorporation of bae, as a grammatical tense-marker, within the verb phrase is not a recent phenomenon, and a consequence of creolisation, but derives (at least in Solomons Pijin) from the decades-old period of plantation

usage. Sankoff and Laberge (1973) imply that although the pattern may have been present earlier, the full grammaticalisation of bai as a tense-marker in Tok Pisin is a recent phenomenon, accelerated by creolisation.

(2) The Pijin to which these older speakers (who learned it as a second language in the 1902s and 1930s) had access allowed of pervasive calquing on substrate languages, in such fundamental respects as the marking of agent-object relations and tense. This strongly suggests that the Queensland Pidgin of the late nineteenth century already incorporated fundamental Oceanic syntactic patterns, an inference borne out by contemporary texts.

(3) Because these and other syntactic elaborations of Melanesian Pidgin date back to the early twentieth (or late nineteenth) century, they provide evidence for a very different pattern of development than those Bickerton has described, in *Roots of language* (1981), as characteristic of 'true creoles'. Bickerton himself (1981, 1984) exempts Melanesian Pidgin from the arguments against substrate influence he advances in his general attack on 'substratophile' interpretations. But the historical and linguistic implications of these differences have not yet been adequately explored.

SOUTHEAST SOLOMONIC AND OCEANIC AUSTRONESIAN

Subgrouping of the Oceanic Austronesian languages at higher levels is still relatively problematic. On the one hand, few of the 400 or so languages (especially in island Melanesia) have been well described; on the other hand, rapid lexical replacement, word tabooing, pervasive borrowing, and chaining at the level of dialect and language have impeded conventional subgrouping techniques. On several points most of the authorities now are in general agreement. One is that the languages of central and northern Vanuatu, Fiji, Rotuma and Polynesia fall into a single subgroup, for which Green and Pawley (1984) have used the term 'Remote Oceanic'. Another is that the languages of the south-eastern Solomons — south-eastern Ysabel, Gela, Guadalcanal, Malaita and San Cristobal (Makira) — form a single subgroup within Oceanic, marked by conservatism in their retention of Proto-Oceanic (POC) lexical, phonological, and syntactic patterns. Most of the Remote Oceanic languages are similarly conservative of POC patterns. In a 1972 monograph Pawley (1972) tentatively grouped Southeast Solomonic and Remote Oceanic languages together as comprising an Eastern Oceanic (EO) subgroup; but no firm evidence has yet established whether the similarities of the putative EO languages represent more than shared retentions of POC patterns (see Grace 1976). A third relevant point on which there is now some measure of agreement is that the Nuclear Micronesian languages — spoken in Kiribati, the Marshalls and the eastern and central Carolines — have some close connection to Remote Oceanic languages and/or Southeast Solomonic languages. Green and Pawley (1984) tentatively include them within Remote Oceanic; Blust (1984) questions the subgrouping of Guadalcanal-Gela and San Cristobal-Malaita languages together as Southeast Solomonic, and provides some tidbits of evidence suggesting a Malaita-Nuclear Micronesian subgrouping. My own guess at this stage is that a subgroup will be firmly established which corresponds roughly to Pawley's original Eastern Oceanic (although it may incorporate the languages of Southern Vanuatu and will probably incorporate Nuclear Micronesian, as well as Southeast Solomonic and the Remote Oceanic languages). These niceties of subgrouping are not crucial to my argument, except insofar as they will be drawn on to show that patterns assignable to an early Oceanic language probably spoken in eastern Melanesia are clearly preserved in

the daughter languages of the south-east Solomons and Nuclear Micronesia. (I shall draw on the latter to illustrate parallel syntactic patterns.) It does, however, leave me with an awkward terminological problem, with which I shall deal by referring to Eastern Oceanic as if it were a firmly established subgroup including Southeast Solomonic and Nuclear Micronesian as well as Remote Oceanic.

SOUTHEAST SOLOMONIC AND THE SHAPING OF PIJIN

Before examining the syntax of subject-marking and tense-marking in Eastern Oceanic languages (loosely defined in this manner), it will be useful to establish that Southeast Solomonic languages are those likely to have had the most significant impact (as sources of substrate models) on the emergence of a somewhat distinctive Solomons Pijin from an antecedent dialect of pidgin spoken in Queensland and other plantation areas in the latter nineteenth century. This is *not* to claim that Southeast Solomonic languages were the dominant source of substrate models shaping the emergence and stabilisation of this earlier Pacific Plantation Pidgin. I elsewhere (Keesing n.d.3) argue that many of the patterns of Melanesian Pidgin were established prior to 1860, and that others emerged in the Labour Trade, prior to 1880. In both periods, I argue, Oceanic (and mainly EO) languages had a primary shaping influence; but the special influence of Southeast Solomonic, if there was one, would have been largely confined to the decades since 1890.

Price and Baker (1976) summarise available evidence on the islands of origin of Pacific Islanders recruited to Queensland in the period 1863-1904. The figures are grouped by five year periods. The data can, for our purposes, be examined from two directions. One is to look at the percentage of speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages within the overall population of recruits from all parts of the south-western Pacific. The second is to compare percentages of speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages vis-a-vis speakers of other Solomons languages (which are mainly Oceanic, but include several small enclaves of non-Austronesian languages). Table 1 shows the percentages of Southeast Solomonic speakers in relation to the total number of islanders recruited to Queensland:

Table 1: Southeast Solomonic speakers in Queensland	
1868–1872	1.5
1873–1877	9.1
1878–1882	13.7
1883–1887	17.9
1888–1892	41.9
1893–1897	50.5
1898–1904	60.0

In Table 2, I compare the percentages of speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages from four areas (Malaita, Guadalcanal, Makira [San Cristobal], and Gela, including smaller offshore islands speaking dialects of Malaita and Makira languages) with speakers of other Oceanic languages and (to the extent they are recognisable from the tables) of non-Austronesian languages.

Table 2: Solomon Islands languages in the Queensland Labour Trade

Numbers in columns show percentages;
total numbers of recruits shown following five year periods.

	MALAITA	GUADALCANAL	MAKIRA	GELA	OTHER OC	NAN
1868–1872 (n = 82)	8.5	14.6	11.0	36.6	29.3	–
1873–1877 (n = 910)	48.6	20.4	12.2	8.8	1.8	8.2
1878–1882 (n = 1688)	31.6	35.4	10.2	15.2	3.9	3.7
1883–1887 (n = 2891)	43.2	26.9	4.4	12.2	6.2	7.0
1888–1892 (n = 3588)	47.3	29.0	1.9	18.7	–	3.1
1893–1897 (n = 3084)	58.6	24.6	3.3	11.6	–	1.8
1898–1904 (n = 5081)	70.9	16.0	5.7	6.3	–	1.1

	TOTAL SE SOLOMONIC %	TOTAL OTHER OC %	TOTAL NAN %
1868–1872	70.7	29.3	–
1873–1877	90.0	1.8	8.2
1878–1882	92.4	3.9	3.7
1883–1887	86.7	6.2	7.0
1888–1892	96.9	–	3.1
1893–1897	98.1	–	1.8
1898–1904	98.9	–	1.1

These figures slightly underestimate the percentages of Southeast Solomonic speakers among Queensland recruits, since all of Ysabel is counted as 'other Oceanic', whereas Bughotu, spoken on the south-eastern end of the island, is a Guadalcanal-Gelic language. However, the figures serve to confirm the overwhelming preponderance of speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages among Queensland recruits from the Solomons, especially in the latter stages of the Labour Trade. Although Fiji did not play as significant a part as Queensland in the development of Pijin (Siegel 1985), Siegel's data indicate a similar preponderance of speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages in the Labour Trade. Table 3 summarises Siegel's data on Fiji recruits from the Solomons.

For the early decades of this century, when an internal plantation system was established in the Solomons and overseas recruiting ended, detailed figures are relatively sparse. However, the available data indicate that the same pattern continued, with recruits from Malaita and Guadalcanal providing the bulk of the labour force. The Labour Commission appointed in 1928 to investigate labour

Table 3: Solomons recruits in Fiji					
	MALAITA	GUADALCANAL	MAKIRA	GELA	OTHER OC	NAN
1876–1887 (n = 4420)	61.0	20.2	12.7	1.6	4.2	0.3
1888–1899 (n = 1084)	76.2	16.8	5.4	0.2	1.2	–
1900–1911 (n = 1807)	88.3	7.6	2.1	0.8	0.9	0.1

	TOTAL SE SOLOMONIC %	TOTAL OTHER OC %	TOTAL NAN %
1876–1887	95.5	4.2	0.3
1888–1899	98.6	1.2	–
1900–1911	98.8	0.9	0.1

regulations in the BSIP gave the following figures for that year. Of the 2,176 Solomon Islanders recruited in 1928, 1,459 (67.1%) were from Malaita, 399 (18.3%) were from Guadalcanal, and 318 (14.6%) were from all other islands (BSIP 3/II/I, 1929, cited in Jourdan n.d.). Jackson (1978:224) gives rough percentage figures for 1925: 66.7% of Solomons plantation workers from Malaita, 33.3% from 'Guadalcanal, San Cristobal and Santa Cruz'. This great preponderance of Malaitans, and secondarily of Guadalcanal men, in the plantation (and domestic) labour force continued through the 1930s, and up until World War II. During World War II the Solomon Islands Labour Corps and Solomon Islands Defence Force were comprised primarily of Malaitans. The percentage of speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages in the plantation and domestic labour force in the Solomons through the first four decades of this century was probably at a relatively constant level of about 85-90%.

From these figures alone we can reasonably conclude that if Solomon Islands languages had any substantial shaping influence on prewar plantation Pijin, it is the Southeast Solomonic languages, especially those of Malaita and Guadalcanal, to which we should look for substrate models. It may be further relevant that in several other parts of the Solomons, one or more indigenous languages were adopted by missions as lingue franche (Rovaina and Marovo in the Western Solomons, Gela, Arosi in Makira, Bughotu on Ysabel). The Catholics on Guadalcanal used Visale and Ghari in some areas; but it was particularly on Malaita and secondarily on Guadalcanal that Pijin became used as a language of inter-ethnic and mission communication as well as plantation work. Not surprisingly, in the postwar Maasina Rule anticolonial movement, centred in Malaita, Pijin played a central part as medium of interethnic communication. Without assuming, then, that *any* Solomon Islands languages had an important shaping influence on the pidgin spoken in Queensland as of, say, 1890, it seems that to the degree Solomons Pijin represents a distinctive development from Queensland Pidgin, and to the degree substrate languages have contributed to this process (both questions to which I will return), Southeast Solomonic languages, especially those of Malaita and Guadalcanal, are the probable sources of such substrate influences.

THE OCEANIC PATTERN OF AGENT-OBJECT AND TENSE-MARKING

A brief review of some features of POC syntax is needed. POC employed a system of pronominal anaphora quite different from that in English,[2] although as I have noted the Oceanic pattern has analogues in other language families. In this system, agent- and object-relations are marked within the verb phrase through clitic pronouns indexing a subject NP and (apparently) referencing an object NP. The obligatory constituents of a transitive verbal sentence, in the canonical Oceanic pattern (Pawley and Reid 1979), comprise a verb phrase consisting a clitic pronoun referencing the actor preceding the verb, a transitive suffix attached to the verb, and (probably) a clitic pronoun following the verb and referencing the direct object. Neither the subject NP nor the object NP need be expressed in the surface syntax: it is the clitic copy[3] pronouns that (at the level of surface syntax) are the obligatory constituents. Subject and object NP's, arguments of the predicate, are (to use Wolff's 1979 term) 'optional adjuncts'.

Four sets of pronouns have been reconstructed for POC, of which two sets are directly relevant for our purposes. Pronouns of the first set, which I will call *focal* pronouns, fit into the slot occupied by a subject NP. Pronouns of the second set, which I will call *subject-referencing* pronouns, fit into a slot in the verb phrase preceding the verb (and as we will see, are usually separated from it by tense/aspect/mode marking particles). A third set of pronouns may have been suffixed to transitive suffixes attached to verb roots, although this may (as Harrison 1978 suggests) represent a development out of an original system in which focal pronouns were used as direct objects. In any case, it is focal and subject-referencing pronouns that are of primary importance in my argument; I will refer to them generically as 'subject pronouns'. Table 4 gives Pawley's (1972) reconstruction of subject pronouns for the putative Proto-Eastern Oceanic (I have slightly simplified some complexities of reconstruction):

Table 4: Subject pronouns in Proto-Eastern Oceanic			
		FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1	i-nau	ku
	2	i-koe	ko, o
	3	inia, ia	na
DUAL	1 incl	kitadua	tadua
	1 excl	kamidua	(ka)midua
	2	kamudua	mudu
	3	(k)idadua	dadua
TRIAL	1 incl	(ki)tatolu	tatolu
	1 excl	kamitolu	mitolu
	2	kamutolu	mutolu
	3	(k)idatolu	datolu
PLURAL	1 incl	kita	ta
	1 excl	kami	kami
	2	kam(i)u	m(i)u
	3	(k)ida	da

The dual and trial sets are marked with morphemes for 'two' and 'three'. What is morphologically a trial set seems to have been used more or less freely as an alternative to the plural set, but usually with some implication of limited number.

The subject-referencing pronouns (which Pawley [1972] calls 'unemphatic subject pronouns') are, as noted, the obligatory pronominal elements in verbal sentences; the focal pronouns were used (in a putative PEO) 'when the speaker wishes to focus on or emphasize the pronoun', serving as 'emphatic or redundant subject' (Pawley 1972:36). We will shortly glimpse this pattern in Southeast Solomonic languages.

We can illustrate the operation of subject-referencing pronouns (SRP's) as clitic copy pronouns embedded in VP's with a few examples from Nuclear Micronesian languages (taken from Harrison 1978), which also serve to show how clitic pronouns reference explicit or implied object NP's.

Kosraen: sru ei   esam-uhi   sohn
             Sru SRP(3s) *remember-him John*
             Sru remembers John.

    or: ei   esam-uhi   sohn
             SRP(3s) *remember-him John*
             He remembers John.

Woleaian: ye   wer-i-yei
             SRP(3s) *see-TrS-me*
             He saw me.

Gilbertese: i   noor-i-ko
             SRP(1s) *see-TrS-you*
             I saw you.

Rehg (1981:158-159) notes a pattern for Ponapean which will probably have to be reconstructed for POC (or PEO?), and which will prove to be significant when we come to look at Southeast Solomonic languages. The subject-referencing pronouns are obligatory constituents of *verbal* sentences, indexing features of the underlying (deep-structure) subject in the VP and marking the base that follows as a verb. However, some sentence-types contain no verbs — in Ponapean, equational sentences and replies to questions. In these sentences, the rule creating the pronoun copy (SRP) of the underlying syntactic subject (what for Polynesian Sandra Chung calls a 'clitic placement' rule) does not operate. Rather, if such a sentence has a pronominal subject, the focal pronoun is used. Thus, in Ponapean:

    kowe   ohl loalekeng
    FPr(2s) *man intelligent*
    You are an intelligent man.

In Ponapean kowe is the reflex of PEO *i-koe, the focal pronoun; the corresponding Ponapean SRP, reflex of PEO *ko, is ke.

As I have noted, such a marking of subject/agent and object/patient on verbs is a common pattern in other language families. It is, for example, pervasive in Mayan languages. Thus in Tzotzil (John Haviland, personal communication):

    ch-i-bat   ta j-na
    NONPST-1sABS-*go to* 1sERG-*house*
    I will go to my house.

```
ch-i-s-maj              li  Xun-e
NONPST-lsABS-3sERG-hit  ART John
John will hit me.
```

The pattern of ergativity need not concern us. Suffice it to note that in both the intransitive and transitive constructions the subject is marked on the verb; and in the transitive construction, the object is marked on the verb as well.

A pattern slightly closer to the Oceanic is found in Ural-Altaic languages. Thus in Turkish:

```
biz gid-eceğ-iz
we  go-FUT-we
We will go.
```

and

```
Izmir-de  ki  adam-lar gel-ecek-ler
Izmir-LOC REL man-PLU  come-FUT-they
The men who are in Izmir will come.
```

can be rendered, without noun or pronoun in the subject NP slot, as:

```
gid-eceğ-iz
go-FUT-we
We will go.
```

and

```
gel-ecek-ler
come-FUT-they
They will come.
```

The first of these shows how the free pronoun in Turkish (here biz *we*), fitting into the same syntactic slot as a noun subject, is — as with the Oceanic focal pronouns — redundant syntactically; where it is used, it adds emphasis.

The system of tense-aspect marking in POC (and a putative PEO) has not yet been worked out in any detail. In his reconstruction of PEO, Pawley (1972:41) infers a pattern where an aspect-marking slot ('continuative') preceded the SRP and another aspect-marking slot followed the SRP. A marker for future-tense (which in many daughter languages is manifest either as marking non-past or as marking irrealis or non-accomplished mode) appears to have fit into the slot following the subject-referencing pronoun (i.e., between the SRP and the verb). Pawley (1972) reconstructs this future-marking particle as *-i. It was probably suffixed to the vowel of the subject-referencing pronoun. As we will shortly see, this is a common pattern in Southeast Solomonic languages. (Another future-marking particle, *na, in a slot following the SRP, has also been reconstructed for POC; but it is not represented in the languages with which we are concerned.)

SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN SOUTHEAST SOLOMONIC LANGUAGES

In general, Southeast Solomonic languages preserve quite clearly and directly the inferred PEO (POC?) pattern of subject pronouns. A set of focal pronouns is optionally used to add topical emphasis; a set of subject-referencing pronouns, embedded in the verb phrase, serves to reference an implied noun or pronoun subject or to reiterate an explicit noun subject (which in the canonical SVO pattern precedes the verb phrase). Here I set out paradigms of focal and subject-referencing pronouns for one Guadalcanal language and two Malaita languages. Further pronominal paradigms from Southeast Solomonic languages are set out in Appendix I (because most of the missionary-grammarians of these

languages did not understand the nature of subject-referencing pronouns, and worked mainly with Bible translations as texts of languages they did not speak fluently, the data are fragmentary in some instances). The forms given represent the subject-referencing pronouns unmarked for future-tense or irrealis/non-accomplished mode.

The pronominal paradigms of Guadalcanal-Gela languages can be illustrated with the interior Guadalcanal language Ghaimuta (Simons 1977):

Table 5: Ghaimuta			
		FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1	(i)nau	ku, u
	2	(i)ghoe	ko, o
	3	ia	e
DUAL	1 incl	(i)kogita	koko
	1 excl	(i)kogami	amiko
	2	(i)kogamu	kamuko
	3	(i)koira	arako
TRIAL	1 incl	(i)lugita	kalu
	1 excl	(i)lugami	amilu
	2	(i)lugamu	kamulu
	3	(i)luira	aralu
PLURAL	1 incl	(i)gita	ka
	1 excl	(i)gami	ami
	2	(i)gamu	kamu
	3	ira	ara

Simons notes that in Ghaimuta 'the verbal [i.e., subject-referencing] pronouns occur in the verb phrase and are used to indicate the person and number of the subject of the verb' (1977:12). In Ghaimuta it is possible, according to Simons, either to use the SRP without the focal pronoun, to use the focal pronoun without the SRP, or to use both in sequence. In general, however, in these Guadalcanal-Gela languages the subject-referencing pronoun is syntactically obligatory and the focal pronoun is optionally used to add topical emphasis. (In some languages there are minor variations on this theme, such as ϕ-marking for the third person singular and use of the focal pronoun rather than SRP in second person singular.)

Turning to the Malaita languages (of the Cristobal-Malaita subgroup), we can take one pronominal paradigm from the northern end of the island and one from the central zone as illustrations. The first, from the north, is To'aba'ita (Lichtenberk 1984), see Table 6.

For Kwaio, spoken in the mountainous central zone of the island, see Table 7 (Keesing 1985).

For Kwaio, the focal pronouns are always optional, the subject-referencing pronouns obligatory — with three provisos. First of all, the short paired pronouns nau ku (usually contracted to na-ku) and ngai e (usually contracted

Table 6: To'aba'ita			FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1		nau	ku
	2		'oe	'o
	3		nia	'e
DUAL	1 incl		koro	koro
	1 excl		kamare'a	mera
	2		kamaro'a	moro
	3		keero'a	kero
PLURAL	1 incl		kulu	kulu
	1 excl		kamili'a	mili
	2		kamalu'a	mulu
	3		kera	kera

Table: 7 Kwaio			FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1		(i)nau	ku
	2		(i)'oo	ko / 'oi
	3		ngai(a)	ka / e
DUAL	1 incl		('i)da'a	golo
	1 excl		('e)me'e	mele
	2		('o)mo'o	molo
	3		('i)ga'a	gala
PAUCAL	1 incl		('i)dauru	goru
	1 excl		('e)meeru	meru
	2		('o)mooru	moru
	3		('i)gauru	garu
PLURAL	1 incl		gia	ki
	1 excl		('i)mani	mi
	2		('a)miu	mu
	3		gila	(gi)la

to nga-e) are usually used together in first and third person singular. Second, the second person singular focal pronoun 'oo is sometimes used where we would expect the corresponding SRP (a pattern found in some Guadalcanal languages as well). Finally, in contexts of discourse where a noun subject is explicit, the SRP referencing it (and indexed to it in number) is occasionally omitted. This omission of a subject-referencing pronoun following a noun subject is also optional in To'aba'ita, but is apparently more common than in Kwaio.

> A verb may appear without a subject marker if the referent
> of the subject is recoverable from the context, either
> linguistic or extralinguistic (Lichtenberk 1984:13).

In Kwaio (and probably in other Southeast Solomonic languages) equational
sentences do not contain verbs. If an equational sentences has a pronominal
subject the focal pronoun is used; the subject-referencing pronoun (which would
mark the following base as a verb) cannot be used. Recall that this same pattern
occurs in Ponapean. In Kwaio the same is true of sentences with locative
phrases as predicates:

    'aga'a i   asi
    FPr(3d) LOC *sea*
    The two of them are at the coast.

In To'abaita, such locative sentences are verbal, using the verb nii *be located* —
which, incidentally, corresponds to Pijin stap.

FUTURE-MARKING IN SOUTHEAST SOLOMONIC

At this stage, we can usefully turn to the marking of future-tense (or irrealis-
or non-accomplished-mode) in the Southeast Solomonic languages. A first
generalisation is that in all the languages for which information is available,
future-tense (or some close equivalent) is marked with an affix attached to the
subject-referencing pronoun. Recall that in PEO as reconstructed by Pawley,
future tense was marked on subject-referencing pronouns with a suffixed *-i
attached to the SRP's. This pattern is preserved in many of the Southeast
Solomonic languages, including most of the Malaita languages. In other South-
east Solomonic languages future-tense is marked on the subject-referencing
pronouns with a monosyllabic *prefix* to the SRP. In either pattern, there is
often some slight modification to the SRP (especially in singular forms), in
the form of a shift in either the vowel or consonant of the SRP or some elision
of the future-marker and SRP.

Let us first look at the Malaita languages. In the northern Malaita languages
for which we have data, future-tense is marked on the SRP with a suffixed -i,
-ke, or -ki. Thus, for To'aba'ita (Lichtenberk 1984:9):

Table 8: To'aba'ita		
		SUBJECT-REFERENCING (NON-ACCOMPLISHED MODE)
SINGULAR	1	kwa-i
	2	'o-ki
	3	ka-i
DUAL	1 incl	ko-ki
	1 excl	me-ki
	2	mo-ki
	3	ke-ki
PLURAL	1 incl	ku-ki
	1 excl	mi-ki
	2	mu-ki
	3	ke-ki

A generally similar pattern occurs in Kwara'ae and other northern Malaita languages (see Appendix II).

In two other Cristobal-Malaita languages for which we have data, Arosi (Makira) and Longgu (Guadalcanal coast), future-tense is marked on the subject-referencing pronoun with a bound or free particle seemingly invariant in form (see Appendix II).

Returning to Malaita, however, we find a rather different pattern of future-marking in Kwaio, where future-tense is marked on the subject-referencing pronoun with a prefixed ta-:

> ta-ku   *I will*
> ta-goru *we* (PAUCAL 1 INCL) *will*

The only irregularities are:

> to-'o   *you* (SING) *will*
> te-'e   *he will*

When we turn to the Guadalcanal-Gela languages, we again find a common pattern of prefixing the future-marking particle to the SRP. Thus in Ghaimuta (Simons 1977:13) future is marked by prefixing bak- (or ba- when the SRP begins with k) to the SRP:

Table 9: Ghaimita			
		UNMARKED SRP	FUTURE-MARKED SRP
SINGULAR	1	ku, u	ba-ku
	2	ko, o	ba-ko
	3	e	bak-e
DUAL	1 incl	koko	ba-koko
	1 excl	amiko	bak-amiko

For Vaturanga (Ndi), another Guadalcanal language, the future-marking particle is again prefixed to the subject-referencing pronoun. From the limited data given by Ivens (1933-35b) it appears that the future-marker has the invariant form k- in all slots:

Table 10: Vaturanga			
		UNMARKED SRP	FUTURE-MARKED SRP
SINGULAR	1	au	k-au
	2	o	k-o
	3	e	k-e
PLURAL	1 incl	a	k-a
	1 excl	ami	k-ami
	2	amu	k-amu
	3	ara	k-ara

Thus, in Vaturanga:

> ka-mu zajaba-na   *You will know it.*

Pawley (1972:101) has commented at some length on the innovation in Guadalcanal-Gela languages whereby the initial consonants of subject-referencing pronouns have been lost, and future-marking k- has emerged as a prefix to these forms.[4] Whatever the historical processes involved, what is important for us is to note that speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages share a general pattern in which:

(a) clitic pronouns marked for person and number and embedded in verb phrases, referencing implicit or explicit noun or pronoun subjects, were the obligatory subject-pronominal constituents of verbal sentences;

(b) focal pronouns, in sentences with pronominal subjects, were used optionally, to foreground or emphasise the pronominal reference; the crucial semantic and syntactic information was carried by subject-referencing pronouns; and many sentences had no subject (and indeed no object) NP's.

(c) future-tense (or irrealis or non-accomplished mode) was marked on the subject-referencing pronoun by a suffixed or prefixed particle. The latter pattern was most common in Guadalcanal-Gela languages, the former most common in Cristobal-Malaita languages, although future-marking by prefixed and suffixed particles occurred in each subgroup.

Let me now come back to Solomons Pijin.

SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN SOLOMONS PIJIN

I believe we err if we try to describe 'the grammar' of a Melanesian Pidgin dialect — not simply because there are local and regional variations in usages, but because Pidgin constructions are flexibly amenable to alternative grammatical analyses depending on the linguistic knowledge a learner of Pidgin brings to the encounter, and the age and circumstances of its acquisition. I thus will make no sweeping claims about *the grammar* of Solomons Pijin. I shall simply suggest, given the patterns of Pijin syntax, pathways along which it appears to have been analysed, and hence used, by some speakers of Solomons languages.

In a long unpublished paper (Keesing n.d.2) I have assayed an interpretation of the development of subject pronouns in Solomons Pijin out of the Plantation Pijin used in the latter nineteenth century in Queensland, New Caledonia, Samoa and (to some extent) Fiji. I suggest that in this Plantation Pidgin, as Solomon Islanders encountered it when (in the 1890s) they began to dominate the plantation scene, a system of subject pronouns, more or less stabilised, preserved the Oceanic pattern, but in a simplified form. In this inferred system (although there were variations in particular pronominal forms), the Oceanic subject-referencing pronoun slot was filled, in singular, with SRP's marked for person:

FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
mi	mi
iu	iu
hem	i

In the non-singular slots, however, the equivalent of focal pronouns were marked for person and number (iumi, mifala, etc.), but apparently a generalised predicate-marker i was being used in lieu of a subject-referencing pronoun

marked for person and number.[5] This pattern is preserved in Bislama and Tok
Pisin, where to maintain reference for person and number a speaker must
apparently use the full (focal pronoun) as well as i as predicate marker (see
Camden 1979).

In the same paper (Keesing n.d.2), I show that older speakers of Kwaio (Malaita)
who learned Pijin in prewar plantation contexts use a quite different pronominal
paradigm. In their Pijin, the nineteenth century Plantation Pidgin paradigm
is re-analysed so as to create a set of subject-referencing pronouns fully
marked for person and number, as in Kwaio. The paradigm these older Kwaio
speakers appear to be using is as follows:

Table 11: Kwaio Pijin			
		FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1	mi	mi
	2	iu	iu
	3	hem	hem-i
DUAL	1 incl	iumi(tufala)	iumi(tufala)
	1 excl	mitufala	mitufala
	2	iutufala	iutufala
	3	tufala	tufala(-i)
PLURAL	1 incl	iumi	iumi
	1 excl	mifala	mifala
	2	iufala	iufala
	3	olketa	olketa(-i)

These pronouns are, in the usage of these older Kwaio speakers of Pijin, subject
to a blocking rule such that focal and subject-referencing pronouns that are
identical in shape (or differ only in the suffixed third-person marker -i) are
not repeated in direct sequence unless some particle intervenes. This can be
the topicalising particle nao (L. Simons, this volume, p.53), a modal maet, or
(as we will see) a future-tense-marking bae. Occasionally a speaker repeats
the paired pronouns directly, but only when they are separated by a pause
emphasising the topicalisation of the focal pronoun (as nao does). Some examples
of the usage of these older Kwaio speakers, all taken from spoken texts, will
show these pronouns used in contexts of discourse. The first passage comes
from Kwalafane'ia, recounting his adventures on a prewar Western Solomons
plantation:

> ou, let-im   hem-i   kam, iumi   bae-em raasen fo iumi
> EXCL *allow*-TrS SRP(3s) *come* SRP(lpi) *buy*-TrS *ration for* Pr(lpi)
> *Oh, let him come, so we can buy ourselves rations.*

> foromu   masta   hem-i   no gif-im   laaseni longo iumi
> *because master* SRP(3s) NEG *give*-TrS *ration* LOC   Pr(lpi)
> *Because our master didn't give us rations.*

nao   mifala   redi   nao, ia
then SRP(lpe) *be ready* PRF   RHET
Then we got ready.

mifala   rukurukudaon   longo wafu
SRP(lpe) *look down*(RED) LOC   *wharf*
We looked down to the wharf.

oraet, mi,   mi   godaon   longo wafu
so   FPr(ls) SRP(ls) *descend* LOC   *wharf*
So me, I went down to the wharf.

Here Kwalafane'ia uses Pijin pronouns in exactly the same ways, and slots, as
he uses Kwaio subject-referencing pronouns; in the last sentence, he uses a
focal pronoun for emphasis, then the corresponding (syntactically obligatory)
SRP. Interestingly, one of the early pieces of pre-1920s evidence that Solomon
Islanders were using the pronominal system I have sketched shows the same
pattern, but using third person plural pronouns. It was recorded by the surveyor
Knibbs (1929:242) in the south-eastern Solomons in 1913: 'Oh, altogether,
altogether go along river. Me waitem along hot water'.

Later in his account, Kwalafane'ia describes how he and his mates were tried
for assaulting the European plantation manager:

olketa   mek-em kout   long mifala nao, ia
SRP(3p) *do-*TrS *trial* LOC Pr(lpe) PRF   RHET
So they put us on trial.

nao mifala   kookout   nao, olketa   see, iufala   ia,
then SRP(lpe) *be tried*(RED) PRF   SRP(3p) *say* FPr(2p) DEI
They tried us, asking, 'You men,

wanem   nao iufala kir-im masta   fo
INT(*what?*) TOP SRP(2p) *hit-*TrS *master for*
why did you hit your master?' ...

hem-i   no gif-im kaikai long mifala — mi   nao mi
SRP(3s) NEG *give-*TrS *food* LOC Pr(lpe) FPr(ls) TOP SRP(ls)
'He didn't give us any food' — *it was I who was the*

fasi   kesi
be first case
first one tried.

hem-i   no gif-im kaikai long mifala
SRP(3s) NEG *give-*TrS *food* LOC Pr(lpe)
'He didn't give us any food.'

waswe   iufala, fosi iufala hangri   tumas nao, iufala
INT(*why?*) FPr(2p) *if*   SRP(2p) *be hungry very* PRF   SRP(2p)
'Why, if you were very hungry, didn't you

no kalaemap kokonate, iufala kaikai-em kokonate?
NEG *climb*   *coconut*   SRP(2p) *eat-*TrS   *coconut*
climb coconut palms and eat the coconuts?'

Kwalafane'ia's usage of focal and subject-referencing pronouns exactly follows
that in corresponding Kwaio sentence structures. The calquing is exact and
pervasive. We see in mi nao mi... the pairing of focal pronoun and SRP.
Later we find the focal pronoun and SRP separated by an embedded clause, in

waswe iufala, fosi iufala hangri tumas nao, iufala...   Such degrees of syntactic
complexity are not supposed to be found in pidgins (except in their later
creolising phases); but here it is possible because the whole pattern is
directly, morpheme-by-morpheme, calqued onto a corresponding Kwaio syntactic
pattern.   Jonathan Fiifi'i, another Kwaio speaker in his sixties, one who
commands a repertoire from the 'bush' Pijin used here to contemporary Honiara
Pijin, here gives another example of focal pronoun and SRP separated by a
topicalising particle:

> iu   stap long hia, iu   stapkwaet
> SRP(2s) *stay* LOC DEI   SRP(2s) *be still*
> *You stay here, stay quiet.*

> no   seksek
> NEG *move*
> *Don't move around.*

> mi   nomoa mi   go
> FPr(ls) *only* SRP(ls) *go*
> *I alone will go.*

This pattern of pronominal usage is not confined to Kwaio speakers of Pijin.
From Tolo'au, a Kwara'ae (Malaita) policeman who learned his Pijin in the 1920s
prior to the massacre he recounts here:

> mista lilisi i   kerap wantaem nao i   go insaet long haos
> *Mr   Lillies* SRP(3) *spring at once* PRF SRP(3) *go inside* LOC   *house*
> *Mr Lillies sprang up and sprang into the*

> takisi, ko insaet haos, olketa kiikil-im   insaet haos,
> *tax   go inside house* SRP(3p) *kill*(RED)-TrS *inside house*
> *tax house, went into the house, and they killed him (there) in the house,*

> mi   no   luk-im nao
> SRP(ls) NEG *see*-TrS PRF
> *I didn't see it.*

> mi   aotsaet wet-em   olketa busumane nao
> FPr(ls) *outside with*-TrS PLU   *bushman   now*
> *I was outside with all the bushmen.*

> mifala   faafaete   aotsaete
> SRP(lpe) *fight*(RED) *outside*
> *We fought outside.*

> mista belo, mista lilisi, tufala-i dae nao
> *Mr   Bell Mr   Lillies* SRP(3d) *die* PRF
> *Mr Bell and Mr Lillies were dead.*

> mi   nao mi   faet wet-em olketa nomoa, mi   aotsaet
> FPr(ls) TOP SRP(ls) *fight* Pr(3p) *only*   FPr(ls) *outside with*-TrS
> *I was just left to fight with them, I was outside*

> wet-em   olketa nomoa
> *with*-TrS Pr(3p) *only*
> *with them.*

Here we find again the paired focal pronoun and SRP mi ... mi separated by the
topicalising particle. We also see an example of tufala-i as subject-referencing
pronoun (marked here for dual number as well as third person) used with an

explicit noun subject. Another narrative by a Malaita policeman who escaped
this 1927 massacre, Usuli Tefu'i from Lau, further illustrates this pattern of
pronominal usage.

> oraet, samting   hem-i   laek-em, na waswe   hem-i   ask-em
> *so   something* SRP(3s) *want*-TrS *so* INT(*why?*) SRP(3s) *ask*-TrS
> *So if there was anything he wanted, then if he asked*

> mi,   mi   nao mi   du-im deskaen   samting
> FPr(1s) FPr(1s) TOP SRP(1s) *do*-TrS *this kind something*
> *me, I'd do whatever it was.*

> taem hem-i   siki,   mista bel i   gar-em siki   nao,
> *time* SRP(3s) *be sick Mr   Bell* SRP(3) *get*-TrS *illness now*
> *When he was sick, when Mr Bell had an illness,*

> mitufala kam   long tulake,
> SRP(1de) *come* LOC   *Tulagi*
> *the two of us came to Tulagi,*

> mi   tuu mi   kam mi   stap weit-em
> FPr(1s) *too* SRP(1s) *come* SRP(1s) *stay with*-TrS
> *I too came and I stayed with him.*

Here again we find mi ... mi sequences; and we also find hem-i as a subject-
referencing pronoun referencing an explicit noun subject.

Was this pattern of pronominal usage confined to speakers of Malaita languages?
The following passage comes from Sale Vuza (Sir Jacob Vouza), who learned Pijin
as a policeman in the 1920s; his native language is Tasimboko (Guadalcanal):

> mi   luk-im wan man nomoa long Toabaita hem-i   kil-im
> SRP(1s) *see*-TrS *one man only* LOC   *To'abaita* SRP(3s) *hit*-TrS
> *I saw a To'abaita man who killed*

> mane wea hem-i   hambaka-im waef blong hem
> *man* REL SRP(3s) *fuck*-TrS   *wife* PsP   Pr(3s)
> *a man who had sex with his wife.*

> hem-i   kil-im finis, kam   long Aoke nao, fo   kam repot,
> SRP(3s) *hit*-TrS COMP   *come* LOC   *Auki* PRF INF AUX *report*
> *He killed him, then came to Auki to report:*

> mi   nao mi   kil-im
> FPr(1s) TOP SRP(1s) *hit*-TrS
> *I'm the one who killed him.*

> hem   nao hem-i   kil-im desfala   mane wea hem-i   hambaka
> FPr(3s) TOP SRP(3s) *hit*-TrS *this*-A/SMkr *man* REL SRP(3s) *have sex*
> *He's the one who killed the man who had sex*

> long wuman blong hem
> LOC   *woman* PsP   Pr(3s)
> *with his wife.*

Here Vuza uses both mi nao mi and hem nao hem-i: unmistakable evidence of the
re-analysis of nineteenth century Plantation Pidgin pronouns (as represented in
Bislama and Tok Pisin) that has occurred among Solomon Islands speakers. What
these Solomon Islanders appear to have done with the Queensland Pidgin they
inherited, with its (for them) semantically impoverished predicate-marker as

generalised copy pronoun (in non-singular slots), is to recapture the
semantically-marked subject pronoun into the SRP slot: hem i or tufala i became
re-analysed as hem-i and tufala-i; with the short unmarked i form used as an
option where reference is clear.

A final piece of text comes from another Guadalcanal speaker of this generation,
Domenico Alibua, a speaker of the Tolo dialect of Talise (cassette and tran-
script from Christine Jourdan). Alibua's experience was in the Catholic mission,
not the constabulary; so the pattern we have seen could not have represented
'police pidgin'.

> den taem olketa muvu kam long hia, padre buyon   and
> *then when SRP(3p) move DEI LOC here father Bouillon and*
> *Then when they moved here, Father Bouillon and*

> padre koako tufala-i stap long hia, long avuavu fastaem,
> *father Koako SRP93d) stay LOC here LOC Avuavu at first*
> *Father Koako stayed here at Avuavu at first,*

> den tu-fala   bigiman long longgu tufala send-em nius
> *then two-A/SMkr leader LOC Longgu SRP(3d) send-TrS news*
> *then two leaders from Longgu sent word*

> po olketa pipol long bush po kom kil-im olketa pristi ia ...
> *for PLU   people LOC bush INF AUX hit-TrS PLU   priest DEI*
> *for the bush people to come and kill those priests ...*

> bikos   gavman   hem-i des kam nomoa, ia
> *because government SRP(3s) TAM come PstVbP RHET*
> *Because the government had just come, right?*

> hem-i   des kam apta — olketa misionari nao kam
> *SRP(3s) TAM come after PLU   missionary TOP come*
> *It just came after — it was the missionaries who had come*

> fastaem long solomon aelans
> *first   LOC Solomon Islands*
> *first to the Solomon Islands.*

> bet gavman   taem i   kam, hem   olsem   hem-i   no
> *but government when SRP(3) arrive FPr(3s) as though SRP(3s) NEG*
> *But when the government came, it wasn't*

> strong   olsem tude
> *be strong like today*
> *strong as it is nowadays.*

Here in two places Alibua references explicit noun subjects with the SRP
tufala(-i). In these constructions and others, Alibua unmistakably calques
the Pijin pronouns onto the pattern in his native language of maintaining
reference with SRP's, and creating semantic emphasis with focal pronouns (note
gavman ... hem olsem hem-i ...). Note again the use of mi ... mi in the following
subsequent passage:

> olketa pipol des her-em lotu, state po kakam   anda
> *PLU   people TAM hear-TrS church start INF come(REDUP) and*
> *People heard about the church, and started to come, and*

> skulboes kom anda aeven mi   tu mi   kam dat taem ...
> *schoolboys come and even FPr(ls) too SRP(ls) come that time*
> *school boys came — even I myself came at that time ...*

      den mi   taem mi   rid-im leta ia tu-fala   skulboe
      then FPr(ls) *when* SRP(ls) *read-TrS letter* DEI *two-A/Smkr schoolboy*
      The time I read the letter was when two schoolboys

      tek-em   go katch-em mi   long talise angarich
      take-TrS DEI *reach-TrS* Pr(ls) LOC *Talise Anchorage*
      took it to me at Talise Anchorage.

A final source of clarification of the pronominal system used by these older
speakers of Solomons Pijin is the pattern used in non-verbal sentences. Data
on such sentences in Solomons Pijin are limited, and usages probably vary
according to the occurrence of such sentences in speakers' first languages.
We have seen that in To'aba'ita (northern Malaita), equational sentences are
non-verbal but locative sentences use a verb 'stay, be located'. In Kwaio
(central Malaita) both equational and locative sentences are non-verbal. Older
Kwaio speakers use exactly the same patterns in Pijin as they do in Kwaio.

      hem   long solowata
      FPr(3s) LOC *sea*
      He's at the coast.

Compare, in Kwaio:

      ngai   i   asi
      FPr(3s) LOC *sea*
      He's at the coast.

That is, the focal pronoun — *not* the subject-referencing pronoun — is used in
such non-verbal constructions. We may guess that To'aba'ita speakers avail
themselves of the alternative Pijin construction:

      hem-i   stap   solowata
      SRP(3s) *be located* LOC *sea*
      He's at the coast.

This construction is of course also available to, and sometimes used by, Kwaio
speakers. That such verbless sentences, using focal pronouns, are common in
Pijin usage in other parts of the Solomons is clear from Heubner and Horoi's
grammatical sketch of Pijin compiled for the U.S. Peace Corps (1979).

Let me now begin to work back toward questions of future-marking in Pijin —
constructions such as bae mi luk-im — with which I began.

FUTURE-MARKING IN PIJIN

It appears that the most common pattern for marking future in late nineteenth
century Pacific Plantation Pidgin was to use bae or baebae in a slot preceding
a subject NP. In such constructions, bae(bae) can probably best be considered
a 'temporal adverb'; it corresponds to the usage in the English constructions
from which the lexical items derives. 'By and by we'll go to town.' This is
the standard pattern among older speakers of Bislama (in Vanuatu) and Tok Pisin
(in Papua New Guinea) for whom Pidgin was a lingua franca of plantation work.

However, it appears that in Bislama, at least, the possibility of using bae
following the subject NP slot has been an alternative available for many
decades. In such constructions, where a subject NP is followed by a pronoun or
predicate-marker, and bae intervenes between them, bae is (it would seem)
incorporated within the VP as a tense-aspect marker. This is the 'movement

toward the verb' which Sankoff and Laberge (1973) associate with recent develop-
ments in Tok Pisin catalysed by creolisation, whereby a peripherally-used
temporal adverb becomes progressively grammaticalised.

Rather than adduce evidence for the early occurrence of such constructions
incorporating bae into the VP, in Bislama and Solomons Pijin, I shall be content
with a single — but to me, compelling — datum: a sentence recorded by Layard in
New Caledonia (apparently in the 1870s), and published by Schuchardt (1883):
'brother belong-a-me by and by he dead'.

My texts gathered from older speakers of Kwaio and other Solomons languages who
learned Pijin in plantation contexts prior to World War II suggest that by the
1930s the incorporation of bae(bae) within the verb phrase was the most common
pattern, although bae(bae) preceding the subject NP remained a frequently used
alternative.   I shall here give a few examples of constructions used by these
older speakers of Pijin where bae(bae) is used following a noun subject or a
focal pronoun, and precedes the subject-referencing pronoun.   First, we can
examine two extracts from Kwalafane'ia's account of arrival of the Japanese in
the Solomons when he was working on a plantation:

> diapani   baebae hem-i   kam tudee, ia
> *Japanese* FUT   SRP(3s) *come today* RHET
> *The Japanese are going to come today.*

> evriting   olsem   baebae hem-i   kas-em   iu
> *everything like that* FUT   SRP(3s) *hit*-TrS Pr(2s)
> *All those sorts of things could hit you*

> long ruga bae iu   dae, ia
> LOC *Lunga* FUT SRP(2s) *die* RHET
> *at Lunga and you'd die, right?*

And later in his account, talking of first Maasina Rule meetings:

> nao iufala   Kwaio baebae iufala   dion-em
> *now* FRP(2p) *Kwaio* FUT   SRP(2p) *join*-TrS
> *So you Kwaio people join it.*

And again, from an account of Tulagi under attack:

> nara   sikesiki i   go moa   longo 'ifiningi baebae hem-i   kam
> *another section* SRP(3) *go* PstVbp LOC *evening*   FUT   SRP(3s) *come*
> *Another* [*plane*] *which took its place in the evening would come.*

Jonathan Fiifi'i, another Kwaio speaker (here using his 'bush' dialect), is
talking of the long matches obtained in trade stores during his childhood:

> dis-fala   masisi ia, nomata siton, safosi thei
> DEI-A/SMkr *matches* DEI *even if stone* *if*   SRP(3p)
> *These matches will ignite even if you*

> sikras-em long hemu, baebae hem-i   save laeti nomoa
> *scrape*-TrS LOC Pr(3s) FUT   SRP(3s) MOD *ignite* PstVbp
> *strike one on a stone.*

Note here Fiifi'i's use of a form of 'they' as third-person plural subject-
referencing pronoun, a pattern I discuss elsewhere (Keesing n.d.1 and n.d.2).

Where a noun subject is explicit, the subject-referencing pronoun can optionally
be deleted, as in many of the substrate languages.   Thus, from Domenico Alibua
of the Guadalcanal Weather Coast:

> den, olketa mane po devodevolo ia, olketa bipo i   kam,
> *then* PLU   *man* *for ancestor* DEI FPr(3p) *before* SRP(3) *come*
> *Then all the pagans, before they had come,*

> olketa-i no wande her-emu, ia, bikosi olketa-i tink,
> SRP(3p) NEG MOD *hear-*TrS RHET *because* SRP(3p) *think*
> *didn't want to hear it, because they thought,*

> ou, lotu ia baebae kam, i   spoel-em   devol   blong iumi
> EXCL *church* DEI FUT   *come* SRP(3) *destroy-*TrS *ancestor* PsP   Pr(lpi)
> *'Oh, if this church comes, it will destroy our ancestors.'* ...

Where the focal pronoun is used in place of a noun subject, the future-marking bae(bae) fits into the slot between focal and subject referencing pronoun. Thus from Simone Maa'eobi, another Kwaio speaker who learned Pijin on a prewar plantation:

> iu   bae iu   mek-em
> FPr(2s) FUT SRP(2s) *do-*TrS
> *You will do it.*

> mi   bae mi   sal-em   naef blong mi   long Taunau'a
> FPr(1s) FUT-SRP(1s) *sell-*TrS *knife* PSP   Pr(1s) LOC *Taunau'a*
> *I'll sell my knife at Taunau'a.*

> iu   bae iu   goap wattaem?
> FPr(2s) FUT SRP(2s) *ascend* INT(*when?*)
> *When will you go up the hill?*

> tufala bae tufala-i kambek wattaem?
> FPr(3d) FUT SRP(3d) *return* INT(*when?*)
> *When will the two of them get back?*

In Fiifi'i's text of his father's theft of a pig, when he was a boy, he tells of how a feral pig would return to its original home:

> googo hem-i   tink-im   ples wea   hem-i bon   long hem
> *then* SRP(3s) *remember-*TrS *place where* SRP(3s) *be born* LOC Pr(3s)
> *And then he remembers the place where he was born,*

> anaa bik-fala   long hem, hem   baebae i   kambaek, ia
> *and be big-*A/SMkr LOC Pr(3s) FPr(3s) FUT   SRP(3) *return*   RHET
> *and grew up, and comes back after a while.*

However, use of bae(bae) in the slot preceding a subject noun remains an option, although in my texts from these older speakers it occurs less than one third as frequently. An example from Domenico Alibua will illustrate:

> baebae evriwan, olketa soldia long merika, olketa tel-em   se
> FUT   *everyone* PLU   *soldier* LOC *America* SRP(3p) *tell-*TrS *that*
> *Then everyone — the American soldiers announced that*

> olketa-i no wand-em eni misionari moa po istapu, ia
> SRP(3p) NEG *want-*TrS QNT *missionary more* INF *stay* RHET
> *they didn't want any more missionaries to remain.*

From Kwalafane'ia's account of his trial for assaulting a plantation manager:

> nao mi   tanlaon nao, mi   see, kokonate long rifa   ia,
> *then* SRP(1s) *turn*   PRF SRP(1s) *say* *coconut* LOC *Lever's* DEI
> *So I turned and said, 'These Levers' coconuts —*

```
fosi mifala   kaikai-em baebae olketa masta  long rifa    i
if   SRP(lpe) eat-TrS   FUT    PLU    master LOC  Lever's SRP(3)
if we ate them all the Lever's bosses would

tokotoko long mifala, ia
quarrel  LOC  Pr(lpe) RHET
get angry with us.
```

Elsewhere Kwalafane'ia's account illustrates the use of bae(bae) preceding a
focal pronoun and subject-referencing pronoun:

```
baebae mi     nao mi    luk  fo hem
FUT    FPr(ls) TOP SRP(ls) look LOC Pr(3s)
I'll look for it.
```

I suspect that what is happening, when these speakers who seem to be calquing
closely on their native languages in equating bae(bae) with a future-marker
place it in a slot preceding a noun or pronoun subject, represents a topicalis-
ation by fronting. In those substrate languages for which I have data, modals
of possibility and probability canonically fit into a slot within the VP
preceding the subject-referencing pronoun (just as maet does in Solomons Pijin).
However, when the modality is to be foregrounded, these modals can be fronted
to a position in the surface syntax preceding a noun subject. This pattern of
fronting a modal from the VP cannot be used with future-marking particles in
the substrate languages because they are marked on the subject-referencing
pronouns by affixation.[6] Bae(bae) in Pijin, being a free form, can (like maet)
be foregrounded in this manner to emphasise the time frame or irrealis mode of
the action described.[7] Kwaio speakers of Pijin often use constructions
employing both a modal of possibility and a future-marker. In such constructions
the modal always precedes bae. The standard slot for maet is at the onset of
the verb phrase, with bae (if used) immediately following it: olketa man maet
bae i kam *the men might come*. If maet is topicalised by fronting, bae remains
in the verb phrase: maet olketa man bae i kam. This exactly follows the pattern
in Kwaio constructions:

```
ta'a   no'ona bala ta-la       nigi i  gani
people DEI    MOD  FUT-SRP(3p) come LOC tomorrow
Maybe those people will come tomorrow.

bala ta'a  no'ona ta-la       nigi i  gani
MOD  people DEI    FUT-SRP     come LOC tomorrow
Maybe those people will come tomorrow.
```

At this point we can step back for a more general assessment of future-marking
among these older speakers of Solomons Pijin who learned it as young adults as
a plantation lingua franca. It would seem that bae(bae) is being analysed by
these speakers as corresponding to a future-marking particle, in their native
languages, occurring within the verb phrase. For speakers of Kwaio and speakers
of Guadalcanal languages, for whom future-marking particles in their native
languages are prefixed to the subject-referencing pronouns, the Pijin form fits
into the same slot and allows of a direct calquing. For speakers of northern
Malaita languages, in which future-marking particles are suffixed to subject-
referencing pronouns, the fit is less exact but entails a shift in the order of
tense/aspect marking within the verb phrase. The shift is not, of course,
insignificant; nor is the contrast between a bound affix, whether prefixed or
suffixed to the SRP, and a free form such as (bae)bae. I will return shortly
to analyse the significance of the contrasts. Despite the significant contrasts

between bae in Pijin and future-marking particles in the substrate languages, for these older speakers of Southeast Solomonic languages, the canonical analysis of bae appears to be as a fully-grammaticalised tense/aspect marker within the VP. My fragmentary data strongly suggest that the rather different semantic shadings of bae among speakers of different Southeast Solomonic languages (to mark irrealis or non-accomplished mode rather than future-tense, or in varying combinations with modals of possibility and probability) will turn out to correspond directly to the usages of 'future-marking' particles in particular languages.

To establish this point with certainty would require a detailed comparative study of substrate languages and Pijin usages; and this has not been possible because of the present political obstacles to research. For Kwaio speakers, however, the evidence is very clear, if we examine the place of future-markers within the tense-aspect system of Kwaio, and the Pijin constructions used by Kwaio men who have learned Pijin as young adults in contexts of plantation work. We have seen how the future-marking particle, in Kwaio, can operate in conjunction with modals of possibility; and how Pijin usages exactly follow the same pattern, both syntactically and semantically. Even more clear evidence comes from the interaction of the future-marking particle with the aspect marker bi'i. By itself, in a slot immediately following the subject referencing pronoun, bi'i indicates that the action of the verb has just taken place:

> gala   bi'i nigi
> SRP(3d) TAM *arrive*
> *The two of them just got here.*

Kwaio speakers use the Pijin aspect marker das as equivalent to bi'i, in exactly the same slot:

> tufala(-i) das kam
> SRP(3d)   TAM *come*
> *The two of them just got here.*

In Kwaio, bi'i can be used in conjunction with the future-marking ta-, and creates a time-frame 'after a while'. Thus in a text from Maa'eobi, we get:

> ta-goru   bi'i aga-si-a
> FUT-SRP(lti) TAM *see*-TrS-PrO(3s)
> *We'll see it soon.*

And in a parallel Pijin account, we find:

> bae iumi   das luk-im
> FUT SRP(lpi) TAM *see*-TrS
> *We'll see it soon.*

From such exact, complex parallels between substrate pattern and Pijin usage, where subtle semantic shadings are created which are not predictable from the tense-aspect markers operating individually, we can be left with no doubt that such older Kwaio speakers are using formulae of morpheme equivalences (ta- = bae, bi'i = das, etc.) in calquing Pijin onto Kwaio. There seems no good reason to doubt that men like Tolo'au, Usuli Tefu'i, Vuza and Alibua were doing the same thing, with their various substrate languages which shared more-or-less similar ways of marking tense/aspect — even though for some of them equating bae(bae) with their future-markers entailed minor changes in the order of constituents within verb phrases. As such men, in contexts of plantation or police work, sat around their fires at night or ate their rations or cut copra, telling

stories in Pijin about adventures at home and away, they very probably correctly interpreted most of the semantic subtleties of one another's utterances despite the variations created by calquing on particular substrate languages. A Lau speaker might not produce a sentence exactly corresponding to bae iumi das lukim, but in a context of discourse he would very probably understand it.

In the Solomons, then, for at least half a century bae(bae) seems to have been fully grammaticalised as the equivalent to the marker of future/irrealis or non-accomplished mode in substrate languages, fitting into a canonical position immediately preceding the subject-referencing pronoun within the verb phrase.

This pattern in Solomons Pijin contrasts with that reported by Sankoff and Laberge (1973) for Tok Pisin, where the grammaticalisation of bae is supposed to be a result of, or reinforced by, creolisation, and to represent a 'shift' of bae in the direction of the verb. We have seen, in one of the sentences from Alibua, the illusion of such a 'shift' created by the (optional) omission of a subject-referencing pronoun following an explicit noun subject. In the other constructions we have examined where the future-marker is incorporated within the VP, it is in each case followed by a subject-referencing pronoun (as in substrate languages, where future is marked on the SRP).

This, then, brings us back to the constructions with which we began, such as bae mi luk-im — constructions where we find bae preceding a single pronoun. At the outset, I suggested that such constructions could be the surface product of three different grammars (as they shape pronominal constructions).

First of all, such constructions go far back in time. Thus Pionnier, based on his observations on Malekula in the early 1890s, gives as a future paradigm (1913:189):

> banbaille mi go
> banbaille you go
> banbaille hi go
> banbaille you mi go (etc.)

Schuchardt (1883) gives 'by and by he come'. And Florence Young, recounting her experiences with Queensland 'Kanakas' in 1887, records (from a man named 'Caleb'):

> He no like-'im school, because he no savee. By-and-by
> he like-'im plenty, he come all the time. (Young 1926:46)

Where older speakers of Malaita and Guadalcanal languages whose Pijin I have examined use bae(bae) followed by a pronoun, it would seem that the pronoun is the (for them syntactically obligatory) subject-referencing pronoun. The future-marker would seem to be (in its for them canonical position) within the verb phrase, in sentences such as (from Kwalafane'ia):

> bae mifala   rus-im   mani   tuu
> FUT SRP(1pe) *lose*-TrS *money too*
> *And we'd lose money, too.*

And, from several points in Fiifi'i's narrative:

> finis, hem-i   see nao, oraeti, baebae iumi   go nao
> *then*   SRP(3s) *say* PRF *OK*   FUT   SRP(1pi) *go now*
> *After that he said, 'OK, we'll go in a while.*

nao, hem-i tal-em   fo mitufala go bata hem-i   see
then SRP(3s) *tell*-TrS *for* SRP(1de) *go but*   SRP(3s) *say*
So then he said we were to go, but said

baebae mitufala go — longo safa   nao.
FUT   SRP(1de) *go* LOC   *evening now*
we were to go in the evening.

googoraoni, mi   go kas-em   roti gogodaon   fo solowata,
circle(RED) SRP(1s) TAM *reach*-TrS *path descend*(RED) LOC *coast*
Circling, I'll go to where the path drops down to the coast,

oraet, baebae mi   put-um bikibiki ia nao
then   FUT   SRP(1s) *put*-TrS *pig*   DEI PRF
then I'll leave the pigs there.

put-um kam kolsafu long ples nomoa, mek-em   taem tutake
put-TrS DEI *near*   LOC *place only*   CAUS(*make*-TrS) *when dark*
He put it close by, so that when it got dark

lelebeti, bifo baebae i   kar-em   kam insaet long haos
slightly before FUT   SRP(3) *carry*-TrS DEI *inside* LOC   *house*
he could bring it into the house.

However, note that when a sentence has neither an explicit noun subject nor a
focal pronoun, if bae(bae) were being used as a temporal adverb (in the slot
preceding the subject NP slot) it would produce the same surface order as a
construction where bae(bae) is a future-marker in the VP, preceding a subject-
referencing pronoun:

bae + (NP) + SRP > bae + SRP (where NP = Ø)
(NP) + bae + SRP > bae + SRP (where NP = Ø)

Data on Bislama (Vanuatu) available to me suggest that the former is the usual
pattern in that dialect, whereas the latter appears to be the usual pattern for
older speakers of Solomons Pijin. The differences between the two constructions
are manifest when we find, in Bislama, both the focal and subject-referencing
pronouns being used. Thus, in a text from a Santo bush Bislama speaker
provided to me by Jacques Guy:

bae mi mi ...

and from Charpentier (1979):

bae mi mi blok-im marid ya
I will prevent this marriage.
and
baebae mi mi ded
I will be dead.

I have speculated (Keesing n.d.2) that it was the surface parallels created in
this manner (and similar constructional ambiguities created by modals such as
maet) that initially allowed Solomon Islanders to reanalyse sequences of pronoun
+ predicate-marker in the nineteenth century Plantation Pidgin into subject-
referencing pronouns marked for person and number. Thus:

bae hem   i kam
FUT Pr(3s) PM *come*

could be reanalysed as:

```
bae hem-i   kam
FUT SRP(3s) come
```

and

```
maet tufala i  du-im
MOD  Pr(3d) PM do-TrS
```

could be reanalysed as:

```
maet tufala-i du-im
MOD  SRP(2s)  do-TrS
```

Two different systems of marking future, then, can produce similar surface constructions. I infer that one, with future-marker as a tense-marking particle within the verb phrase, was the standard pattern in prewar Solomons Pijin. As we have seen, it follows closely the pattern of future-marking in substrate languages of the south-eastern Solomons (whose speakers comprised the bulk of the plantation labour force). A different pattern, canonical in Bislama (and in older dialects of Tok Pisin), uses bae(bae) as a temporal adverb in a slot preceding a noun subject or focal pronoun. The two patterns produce parallel constructions when subject NP or focal pronoun is omitted.

I will return at this stage to the contrasts between (bae)bae as a free form, preceding the subject-referencing pronoun, and the future-marking particle in the Oceanic languages of eastern Melanesia, which characteristically is a bound suffix attached to the SRP. Why, we might ask, if substrate influences have indeed shaped future-marking in Melanesian Pidgin, and if the future-marking particle in most of the languages of Vanuatu and the south-east Solomons is *suffixed* to the subject-referencing pronoun, do we not get such constructions as *mi bae go? I infer that where bae has been grammaticalised by Melanesian speakers, analysed as part of the verb phrase, it has been placed in a slot preceding the SRP (a slot characteristically filled in these Oceanic languages by modals) through a kind of ongoing dialectical interaction with superstrate models and speakers of 'Tok Masta'. English-speakers using Pidgin, throughout the plantation period, seemingly always have used 'by and by' in clause-initial position, as in English: 'by and by you do him', or 'by and by this fella man he come'. Melanesians who, as Southeast Solomons speakers seem to have done, analyse baebae as semantically equivalent to the future-marking particles in their native languages, and the pronouns of Pidgin as equivalent syntactically to the obligatory SRP's, produced a linguistic coin equivalent to that of their overseers as long as they kept the future-marker in the slot preceding the SRP (retaining the option to topicalise the future-marker by fronting it in the slot preceding a noun subject, as modals can be so fronted in many of the substrate languages).[8]

This scenario illustrates how a third grammatical system can produce similar surface constructions. Pronouns can be analysed in an English-like manner, such that rather than pronominal reference being indexed within the verb phrase (with a subject-referencing pronoun), pronominal anaphora entails substitution of a pronoun for a noun subject, in the same slot. In such a grammar — which may be emerging among urban speakers of Solomons Pijin extensively exposed to English in school and other contexts — a bae-marker preceding a pronoun represents a temporal adverb: but the subject NP slot is filled (with a pronoun), not empty.

The point, then, is that the same surface constructions in Pijin may be produced by, or analysed in terms of, different grammatical systems. This, I presume, is a process which has been going on throughout the history of Melanesian Pidgin. For many decades the accommodation has been among speakers of different and mutually unintelligible (but usually genetically related and grammatically similar) Pacific Islands languages, and between them and speakers of 'Tok Masta' mapping Pidgin onto superstrate patterns. Now the patterns of mutual accomodation have changed somewhat, especially in the urban context (Jourdan 1985); but the flexibility remains.

CONCLUSION

The argument I have advanced points in a number of directions. First it suggests the need for a much closer examination of the processes of substrate modelling, and the sources of substrate models, than has yet been attempted. This is a task I am pursuing elsewhere (Keesing n.d.3), although the contributions of any one scholar in this enormous task will inevitably be limited and partial. It is a task, I suggest, that will require a dialectic between 'substratomania' (Bickerton 1977:61) and exploration of universal grammatical patterns, faculties and constraints.

Second, it calls for great caution in inferring from patterns of surface syntax the grammar being used by speakers of Melanesian Pidgins. At the very least, one would require a substantial corpus from a single speaker to interpret constructions such as bae mi luk-im.

Third, it suggests the value of close-grained examination of the usage of Pijin by speakers of different Solomons (or Vanuatu or Papua New Guinea) languages, to assess the nature and degree of calquing (a project pursued by Mosel, 1980, for Kuanua and Camden, 1979, for Tangoa).

Fourth, to the extent we take substrate modelling seriously, we must carefully examine the historical evidence to determine which speakers of which languages in which periods were centrally involved. I have suggested elsewhere (n.d.3) that studies of Tok Pisin have too often taken the wrong focus both in time and in space. Bickerton (1981, 1984) is undoubtedly right in exempting Melanesian Pidgin from the model of pidgincreole development he advances. It would seem that for at least a century, Pidgin has had a degree of syntactic elaboration and standardisation far beyond what prevailing theories would lead us to expect of a trade jargon or impoverished plantation lingua franca. Indeed, emerging fragmentary evidence suggests to me that much of this elaboration and standardisation antedates the onset of the Labour Trade. An early Beach-la-Mar spoken by Islands ships crews by the onset of the sandalwood period (1840s) already seems to have incorporated both a fundamental Oceanic syntactic structure and a degree of elaboration and standardisation that went well beyond a trade jargon.[9] Melanesian Pidgin has a very different kind of history, and a very different structure, than the simple, unstandardised jargons prevailing linguistic theory would lead us to expect.

The future-marking bae is a case in point. Far from being (as a grammatical marker within the verb phrase) a recent outcome of creolisation, the evidence from Solomons Pijin suggests a much longer history. Layard's tantalysing 'brother belong-a-me by and by he dead', recorded in New Caledonia more than a century ago, can well give us food for thought.

NOTES

[1]For helpful comments and suggestions on a preliminary version of this paper, I am indebted to Tom Dutton, Alan Jones, Don Laycock, Andrew Pawley, Malcolm Ross, Darrell Tryon and Professor E.M. Uhlenbeck. Christine Jourdan has assisted in many ways, providing data, enduring hours of debate about Pijin pronouns and substrate models, and proffering many useful suggestions and insights. She also provided a valuable text from Guadalcanal Tolo speaker Domenico Alibua.

[2]Anna Shnukal has usefully pointed out to me that the pattern of pronominal anaphora in the colloquial English spoken on ships and on plantations in the nineteenth century may have provided models for Pidgin pronominal usages: these speakers may commonly have used a pronoun recapitulating and referencing a preceding subject NP ('my brother he ...'; 'John and Jack and Sam they ...).

[3]While the clitic subject-referencing pronouns copy an underlying *pronoun* subject, they *index* an underlying noun subject. In Oceanic languages they characteristically are marked for non-singular number only when the explicit or implied noun subject is higher-animate as well as non-singular, and when reference is to the plurality as individuals rather than as a collectivity. Otherwise, the third person singular subject-referencing pronoun is character- istically used.

Note that whereas the subject-referencing pronoun is indexed to an underlying noun subject, it may not be indexed in person and number to a surface noun subject. Kwaio (Malaita) provides a useful example. In a sentence where the underlying subject is ''Ubuni, Seda and I', this can be realised in surface constructions as:

    la 'Ubuni ma la Seda meru ...
    ART *'Ubuni* CON ART *Seda* SRP(1te)
    'Ubuni and Seda, we ...

Here the underlying subject is

    la 'Ubuni la Seda ma inau ...
    'Ubuni and Seda and I ...

or characteristically, in EO languages at least,

    'e-meeru la 'Ubuni ma la Seda ...
    FPr(3te) ART *'Ubuni* CON ART *Seda*
    We, 'Ubuni and Seda (and I) ...

If, in PEO, an explicit direct object NP was referenced by a clitic pronoun suffixed to the transitive suffix (this is not certain; see Harrison 1978), this clitic was apparently in an invariant 3p.s. form (i.e., it was not marked for non-singular number, even though the following direct object NP might be plural).

[4]Pawley notes that:

> PEO *(ng)ku, *ko, and *n(i)a are reconstructed ... as the
> shapes of the embedded subject pronouns marking 1st, 2nd
> and 3rd person singular respectively. They are replaced
> in Bugotu, Nggela [Gela], Vaturanga (Guadalcanal-Nggelic
> languages) and in Sa'a (Malaita) by u, o and e respectively ...

> The loss of *k appears to be related to the development
> in these languages of a special series of preverbal forms

> marking future tense plus person and number. Bugotu,
> Nggela and Vaturanga exhibit forms consisting of a
> future marker plus pronouns -u, -o, and -e ...   The
> simplifications led to the development of u, o and e
> as the basic, isolable pronoun forms, ke having been
> reinterpreted as consisting of future marker k- plus
> 3rd singular pronoun -e.

[5]In Keesing n.d.2, I suggest that the semantic impoverishment of Oceanic
subject-referencing pronouns in Queensland Pidgin may not simply represent the
simplification characteristic of pidgins, but may reflect the fact that in
many of the Northern New Hebridean languages spoken in the heartland of the
1870s-1880s Labour Trade, the Oceanic subject-referencing pronouns are
similarly impoverished semantically. Thus in Mota, SRP's marked for person
and number have vanished, and in a sentence unmarked for tense or modality are
represented in vestigial form by the invariant predicate-marker i; in Maewo,
the two sets of SRP's contain only residual semantic marking, the one used in
'simple indicative sentences' has the invariant form i, except in 2p.s. and
1p.p.e., where it assumes the form u (Codrington 1885:410, 412-413).

[6]Kwaio provides an interesting partial exception. Where the normal pattern of
future-marking operates by prefixing the particle ta- (or an allomorph) to the
subject-referencing pronoun, Kwaio speakers occasionally use a longer, free,
form of the future-marker ta'a, in the slot preceding a subject-referencing
pronoun: ta'a gila leka is a rare alternative of ta-la leka *they will go*. In
a verbal sentence, where there is a subject-referencing pronoun and a slot
within the verb phrase for ta'a or ta-, the future-marker would not be fronted
into a slot preceding a noun subject or focal pronoun. However, in a non-
verbal sentence with a prepositional phrase as predicate there is no subject-
referencing pronoun or verb phrase; and although the need for future-marking
in such a sentence would be rare, I have recorded:

> ta'a 'e-meeru 'ubu-na   ano
> FUT FPr(1te) *inside*-PrS(3s) *forest*
> *We will be in the forest.*

Here the future-marker is fronted to a position preceding the focal pronoun,
which is in the same slot as a noun subject would be; this exactly corresponds
to (a Kwaio speaker's) Pijin baebae mifala long sikilafu, where the sentence
is verbless and mifala is the focal pronoun.

[7]Camden (personal communication) believes that for at least some speakers of
Bislama, who use bae(bae) both within the VP and preceding a noun (or pronoun)
subject, the latter usage represents a topicalisation or foregrounding of the
temporality or modality by means of fronting.

[8]I am indebted to Tom Dutton and Darrell Tryon for useful discussion of this
problem.

[9]In 1977 correspondence with me, Bickerton (personal communication) posed the
following intriguing questions:

> It occurs to me that if, somewhere in the South Pacific
> around 1850 or thereabouts, there had been a plantation
> settled over a period long enough for children to grow
> up and acquire and stabilize the language, that language
> could have been *repidginized* (as has certainly happened
> with Krio in West Africa) and retained its structure as

> it was disseminated through the Pacific, taking on
> substratal undertones (or overtones!) in the various
> places it took root. Is there any historical evidence
> whatsoever that such a development might have occured
> (it might have happened in somewhere that's no longer
> pidgin speaking, one of the Micronesian islands say)?

In 1977 I thought that Bickerton was wrong, and that the fundamental structures
of Pidgin had evolved during the Labour Trade, with Oceanic languages of the
New Hebrides and Solomons providing the crucial substratal influences. I now
believe, although the evidence is fragmentary that Bickerton was right — that
a Pacific trade jargon creolised by the latter 1840s, was imported by ships'
crews into southern Melanesia during the sandalwood trade, underwent subsequent
further creolising influences in that period, and was introduced more or less
fully developed into the Labour Trade, with sailors from the Loyalties, Isle
des Pins, etc., as crucial agents. But I believe Bickerton was wrong in
guessing that plantations provided the crucial locus. I believe multilingual,
multi-ethnic ships' crews, and children (including half-European children)
growing up on them were the crucial loci, with such shore-bases as Kosrae in
the Carolines, Rotuma and the 'Kingsmill Islands' (Gilberts = Kiribati) playing
an important part as well. However, I believe that some grammatical elabor-
ation and standardisation took place during the Labour Trade, prior to the
separation of Tok Pisin (via Samoa and the Bismarcks) from the Melanesian
Pidgin lineage. These speculations are pursued further in Keesing n.d.3. If
they are correct, the early Oceanic substrate models underlying Melanesian
Pidgin syntax came from Eastern Oceanic languages, but predominantly from
Nuclear Micronesian languages.

APPENDIX I: SUBJECT PRONOUNS IN SOUTHEAST SOLOMONIC

Some grammatical information on other languages in the Guadalcanal-Gela sub-
group is available, although pronominal paradigms are fragmentary and partial.
(As noted, the early missionary grammarians were not aware of the grammatical
nature and function of subject-referencing pronouns, so data on them is
necessarily inferential and often incomplete.) Forms given here are those
unmarked for future-tense or irrealis mode (see Appendix II for future-marked
forms).

Table 12: Inakona (Guadalcanal)			
		FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1	(i)nau	nu
	2	(i)ghoe, gho	o
	3	(i)ghia	ni
DUAL	1 incl	(tauka)	tako
	1 excl	ghamiruka (gharika)	miko
	2	ghamuruka	muko
	3	ghiruka (rauka)	ako

Table 12 continued ...

TRIAL	1 incl	[ghitatolu?]	[tatu?]
	1 excl	[ghamitolu]	[mitu?]
	2	[ghamutolu]	[mutu?]
	3	ghiratolu	atu
PLURAL	1 incl	(i)ghita	ta
	1 excl	(i)ghami	mi
	2	(i)ghamu	mu
	3	(i)ghira	a

Here the data are taken from Capell (1930), augmented by data from Tryon and Hackman (1983: in parentheses). For Vaturanga (Ndi) we find some condensation of semantic information in the non-singular subject-referencing pronouns, which (optionally?) omit the number-marking 'two' or 'three' morpheme:

Table 13: Vaturanga (Guadalcanal)			
		FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1	(i)nau	au, nau
	2	(i)hoe	o, hoe
	3	aia	e
DUAL	1 incl	kuta	a
	1 excl	kuami	ami
	2	kuamu	amu
	3	kura	ara
TRIAL	1 incl	taluhita	a
	1 excl	taluhami	ami
	2	taluhamu	amu
	3	taluhira	ara
PLURAL	1 incl	(i)hita	a
	1 excl	(i)hami	ami
	2	(i)hamu	amu
	3	(i)hira	ara

Ivens (1933-35b:358) notes that:

> the short forms in the [second] column are used by themselves
> as the subject: au vano *I am going*; but the long forms of the
> first column, inau, etc. [i.e., the focal pronouns marked
> with i-] must always be followed in the singular and plural
> by the shorter forms ... while the forms of the [first] column
> [which are marked with -i] must always be followed by the
> short forms. However, hoe is never used with ihoe, though
> it may serve as a subject, being followed by o ... The dual
> and trial forms are never used alone as the subject, but are
> always followed by the short plural forms of the third column.

For languages of the Cristobal-Malaita subgroup we have, first the Longgu language of the Guadalcanal coast (Ivens 1933-35a:609-610).

Table 14: Longgu			FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1		(i)nau	u
	2		(i)oe	o
	3		(i)ngaia	e
PLURAL	1 incl		(i)nggia	nggia'a
	1 excl		(i)ami	ami
	2		(i)amu	amu
	3		(i)nggira	nggira, ara

Dual forms are the same as plural ones, but marked with rua *two*. Ivens notes that 'the forms in the second column [the SRP's] are used by themselves as the subject, or they may follow the longer forms of the first column' (Ivens 1933-35a:610).

For Arosi, spoken on Makira (San Cristobal), we have (Capell 1971):

Table 15: Arosi			FOCAL	SUBJECT-REFERENCING
SINGULAR	1		inau	au
	2		i'oe	'o
	3		iia	a
DUAL	1 incl		igara	gari
	1 excl		i'amiria	miri
	2		('a)murua	muru
	3		irarua	raru
PLURAL	1 incl		igia	gaau
	1 excl		i'ameu	mi, meu
	2		i'amou	mou
	3		iraau	ra, rau

Capell (1971:23) comments that:

> it is not possible to say inau 'ari = *I go*. There must be an indicator of person, number and time [i.e., an SRP] that links the actor inau to the action 'ari: in this case nau, so that the utterance becomes inau 'ari, *I go*. The part that *can* be omitted is the actor, inau, unless the utterance is emphatic, <u>I</u> *am going*.

The pronouns or the northern Malaita languages are essentially the same as those given for To'aba'ita. The subject-referencing pronouns (unmarked for future) in Kwara'ae (north-central Malaita) are given in Appendix II, along with future-marked forms.

APPENDIX II: FUTURE-MARKING IN CRISTOBAL-MALAITA LANGUAGES

Here a few further exemplifications of future-marking in Cristobal-Malaita languages are given. For Kwara'ae, spoken in north-central Malaita, we can compare subject-referencing pronouns unmarked for future (column 1) and marked for future (column 2); data are from Deck (1934:36-40):

Table 16: Kwara'ae				
			SRP (UNMARKED)	SRP (MARKED FOR FUTURE)
SINGULAR	1		ku	ku-i
	2		ko	'o-ke
	3		ka	ke
DUAL	1 incl		koro	koro-ke
	1 excl		mere	me-ke
	2		moro	mo-ke
	3		ka	ke
TRIAL	1 incl		kulu	kulu-ke
	1 excl		mili	(kai)mili-ke
	2		mulu	mulu-ke
	3		kirulu	kirulu-ke
PLURAL	1 incl		ka	ke
	1 excl		kami	kami-ke
	2		kamu	kamu-ke
	3		kira	kira-ke

In Arosi (Capell 1971:27) future-tense is marked on the SRP with a suffixed -i, with only minimal modifications of the SRP's:

Table 17: Arosi				
			NON-FUTURE SRP	FUTURE-MARKED SRP
SINGULAR	1		(n)au	wa-i
	2		'o	'o-i
	3		a	(n)a-i
DUAL	1 incl		gari	gari-i
	1 excl		miri	miri-i

In Longgu, though the data are incomplete and confused, future-marking seems to be accomplished with the invariant particle gho following the subject-referencing pronoun (Ivens 1933-35a).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BICKERTON, D.

  1977   Pidginization and creolization: language acquisition and language universals. In A. Valdman, ed. *Pidgin and creole linguistics*, 49-69. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

  1981   *Roots of language.* Ann Arbor, Mich: Karoma.

  1984   The Language Bioprogram hypothesis. *Brain and Behaviour Sciences* 7:173-221.

BLUST, R.

  1984   Malaita-Micronesian: an Eastern Oceanic subgroup? *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 93/2:99-140.

CAMDEN, W.

  1979   Parallels in structure of lexicon and syntax between New Hebrides Bislama and the South Santo language as spoken at Tangoa. *Papers in pidgin and creole linguistics* No.2, 51-117. *PL*, A-57.

CAPELL, A.

  1930   The language of Inakona, Guadalcanal, Solomon Islands. *Journal of the Polynesian Society* 39:113-136.

  1971   *Arosi grammar. PL*, B-20.

CHARPENTIER, J. -M.

  1979   *Le Bislama: pidgin des Nouvelles-Hébrides.* Paris: SELAF.

CODRINGTON, R.H.

  1885   *The Melanesian languages.* Oxford: Claredon Press.

DECK, N.

  1934   *Grammar of the language spoken by the Kwara'ae people of Mala, British Solomon Islands. Journal of the Polynesian Society* reprint no.5, from vols. 42-43.

GRACE, G.W.

  1976   Review article on R.C. Green and M. Kelly, eds *Studies in Oceanic culture history. Journal of the Polynesian society* 85:103-112.

GREEN, R. and A. PAWLEY

  1984   The Proto-Oceanic language community. *Journal of Pacific History* 19/3-4:123-147.

HARRISON, S.P.

  1978   Transitive marking in Micronesian languages. In S.A. Wurm and Lois Carrington, eds *Second International Conference on Austronesian Linguistics: proceedings*, Fascicle 2: *Eastern Austronesian*, 1067-1127. *PL*, C-61.

HUEBNER T. and R. HOROI

  1979   *Solomon Islands Pijin: the grammar handbook*. U.S. Peace Corps language handbook series. Brattleboro, Vermont: Experiments in International Living.

IVENS, W.G.

    1933-35a   A grammar of the language of Longgu, Guadalcanal, British Solomon Islands. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7:601-621.

    1933-35b   A grammar of the language of Vaturanga, Guadalcanal, British Solomon Islands. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 7:349-375.

JACKSON, K.

    1979   Black man, white man. Unpublished PhD thesis, The Australian National University.

JOURDAN, C.

    1985   Creolisation, nativisation or substrate influences: what is happening to *bae* in Solomon Islands Pijin. In this volume, pp.67-96.

    n.d.   Sapos iumi mitim iumi: the social context of creolization in the Solomon Islands. PhD thesis, Department of Anthropology and Linguistics, Australian National University (for submission July 1985).

KEESING, R.M.

    1985   *Kwaio grammar. PL,* B-88.

    n.d.1   Solomons Pijin and the Malaita languages: Kwaio grammar and Pijin grammar. MS, Department of Anthropology, Australian National University, 1983.

    n.d.2   Solomons Pijin Pronouns and the Oceanic Substrate. MS, Department of Anthropology, Australian National University, 1984.

    n.d.3   Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic Substrate. MS, Department of Anthropology, Australian National University, 1985.

KNIBBS, S.G.C.

    1929   *The savage Solomons as they were and are*. London: Seeley, Service.

LICHTENBERK, F.

    1984   *To'aba'ita language of Malaita*. Working Papers in Anthropology, Archaeology, Linguistics, Maori Studies No.65, Department of Anthropology, University of Auckland.

MOSEL, U.

    1980   *Tolai and Tok Pisin: the influence of the substratum on the development of New Guinea Pidgin. PL,* B-73.

PAWLEY, A.

    1972   On the internal relationships of Eastern Oceanic languages. In R.C. Green and M. Kelly, eds *Studies in Oceanic culture history,* vol.3:1-142. Pacific Anthropological Records, 13. Honolulu: Bernice P. Bishop Museum.

PAWLEY, A. and L.A. REID

  1979   The evolution of transitive constructions in Austronesian. In
          P.B. Naylor, ed. *Austronesian studies: papers from the Second
          Eastern Conference on Austronesian Languages,* 103-130. Ann Arbor:
          The University of Michigan.

PIONNIER, J. -N.

  1913   Pigeon English or Bichelamar, *Revue de Linguistique et Philologie
          Comparée* 46:109-117; 184-198.

PRICE, C.A. with E. BAKER

  1976   Origins of Pacific Island labourers in Queensland, 1863-1904: a
          research note. *Journal of Pacific History* 11:106-121.

REHG, K.L.

  1981   *Ponapean reference grammar.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

SANKOFF, G. and S. LABERGE

  1973   On the acquisition of native speakers by a language. *Kivung* 6:
          32-47 (republished in G. Sankoff *The social life of language*, 195-
          209. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1980).

SCHUCHARDT, H.

  1883   Kreolische Studien V: Uber das Melaneso-englische, reprinted in
          H. Schuchardt *Pidgin and creole languages* (ed. and translated by
          G.G. Gilbert). London: Cambridge University Press.

SIEGEL, J.

  1985   Plantation languages of Fiji. PhD thesis, Department of Linguistics,
          Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University.

SIMONS, G.

  1977   *The Ghaimuta language of interior Guadalcanal.* Working Papers for
          the Language Variation and Limits to Communication Project, 8.
          Department of Linguistics, Cornell University.

SIMONS, L.

  1985   Malaitan influence on two grammatical particles in Solomon Islands
          Pijin. In this volume, pp.53-65.

TRYON, D. and B. HACKMAN

  1983   *The languages of the Solomon Islands: an internal classification.*
          PL, C-72.

WOLFF, J.U.

  1979   Verbal morphology and verbal senses in Proto-Austronesian. In
          P.B. Naylor, ed. *Austronesian studies: papers from the Second
          Eastern Conference on Austronesian languages,* 153-167. Ann Arbor:
          University of Michigan.

YOUNG, F.

  1926   *Pearls from the Pacific.* London, Edinburgh: Marshall Bros.