Journal of the Linguistic Society of Papua New Guinea
ISSN 0023-1959

Special Issue 2017

Péter Maitz & Craig A. Volker (eds.):

Language Contact in the German Colonies: Papua New Guinea and beyond

THE DATABASE OF EARLY PIDGIN AND CREOLE TEXTS: ON THE ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF SOLOMON ISLANDS PIJIN, TOK PISIN AND BISLAMA

Damaris Neuhof

Justus-Liebig University Gießen
Damaris.Neuhof@anglistik.uni-giessen.de

ABSTRACT

The *Database of Early Pidgin and Creole Texts* (DEPiCT) assembles early attestations and descriptions of contact languages and makes them searchable online. The data integrated into the DEPiCT database consists of early language samples, which are supplemented by socio-biographical speaker information and contextual and sociolinguistic testimonies, such as domains of language use or language attitudes. DEPiCT will facilitate a wide variety of linguistic studies on contact languages. In this paper, the potential of DEPiCT is illustrated by a study on meta-linguistic data on the origin and development of Pidgin English in the Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea and Vanuatu.

KEYWORDS

Database of Early Pidgin and Creole Texts, DEPiCT, contact languages, language documentation, genesis, Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, Papua New Guinea

1 INTRODUCTION

This article introduces the *Database of Early Pidgin and Creole Texts* (DEPiCT, www.uni-giessen.de/depict) which assembles early attestations

and descriptions of contact languages that were collected by contact linguists worldwide. The testimonies will be annotated with the tool DEPiCTed, which was specifically designed for the project and guarantees a standardised annotation of the data. The final database will be made searchable online and can be openly accessed. Besides actual language samples, which are supplemented by socio-biographical speaker information, the database will also contain early attestations on the overall contact situation, domains of language use and language attitudes. Thus, DEPiCT opens new research possibilities such as structural linguistic studies on grammaticalisation paths, sociolinguistic and sociological studies on languages use and attitudes in the early stages of contact languages and a more comprehensive documentation of the development and history of individual contact varieties.

The latter will be the focus of the second part of this paper, which is devoted to the genesis of the three Melanesian Pidgin varieties: Solomon Islands Pijin, Bislama, and Tok Pisin. By way of example I will show how meta-linguistic data of DEPiCT can be used to shed light on the genesis of specific contact language varieties. As the database is still under construction the examples given here are not exhaustive, but rather allow a first glance into the potential of the future database.

2 CONTACT LANGUAGES AND RESEARCH

2.1 The importance of early data for contact language studies / contact linguistics

Pidgin and creole languages are the result of intense language contact situations in which people with different linguistic backgrounds came together and they are characterised by having more than one ancestor language. They challenge conventional language theories and thus, have received increasing attention over the last number of decades. A major debate on the nature and origin of pidgin and creole languages and their relationship to one another has been ongoing since the 19th century. Although a number of theories have been proposed to explain the varieties' genesis and development, most of the theories have been built on

synchronic rather than diachronic data. In order to trace the development of languages, however, historical data is essential.

The most common, but also most highly debated, theory on the origin of creole languages is Derek Bickerton's *Language Bioprogram Hypothesis* (LBH) which is based on the idea of Chomsky's model of universal grammar. Bickerton (1981, 1984, 1988) argues that creoles are the result of first-language acquisition with restricted input. By comparing the structures in records of Hawai'i Pidgin English and Hawai'i Creole English, Bickerton noticed various structural differences. According to Bickerton, the only possible explanation for the structural innovations in the creole variety was that children who are born in situations of intense language contact and whose primary language input was a pidgin variety, would resort to an innate program to build an adequate language. Similarities between different creoles are, according to Bickerton, based on this innate language bioprogram, which would be the same for all people.

Bickerton's LBH theory is however highly debated. Bickerton assumes that the pidgin is the child's only input in such contact situations and therefore the child would create a creole, which in itself disregards the multilingual nature of contact situations and the possibility of domestic bi- or multilingualism. In addition, the theory does not take into account at all the role of diffusion in the development of a contact variety.

Due to these and other reasons, many creolists criticised Bickerton's LBH and it was never really accepted inside the field of creolistics (cf. Veenstra 2008: 228–234). It was especially critiqued that particular creoles do not display the bioprogram features proposed by Bickerton (cf. Veenstra 2008: 235). Bickerton makes his assertions without historical data on the contact situation, which however is necessary to make claims on the origin of contact languages.

Several other theories, such as the *Feature Pool Hypothesis* (Mufwene 2001, 2006), the *Relexification Theory* (Lefebvre 1998, 2004), the *Founder Principle* (Mufwene 1996, 2001), and the *Gradualist Model* (Arends 1992) have been proposed to explain the genesis of creole languages. As Velupillai shows, all of them have their appeals as well as drawbacks (cf. Velupillai 2015: 187–188). In order to assess in how far these theories are applicable to the nature of creole genesis, historical data is needed. DEPiCT will thus offer an opportunity to shed light on the specific processes

involved in the genesis of contact languages. In addition, in most of the theories on pidgin and creole genesis, focus has been given to a specific variety or a small number of varieties for which the theory seemed plausible. The degree to which the theories are valid and applicable to other contact language varieties needs to be investigated and this can best be done with the help of early data and a database covering all types of contact languages.

2.2 Typological databases for Pidgins, Creoles and mixed languages

Since the works of Joseph Greenberg (1963) the importance of cross-linguistic databases has been increasingly recognised. In 2005, the *World Atlas of Language Structures* (WALS, Haspelmath et al. 2005) appeared and set a new standard for such cross-linguistic, typological databases. WALS contains chapters on phonological, morphological, grammatical, syntactical and lexical features, and there is a chapter for each feature. The total number of languages included in the online version of WALS is 2679, however, only a 100-language sample can be found in each chapter. The database includes almost no pidgin and creole languages.

The Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia and the Americas (Wurm et al. 1996) represents a major work of cross-linguistic surveys using historical data and focussing, among others, on pidgin and creole languages. Though specific features and their early attestations are listed, it is not a database as such and it does not make the historical data available. In fact, the first real major cross-linguistic database that is comparable to WALS but that is focussed on pidgins and creoles is the *Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures* (APiCS, Michaelis et al. 2013).

In response to the World Atlas of Language Structures, contact linguists' interest was attracted to the need for a similar database for pidgin and creole languages. Michaelis et al. together with 88 language experts created the Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures (APiCS, Michaelis et al. 2013). The database represents the first large-scale collection of information on pidgins, creoles and mixed languages and covers 120 structural and 20 socio-linguistic features in 78 contact languages. It provides information on both the sociohistorical background

and the sociolinguistic situation of the contact varieties. The languages are described in terms of a linguistic structure dataset. While the database lists some early contact languages which are by now extinct, such as, for instance, Negerhollands, the data and language examples provided in APiCS are restricted to synchronic data. Thus, though the database allows a direct comparison of pidgin and creole languages it does not further diachronic research of pidgins, creoles or mixed languages.

2.3 The need for a database of early attestations on contact languages

Individual researchers have devoted a considerable amount of their time doing archival research and have collected early attestations and descriptions on contact languages. Travel accounts, court proceedings, memoirs etc. have been collected by individual scholars for many decades. A great number of historical material has thus already been sighted. However, these individual collections are only available offline and are scattered around the world among the individual researchers. To date, this means that different researchers consult the same archive collections from scratch, doing double work. Furthermore, linguistic annotation is done by the individual researcher or research team, who all make use of personal non-standardised forms of annotation.

DEPiCT aims to assemble those individual data collections into a single database, which will be made publicly available online and thus serves as an archive for posterity. By sharing the results of archival research, linguists can focus on the actual language analysis and no longer need to double the time-consuming archival research.

Though some electronical databases are under development, such as, for instance, the Early Suriname Creole Archive (SUCA, suca.ruhosting.nl) or the Negerhollands Database (NEHOL, http://www.clarin.nl/node/162), those databases each focus on a single variety. The discussion above has however demonstrated the importance of having a database available, which consists of as many contact varieties as possible in order to investigate and add clarity to the general processes in place during the genesis of contact languages.

3 THE DATABASE OF EARLY PIDGIN AND CREOLE TEXTS

The Database of Early Pidgin and Creole Texts (DEPiCT), funded by the German Science Foundation (DFG, http://www.dfg.de/), assembles early testimonies and descriptions of contact languages. The attestations, which were collected by contact linguists all around the world, will be annotated and made searchable online. DEPiCT will serve as a standard reference database for historical linguistic analysis, language internal as well as cross-linguistic studies, studies from structural as well as from sociolinguistic perspectives and will allow for a better analysis of grammaticalisation processes. As the data will be digitalised, DEPiCT provides the advantage of serving as a sustainable data backup.

A closer look at the name of the database will explain DEPiCT's structure and scope:

- As the term *Database* implies, the early attestations and descriptions of contact languages will be saved in a database format. This is necessary to allow complex language-internal but also cross-linguistic search queries. It will be possible for users to provide precise information on what the database should output. For instance, users will be able to limit the search results to utterances made by female speakers between 1850 and 1880.
- The designation *Early* emphasises that the data in DEPiCT will be historical data. Depending on the contact variety, the term *early* will vary in what time period it refers to due to the fact that the individual contact varieties came into being at different times. In addition, it is also dependent on the data situation for each contact variety. Generally, however, in DEPiCT all data are integrated that are not under copyright protection. This approach is necessary as DEPiCT will be a public open access database.
- The terms *Pidgin and Creole* imply the focus and content of the database. While only pidgin and creoles are mentioned in the title, all other kinds of contact languages will be included into the database as well. Contact languages, in terms of the DEPiCT database, can be defined as those languages which evolved and where used in contact situations. Thus, in addition to pidgins and creoles, jargons, mixed

languages and high contact varieties are eligible language varieties for DEPiCT. The language set does not only contain historical data on the most widely studied pidgins and creoles, but also on less well known varieties as well as extinct varieties, such as, for instance the possible mixed language in the Norn to Scots shift. This allows a holistic overview over the origin and development of contact languages in general. At the same time, it allows insight on why contact languages may cease to exist.

- Though the term *Texts* is used in the database's name, contributions of any size can be submitted. Submissions can vary from a single word, to phrases, to a whole collection of texts. The contributed data can consist not only of actual language samples, but also of descriptions of the general contact situation, the domains of use, attitudes and grammatical descriptions. In addition, types of texts will also vary from travel accounts, court reports, missionary reports, through to early dictionaries, grammars and wordlists. The inclusion of other material, such as pictures and audio material is in general possible, but will, however, be postponed for the moment.

DEPiCT will be accompanied by a handbook on the contact languages present in the database. The articles will describe the sources, previous historical studies as well as relevant aspects of the diachronic sociolinguistic and structural development of individual languages. In addition, it will contain chapters on cross-linguistic studies, such as on the development of specific structural features across languages. The DEPiCT database and its concomitant conflation of early testimonies has several advantages:

Among the advantages of DEPiCT is that each contributor can submit data on any language variety, which means that the data set for a single variety can consist of data contributions from various researchers and that a single researcher can submit data for different varieties. Though most linguists will have a single variety that is the focus of their research and will have primarily collected data for that specific variety, they may have obtained language data on other varieties as a byproduct of their research. Personal research in the German Colonial Archives in Frankfurt has shown that especially for the Pacific region, travel reports do not only focus on the

contact situation of one area but include interesting material for several varieties, as authors often travelled to various regions. Allowing the contributors to submit all data they possess will add to the holistic nature of the database. Another reason for allowing each contributor to submit data on any language variety is that not all early material will be at all researchers' command. Merging the individual attestations and descriptions of contact languages of the individual contributors thus increases the validity and significance of the database.

Researchers' contribution will vary from single words to whole collections of texts. The amount of data being contributed for a single variety will also depend on the availability of data to that specific variety. Where possible, the appropriate electronic full texts of the submitted excerpts will be integrated into the database as well, which has the advantage that interesting passages not identified so far can be detected in a later step.

Another advantage of DEPiCT is that the database allows better judgements on the reliability of early sources. The early attestations found in travel reports, diaries, court reports etc. are often the only source for data. Though there is no other possibility in obtaining historical language data, it is necessary to be aware of the hazards which early sources involve. Huber & Velupillai (2016) and Baker & Winer (1999) mention, among others, the risks of "dialogue invented by people without first-hand experience of the language concerned, of plagiarism, and of the language of one territory being attributed to another" (Baker & Winer 1999: 103). Due to the simplified comparability of sources in DEPiCT, plagiarism can be more easily identified. As language attitudes will be annotated in DEPiCT as well, bias in language descriptions and stereotypical language portrayals are more likely to be identified.

A major advantage is that DEPiCT offers a more complete overview and more comprehensive documentation of the development and history of contact languages. DEPiCT will be a holistic database as it does not only provide linguistic data but also contextual and sociolinguistic annotation. Information regarding the languages spoken in a contact situation, as well as general information on the political and economic situation will serve to systematically analyse the extralinguistic circumstances that lead to the development of a contact language. Testimonies that indicate the attitude

(either positive or negative) of the author or the society towards a contact language, will allow for studies connecting language development and policy with language attitudes. Language data will be contextualised and supplemented by socio-biographical speaker information and location of the utterance so that linguistic data can be correlated with sociolinguistic parameters.

The greatest advantage can be seen in that linguistic data is annotated as 1. morphologically segmented text, 2. orthographic lexifier equivalence, 3. source language, 4. gloss, 5. word class and 6. free translation. This not only makes the database maximally searchable for language data on individual languages, but also allows studies on the development of specific linguistic items, as well as cross-comparison of linguistic data and grammaticalisation paths between contact languages. Table 1 illustrates the different annotation lines on an example of early Tok Pisin (von Hesse-Wartegg 1902: 53) line 1 = original, line 2 = morphologically segmented text, line 3 = lexifier orthography, line 4 = source language, line 5 = gloss, line 6 = word class, line 7 = free translation:

_____

1	*big*	*fellow*	*master,*	*he*	*rauss*	*me*
2	*big*	*fellow*	*master,*	*he*	*rauss*	*me*
3	big	fellow	master	he	raus	me
4	Eng	Eng	Eng	Eng	Ger	Eng
5	big	MODIF	master	PM/3SG	throw.out	1SG
6	ADJ	PART	N	PART/P	V	P
7	(The) great master (he) threw me out.					

_____

Table 1. Annotation scheme for language data in DEPiCT

In order to ensure a consistent annotation of the early pidgin and creole texts, an annotation tool, called DEPiCTed, was specifically developed by Magnus Nissel for the DEPiCT project. DEPiCTed is an easy to use and

intuitive tool, which allows each contributor to annotate text for meta-linguistic and linguistic information. Only a set of predefined annotation tags are available to choose from in order to ensure a consistent annotation of texts among all contributors. In addition, DEPiCT contributors will only be able to choose from a given predefined gloss abbreviation list while doing the interlinear glossing in order to make the database maximally cross-comparable with all other texts to be integrated into the final database. The tool has a menu-driven Graphic User Interface (GUI), which guides the contributors through the annotation steps. DEPiCTed will transform the normal text files into Extensible Markup Language (XML) so that the texts can be easily transferred into the final database. As the tool allows a straightforward editing in that it automatically checks the status of the XML and flags what type of error occurred when relevant, no prior knowledge of mark-up language is required of the user. The predefined tagging system and the ability to tag also metalinguistic data allows users of the final database to ask search engines more complex questions. Besides a pure text retrieval (in which regular expressions [RegEX] can be integrated), complicated queries, which combine the text retrieval with other annotation parameters such as glosses, word class annotation, translation etc. can be created. Thus, it could, for instance, be searched for personal pronouns used by female speakers only during 1850 and 1940. The search results will be displayed in the form of a concordance, i.e. in a list of examples of the search word as it occurs in the corpus. Users will be able to export and save their concordance results so that the data can be further processed for specific research questions. In addition to language sample specific searches, other systematic searches can be made, such as for testimonies giving information on the socio-historical background that led to the development of a contact variety or for testimonies on language attitudes.

DEPiCT will also serve as a sustainable data backup of the early sources. As previously mentioned, so far, the early attestations on contact languages are scattered among individual researchers. This has the disadvantage that in case a researcher loses his collected material due to, for instance, a tropical storm, this will lead to data loss. In DEPiCT, handwritten records as well as photocopies will be transferred into a digital format and saved permanently.

4 SOCIOHISTORICAL CONTEXT AND ORIGIN OF PIDGIN ENGLISH IN GERMAN NEW GUINEA, SOLOMON ISLANDS AND VANUATU

As mentioned above, DEPiCT can be used as the data basis for various studies. The database will contribute in unveiling how the different pidgin varieties came into being and spread. As to the development of pidgins in general, there are also various theories specifically focussing on the origin of the Melanesian pidgin varieties. A considerable debate has developed out of the question, in how far plantation pidgins, especially those spoken on the plantations in Queensland (Queensland Plantation Pidgin English) and in Samoa (Samoan Plantation Pidgin English), have influenced the development of the Pacific varieties. Focussing on Melanesian pidgin varieties, in the following part I will show by way of example how the DEPiCT data will shed light on the varieties' origin.

4.1 Theories on the origin of Melanesian Pidgin English

Though the number of theories is by far more numerous, in the following part I will bring up the three main theories that have been developed with respect to the origin of Melanesian Pidgin English varieties.

Roger Keesing (1988) argues for the existence of a single Pacific-wide nautical jargon which, "although not yet fully stable, was relatively uniform" and would have become homogenous and steady until the mid-1870s (Keesing 1988: 4). According to Keesing, the pidgin spoken on the different plantations, irrespectively of whether on Queensland or Samoan plantations, was the same and belonged to a widespread speech community:

> [I]n the early 1860s there was a single dialect of Pacific Pidgin, largely shipboard-based, which provided the linguistic input into plantations in Queensland, Samoa, New Caledonia, Fiji, the Marshalls, and other areas […] this shipboard-based dialect already incorporated many of the grammatical patterns later recorded in Samoa and Queensland. (Keesing 1988: 53)

The modification of the different Melanesian pidgin varieties and differentiation of Tok Pisin from the other two varieties would have been due to "superstrate influence of German and the substrate influences of the

Oceanic Austronesian languages of the Bismarcks and the New Guinea coast, and of Papuan languages" (Keesing 1988: 61) after the 1870s.

Philip Baker (1993) argues for an Australian origin of the Melanesian pidgin varieties. In his view, the Melanesian pidgins derive from Queensland Plantation Pidgin English, which in turn would be a continuation of New South Wales Pidgin English. As Sydney served as the main trading area to which European and American ships came, Baker argues that

> its pidgin [New South Wales Pidgin English] was not only the recipient of more features from pre-existing pidgins and creoles of the Atlantic region and Asia than other pidgins which were subsequently to develop in the southwestern Pacific, but it was also the most important donor of features to the latter. (Baker 1993: 61)

Baker supposes that in these early trading contacts a kind of foreigner talk English (cf. Baker 1993: 7) would have been applied. When the first plantations were established in Queensland, features of this foreigner talk English would have served as the basis for Queensland Plantation Pidgin English. Melanesian island workers serving on Queensland plantations would have learned the variety during their stay on the plantations and would have brought back their knowledge when repatriated. As the pidgin spoken in Melanesia up to that point would have been less developed, "it would have been rapidly absorbed into QLD [Queensland Plantation Pidgin English] to create what may properly be termed MPE [Melanesian Pidgin English]" (Baker 1993: 56).

Peter Mühlhäusler (1978) also considers the plantations to have had an impact on the development of the Pacific Pidgin varieties. However, according to Mühlhäusler, the Queensland plantations were only important for the development of Solomon Islands Pijin and Bislama, but not for the development of Tok Pisin. The origin of Tok Pisin, in contrast to the other two Melanesian pidgin varieties, would go back to Samoan plantations and the variety spoken there. When the Germans took control of New Guinea in 1884, only German plantations were still allowed to recruit labour in German New Guinea and the Bismarck Archipelago (cf. Schnee 1904: 60). As a consequence, from 1885 onwards labourers from German New Guinea were no longer recruited for Queensland plantations but only for plantations in the German protectorate including Samoa. In contrast, Solomon Islands and New Hebrides (modern-day Vanuatu) islanders were no longer

recruited to work on Samoan plantations, but continued to be recruited for Queensland and Fiji plantations. Due to this fact, Mühlhäusler regards 1884 as the crucial year in the individual development of the Pacific varieties here considered. He attributes a decisive role in the individual development of Tok Pisin to the recruiting for the Samoan plantations and argues that Tok Pisin had developed exogenously on the plantations in Samoa and was brought to New Guinea by returning labourers.

4.2 Trading contact

Though the first contacts between Europeans and Pacific islanders occurred much earlier, the 19th century can be regarded as the beginning of contact and communication. Since the beginning of the 19th century, contacts between Europeans and Pacific islanders had their nature in trading. Whaling activities marked the start of sporadic contact on the coastal areas and on board of ships, as ship crews consisted of multinational labourers. Besides whaling, sandalwood trade in the 1830s and 1840s as well as trepan trade evoked loose contact in the Pacific. On board the ships and in the trade areas, what the early sources call an early "Walerjargon" (Schuchardt 1883: 151) developed. Though trading took place in the Pacific, it needs to be clarified how much the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu, and New Guinea were involved in the early trade and if the trade evoked the usage of a contact jargon. As data in DEPiCT will be annotated for meta-linguistic information such as the *Situation* in which contact emerged, users will be able to search for data in the database that are specified to the specific time period from 1800 till 1850s.

Thus, users will find that for the Solomon Islands evidence is found in a book by Andrew Cheyne, who was a trader in the Solomon Islands in the 1840s. Referring to Sikaiana, an atoll of the Solomon Islands, he claims that "[t]hey can nearly all speak more or less broken English, which they have picked up through their intercourse with whale ships, who often visit them to get supplies of cocoa-nuts and pigs" (Cheyne 1852: 53), showing that trading contact between Sikaina islanders and Europeans took place. At the same time, this shows that the contact was based on what Cheyne calls 'broken English'. Also in Webster (1863), referring to the same island and the year 1851, evidence is found that a contact variety was used:

> We were surprised to hear several of them address us in very good broken English. They informed us that a party of Europeans had been some time on their Island, collecting beche-le-mer, which abounds on the reefs. From this party they had gained considerable proficiency in our language. (Webster 1863: 51–52)

It also seems reasonable to assume that contact took place in Malaita since Rannie (1912: 183) reports that "[o]ne of the recognised routes to China runs close past the east coast of Malayta" and Cheyne (1852: 67) mentions that Malaita and the Bougainville islands had been involved in whaling contact. In terms of Makira, evidence of an early contact variety is found which dates to 1851: "He gave his name as Jerobo, and could speak a few words of English, having been on board a whaler for a short time off this coast. […] By the assistance of Jerobo's broken English, we had a long conversation with the party" (Webster 1863: 102). In addition, there is evidence that besides the usage of a contact variety, interpreters were employed in order to trade with Solomon islanders (cf., for instance, Cheyne 1852: 67).

The early sources collected for the area of the New Hebrides provide evidence that though trading contact took place, whaling activities were of no importance in the area. The contact was evoked due to trepan and sandalwood trade. From very early days there is evidence that a kind of contact jargon was used in these trading contacts. In Erskine there is a report about a man in Tanna in the 1840s who "spoke some words of English with a very distinct pronunciation" (Erskine 1853: 307) and at another point the reader is informed about a boy who had worked on board of a ship and "spoke English tolerably" (Erskine 1853: 393). Another very early source of evidence can be found in Hilliard (1970): When the bishop Selwyn visits the Irelands in 1851, it is reported that "'sandalwood English' was widely understood" (Hilliard 1970: 122). What is special for Vanuatu is that there is not only evidence that a contact jargon existed but there are also language examples dating back as early as 1830. George Bennett travelled in the South Pacific from 1829 to 1831 and during his voyage came in contact with a child from Erromango, called Elau. In Bennett we can thus find the earliest language examples of a contact variety from Vanuatu: "Ungka no like play now" (Bennett 1883: 3). That trading contact started quite early can also be seen in the fact that the first trading station was established on Aneityum by James Paddon as early as 1844 (Hilliard 1970: 122). In addition, as early as from 1843 onwards, Vanuatu islanders

were recruited to work on sandalwood shore stations in New Caledonia, as is shown by the following quote: "[N]ew Caledonia big canoe come, stop for hims […] Cap'n use native, and him give guns" (Munro 1867: 201–202).

For most parts of New Guinea there is only scanty evidence of early trade contacts. The earliest language sample of an English-lexified contact variety refers to the Witu islands. The speaker inter alia uses the words "Me no speak lie! me real Darco […]" (Jacobs 1844: 80) showing that the area probably was visited by trading vessels. No further testimonies were found when focussing just on the years 1800 till the end of the 1850s. Evidence for New Ireland dates to the year 1876 and is found in the book by the German Strauch who states that due to the contact between New Irelanders and trading ships, some of them had a small knowledge of English:

> The inhabitants of the small here-located village were in contact with ships apparently spending time here on a regular basis; some of them even had a pleasant knowledge of the English language. (Strauch 1876: 406; translation by author[1])

In addition, the missionary George Brown in his accounts referring to the year 1875, reports to have met a Matupit islander, named Topulu, who served as an interpreter and spoke, what Brown defines as "the best kind of English that was then spoken there by the few who knew it" (Brown 1908: 93). The earliest evidence of pidgin language samples for this region is thus: "Missionary no come Matupit, ah! Topulu he no come. Missionary come, oh! Topulu he come. He go house belong Matupit" (Brown 1908: 93).

The early sources show that trade contact in the New Hebrides and Solomon Islands was earlier and more common than in New Guinea. Nonetheless, all three areas were involved in some kind of trade contact, generating interaction between Europeans and islanders concomitant the development of a contact jargon. The contact, however, was rather sporadic as Churchill (1911: 8) points out:

> [S]o far, we have accounted for no more than sporadic foci of evolution of some mongrel dialects, each narrowly restricted in essential conditions to one or at most

---

[1] "Die Bewohner des kleinen hier befindlichen Dorfes waren jedenfalls vielfach in Berührung mit dort anscheinend regelmässig verweilenden Schiffen gewesen, einige besassen sogar eine erfreuliche Kenntniss [sic!] der englischen Sprache." (Strauch 1876: 406)

two white men, and the few communities of islanders with which they were in intimate contact. Being sedentary in their employment, the white men, as the principal actuating cause, were not in a position to become agents in disseminating their particular mongrel speech beyond the narrow limits of their influence, and, in the habitual hostility of the savage communities, this influence could never extend beyond the island upon which they were domiciled and seldom (save only in the case of the very smallest) attained to the whole of that island. (Churchill 1911: 8)

This shows that the language used to communicate in those situations of contact predominantly served the purpose of facilitating trade. It needs to be pointed out that the focus in this article is on jargons with English influence. It seems reasonable to assume that despite European contact, other contact jargons existed (see Drechsel 2014). As the final DEPiCT database will consist of European as well as non-European contact varieties, it will allow a better comparison and longitudinal study of early Pacific jargons and their interrelationships. In addition, it seems reasonable to assume that despite an amount of archival research, information on early jargons might still be hidden in old manuscripts.

Bringing all sources together which were conducted by researchers so far into DEPiCT, and allowing the addition of data at a later point in time, will contribute to a better understanding of the emergence and character of contact jargons.

4.3 Plantation labour: Queensland and Samoan Plantation Pidgins as predecessors of Melanesian Pidgin varieties

More intense contact between Europeans and Melanesians as well as between Melanesians from different geographical areas arose with the establishment of plantations in Queensland, Samoa, New Caledonia and Fiji. Requiring a high amount of labour, workers were recruited from surrounding islands.

Indentured labourers were bound per contract to work on a plantation for a specific amount of time, most typically for three years (cf. Jacques 1922: 72). The labourers were recruited, for example in the Solomon Islands, New Guinea and the New Hebrides. All three areas were and are characterised by a high level of language diversity (cf. Collinson 1929: 20; Lynch 1923: 26; Frommund 1926: 52). Thus, on the plantations labourers

with different linguistic backgrounds had to work under European supervision, which resulted in the development of plantation pidgins. As contact jargons existed and were used in the Pacific prior to the establishment of plantations, it seems reasonable to assume that the small number of labourers who already had a knowledge of a contact jargon due to having been in previous contact with Europeans might have made use of it. There is evidence that the contact jargons were used on board the recruiting vessels which visited all three areas: In Giles (1968: 41) Europeans are said to have used the following words to recruit Vanuatu natives: "Yes; suppose you let him some boy go along a Queensland, we buy him altogether […]", and in Forbes (1875: 251) recruiters address the Vanuatu natives with "You likee come work Fiji?" Also in the other two areas the contact variety was used by recruiters (cf. Parkinson 1887: 28 for German New Guinea; Cromar 1935: 138 for the Solomon Islands).

Out of the contact situations on the plantations inter alia, Queensland Plantation Pidgin English in Queensland and Samoan Plantation Pidgin English on Samoa developed. The plantations played an important role in the formation of Melanesian pidgin languages, as the indentured labourers, when their contracts expired, were repatriated to their places of origin (cf. Parkinson 1887: 27; Cromar 1935: 117) and brought with them a knowledge of the plantation variety.

Even if repatriates probably had not spoken the learned contact language with their tribe members, the early data proves that the plantation pidgin varieties were used in later contacts with Europeans. In terms of Papua New Guinea, the German Krämer-Bannow reports that in their interactions with natives they made use of the Pidgin English of the Bismarck Archipelago, which would have been brought to the area by returned workers (cf. Krämer-Bannow 1916: 20). Wendland provides an example in which the recruit forgets his home language. When he meets a compatriot who tries to talk with him in his mother tongue, Wendland claims "[e]ven though he understood him, he could not answer in his native language, because it had disappeared from his memory" (Wendland 1939: 76–77, translation by the author[2]). It seems reasonable to suggest that

---

[2] "Auf meine teilnehmende Frage, was ihn so traurig stimmte, schluchzte er: „*Master! Me lose him talk b'long place b'long me; suppose me come back belong place b'long me, me no more save talk*." (Herr! Ich habe meine Heimatsprache vergessen; wenn ich nach meinem Platz zurückkomme, kann ich nicht mehr die Sprache reden.) […] Heute war er

natives regained the knowledge of their mother tongue quickly. Still the returnees might have made use of the pidgin language until the full knowledge of their native language came back. In addition, there are reports about returned labourers having taught the pidgin variety to other men in the islands:

> Children pick up South Sea English very quickly; and I have known boys who came on board my vessel converse fluently, having acquired the language from returned labourers and by visiting trading and labour vessels. (Wawn 1893: 41)

The origin of the plantation workers is thus crucial in order to determine whether Samoan Plantation Pidgin or Queensland Plantation Pidgin had an influence on the development of the individual Melanesian varieties, namely Tok Pisin, Solomon Islands Pijin and Bislama.

According to Moses' compilation (1973) for Samoa, Price & Baker's compilation on Queensland, and the compilation for Fiji and New Caledonia in Tyron & Charpentier (2004) on the islands of origin of recruits, the majority of Solomon islanders had served on Queensland plantations (cf. Table 2). The majority of Vanuatu labourers had been to Queensland; however, also the plantations in New Caledonia and Fiji were provided with a high amount of labour from Vanuatu. New Guinea islanders had worked predominantly on Samoan plantations.

	Queensland		Samoa		Fiji		New Caledonia	
	1863–1885	1886–1914	1863–1885	1886–1914	1863–1885	1886–1914	1863–1885	1886–1914
German New Guinea	2,809	0	693	5,307	1,618	0	0	
Vanuatu	27,028	12,947	1,201	0	13,471	727	ca. 14,000	
Solomon Islands	5,118	13,099	618	0	5,030	3,198	ca. 1,000	

Table 2. Number of labourers on plantations in Queensland, Samoa, Fiji and New Caledonia

I will now discuss whether the early meta-linguistic data support the numbers given above and whether evidence can be found to determine to

---

einem neuangeworbenen, eben mit dem Schiff eingetroffenen Landsmann begegnet, der ihn freudig in seiner Muttersprache begrüßt hatte. Obwohl er ihn verstand, konnte er ihm nicht in seiner Heimatsprache antworten, weil sie ihm aus dem Gedächtnis geschwunden war." (Wendland 1939: 76–77)

which extent the pidgin varieties spoken on the four plantations were brought back to the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and German New Guinea.

4.4 Reports about Pidgin English-speaking Ex-Queensland, Ex-Samoan, Ex-Fiji and Ex-New Caledonia workers

The early data referring to the Solomon Islands contains multiple reports about Solomon islanders who had served on Queensland plantations. Several writers give accounts of coming into contact with islanders "who had spent several years in Queensland" (Woodford 1890: 26) and reports of vessels repatriating islanders to their places of origin in the Solomon Islands are prevalent. Thus, the recruiting vessels "land[ed] Boys from Queensland" (Young 1925: 187). In addition, the sources contain language data examples in which Solomon islanders state in pidgin to have worked "alonga plantation longa Queenslan' one time" (Abbott 1908: 59). In Dickinson not only one but several examples of natives reporting in pidgin about their Queensland plantation experience are present: "Me been work along Queensland for make um sugar" (Dickinson 1927: 64) and "Me been work sugar-cane along Queensland" (Dickinson 1927: 108) are just to mention two. Also Philip referring to 1912 on board of the Makira states that "[t]he returned Queensland 'boy' is much in evidence here" and quotes one of them saying "me been alonga Queensland" (Philip 1978: 87–88). The strongest evidence that Solomon islanders brought Queensland Plantation Pidgin English with them when they returned is provided for example, by Cormack who states that "a class of boys of a school leave their village and go off in a body to Queensland, to return someday in black clothes, hats, and boots, with pidgin English" (Cormack 1944: 142). A similar report can be found in Hogbin (1939: 167) who claims that "[r]eturned plantation labourers in particular are often swollen-headed, loud-mouthed, and bumptious, and parade any information they may have in pidgin English, to the intense annoyance of those who have remained at home". As previously shown, a contact jargon was already present in the Solomon Islands before the plantation economy and the labour trade started. That the language used on the plantations differed from the earlier trade jargon can be seen in a quote by Cromar (1935: 137) referring to Malaita: "Some of the men could speak a little bêche-de-mer, but one was very

fluent, and said that he had been to Queensland". The quote shows on the one hand that the earlier trade jargon and plantation pidgin variety were similar. On the other hand, it shows that the contact variety in Queensland was used more permanently and thus, was perceived as more fluent and developed.

In contrast, the early Solomon Islands sources analysed so far provide no attestations of natives reporting to have worked on the plantations in Samoa or in New Caledonia, which reflects that only a comparatively small number of labourers were recruited for these areas. The Fiji plantations seem to have played a minor role in the development of pidgin in the Solomon Islands as well. Though there is evidence that labourers were recruited to work on plantations in Fiji, as Norden (1926: 96) was in contact with a Solomon islander who "was recruited for Queensland, and later for Fiji", most of the early sources claim that Fijian was the language used on Fijian plantations: "[T]he Fijian tongue, [is] a language understood by the men who had served their term on the Fiji plantations" (Guppy 1887: 53). Only one source could be identified in which an English based pidgin was learned on Fiji. Rannie reports coming into contact with "only one English-speaking native at Vanikoro, and he had picked up a very indifferent smattering of the language during a stay in Fiji" (Rannie 1912: 172). However, it is not clarified where exactly he picked up the language, for instance, whether he picked up the language on the plantations.

For the New Hebrides, almost no reports were sighted in which a concrete statement that returned labourers brought Queensland Plantation Pidgin English with them was given. Only one contemporary writer draws a direct connection claiming that:

> There have evidently been many labour vessels here [Lo Island] from time to time, for we found that several men could speak a little "sandal-wood English," as it is called; none of them, however, appeared at all pleased with their experience of civilisation. The place they had been to was Port Mackay in Queensland, the centre of the sugar district. (Coote 1883: 80)

Furthermore, reports about natives having served on plantations in Queensland are numerous. Several of the European authors report having boys or coming into contact with men who have worked or "been to Queensland" (Thomas 1886: 314). In addition, there are a number of attestations showing that returned Queensland labourers were able to speak

162

a pidgin variety, such as "Me speakee English, my name belong Black John, me been Porter Mackai" (Coote 1883: 80). In his reports, Cromar meets returnees which should "be landed at various places in the New Hebrides" and "came by steamer from Northern Queensland" (Cromar 1935: 117). Responding to his question what they have done with their money, he receives the response in pidgin English: "Me fellow keep him [...] By and by me fellow buy'em gun along man-we-we and German man" (Cromar 1935: 117–118) showing that the returned Queensland labourers were able to speak a pidgin variety. In addition, natives report about tribe members serving on Australian plantations: "Oh, he stop along Queensland, by-and-by he come back" (Great Britain, Colonial Office 1883–84: 223). Also in discourse between Europeans and New Hebrides islanders, islanders often referred to having served for a period in Queensland, as the conversation in Lamb (1905: 159) shows, which echoes a French asking "You been along Queensland?" and a native responding with "Yes".

It is remarkable that apart from evidence which shows that Queensland plantations played an important part, evidence can be found that New Hebrides islanders served on the plantations in Fiji. As shown by Siegel (1987) the predominant language used on Fiji plantations was Fijian along with Pidgin Fijan. This conforms to historical data found in Wawn who reports about "a returned [Vanuatu] labourer from Fiji, who could speak a mixture of English and Fijian" (Wawn 1973: 75). Similarly, Schuchardt reports that workers in Fiji would have picked up "a barbarian Fijian, but not mixed with English" (Schuchardt 1889: 162, translation by me[3]). Even though the English-based contact jargon was not used on plantations in Fiji, there is evidence that it served as the primary tool in recruiting labourers. In cases in which it is reported that new recruiting vessels came to Vanuatu, the islanders are said to have responded in Beach-la-Mar with: "Fiji no good man; too muchey work, Fiji" (Romilly 1886: 179), "Too muchy work Fiji; no good" (Forbes 1875: 251). Furthermore, there is evidence that some New Hebrides islanders spoke an English-based contact variety during their stay in Fiji. Thus, it is for instance reported that Tanna men having been in Fiji stated "No more Tanna men come Fiji-we no like him eat we" (Great Britain 1869: 1024). On Levuka, Wawn observes a conversation between a

---

[3] "Die fremden insulaner, die nach Fidschi kämen, lernten Fidschiisch, nicht Englisch; sie nähmen ein barbarisches, aber nicht mit Englisch vermischtes Fidschiisch nach ihren inseln zurück [...]." (Schuchardt 1889: 162)

European storekeeper and plantation labourers. Only one of the plantation labourers is said to be able to speak English (Wawn 1893: 122). While the conversation is first carried on in an English-based contact variety, the European switches into Fijian when he became aware of Wawn observing them (Wawn 1893: 123). The fact that only one of the plantation workers was able to speak pidgin and only because he had worked previously as a house servant shows that pidgin was not used as the language for intertribal communication on the plantations.

In addition, the plantations in New Caledonia seem to have played an important role. One writer reports meeting a Vila native who had served a term in New Caledonia. "He presented, consequently, a burlesque imitation of his former employers. In particular, he had learned to jabber and gesticulate as well as any Frenchman" (Wawn 1893: 143). What follows is a conversation in Pidgin English. In addition, Thomas (1886: 257) also reported about a Tannese, who had worked in Queensland and New Caledonia stating "No good man-a-wee-wee!" Evidence is also found in Le Chartier (1885) that Vanuatu islanders served in New Caledonia and that the contact "allowed any indigene to learn French and English sufficiently in order to provide travellers with basic information" (Le Chartier 1885: 119, translation by me[4]). This shows that the Vanuatu islanders did not only get into contact with an English pidgin variety but also with a kind of pidgin French as the following sentence shows: "Toi grand chef Ambrym, becaucoup popinées jolies, pas besoin femmes blanches" (Le Chartier 1885: 257).

There is only one source identified so far, which refers to a worker who had worked on a plantation in Samoa and afterwards was reemployed on a plantation in Efate (Great Britain, Colonial Office 1883–84: 218) and it thus seems reasonable to assume that Samoan Plantation Pidgin English had no influence on the development of Bislama.

The early sources for New Guinea in general show that New Guinea islanders had served on plantations in Fiji, Samoa and Queensland. For instance, Schellong (1934: 171) reports that when recruiting vessels from mainland New Guinea arrived at the Bismarck Archipelago the natives from the islands did not know how to classify New Guinea as they were

---

[4] "[…] permis à quelques-uns des indigènes d'apprendre le francais et l'anglais suffisamment pour fournir quelques renseignements élémentaires au voyageur désireux de se les procurer." (Le Chartier 1885: 119)

only used to vessels recruiting for plantations in Fiji, Samoa and Makay. In addition, the data show that the returned labourers brought back a pidgin variety as Behrmann states that "some people had already worked on the plantations of the whites, one could communicate with them in pidgin-English" (Behrmann 1922: 309, translation by me[5]).

The early data differs from those of the Solomon Islands and New Hebrides in that the reports about ex-Samoan workers are more frequent than in the other island groups. For New Britain plantations, Jung reports that workers who had previously laboured on Samoan plantations, were reemployed (Jung 1885: 298). Stephan & Graebner state that they worked with a Pidgin-speaking interpreter during their stay in German New Guinea who had come to Samoa as a young boy and had served for a long time as a sailor and plantation worker (cf. Stephan & Graebner 1907: 21). Krämer-Bannow reports about a man named Anis von Tano, who would have worked in Samoa together with other people and as a consequence they were able to express themselves in Pidgin (cf. Krämer-Bannow 1916: 20). In addition, the *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung* contains a report by Krämer (1913: 406) about Pidgin English-speaking New Irelanders who were said to have acquired their knowledge of the language during their stay in Samoa and in the Bismarck Archipelago.[6]

For Queensland, evidence is found in Schellong who reports about a voyage of a New Guinea Company ship, trying to recruit labour for mainland Kaiser-Wilhelmsland. He states that "in another area of the Archipelago the captain achieved to recruit six blacks […]; they had worked once in the sugar plantations of Queensland and spoke a good Pidgin English" (Schellong 1934: 90, translation by me[7]). This quotation does not only show that the pidgin language learned in Australia was brought back and spread by the returned labourers, but also that those

---

[5] "Einige Leute hatten bereits in den Plantagen der Weißen gearbeitet, man konnte sich mit ihnen auf pidgin-englisch verständigen." (Behrmann 1922: 309)

[6] "Trotz der Jungfräulichkeit des Landes hinsichtlich weißer Besucher waren mehrere etwas Pidgin-Englisch radebrechende Eingeborene vorhanden, die vordem als Arbeiter auf Planzungen im Archipel und auf Samoa ihre Kenntnisse erworben hatten." (Krämer 1913: 406)

[7] "[…] denn an einer anderen Stelle des Archipels gelang es dem Kapitän, sechs Schwarze auf redliche Weise anzuwerben; sie haben bereits einmal in den Zuckerplantagen Queenslands gearbeitet und sprechen ein gutes Pidgin-Englisch." (Schellong 1934: 90)

returned labourers were reemployed on the plantations in German New Guinea. Stephan & Graebner, who also had a Samoan-speaking interpreter, mentioned that another interpreter of theirs "was before the German occupancy a sailor in Queensland and has acquired a considerable amount of pidgin vocabulary" (Stephan & Graebner 1907: 22–23, translation by me[8]), which shows that also the pidgins formed or learned on the ships travelling to Queensland were brought back home and could spread.

There is in addition evidence that New Guinea natives served on the plantations in Fiji (cf. for instance Parkinson 1887: 35). Schellong reports about natives in New Ireland who had worked on the plantations in Fiji stating that: "master he speak two fellow yam; me stop here; by and by me go back Fidji" (Schellong 1934: 171).

Based on solely meta-linguistic data, it can be summarised that Queensland Plantation Pidgin English was brought to the Solomon Islands, Vanuatu and German New Guinea by repatriated labourers and is thus likely to have influenced the varieties spoken in the area. At the same time, it became evident that Samoan Plantation Pidgin English was brought to New Guinea by returned labourers, but no such evidence is found for the Solomon Islands and Vanuatu. Though for all three areas there are reports on natives working in Fiji, no English-based pidgin was used on the plantations, Fiji or Fijan Pidgin being used instead. Pidgin English, however, was not completely absent in Fiji as it was used to recruit labourers for the plantations as well as in some contact situations outside the plantations. The English-based pidgin used on Fiji is not likely to have had a great influence on Melanesian pidgin. Still, it might be that Pidgin Fijian or Fijian has left lexical traces.

5 A COLONIAL VARIETY OF GERMAN – AN ADDITIONAL INFLUENCE?

So far, this paper has mainly focussed on English-speaking plantation varieties and their influence on the formation of Tok Pisin, Solomon Islands Pijin and Bislama. However, the early sources indicate that not only

---

[8] "Tompuan aus Lamassa mochte ungefähr 40 Jahre zählen. Er war noch von der deutschen Begriffsergreifung als Matrose in Queensland gewesen und hatte sich einen bedeutenden Pidgeon-Wortschatz erworben." (Stephan & Graebner 1907: 22–23)

English-lexified pidgin languages were prevalent in the Melanesian territory. As pointed out above, a French-lexified contact language was spoken in New Caledonia and Fijan Pidgin was attested to be spoken on Fiji. A German influence and a possible existence of a colonial variety of German has so far not been considered and will be the focus of this section.

In the majority of the colonial sources on Samoa, the authors mention an English-lexified contact language that was spoken on Samoan plantations. There are only two sources identified so far which indicate the possibility that a form of German served as an additional means of communication. In an article in the *Samoanische Zeitung*, which dates to the year 1913, the author advocates for a control of Pidgin English and the "prevalent German vernacular with more or less corrupted English expressions" (Anonymous 1913: 1, translation by the author[9]). In addition, Zieschank reports that their German on Samoa was "strongly mixed with English chunks" (Zieschank 1918: 57, author's translation[10]). However, there is no information available on who in fact spoke this colloquial German and where exactly it was used. Though there are no language data available, the quotes make clear that the German language was not completely absent in the contact situation on Samoa. At the same time, the little evidence found reflects that Samoan Pidgin English represented the dominant contact language variety on Samoa.

Even though no German contact variety was brought to German New Guinea by returning labourers from Samoa, the German presence in the Pacific left linguistic traces. With the German occupation of German New Guinea, efforts were made by the colonial government to implement German to meet the administrative and educational needs of the colony. The introduction of German, however, proved difficult. Pidgin-English already represented the "most widespread lingua franca" (von Hesse-

---

[9] "Die Bestrebungen der beiden Schutzgebiete Neuguinea und Kamerun, den Gebrauch der englischen Sprache, und sei es auch nur das Pidgin-Englisch, einzudämmen, sind mit Freuden zu begrüssen und sollten auch in Samoa grossen Anklang finden. Sie richten sich in zweiter Linie natürlich auch gegen die sehr überhand nehmende Durchsetzung der deutschen Umgangssprache mit mehr oder weniger verballhornisierten englischen Ausdrücken, deren Gebrauch durch das starke Vorhandensein des Pidgin-Englisch sehr gefördert wird." (Anonymous 1913: 1)

[10] "Daß aber die englische Sprache vorherrschend blieb und auch unser Deutsch hier stark mit englischen Brocken vermengt wird, ist fast die ausschließliche Schuld der alten Ansiedler selbst, die über den Mangel an deutscher Art beklagen." (Zieschank 1918: 57)

Wartegg 1902: 52, translation by the author[11]) in New Guinea and served as an interlanguage in many other parts of the Pacific. Likewise, the use of an indigenous language for wider communication was discussed, such as for instance the usage of Tolai (cf. Friederici 1911: 94), but authors such as Hogbin proved right in their suspicion that "[t]he adoption of a native dialect as a universal language seems at this stage to be an impossibility" (Hogbin 1939: 259).

Due to the already existing English-based contact variety, there was no need for a further interlanguage to enable communication. To nonetheless promote the German language in the colony, German was introduced as the language of instruction in several missionary schools, such as, for instance, in the Catholic missionary schools in Alexishafen. In some missionary schools, the missionary school students started to use the German language outside the classroom setting for intertribal communication, which led to the emergence of a colonial variety of German. The emergence of the colonial variety of German was by no means intended and the colonial administration had not foreseen this development. Neuhauss reports that natives who have acquired their German knowledge in mission schools would "concoct a German gibberish, which is grammatically on line with Pidgin English" (Neuhauss 1911: 121–122, translation by the author[12]). Similarly, an early source is available in which it is argued that a kind of Pidgin-German existed on New Britian. Schafroth claims that "former mission students, who descend from distinct villages and tried to communicate in the newly acquired language", namely German, "concocted a Pidgin-German, worse than Pidgin-English" (Schafroth 1916: 19, translation by the author[13]). In the mission schools in East New Britain, in Vunapope, this led to the development of *Unserdeutsch*.

---

[11] "[…] das Pidgen-Englisch war bereits die verbreitetste Verkehrssprache, als die Deutschen hierherkamen, sie ist es auch auf den anderen Inseln der Südsee, und man konnte sie begreiflicherweise nicht einfach wegdekretieren und durch die deutsche ersetzen." (von Hesse-Wartegg 1902: 52)

[12] "Wenn Eingeborene aus sprachlich verschiedenen Gegenden, die in der Schule Deutsch lernten, sich gegenseitig zu verständigen suchen, brauen sie ein deutsches Kauderwelsch zusammen, welches grammatikalisch ungefähr auf der Höhe des Pidjin steht." (Neuhauss 1911: 121–122).

[13] "Die katholische Mission in Neu-Pommern und die evangelische Barmer Mission in Neu-Guinea lehren ihre Schüler Deutsch, daher mag ja nach und nach ein etwas Deutsch sprechender Nachwuchs heranwachsen. Doch hat man schon jetzt beobachtet, daß ehemalige Missionsschüler, die aus verschiedenen Dörfern stammten und sich

Though a rather stable German colonial variety only seems to have established itself in Vunapope, the German prevalence left its traces in Tok Pisin as well. A German – Tok Pisin dictionary dating to around 1935 contains words such as *beten* (German: *beten* 'to pray'), *gewer* (German: *Gewehr* 'gun') and *kirke* (German: *Kirche* 'church') which clearly have a German origin. In addition, it contains example sentences which show that German has found its ways into Tok Pisin lexis [cf. (1), (2), (3)]. Likewise, other early sources, such as the travel account by Vogel, show the influence of German on Tok Pisin [cf. (4), (5)].

(1)　　*Yu　　go　　links*
　　　　2SG　　go　　left
　　　　Eng　　Eng　　Ger
　　　　'Go to the left.' (Anonymus 1935: 50)

(2)　　*Mi　　strafe　　long　　yu*
　　　　1SG　　punish　　PREP　　2SG
　　　　Eng　　Ger　　　Eng　　Eng
　　　　'I punish you.' (Anonymus 1935: 87)

(3)　　*Surik　yufelo!*
　　　　back　　2PL
　　　　Ger　　Eng
　　　　'Go back!' (Anonymus 1935: 88)

(4)　　*alle　　boy-s　　　raus　　　schuv　　　him　　boat*
　　　　PL　　boy-PL　　get.out　　shove　　　TR　　boat
　　　　Ger　　Eng　　　　Ger　　　Ger/Eng　　Eng　　Eng
　　　　'Everybody get out, shove the boat!' (Vogel 1911: 159)

(5)　　*You　steal　him　musket,　　Rindchivieh,　paß mol op!*
　　　　2SG　　steal　TR　　musket　　　fool　　　　watch.out
　　　　Eng　　Eng　　Eng　　Eng　　　　Ger　　　　Ger
　　　　'You stole the musket, stupid fool, watch out!' (Vogel 1911: 72)

untereinander in der neu erworbenen Sprache zu verständigen suchten, ein Pidgin-Deutsch daraus zusammenbrauten, schlimmer als das Pidgin-Englisch." (Schafroth 1916: 19)

There is no indication in the colonial sources for any German influence on the Proto-Melanesian Pidgin English that would later lead to the individual varieties Tok Pisin, Solomon Islands Pijin and Bislama, rather, the sources indicate that this Proto-Melanesian Pidgin English was already in place when the German colonial powers came to the area. However, colonial sources do in fact indicate that the further development of Tok Pisin was influenced by German to a noticeable degree, while neither Solomon Islands Pijin nor Bislama was exposed to German. This could possibly be one of the factors that led to the differences between Tok Pisin and the other two descendants of Proto-Melanesian Pidgin English.

6 CONCLUSION

In this article, the *Database of Early Pidgin and Creole Texts* (DEPiCT), the electronic and online-searchable database which assembles early attestations on contact languages, was introduced. DEPiCT is a new tool for contact linguists and allows language-historical studies. The conflation of linguistic as well as metalinguistic data on many contact varieties into a single database permits language internal as well as cross-linguistic studies both from structural as well as from sociolinguistic perspectives and will contribute to shed light on the genesis of pidgin and creole languages.

In the second part of this paper I showed what kind of data DEPiCT can provide for a historical study of the origin and development of contact languages. To illustrate the scope of the database, meta-linguistic data were consulted to learn more about the genesis and diffusion of the Pacific pidgin contact varieties Solomon Islands Pijin, Bislama and Tok Pisin. The data revealed that a kind of contact jargon was used already as early as in the 1830s in Vanuatu and in the 1840s in the Solomon Islands and New Guinea. Though contact jargons were used, more permanent contact arose with the establishment of plantations in Queensland, Samoa, Fiji and New Caledonia and the concomitant labour recruitment on the Pacific islands. The early data provided evidence that ex-Queensland plantation workers and the Queensland Plantation Pidgin English played a major role in the development of Solomon Islands Pijin and Bislama. Besides the influence of Queensland Plantation Pidgin English on Tok Pisin, evidence was

provided that ex-Samoan workers brought and applied their Pidgin English knowledge when they returned to their home area in German New Guinea.

The results are not exclusive. Further evidence might still be hidden in archives or among single researchers, and the meta-linguistic data should be supplemented by a comparative feature analysis. Apart from trading and plantation contacts, missionary contacts should be integrated into the analysis as well, as the language diversity of the Pacific which evoked a need for a communication tool on the plantations was a difficulty missionaries and missions were confronted with as well. Though many missions decided to learn the respective language of the area they were at, or tried to teach a native language as a lingua franca[14], contact jargons and later pidgins were used to communicate with people from other areas.[15]

ABBREVIATIONS

ADJ	adjective	PM	predicate marker
Eng	English	PREP	preposition
Ger	German	TR	transitive
MODIF	modifier	V	verb
N	noun	1SG	first-person singular
P	pronoun	2SG	second-person singular
PART	particle	3SG	third-person singular
PL	plural	2PL	second-person plural

---

[14] The Melanesian Mission regarded Pidgin English as an inadequate tool to missionize. Instead of learning all local varieties, they tried to teach in and to establish Mota as the lingua franca of the mission (cf. Hogbin 1939: 259).

[15] Cormack (1944: 130) argues that even though missionaries tried to teach in the vernacular languages "pidgin English allow[ed them] to converse with the natives of other language groups". There is also evidence of services of the Methodists and Protestants having been conducted in Pidgin English (cf. for instance, Paton 1894: 6). The South Sea Evangelical Mission realised the advantage and potential of Pidgin English in order to reach a greater amount of people at the same time. The mission decided to use Pidgin as their primary medium of communication with the islanders.

REFERENCES

Abbott, John Henry Macartney. 1908. *Peeps at Many Lands: The South Seas (Melanesia).* London: Adam & Charles Black.

Anonymous. 1935. *Wörterbuch mit Redewendungen Pidgin-Englisch-Deutsch.*

Anonymous. 1913. Pidgin-English. *Samoanische Zeitung* 12(39). 26.07.1913.

Arends, Jacques. 1992. Towards a gradualist model of creolization. In Francis Byrne & John Holm (eds.), *Atlantic meets Pacific. A Global View of Pidginization and Creolization,* 15–24. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Baker, Philip & Lise Winer. 1998. Separating the wheat from the chaff. How far can we rely on old pidgin and creole Texts? In Philip Baker & Adrienne A. Bruyn (eds.), *St. Kitts and the Atlantic Creoles: The Texts of Samuel Augustus Mathews in Perspective*, 103–122. London: University of Westminster Press.

Baker, Philip. 1993. Australian influence on Melanesian Pidgin English. *Te Reo* 36. 3–67.

Behrmann, Walter. 1922. *Im Stromgebiet des Sepik. Eine deutsche Forschungsreise in Neuguinea.* Berlin: August Scherl.

Bennett, George. 1883. *An Account of Elau, a Malayan Papuan Child, and a Native of the Island of Erromanga, one of the New Hebrides Group, and Southern Pacific Ocean.* Sydney: F. Cunninghame & Co.

Bickerton, Derek. 1988. Creole language and the bioprogram. In Frederick J. Newmeyer (ed.), *Linguistics: The Cambridge Survey* 2, 267–284. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bickerton, Derek. 1984. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* 7. 173–221.

Bickerton, Derek. 1981. *Roots of Language.* Ann Arbor: Karoma.

Brown, George. 1908. *Pioneer Missionary and Explorer: An Autobiography*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Cheyne, Andrew. 1852. *A Description of the Islands in the Western Pacific Ocean*. London: J. D. Potter.

Churchill, William. 1911. *Beach-la-mar. The Jargon or Trade Speech of the Western Pacific.* Washington: Carnegie Institutions.

Collinson, Clifford W. 1929. *Cannibals and Coconuts.* London: George Philip & Son Ltd.

Coote, Walter. 1883. *The Western Pacific. Being a Description of the Group of Islands to the North and East of the Australian Continent.* London: Sampson Low, Marston, Searle & Rivington.

Cormack, James E. 1944. *Isles of Solomon.* Washington, D. C.: Review and Herald.

Cromar, John. 1935. *Jock of the Islands.* London: Faber & Faber.

Dickinson, Joseph H. C. 1927. *A Trader in the Savage Solomons.* London: H. F. & G. Witherby.

Drechsel, Emanuel J. 2014. *Language Contact in the Early Colonial Pacific: Maritime Polynesian Pidgin before Pidgin English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Erskine, John E. 1853. *Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific including the Feejees and others inhabited by the Polynesian Negro Races, in her Majesty's Ship Hawannah.* Murray: London.

Forbes, Litton. 1875. *Two Years in Fiji.* London: Longmans Green & Co.

Friederici, Georg. 1911. Pidgin-Englisch in Deutsch-Neuguinea. *Koloniale Rundschau* 2. 92–106.

Frommund, Bernhard. 1926. *Deutsch-Neuguinea 1905–1908.* Hamburg: Volkmar.

Giles, William E. 1968. *A Cruize in a Queensland Labour Vessel to the South Seas.* Canberra & London: ANUP & Hurst.

Great Britain. Colonial Office. 1883–84. Western Pacific: Original correspondence. London: Colonial Office (CO 225/18).

Great Britain. 1869. Copy or Extracts of all Correspondence relating to the Importation of South Sea Islanders into Queensland. *Great Britain Parliamentary Papers* 43. 1005–1168. London.

Greenberg, Joseph H. 1963. Some universals of grammar with particular reference to the order of meaningful elements. In Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.), *Universals of Language,* 58–90. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Guppy, Henry B. 1887. *The Solomon Islands and their Natives.* London: Swan Sonnenschein, Lowrey & Co.

Haspelmath, Martin, Matthew S. Dreyer, David Gil & Bernard Comrie. 2005. *The World Atlas of Language Structures*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hesse-Wartegg, Ernst von. 1902. *Samoa, Bismarckarchipel und Neuguinea. Drei deutsche Kolonien in der Südsee.* Leipzig: Weber.

Hilliard, David. 1970. Bishop G. A. Selwyn and the Melanesian Mission. *The New Zealand Journal of History* 4(2). 120–137.

Hogbin, Herbert I. 1939. *Experiments in Civilization; The Effects of European Culture on a Native Community of the Solomon Island.* London: G. Routledge & Sons.

Huber, Magnus & Viveka Velupillai. 2016. Sprachkontakt in kolonialen Kontexten II. Das Pidgin-Englische in den ehemaligen deutschen Kolonien. In Thomas Stolz, Ingo H. Warnke & Daniel Schmidt-Brücken (eds.), *Studienbuch Sprache und Kolonialismus. Eine interdisziplinäre Einführung zu Sprache und Kommunikation in kolonialen Kontexten,* 121–144. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Jacobs, Thomas J. 1844. *Scenes, Incidents, and Adventures in the Pacific Ocean, or the Islands of the Australasian Seas, during the Cruise of the Clipper Margaret Oakley, under Capt. Benjamin Morrell.* New York: Harper & Brothers.

Jacques, Norbert. 1922. *Südsee. Ein Reisetagebuch.* München: Drei Masken.

Jung, Emil. 1885. Die Arbeiterverhältnisse in der Südsee mit Bezug auf die Entwicklung unserer dortigen Erwerbungen. *Globus* 48. 282–285, 295–298.

Keesing, Roger M. 1988. *Melanesian Pidgin and the Oceanic Substrate.* California: Stanford University Press.

Krämer, Augustin. 1913. Redet Deutsch in unseren Kolonien. *Deutsche Kolonialzeitung* XXX: 24. 406–407.

Krämer-Bannow, Elisabeth. 1916. *Bei kunstsinnigen Kannibalen der Südsee: Wanderungen auf Neu-Mecklenburg 1908–1909.* Berlin: Reimer.

Lamb, Robert. 1905. *Saints and Savages.* Edinburgh & London: MacMillan & Co.

Le Chartier, Henri. 1885. *La Nouvelle-Calédonie et les Nouvelles-Hébrides.* Paris: Jouvet et Cie.

Lefebvre, Claire. 2004. *Issues in the Study of Pidgin and Creole Languages.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Lefebvre, Claire. 1998. *Creole Genesis and the Acquisition of Grammar: The Case of Haitian Creole*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, Bohun. 1923. *Ilses of illusion: Letters from the South Seas.* London, Bombay & Sydney: Constable.

Michaelis, Maria S., Philippe Maurer, Martin Haspelmath & Magnus Huber. 2013. *The Atlas and Survey of Pidgin and Creole Languages.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Vol. 1: *English-based and Dutch-based Languages.*
Vol. 2: *Portuguese-based, Spanish-based and French-based Languages.*
Vol. 3: *Contact Languages based on Languages from Africa, Asia, Australia and the Americas.*
Vol. 4: *The Atlas of Pidgin and Creole Language Structures.*

Moses, John A. 1973. The coolie labour question and German colonial policy in Samoa, 1900–1914. *The Journal of Pacific History* 8. 101–124.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2006. Multilingualism in linguistic history: creolization and indigenization. In Tei K. Bhatia & William C. Ritchie (eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 460–488. Malden: Blackwell.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 1996. The founder principle in creole genesis. *Diachronica* 13. 83–143.

Munro, J. K. 1867. *The Mary Ira. Being the Narrative Journal of a Yachting Expedition from Auckland to the South Sea Islands, and a Pedestrian Tour in a New District of New Zealand Bush.* London: T. Cautley Newby.

Mühlhäusler, Peter. 1978. Samoan Plantation Pidgin English and the origin of New Guinea Pidgin. In Peter Mühlhäusler (ed.), *Papers in Pidgin and Creole Linguistics* 1, 67–120. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics Series A. No. 54.

Neuhauss, Richard. 1911. *Deutsch-Neu-Guinea: In drei Bänden.* Berlin: Reimer.

Norden, Hermann. 1926. *Byways of the Tropic Seas. Wanderings among*

the Solomons and in the Malay Archipelago. London: H. F. G. Whitherby.

Parkinson, Richard. 1887. *Im Bismarck-Archipel.* Leipzig: Brockhaus.

Paton, Maggie W. 1894. *Letters and Sketches from the New Hebrides.* London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Philip, John E. 1978. *A Solomon Sojourn: J. E. Philip's log.* Hogbart: Tasmanian Historical Research Association.

Price, Charles A. & Elizabeth Baker. 1976. Origins of Pacific island labourers in Queensland, 1863–1904: A research note. *The Journal of Pacific History* 11.2. *Labour Trade [Part Two]*. 106–121.

Rannie, Douglas. 1912. *My Adventures among South Sea Cannibals.* London: Seeley, Service & Co.

Romilly, Hugh H. 1886. *The Western Pacific and New Guinea: Notes on the Natives, Christian and Cannibal, with some Account of the Old Labour Trade.* London: John Murray.

Schafroth, Marie. 1916. *Südsee-Welten vor dem großen Krieg.* Bern: Franke.

Schellong, Otto. 1934. *Alte Dokumente aus der Südsee. Zur Geschichte der Gründung einer Kolonie. Erlebtes und Eingeborenenstudien.* Königsberg: Gräfe & Unzer.

Schnee, Heinrich. 1904. *Bilder aus der Südsee. Unter kannibalischen Stämmen des Bismarck-Archipels.* Berlin: D. Reimer.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1889. Beiträge zur Kenntnis des englischen Kreolisch II. *Melaneso-englisches, Englische Studien* 13. 158–162.

Schuchardt, Hugo. 1883. Kreolische Studien V 'Ueber das Melaneso-englische.' Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien 105. 151–161.

Siegel, Jeff. 1987. *Language Contact in a Plantation Environment: A Sociolinguistic History of Fiji.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Strauch, H. 1876. Verzeichniss [sic!] von 477 Wörtern, gesammelt während des Aufenthaltes S.M.S. „Gazelle" in Neu Guinea, Neu-Hannover, Neu-Irland, Neu-Britannien und Brisbane. *Zeitschrift für Ethnologie* 8. 405–419.

Stephan, Emil & Fritz Graebner. 1907. *Neu-Mecklenburg (Bismarck Archipel): Die Küste von Umuddu bis Kap St. Georg:*

Forschungsergebnisse bei den Vermessungsfahrten von S.M.S. Möwe im Jahre 1904. Berlin: D. Reimer.

Thomas, Julian. 1886. *Cannibals and Convicts.* London, Paris, New York & Melbourne: Cassell.

Tyron, Darrell T. & Jean-Michel Charpentier. 2004. *Pacific Pidgins and Creoles: Origin, Growth and Development.* Berlin & New York: de Gruyter.

Veenstra, Tonjes. 2008. Creole genesis: The impact of the Language Bioprogram Hypothesis. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John V. Singler (eds.), *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies,* 219–241. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Velupillai, Viveka. 2015. *Pidgins, Creoles & Mixed Languages: An Introduction.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Vogel, Hans. 1911. *Eine Forschungsreise im Bismarckarchipel.* Hamburg: Friederichsen.

Wawn, William Twizell. 1893. *The South Sea Islanders and the Queensland Labour Trade.* London: Swan Sonnenschein & Co.

Webster, John. 1863. *The Last Cruise of "The Wanderer".* Sydney: F. Cunninghame.

Wendland, Wilhelm. 1939. *Im Wunderland der Papuas: Ein deutscher Kolonialarzt erlebt die Südsee.* Berlin: Verlag für Volkstum, Wehr und Wirtschaft.

Woodford, Charles M. 1890. *A Naturalist among the Head-Hunters: Being an Account of Three Visits to the Solomon Islands in the Year 1886, 1887 and 1888.* London: George Philip & Co.

Wurm, Stephen A., Peter Mühlhäusler & Darrell T. Tyron. 1996. *Atlas of Languages of Intercultural Communication in the Pacific, Asia, and the Americas.* Vol. I: *Maps.* Vol. II: *Texts.* Berlin: de Gruyter.

Young, Florence S. H. 1925. *Pearls from the Pacific.* London & Edinburgh: Marshall Brothers.

Zieschank, Frieda. 1918. *Ein Jahrzehnt in Samoa (1906–1916).* Leipzig: Haberland.