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ABSTRACT

The goal of this dissertation is to make a contribution to the description of the usages of the copula and past tense in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum. In order to accomplish this, data were gathered using sociolinguistic methods from a number of persons living in the Hawaiian Islands. These individuals were from all age groups, and from many different ethnic and socio-economic groups with varying degrees of educational backgrounds. The data were tape-recorded in interviews, story-telling sessions, and peer-interaction groups. In an effort to keep self-monitoring at a minimum and obtain a speaker's most relaxed, systematic style of speaking, no one was told the exact purpose of the recordings.

The data were analyzed to discover the usages of copula and past tense. The examination supported an interpretation that the English language in Hawaii was best described as a post-creole continuum composed of overlapping systems and that the lects in the continuum were in the process of decreolization. In addition, the analysis showed that an interpretation of the data by positing a series of coexistent systems could not be completely substantiated; nor, however, could the coexistent-systems hypothesis be completely refuted. The traditional notion of code-switching as a complete break
from one system to another was shown not to be viable and that a new concept of code-switching is needed in which only one feature can be involved in a switch.

A detailed examination of twenty-three speakers showed that the occurrences of the present tense Standard English (SE) copula can be arranged on a Guttman implicational scale in four syntactic environments: in the environment before a noun phrase to the environment before a predicate adjective to before a locative to before a progressive. The implication is that if an individual lacks a form of the present tense SE copula in any given environment, then he will also not have any forms in all environments to the right. It was further demonstrated that, with the exception of the implicational patterning, the speakers could not be grouped according to age, sex, ethnic group, educational level, or geographic space. It was claimed that this was due to the continuum's undergoing decreolization. This process evidently has cut across the various social and economic patterns in the speech community.

Examples from the data were used to support the theoretical claim that the progressive has as its underlying source a locative. The final theoretical concern dealt with the treatment of the past tense in the grammar. A process of tense neutralization, whereby the past tense, in conjunction with another past tense or a
past time adverbial, is neutralized to the unmarked, or present, tense, corresponds to the claim that the past tense is an intransitive verb. Further, it was shown that tense neutralization and the representation of adverbials and tense in the same grammatical category can support a claim of what the historical present was in early Indo-European.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The study of **pidgins** and **creoles** has long been a neglected phenomenon in theoretical linguistics. They are often regarded as poor cousins, not as worthy of serious investigation as so-called natural or "normal" languages are.\(^1\) Why this situation exists is not entirely clear. Perhaps one of the reasons is that the formation of pidgins and creoles has been viewed as a relatively isolated event, whose relationship to other language processes was slight, at best. However, it is now becoming increasingly apparent that this may not be completely accurate. That is, this formation could be a more wide-spread phenomenon than was previously thought. For example, the idea that modern English might be an ex-creole is being considered.\(^2\)

Along with this have come, in recent years, a number of international conferences which dealt with creoles and pidgins. Linguists concerned have realized that these supposedly marginal systems are rich sources of data on topics of interest to theoretical linguistics. This is because the formation of a creole involves the creation of a language. This kind of event offers invaluable data on such concerns as the nature and formation of rules, linguistic change, the nature of a linguistic system,
underlying and surface structures, to name but a few.

In addition, linguists in the so-called hyphenated branches of linguistics can turn (and in some cases, have turned) to the study of creole systems as a source of insights. One of the more obvious of these branches is sociolinguistics, as interpreted and practiced by such linguists as William Labov, Roger Shuy, and Derek Bickerton, to name only a few. In the social uses of creoles and pidgins a wealth of data is to be found on such topics as code-switching, and verbal strategies involving speaker-hearer-topic-setting relationships. Psycholinguists, for example, should find here a fertile field for insights into language acquisition and the effect of literacy on speech.

This dissertation treats several topics of theoretical importance to linguistics, and uses data from what DeCamp (1971) has called a post-creole speech continuum to shed light on these topics. This chapter serves as a general introduction to the English language situation in Hawaii. The second chapter treats the various usages of the copula, code-switching, the continuum interpretation and the coexistent systems hypothesis. In Chapter III, I discuss the nature of the post-creole continuum and the implicational patterning of the data dealing with the copula. The fourth chapter focuses on the various ways of treating or formalizing the data variation found in
the continuum. The subject of the fifth and final chapter is the variation of the use of the past tense and a process which I label tense neutralization.

In order to avoid terminological confusion, I would like to offer several definitions at this point. These are the same as those proposed by Bailey (1971b) and Hymes (1971). Pidgin is used in its most widely-established sense: a form of communication employed by native speakers of two or more different languages in a non-bilingual and non-diglossic situation; it is not anyone's first (i.e. native) language and has no history of native speakers. A pidgin is usually characterized by its simple or reduced morphological and syntactic constructions. For example, Reinecke (1964:535), in describing languages which he terms marginal, writes, "Their structure, relative to that of the languages from which they have been derived rather recently, is greatly broken down and simplified."

Pidgins have also been referred to as being somehow inadequate compared with other linguistic systems which have native speakers. Labov (ms: 25) claims that they are "deficient in most of the basic grammatical categories and syntactic operations typical of more developed languages." His reasoning for this is that a pidgin which becomes a creole (see below) develops these missing features when it acquires native speakers.
I use creole to designate that stage of a pidgin which has acquired native speakers. As mentioned above, Labov feels there is reason to believe that a creole is more complex than the pidgin from which it is derived. His claim is based on his observation that a creole will develop grammatical categories such as an obligatory past tense, for example, which are lacking in pidgins. Gumperz and Wilson (1971) apparently have discovered a situation where there is a creole without any history of a pidgin. The claim of creolization is based on their finding that there are grammatical structures and lexical forms which indicate "different sources, quite like the stereo-type of a pidgin or creole as the words of one language used with the grammar of another" (1971:165).

DeCamp (1971:349) feels that there are four possible courses open to a creole:

A creole can continue indefinitely without substantial change, as Haitian French seems to be doing. It may become extinct, as Negerhollands and Gullah are going. We say that it may further evolve into a 'normal' language, though we are hard put to find documented examples of this, and even harder to define what we mean by a 'non-creole' or 'ex-creole' language. Finally it may gradually merge with the corresponding standard language, as is happening in Jamaica.

DeCamp's is a good analysis with, however, one weak spot. This is in the third course, where he says that a creole may become a 'normal' language. I submit that there is
really no difference between this process and the first course in which the creole goes its own way. It may be that DeCamp recognizes this shortcoming when he says that it is difficult to define the terms 'non-creole' and 'ex-creole'. At what point in time does the system in option number one above---a creole which goes it alone---become an ex-creole or a non-creole? I think it is doubtful that there would be a synchronic difference in general structure between an ex-creole and a 'normal' language.

DeCamp's last possibility---in which the creole gradually merges with the standard language from which it is derived---takes place when one of the contributing or parent languages---usually the one in a superordinate relationship vis-a-vis the creole---remains in the vicinity. The system then changes gradually over time and acquires many of the same features---semantic, phonological, morphological, and syntactic---which are in the more prestigious system. This process is commonly called decreolization and has been recognized by linguists for quite some time. Bloomfield, for example, writes of the language of the Negro slaves in America as "being decreolized" (1933:474), and describes this process as one of "constant leveling-out and improvement in the direction of the latter (scil. the slave owners' speech)" (1933:474).
Decreolization occurs in what DeCamp (1971:349) has called post-creole speech communities, in which there is no sharp distinction between the creole and the superordinate language. Note that the term creole is still being applied to designate a particular grammar of the speech community. This usage causes some confusion, given the term post-creole. The point is, at what period of time does the creole involved in the process of decreolization cease being referred to as a creole? When should we label it an ex-creole or a dialect of the superordinate language? Unfortunately, there are no clear answers at this time.

As mentioned above, decreolization is a gradual process, occurring over a period of time. With the passage of time, the creole will come to resemble the standard language more and more. In Day (1971), I proposed that in doing so, the creole (or, in the terminology used in that paper, the satellect) could demonstrate the reverse of natural language development. That is, instead of language change through a process of rule simplification, re-ordering, and deletion (cf. King 1969; Kiparsky 1968a), the satellect could change by some of its rules becoming more restrictive, less simple. C.-J. Bailey (1971b:41) correctly points out that this does not exclude "co-occurrence natural developments, any more than natural developments in established
languages exclude adult changes to marked phenomena."
It should be pointed out that the type of language change
to which I am referring is what Labov (1966) calls change
from below, which occurs during the language acquisition
process.

DeCamp (1971:351) suggests that for decreolization
to take place, two conditions have to be met. The first
is that the standard, prestigious language of the speech
community be one of the parent or donor languages of the
creole. The second condition is that the social factors
which at one time prevented creole speakers from advanc­ing
in the community must be loosened enough so as to
allow the creole speakers opportunity to advance or
better themselves in the society. This opportunity for
social mobility gives the creole speakers reason for
modifying their speech toward the standard language.
Once this happens, it is obvious that a situation could
develop in which the distinction between the creole and
the standard language is not as clear-cut as it was
before decreolization. There are no longer two separate
systems, but many varieties in-between the two extremes.
Reinecke and Tokimasa (1934) claimed that this was the
situation in Hawaii in the early 1930's and called it a
dialect continuum. Reinecke, writing in 1934, describes
this language mastery continuum (1969:21-22):

There is indeed a continuum of mastery.

At one end of the scale is the uneducated laborer who, in atrociously mispronounced and extremely simplified English, can barely make known his elementary wants; at the other end is the exceptional immigrant, or more likely the son or grandson of an immigrant, who expresses himself in fluent, idiomatic, and adequate English but who retains a scarcely perceptible smack of the "foreign accent" and idioms peculiar to this language group.

DeCamp also uses the term *continuum* in describing the situation in Jamaica. He writes (1971:350), "Further, in Jamaica there is no sharp cleavage between creole and standard. Rather there is a linguistic continuum, a continuous spectrum of speech varieties . . . ."

Within such a linguistic continuum, the creole serves as the *basilect* at one end and the standard as the *acrolect* at the other end. The acrolect and the basilect are separated from each other by any number of *mesolects*. It should be made clear at this point that continuum is not being used here in its literal sense, for the number of varieties or *lects* is not infinite.6 With this qualification, the term will continue to be used here, for it expresses quite well the concept of a series of speech varieties which are to be found in the decreolization process.7

As reflected in the title of this work, my position is that the basilect, Hawaiian Creole (HC), is undergoing decreolization and the result is a post-creole continuum. It should be explained at this point that the term
Hawaiian Creole is in one sense misleading but in another, informative. It is misleading because, as I show in the following chapters, I have been unable to discover any data which prove that HC exists as a separate system as it may have before it started to decreolize. Unfortunately, we have no records or descriptions of that stage. The term HC is useful, however, since it can serve as a referent to those features in the continuum, only some of which are examined in this study, which are different from those in the varieties of Standard English (SE) which form the acrolect. These features are not restricted to syntax, but are also found in phonology and semantics. Therefore, for this reason, I use the term HC in this work, with the reservation that the term does not necessarily refer to an attested variety of speech, but to a collection of non-SE features.

The early stages of the pidginization and creolization processes have been documented by Reinecke in numerous publications (see especially Reinecke 1969). More recent studies of the language situation in Hawaii have been done by Tsuzaki, Carr (forthcoming), Nagara (1972), and Glissmeyer (ms).

Tsuzaki (1971) takes a different view of the situation than the one taken in this work. He argues for a series of three separate language systems which coexist.
He explains (1971:330):

In my version of the coexistent view the basic systems of HE (scil. Hawaiian English) consist of (1) an English-based pidgin, (2) an English-based creole, and (3) a dialect of English, which in turn is divisible into (a) a non-standard, and (b) a standard variety.

In this work I try to point out how Tsuzaki was correct insofar as he went, and I attempt to show how the coexistent-systems interpretation can be contained in the continuum position and how this position is indeed supported by data.

My work is an account of certain syntactic structures which occur in the Hawaiian Post-Creole (HPC) Continuum. It is not like B. Bailey's (1968) work on Jamaican creole syntax which described only the basilectal end of the continuum. As Bailey herself admits, her description is a remembrance of her speech as a child, and the speech she describes is probably not spoken by anybody today. I have avoided such an approach in that I have taken data from many different sorts of speakers in many different situations.

One of the primary concerns of most linguistic investigations is the nature of the data. The question is: How can we be sure that the data we use are actually representative of the system(s) under investigation? Labov (1969:715) clearly states the issue:

However, whenever a subordinate (non-standard)
dialect is in contact with a superordinate (standard) dialect, it is not possible to investigate the grammar by eliciting intuitive judgments of grammaticality from native speakers. Data gathered by such a method will reflect the superordinate dialect more than the one being studied. Therefore it is necessary to study the subordinate dialect by more sophisticated methods, observing the use of this dialect in its normal social setting.

If "basilect" is substituted for "subordinate dialect," and "acrolect" for "superordinate dialect," then the dangers for creole studies are clear. Most linguistic investigations rely solely on informants and their intuitions of their language. Labov argues that in dialect studies such methods of research must miss a great deal; for studies of a post-creole continuum, this is even more true. This is because data gathered by using native speakers' intuitions would reflect the speakers' attempts to use the acrolect and would thus slight the other areas of the continuum. Any description based on such data would be unbalanced.

In Hawaii, people are acutely aware of language. In most public encounters, there is a great deal of self-monitoring of speech. It seems as though most speakers in the HPC Continuum feel the need to hear a fair sample of speech from a stranger before knowing how to shape their responses. One of the most deeply rooted aims of formal education in the public school system—and in the private schools as well—has been to get rid
of HC, or Pidgin as it is commonly called in Hawaii. One of the local myths is that a person cannot succeed speaking Pidgin, and there is some basis in reality to this since the most consistent HC speakers (i.e. those with the most HC features in their speech most of the time) are those with relatively less education holding blue-collar-type jobs.

Therefore, it is quite obvious that a linguist who is a non-HC speaker approaching what he hopefully believes to be an HC speaker would most likely elicit something other than HC. This could be any one of a number of things. It could be some variety of SE; it might possibly be that speaker's idealized and unsystematic attempts at SE; or it could be display HC--certain stock phrases which a real HC speaker would never use (except in that situation), but which pass for HC to the uninitiated.

In the passage quoted above, Labov claims that a solution to this problem is observing the use of language as it occurs in normal social settings. In another article, Labov (1970:33) argues that:

...it is difficult to avoid the common-sense conclusion that the object of linguistics must ultimately be the instrument of communication used by the speech community; and if we are not talking about that language, there is something trivial in our proceeding. (Emphasis in the original.)
One of the results of Labov's work is the claim that "the style which is most regular in its structure and in its relation to the evolution of the language is the vernacular, in which the minimum attention is paid to speech" (1972:112). Labov terms this the vernacular principle. The problem is, of course, how to obtain such data. As Labov writes (1972:113):

We are then left with the observer's paradox: To obtain the data most important for linguistic theory, we have to observe how people speak when they are not being observed. (Emphasis in original.)


This line of reasoning is rather different from what traditional linguistic theory holds. For example, Chomsky (1965:3) argues that "linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech-community . . . ." One of the reasons for this is that linguistic variation is relatively less in the type of data Chomsky would use than in the type Labov prefers. This is not very surprising, since traditional generative theory is not too adequately equipped to handle variation. Some variation, of course, can be handled through the device of optional rules. This difficulty which variation caused has, to some extent at least, been alleviated by the introduction of variable rules (cf. Labov 1969). Such rules, I believe,
thus allow data with comparatively more linguistic variation to be analyzed in a linguistic study.

In obtaining data for this work, I tried to obtain them from as nearly natural settings as possible. Most of the data were recorded while speakers were interacting freely with each other: conversing, talking story,9 telling jokes, in private homes, on beaches, in streets. The subjects were never told the exact purpose of the recordings in order to keep self-monitoring to a minimum. Some data were not tape recorded but were noted during situations in which I was a participant as well as an observer. In addition, some data were tape recorded by the subjects themselves, with no 'outsider' present. I have indicated the various sources of the examples from the data by the use of a speaker number. Each speaker whose speech is used has been assigned a number; in Appendix A, there is a listing of the numbers along with biographical information about the speakers. It should be made clear that I do not regard the data as perfect, in two ways. First of all, it is difficult to control completely all self-monitoring by the speaker. In order to do so, much more sophisticated equipment (and perhaps even more elaborate subterfuges) would be needed.10

The second reason why I regard the data as less than perfect concerns the issue of sampling. Unfortunately, I lacked both the time and resources necessary for a
rigorous sampling such as that done by Labov in New York City (see Labov 1966). The data used in this work have come from speakers selected mainly by the criterion of availability. That is, they were available and willing when the person doing the tape recording was also present. Thus, by such a random informant selection process, I cannot claim with any complete degree of assurance that I have actually collected samples of speech from the whole post-creole continuum.

The goal, then, is to describe usages which occur in that portion of the HPC Continuum found in my data. I have not, of course, attempted to account for the SE end of the spectrum; to do so would be quite beyond the scope of this work.
NOTES

1Bickerton (1971a:31) points out that when a linguist of the stature of Bloomfield or Chomsky comments on creoles, such remarks only show "...by their rarity, perfunctoriness, and downright inaccuracy, that theoretical interest in creoles has hitherto been near zero." This should not be taken to mean that earlier linguists did not concern themselves with creoles and pidgins. For example, Schuchardt made the theoretical importance of creoles a major part of his life work. Hall (1966) also expressed interest in the place of pidgins and creoles in linguistics. For a good summary of the field, see Hymes (1971:3-12).

2See, for example, C.-J. Bailey (forthcoming).

3I do not mean to imply that I treat all of these topics here. For a good example of the insights a creole offers theoretical linguistics, see C.-J. Bailey (1971a).

4However, as accurate as their findings most likely are, I would like to express disagreement with their use of the term creole. Given the fact that the term as defined in this work has gained acceptance would indicate that perhaps Gumperz and Wilson really did not discover a creole but a new process by which language contact produces another linguistic system.

5I am grateful to Michael Forman for bringing this passage to my attention.

6Much of the recent work involving variation has
shown that the traditional term of dialects has little meaning for linguists (cf. Labov 1966). I have chosen to use a more neutral term, lect, when referring to any combination of linguistic differences. This definition comes from C.-J. Bailey (1972).

7 See also DeCamp (1971:354) for a similar reservation about the term. C.-J. Bailey (personal communication) offers the term gradation of many overlapping systems to express the language situation during decreolization.

8 I do not mean to imply that pre-Labovian linguistics shunned or denied variability. (See for example, Sapir 1921:147-170.) As William Stewart points out (personal communication), "A linguistic concern with variability is certainly as old as discussions as to whether variation could be 'free' or not, and those who argued that variation was motivated sometimes engaged in a great deal of speculation as to the probable reasons for it."

9 Talking story (or talk story) is a local speech event whose exact parameters are not yet clearly defined. As far as I can determine, it usually consists of individuals trading stories on such topics as fights, the supernatural, sex, and on.

10 Bickerton (ms:14-15) claims that the "perfect
corpus would probably all be obtained by long-range electronic devices and would contain no situation engineered by the investigator."
CHAPTER II
USAGES OF THE COPULA AND AUXILIARY BE

This chapter is an account of two investigations into the copula and auxiliary be in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum. The main focus of the chapter is on the alternation in the data between ±z and zero, as in (1-3).

(1) ma'e bad ±z agəns da doa (9)
'my bed is against the door'
"My bed is against the door."

(2) ma'e bad ba e da doa (10)
'my bed by the door'
"My bed is by the door."

(3) ḣa y dīfən#dae bo l ±z dīfən dow (25)
'George different. That boy is different though'
"George is different. That boy is different, though."

Arguments are offered which give evidence both for and against two possible interpretations of the English language in Hawaii—the post-creole speech continuum and the coexistent systems. As we shall see, the evidence allows us to claim that a continuum is composed of many decreolizing, overlapping systems. Such a claim enables us to include in the continuum the concept of coexistent systems.
Before describing the investigations themselves, I should describe some of my biases. I assumed at the first that there were coexistent systems in Hawaii (see above, Chapter I, p. 10). I did not expect to find in HC the forms of the copula found in SE--am, is, are, were, and be. I regarded waz as a past tense morpheme in complementary distribution with wən + verb, with wən being another past tense morpheme which appears in a preverbal position, as in (4).

(4) æs wa wən fak əp da ti (19)

'as what wen fuck up the thing'

"That's what fucked up the thing."

I surmised that the alternation between ḻz and zero, as illustrated above by (1-3), was the result of code-switching. That is, the speakers employed one "system," HC, and then changed or switched to another, SE. As is shown below, the investigations did not completely substantiate these ideas; however, they were not categorically refuted, either. This situation leads us to the claim mentioned above, that a post-creole continuum is composed of many decreolizing, overlapping systems.

There have been no rigorous linguistic studies of the copula in HC to date. What little has been done has been informal and anecdotal. A brief, preliminary analysis by the present writer carried out in the first half of 1970 came to the following conclusions:
1. There are no SE forms of the copula in HC.
2. Waz is a past tense morpheme in complementary distribution with wen + verb.
3. Ste is a copula used before locatives.
4. Otherwise, HC has no copula.

The data used for the first of the two investigations described in this chapter came from three sources: two recorded sessions conducted by William Labov and one by the present writer. Various portions were selected from the tapes of these sessions and were transcribed and analyzed. The selection was done on the basis of length of speaker's utterance. Short, one or two sentence utterances were ignored in favor of longer passages, usually a minimum of six sentences. One of Labov's sessions yielded the best results in terms of the amount of unmonitored speech obtained in a three-month study of HC conducted during the summer of 1970. The informants, four pre-adolescent boys of predominantly Hawaiian ancestry from a community on Oahu's North Shore, were close friends of Labov, and were taking an hour-long trip with him in his car. Two microphones were used, and the boys took turns wearing them around their necks. This was the second excursion for the group, so it did not represent a new or threatening experience. The boys apparently acted spontaneously with one another. Thus I feel that the boys were not monitoring their speech as
much as is usually done in most data-gathering situations when a tape recorder is present.

The other data from Labov were obtained in a recording of a group session of four adolescent boys, also of mainly Hawaiian ancestry, from a community of the leeward side of Oahu. The boys seemed to be interacting freely with each other and with Labov. This group had a tape recorder, and one of the members had undertaken to conduct interview sessions for Dr. Steven Boggs, an anthropologist from the University of Hawaii, who was working with them. Boggs had told the group about Labov, so he was not in the position of a complete stranger walking up to a group of teenage boys in order to interview them.

The data which I collected were the result of a taping of a conversation I had with two brothers of Hawaiian-Chinese descent, ages ten and eleven, in lower Pauoa Valley in Honolulu. I knew these boys well, and had previously interviewed them. They enjoyed talking, and were not afraid of the tape recorder or of the microphone. Consequently, the boys seemed to do little self-monitoring.

Thus the three groups of data were obtained from ten persons in all, ranging in ages from nine to fifteen, living in three different areas on Oahu. Approximately four hours of recorded speech were analyzed from these
three sources. The data were analyzed for occurrences of be, in any form including "implicit" occurrences following Labov 1969. Exx. (5-15) are representative samples.

___Noun Phrase (NP)

(5) di₃ da lae₃ ta₉m a⁶ eva kæ₇n kæ₇m (1)
'this the last time I ever can come'
"This is the last time that I can ever come."

(6) hi waz wän boᵢ skaᵢt (9)
'he was one boy scout'
"He was a boy scout."

___Predicate Adjective (PA)

(7) deᵢ fakin dətᵢ (20)
'they fucking dirty'
"They are fucking dirty."

(8) wän mæ⁶ fada waz sma (9)
'when my father was small'
"When my father was small . . . ."

___Locative (Loc)

(9) da puka əp dea (3)
'the puka up there'
"The hole is up there."

(10) hiz badi waz ȵsa⁶ da kah (20)
'his body was inside the car'
"His body was inside the car."
___Verb+ing

(11) faka a₇ na jok₄n (4)
'fucker, I not joking'
"Fucker, I'm not joking."

(12) yu æsho a₇ tæl₄n yu ra₇ øp de₇a (4)
'you asshole, I telling you right up there'
"You asshole, I'm telling you right up there."

(13) wi waz ple¹n bæskìtba₀ (19)
'we was playing basketball'
"We were playing basketball."

___gon

(14) wi gon kuk øm (1)
'we gon cook them'
"We're going to cook them."

(15) hi waz gon pik øm (1)
'he was gon pick it'
"He was going to pick it."

It is apparent from (5-15) that in analyzing the data a distinction must be made between those occurrences which are past tense—in a past tense environment or context—and those which are not. In these eleven sentences, five—(6, 8, 10, 13, 15)—must be considered past since waz occurs, while the remaining sentences exhibit no copula, at least as far as the surface structure is concerned. So the data were analyzed for both waz and for
forms of *be* occurring in the five syntactic environments. The results are shown in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

Presence or Absence of *waz* and *be*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>waz</em></td>
<td><em>be</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ving</em></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>PA</em></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>NP</em></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>gon</em></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Loc</em></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 1 demonstrates, a breakdown among the five syntactic environments gives us what (5-15) above lead us to expect: *waz* occurs in the data in all of the five syntactic environments, and the cognates of SE *be* do not occur. The six apparent deviations are circled and are discussed at length in this chapter. As Table 1 shows, there are 137 realizations of *waz* in the data out of a possible 164. It turns out that the absence of expected *waz* is often the result of a process which I call tense neutralization, a type of anaphoric deletion (see Chapter V).
In addition to the above findings, it was also confirmed that ste occurs before a locative, usually without a preposition, as in (16).

(16) hi ste maʻoi (9)

'he stay Maui'

"He is in Maui."

This is in line with the early, tentative results mentioned above.

So, still disregarding for the present the six circled occurrences of be in Table 1, a clear pattern emerges: ste is used infrequently before locatives, and waz is used in past tense situations. One interpretation of this is that in HC we get ste before locatives, waz in the past tense, otherwise nothing; ste alternates with zero before locatives and is used as a copula in HC, and waz is a past tense form.

Looking at the six instances of be in a nonpast tense context, the most obvious thing is that they are all occurrences of ʻaz. All of the examples occur with a third person singular subject. Since the investigation was being conducted under the hypothesis that HC was a separate system coexisting with SE, it was relatively straightforward and logical to claim that the appearances of ʻaz were instances of code-switching. The speakers moved from one system, HC, to another, SE.

It should be further noted that there were only six
cases of _z_ out of 109. That is, as Table 1 indicates, there are 103 instances in which there were no realizations of a present tense copula. Or, to put it another way, 5.5% of the time _z_ was used in the present. This is not a very high percentage.

Thus it would appear that the hypothesis was substantiated by the data. Variation—the alternation between _z_ and zero—is explained by code-switching. Gumperz (1970) discusses code-switching, and cites several interesting cases which are relevant here. One involves a switch from Spanish to English in which Puerto Rican mothers in Jersey City, New Jersey, would call their children to come by saying, "Ven aqui, ven aqui." Lacking a response from a child, a mother would say, "Come here, you." (1970:5). A second example concerns a black school teacher and a black student (1970:13):

Student: (Reading from an autobiographical essay) This lady didn't have no sense.

Teacher: What would be another way of saying that sentence?

Student: She didn't have any sense. But not this lady; she didn't have no sense.

Gumperz explains that such switching is not random verbal behavior; rather, it is part of a verbal strategy, available to speakers who command more than one language and/or dialect. The speaker switches in order to convey a
certain message or meaning.

Stewart (1968), in studying what he terms Rural Creole and Haitian French in Haiti, reports a similar phenomenon. What at first appeared to be unsystematic language behavior, later seemed to resemble highly structured code-switching. Stewart (1968:469) claims, "Both the language shift in the Haitian conversation and the style shift in its English equivalent are devices used by the speaker to communicate information to the addressee . . . " Thus, speaker intent is a highly important factor in language behavior, as studies of presupposition in semantics have amply shown in the past few years.

In another case study of code-switching, Ervin-Tripp (1964) analyzed verbal behavior in terms of the relations between the participants, the topic, the setting, the form, and the functions of the interaction. She proved in an experiment involving Japanese bilinguals that the speech the individuals used was influenced by all of the above-listed factors. She also discovered that as "language shifts, content will shift." (1964:95).

This whole line of reasoning is very appealing. My feeling was that if it could be adapted to fit the data on hand, then I would have a powerful explanatory tool. So I decided to analyze the six instances of $z$ in order to determine the reasons why code-switching was used.
The six instances are as follows:

(17) ma\textsuperscript{e} bed \text{\textasciitilde} z ag\text{\textasciitilde}ns da doa (9)

'my bed is against the door'
"My bed is against the door."

(18) a\textsuperscript{o} yu haev te du \text{\textasciitilde} z go ra\textsuperscript{e}t biha\textsuperscript{e}n (1)

'all you have to do is go right behind
the pheasant and just grab him'
"All you have to do is go right behind
the pheasant and just grab him."

(19) d\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde}e ka\textsuperscript{e}n dag \text{\textasciitilde} z gud y\text{\textasciitilde}h \text{\textasciitilde}elf\textsuperscript{e}d (3)

'that kind dog is good, yeah Alfred'
"That kind of dog is good, isn't it Alfred?"

(20) wa yu nid \text{\textasciitilde} z w\text{\textasciitilde}n d\text{\textasciitilde}m ga\textsuperscript{e} fo k\text{\textasciitilde}m a\textsuperscript{o}t (19)

'what you need is one dumb guy for come out
of the car'
"What you need is for a dumb guy to come
out of his car."

(21) b\textsuperscript{\textasciitilde} a\textsuperscript{o} de \text{\textasciitilde} z no mo \text{\textasciitilde}p \text{\textasciitilde}e n \text{\textasciitilde}p (20)

'but out there is no more up and up'
"But out there (outside of the boxing ring)
there aren't any more fair fights."

(22) a\textsuperscript{o} \text{\textasciitilde} z smae\textsuperscript{e}t tu gl\text{\textasciitilde}es (4)

'all is smashed to glass'
"Everything is broken up into bits and
pieces like glass."

Unfortunately, none of the examples has other than third person singular subjects. I say "unfortunately" because it would have been interesting to discover what does occur when some form of be appears with other than third person singular as the subject.

In all of these instances, the factors studied by Ervin-Tripp remained constant. That is, my analysis of these cases leads me to conclude that the speakers, their relationships with each other, the settings, the form, and the functions of the interactions did not change from the beginning of the taped sessions to the end. What did change, however, was the topic. But in each of the interactions studied, at the point when iz was used, the topic had not suddenly shifted. The contexts had not shifted from less formal to more formal, or vice-versa. Three of the examples—(17, 21, 22)—are addressed to the investigator present in the audience; the remaining three are addressed to the speakers' peers.

There is no question that if one studies any examples of code-switching, he would not be able to explain them all by changes in the factors studied by Ervin-Tripp. It is not unreasonable, however, to expect to find at least a small percentage of them to be explainable by these factors undergoing change somewhere in the discourse. The fact that I have not been able to do so in the six
examples under investigation here is significant.

So what I think we are left with is what Stewart calls **speaker intention** and what Gumperz calls **verbal strategies** (or **focus** in generative semantics). Let's examine (17) in detail in order to see if we can discover the speaker's intention or his strategy. The relevant parts of the conversation are in (23). The talk which precedes (23) concerns what the two boys do at night when they are in bed.

(23) Day: Jeffrey, are you telling the truth?

G: (Jeffrey's younger brother) (10)

tel am je"fi yu beta tel da trut
"Tell him, Jeffrey, you better tell the truth."

J: ma e bêd az aqens da doa (9)
"My bed is against the door."

G: aha ma e bêd ba e da doa (10)
'uhuh, my bed by the door'
"Uhuh, my bed is by the door."

Here J., whose speech usually contains mainly HC features, employs az before a locative in a nonpast tense environment. What is his intent? Apparently it is to convince me, a non-HC speaker, of the fact that his bed, not his brother's, is against the bedroom door. Therefore he shifted from HC to SE in order to accomplish or
facilitate this.

There are two reasons why this explanation can be considered less than perfect. Since one of these reasons is stronger than the other, let's discuss the better one first. J.'s utterance—(17)—cannot be tagged as a SE utterance, even though it contains \( \tilde{z} \). Looking at it carefully, we notice that two markers of HC—r-lessness and stops in place of SE fricatives—are present: \( \text{doa} \) and \( \text{da} \), 'door' and 'the', respectively. What this means is that the sentence remains HC in phonology but is SE in one grammatical feature. Because of this, I feel that concept of code-switching should be modified to indicate that perhaps only part of a code—say, the syntax or the phonology—needs to be involved in a switch from one code to another. Either this or we cannot claim that code-switching is at work in (17).

The second reason why code-switching as an explanation for the appearance of \( \tilde{z} \) in (17) is not completely acceptable is that it is also G.'s intention to convince me that his bed, and not his brother's, is by the bedroom door. However, G. does not employ \( \tilde{z} \). Both sentences have very similar syntactic structures, the stress patterns are the same, and they apparently carry the same semantic messages. Presumably code-switching is available to both speakers, but it is used only by one. The weakness of this argument is that if code-switching is
indeed available to both it does not necessarily imply that both will make use of it.

Two other instances of az which are somewhat similar to the az in (17) are (21-22). Ex. (22) is a description of the result of an automobile accident, and (21) is in response to a question from the interviewer about fights. They are similar to (17) in that both are addressed to the investigator, a non-HC speaker, present during the conversations. Both demonstrate phonological features of HC. In addition, (21) has a very definite syntactic HC construction—no mo—a negative formation.

Ex. (22) is perhaps a somewhat better example of code-switching since it contains another SE feature, in addition to the present tense copula. This is unlike any of the other five sentences under discussion. This other SE feature is the -ed suffix on smash. Even though the following word begins with a voiceless stop, the final stop of smashed is clearly identifiable, and has no connection with the stop at the beginning of the next word in the sentence. Further, the speaker's intent here is somewhat easier to imagine than in the other examples. The speaker is trying to be dramatic and impress the others, including perhaps the SE-speaking investigator, of the seriousness of the accident which he was describing. The climax of his discourse is (22).

Ex. (18) came during an excited interaction among
three boys talking about a visit to a ranch located on one of the other islands. It is quite different, then, from the three discussed above. The conversation is given as (24).

(24) B: aë tel yu dis#hæd wân fësîn ân dea (2)
'I tell you this. Had one pheasant in there'
"I'll tell you this. There was a pheasant in there."

H: o âp baë da rænë ân molokaë mi âen buli
'Oh, up by the ranch in Molokai me and Buli
âen maë kâsin go âeh#3evâl taëm wi wën go
and my cousin go, eh. Every time we wën go
fo keë da šikën sambëi hæda stat
for catch the chicken somebody hadda start
da kah# æh yu go te graw hë dën
the car. Ah, you go to grab her, then
da fësîn flaë âwe (1)
the pheasant fly away'
"Oh, up by the ranch on Molokai, me and
Buli and my cousin went. Every time we
went to catch the chicken, somebody had
to start a car. You went to grab her,
then the pheasant flew away."

A: fësîn šikën fak#3yu tel yu
'pheasant, chicken, fuck. You tell you
go fo grab da ġākān da fēsīn ran
go for grab the chicken the pheasant run

awe##yu min yu gāe z waz kēčān fēsīn (4)
away. You mean you guys was catching
pheasants

"Pheasant, chicken, fuck. You say you go
to grab the chicken, the pheasant runs
away. You mean that you guys were
catching pheasant?"

H: da fēsīn (1)
"The pheasant."

B: yē (2)
"Yeah."

H: wi laēk it ām (1)
'we like eat it'
"We want to eat it."

A: izi fo kēč (1+)
'easy for catch'
"Are they easy to catch?"

H: izi (1)
"Easy."

B: yē (2)
"Yeah."

H: hadli kān flaē (1)
'hardly can fly'
"They can hardly fly."
B: had in da græs yu no (2)
'hide in the grass, you know'
"They hide in the grass, you know."

H: had in da græs##a yu haev tø do
'hide in the grass. All you have to do
iz go raët bihaën da fæsin æn
is go right behind the pheasant and
jas græb m##a lita mo kek wan#
just grab him. I little more catch one.
da kaën deï kam ida we aë tank tsk
The kind they come either way I think tsk
flæ##we##æ waz gon brij am hom
fly away. I was gon bring him home
sell him to Tom, eh. He buy him'
"They hide in the grass. All you have to
do is to go right behind the pheasant and
just grab it. I almost caught one.
Pheasants, they would come from either
direction, I thought. Tsk. It flew away.
I was going to bring it home and sell it
to Tom. He buys them."

Here we have the relevant parts of the conversation.
We see iz appearing in the heat of a spontaneous conversa-
tion among three boys; two are trying to explain to the
third how they catch pheasants. There is no intrusion of
an adult SE speaker. That is, they are not interrupted by the driver. Given the rapid tempo of the speech and the excited tone in their voices, it is safe to assume that the boys are not conscious of the microphones or the tape recorder. As in the other three examples discussed above, there are no other indications that a shift has been made to SE. That is, we find no other features of SE in phonology or syntax. Because of all of this, it is possible to question a claim that the (18) is an instance of code-switching. There seems to be no apparent reason for the speaker to do so, and no other indication—other than ~z— that he has indeed done so.

Exx. (19-20) are very similar to (18), in that neither one is addressed to a speaker of SE, but to a peer; both occur during a conversation with peers. The only possible indication of a shift in the direction of SE in both of these utterances is the sudden, unexpected intrusion of ~z.

Now that we have examined the six appearances of ~z in the initial investigation, let's look at the results. Apparently there is one clear-cut case of what can be established as code-switching. The others might be called such, but this creates more problems than it solves, for the most common definition of code-switching, as I understand the concept, usually involves more than one feature of a given system being used. In the Gumperz
example cited above, we can see a definite switch from one system to another—Spanish to English. In five of the cases under discussion here, there is no such clear line. One possible explanation or way out of this would be to say that the shift to SE only involves the one feature; that for the one structure or feature, the speaker abandoned his HC grammar, shifted into an SE grammar for the copula, and then moved back into his HC grammar for the remainder of the utterance. I am not too sure what might be gained by doing this. By sweeping variation under the rug of so-called code-switching, what more do we know about the system(s) under investigation? What insights are gained by doing this?

Another fact which perhaps serves to cast a shadow on code-switching as an explanation for the appearance of ~z is this: Why are there only six in four recorded hours of conversation? These six times are not the only occasions when the subjects addressed the interviewer or sought to make something clear to him and/or other addressees. In all of these other instances, why wasn't code-switching utilized by the speakers?

Thus we can see that there are two reasons why the hypothesis is open to question. These reasons are less objectively probative than intuitively convincing, however, since there are only six examples of ~z in the data. Merely finding six cases, whether or not they can be
explained, is no cause alone for rejecting the hypothesis. What is needed is a more detailed examination of more data—additional samples of speech from different age groups and different ethnic groups—which might reveal factors overlooked in the initial investigation. The initial study was based only on frequency of occurrence of \( \text{az} \) in five syntactic environments. What is necessary to resolve the issue is an analysis of more data in an attempt to determine the conditions under which \( \text{az} \) (or any other SE form of the copula) appears. Therefore, additional data were analyzed in order to determine the relationships between \( \text{az} \) and the following conditions:\(^3\)

a. Wide individual variation in the amount of forms used

b. Tendency to correct from zero to plus copula
c. Hypercorrection
d. Co-occurrence with formal context
e. Copula support
   i. past tense
   ii. negatives
   iii. tag questions
   iv. question flip-flop
   v. elliptical responses
   vi. following a verb or auxiliary
   vii. where WH-movement has occurred
   viii. imperatives
f. Consistent patterns of contraction and deletion conditioned by grammatical and phonological features

Before discussing the results of the analysis of these conditions, one point should be kept in mind. At issue here is only the appearance of *\~z* (and any other forms or cognates of the SE copula which might turn up in the data) in alternation with zero. The other forms of the copula in HC are discussed later.

The data used in the second investigation are taken from several sources, the most common one being an interview situation, with the present writer as the interviewer. Data have been taken from people on the islands of Hawaii and Maui, as well as Oahu. Samples of speech were obtained from men, women, and children from most of the major ethnic groups in Hawaii. Other data have come from tape recordings of Steven Boggs and Michael and Violet Mays.

Out of the total number of 56 individuals interviewed in one fashion or another, the speech of twenty-seven was analyzed. These twenty-seven were chosen because they represent a cross-section of the sample. In addition, certain tapes were chosen because of the quality of the recordings, and the subjects' willingness to converse freely. Included in these twenty-seven are the ten from the initial study. Instead of merely re-analyzing the
same data used in that study, I transcribed all of their speech on all of the tapes in which they were involved. (As mentioned earlier in this chapter, p. 21, only selected portions were utilized.)

Now let's look at the results of the analysis:

a) Wide individual variation in the amount of forms used. All but one speaker used $\text{nz}$ at some time. The one exception is speaker 12, a 62-year-old Filipino whose speech contains few SE features. Now a retired sugar worker, he immigrated to the island of Hawaii in his middle teens. By way of contrast, his wife, born on Hawaii, addressed him with mainly HC features in her speech, but addressed the interviewer in what could be described as 'educated Island English,' or Tsuzaki's Hawaiian Island dialect (see above, Chapter I). There are many instances of $\text{nz}$ in her speech, even when speaking to her husband. Looking at the other twenty-six speakers, no speaker used $\text{nz}$ all of the time, at every opportunity, but all of them used it at some time. (For a breakdown of these figures by environment and by speaker, see Chapter III.) The data indicate wide individual variation in the amount used. This then would appear to be evidence against the hypothesis of coexistent systems.

b) Tendency to correct from zero to plus copula. If this occurred, then it would be evidence that the
speaker was apparently moving from one system—which lacks the form—to a second system which has the form. There are no examples of this occurring in the data. There are, though, two instances when a speaker repeats the same or substantially the same sentence and uses ~z the second time but not the first. Exx. (25-26) are the sentences in question; both were said by the same individual.

(25) bə tə maɓ hɔzbin nat##tə maɓ
   'but to my husband not. To my
hɔzbin ~z nat (25)
husband is not'

"But to my husband, it is not true.
To my husband, it is not true."

(26) jɔ j difn##dæ bo¹ ~z difn do (25)
   'George different. That boy is different
though'

"George is different. That boy is different
though."

In (25) we see the speaker—a forty-six year-old Hawaiian woman—saying one thing, and then repeating the sentence and inserting ~z. This same thing happens in (26), although in addition to adding ~z, the speaker also changes George to that boy and adds though. The crucial question in this argument is whether or not the speaker was correcting, and in these two examples she apparently was not. In each sentence, after the first utterance
without the copula, there is a sentence juncture; she does not stop or break off in the middle and repeat the utterance with a copula. Since there are no other instances of a speaker changing from zero to plus copula, it can be assumed that this is not a phenomenon in HC. As mentioned above, its appearance could be construed as evidence that HC lacks the copula \( \hat{z} \). I feel that its absence in the data offers counterevidence for the hypothesis of HC being a separate system from SE.

One possible way to account for the appearance of \( \hat{z} \) in (25) and (26) would be to claim that the speaker is merely adding emphasis to her statement. The rule for handling this would be something like:

\[
\begin{align*}
[+\text{cop}] [-\text{emph}] & \rightarrow \emptyset \\
[+\text{cop}] [+\text{emph}] & \rightarrow \hat{z}
\end{align*}
\]

c) Hypercorrection. By this I refer to the process of using a form in a way which violates normal rule usage by overgeneralization. For example, it has been proposed that individuals with r-less speech often hypercorrect and use \( r \) where normal r-ful speakers do not use it. The conclusion which is reached from this is that such r-less speakers lack the underlying \( r \) in the grammar. In the situation under study here, if the present tense copula were to turn up in structures which apparently violated
SE rules, and could not be demonstrated to be HC rules, then we would have evidence of hypercorrection, of an importation of a form. However, there is no evidence of this in the data. There are cases where \textit{\#z} is used somewhat differently than it is used in SE, as in (27), but this usage is clearly not hypercorrection. This is discussed below in (e) and at length in Chapter IV.

(27) yu no wat \textit{\#z pa\^} \hfill (26)

'you know what \textit{pau} means?'

"Do you know what \textit{pau} means?"

Here we find \textit{\#z} in a construction which is most likely not acceptable to most speakers of SE. This would be regarded as hypercorrection were it not for the fact that it is a common structure in the data and, as shown below, is rule-governed. Other constructions which would not be regarded as examples of hypercorrection are those involving a lack of subject-verb agreement, in the SE sense (e.g. using the present tense singular copula with a plural subject).

Since hypercorrection is apparently not a factor in the use of \textit{\#z}, we have an argumentum ex silentio against the appearances of \textit{\#z} being regarded as examples of code-switching. If hypercorrection were a factor, then we would expect to see at least a few instances of odd or unusual usages. Since we have not found them, we can justifiably conclude that the usages of \textit{\#z} in the data
are rule-governed, i.e. part of the speakers' grammar.

d) Co-occurrence with formal context. If there were such examples in the data, this would be evidence against the hypothesis. That is, if there were one continuous system with no zero base (i.e. a copula in the base), we would expect to find more examples of in formal style, because that is the way such a variable works.7 There are several good examples of this. One of these is (28) where the speaker, a thirteen year-old boy living in an urban area on the island of Maui, began speaking very formally to me when I asked him his name.

(28) hiz ne1m iz eki æn ma³ ne1m iz kriket (7)
'his name is Eki and my name is Cricket'

"His name is Eki and my name is Cricket."

The tempo of his speech was slow, deliberate, and obviously more monitored than the normal vernacular. Then later, as Cricket felt less threatened and more relaxed, his speech changed and became more rapid and, presumably, less monitored or formal. This is not to maintain that the subject was completely relaxed and was not monitoring his speech at all. Such unmonitored speech does indeed occur at various times throughout any given interview, if the interviewer is able to get the subject interested and excited enough about the story which the speaker is relating at the moment.

In his writings, Labov makes a distinction between
what he calls Style A and Style B. Style B is the more formal style of speaking, while A is the one in which little attention is paid to speech. There is little doubt that speaker 7 was using Style B when he uttered ex. (28). However, with the same speaker using Style A, there are instances when he uses forms of the SE copula. One example is (29).

(29) no de\textsuperscript{1}ə f\textsuperscript{u}##fu\ gro æn hæv da i\textsuperscript{y}æz (7)
'no they are fu. full-grow and have the ears'
"No, they are full. Full-grown and have the ears."

This, then, is what is best described as an informal context—the speaker was relaxed and talking casually—and we have an occurrence of a form of the SE copula—here it is are.

Another example of are occurring in an informal context is (30).

(30) wa\textsuperscript{e} yu ga\textsuperscript{e}z a\textsuperscript{ə} nat dæt klia (18)
'why you guys are not that clear'
"Why aren't yours that clear?"

In this sentence the speaker was asking his friends why their television pictures were not as clear as the picture he received at his home. In doing so he uses are! There is nothing to indicate that suddenly the context became formal. The situation is that a group of teenagers are talking among themselves, using a tape
They are extremely relaxed and apparently are not bothered by the tape recorder. The conversation flows freely and easily along, and in pops the form *are*. It is difficult to make the case that the subject of television introduces a more formal context into the situation, for television is an integral part of their daily lives. So this must also be classified as an example of a form of the SE copula in a context which is not formal.

What we have, then, for this condition is that there are indeed instances of *is* and other forms of the SE copula co-occurring with formal contexts but also co-occurring in other, less formal contexts as well. This finding offers little support for the continuum interpretation, but, since we do find *is* in informal contexts as well as formal, does not advance the hypothesis of coexistent systems, either.

e) Copula support. The following seven cases concern a number of items involving copula support. If we find the same copula support in HC as in SE, then we are dealing with the same copula operating under the same rules. However, if we do not have the same thing, then we are into another, overlapping (but not conterminous) system or a continuum of overlapping systems. That is, HC may have a copula which is similar in appearance to the SE copula, but which operates under different (sets
of) rules. These differences would allow different occurrences and realizations from the rules governing the SE copula usage.

i. Past tense. This is an important issue, for it is hypothesized (see above, p. 20) that was is a past tense morpheme in complementary distribution with wən, i.e. was + ø parallels wən + verb. The data show that was is restricted in its usage: it does not appear in what can be termed a non-copula environment; the only verbs which occur after was are those verbs in a progressive construction. wən occurs before stative and non-stative verbs. The usage and distribution of the was found in HC is strikingly similar to the was found in SE. This does very little to support arguments about the creole nature of HC, and thus does not help the hypothesis of coexistent systems.

ii. Negatives. This is a very interesting area, for we find that there are both negatives which use and do not use a copula. Ex. (25) demonstrates this quite clearly; (21) shows a copula and an HC negative construction; (30) has are + not. In addition, ain't appears a number of times, as in (31).

(31) də æin wən tru stoi (10)
'dat ain't one true story'
"That isn't a true story."

One interpretation of these examples is that HC apparently
has free use (i.e. random) of a copula, and that some modification must be made of the coexistent-systems hypothesis.

iii. Tag questions. Tag questions do occur in HC but they do not involve the use of be. Instead, no may be used:

(32) gud fun no (26)
'good fun no'
"It's good fun, isn't it?"

We also find that an affirmative morpheme can be used, such as yeah or ah. The complete picture of tag questions is obviously more complex than what is sketched here, but the point is that tag questions are not an issue since they reveal nothing about the use of a possible copula in HC.

iv. Question flip-flop. By this I am referring to the phenomenon of forming a yes-no question by subject-verb inversion. In order to facilitate the discussion, I posit two hypothetical examples (33-34); neither comes from the data.

(33) Is Leonard a football player?
Here in a yes-no question the question is signalled by the copula changing positions in the sentence. The intonation pattern for this type of a question can either remain the same as a declarative sentence or it can change and exhibit rising intonation. The situation
is somewhat different in HC. This type of question is signaled only by a change in intonation—-from the normal declarative pattern to the pattern illustrated in (34). (For a good account of the prosodic features in HC, see Vanderslice and Pierson 1967. The style used to show the intonation pattern in (34) is different than the one used by Vanderslice and Pierson.) No form of the copula is needed.

\[ l\textit{fna wan futba}^o \]

\[ (34) \quad \text{ple}^i \]

'a

'Leonard one football player'

"Is Leonard a football player?"

The matter of subject-verb inversion is very interesting and is taken up in detail in Chapter IV. This brief glance here serves to show only that question flip-flop is of no help in deciding the issue of coexistent systems.

At this point, before discussing the final four conditions, it is beneficial to compare Labov's findings (1969) about the copula in the Black Vernacular English (BVE) to HC. As is shown above, there is no copula support involved in:

1. tag questions
2. the morphophonemics of negative

This is unlike the situation in BVE. Further, unlike the BVE usage, we do not have:
Finally, compared to BVE, what copula support there is in HC is of a much lower level of use. Thus the evidence readily illustrates that HC is different from BVE and does not have the same kind of copula support. But it should be made clear that we do have \textit{was}, grammatical conditioning, some forms of \textit{be}, in addition to the fact that everyone (with one exception) uses the form \textit{az} a little bit.

Since the next three conditions concern the copula in clause-final position, it will be helpful to examine a paper by Anshen which was delivered during the Creole Symposium at the American Anthropological Association's Annual Meeting in 1970. Anshen considered the forms of the copula in (1) clause-final position and (2) following another verb or auxiliary, and labelled them "Labov-positions" since they are where Labov found an explicit copula in Black English.

West African Pidgin, Anshen reports, has a form of the copula \textit{be} which occurs in the Labov-positions. This form also alternates with other forms in other positions. The situation is somewhat different in Haitian (French) Creole, for in most sentences there is no copula. However in the clause-final position, the copula in the form...
of *ye* appears, even though it does not appear after other verbs—i.e. in the other Labov-position.

The point of Anshen's work is to reconcile arguments both for and against the creole nature of Black English. His conclusion is that the Labov-positions have "some sort of interlanguage importance to copulas in that funny things happen to copulas in these positions" (1970:6). This, Anshen claims, weakens Labov's (1969) former position against the creole nature of Black English, but Stewart's argument (1969) for creole affinities of Black English based on the similarity between it and Haitian Creole is also weakened.

The next three categories must be analyzed with Anshen's findings in mind. If it is also true that "funny things happen to copulas in these positions" in HC, it could help to shed some light on where the copula appears and under what conditions.

v. Elliptical responses. In this category I am concerned with the kind of elliptical response illustrated by (35), a hypothetical sentence from SE, where the ellipsis leaves *is, are, was, or were* as the last element in the sentence, bearing the stress.

(35) Yes, he is Senator Skreup → Yes (he is)
The question here is: What does HC do in answer to such questions as *He the one you mean?* If we don't have *Yes he is,* what do we have?
The data reveal that the copula does appear in past tense contexts, as expected, but does not appear in non-past tense contexts, as shown by (36).

(36) de^i da gae^z de^a wen bi as da laes ge^im (27)
'they the guys that wen beat us the last game'
"Are they the guys that beat us the last game?"
yæh (26)
"Yeah."

This exchange occurred between two speakers at a mountain-ball game. The first speaker was asking about a team which was playing a game at the time he was speaking, making the context present. The response was a simple affirmation. This type of reply is the only reply that I have a record of, either in data actually recorded or heard in conversations. I have never heard a reply like (37):

(37) *yæh hi
'yeah, he'
*"Yeah, he."12

In addition to the type of reply illustrated by (36), I have also heard replies as in (38):

(38) yæh hi da wen (27)
'yeah he the one'
"Yeah, he is the one."

But it should be pointed out that although this is not the
same since it does not leave the possible copula in the stress-bearing position, it is the obvious strategy for avoiding the whole problem.

The lack of a copula in this position would support a creole nature of HC and help to substantiate the co-existent systems hypothesis. However, the argument presented here is rather weak since, in general, people usually do not give fuller forms than that illustrated in (36).

Although the elliptical response position studied here is a form of the clause-final environment, Anshen's work did not consider this environment. Thus we have no real basis for comparison. It is in the next two categories where a valid comparison can be made.

vi. Following a verb or auxiliary. This is one of the environments which Anshen dubbed a Labov-position. The findings here are strikingly different from what occurred in the elliptical response category. Following a verb (or verb + to) or an auxiliary, the data show be occurring invariably. This is illustrated by the following sentences.

(39) yu ga tə bi wan oda ga e
    'yu got to be one older guy'
    "You have to be an older guy."

(40) sì yus tə bi ru mæd
    'she use to be real mad'
"She used to be real mad."

(41) wən əv əm səpoz tə bi græfiks ats (16)
'one of them supposed to be graphic arts'
"One of them is supposed to be graphic arts."

(42) deɪ gon bi da nu ʧæmps (11)
'they gon be the new champs'
"They are going to be the new champs."

(43) deɪ ˈlæk bɪ wər ˈdeɪ frɛnz əˈreɪdi (25)
'they like be with their friends already'
"They want to be with their friends already."

(44) da wrndə məs bi bələt prəf tu no (18)
'the window must be bullet-proof, too, no'
"The window must be bullet-proof, too, mustn't it?"

The data are unmistakable. To argue that these six examples are merely shifts into SE from HC would be unmotivated. Exx. (39-44) are examples which could be multiplied several times again with other similar sentences from the data. They are too plentiful, they occur in such spontaneous speech and under too diverse contexts to be construed as SE forms. It is clear to this investigator that in this Labov-position be does occur and is invariant.

This adds support to Anshen's contention that funny things happen to copulas in Labov-positions. In elliptical responses, apparently there is no way in which a
copula can occur. (The other clause-final environment is taken up below--where WH-movement has occurred.) After a verb or an auxiliary, the occurrence of the copula is well-established. This latter finding is extremely damaging to the claim that there are no forms of the SE copula in HC (see above, p. 20).

vii. Where WH-movement has occurred. When WH-movement occurs, it leaves the copula in a clause-final position, another Labov-position. The findings of my investigation in this environment are very different from those reported above in the other two environments. Before going into these forms, it is important to look at Zwicky's (1970) treatment of auxiliary reduction in English. He analyzes the contraction rule governing auxiliary reduction in order to determine

the extent to which it and rules related to it are dependent upon information not available in surface structure, or are restricted by complex conditions referring to syntactic and phonological information available in surface structure. (1970:326)

Zwicky discovered that the conditioning factor which makes contraction and deletion impossible in English is any WH-movement or other movement from the position after the copula. Thus (45) cannot be either contracted or deleted in SE.

(45) a. I don't know what his name is.

    b. *I don't know what his name's.
c. *I don't know what his name.

As Zwicky says (1970:335), "It seems that Auxiliary Reduction is barred from applying to a form when the constituent following that form has been removed." So when we have (45d) and apply WH-movement to get (45e), what is moved, thereby preventing the reduction of is to 's.

(45) d. \[
S \\
I don't know \quad S \\
his name is what
\]

(45) e. \[
S \\
I don't know \quad S \\
what his name is
\]

King (1970) also observes the same phenomenon, and notes that the contraction of be is blocked if a constituent following be has been removed at any point in a derivation.

The explanation for this apparently is found in the stress mechanism. That is, contraction is presumably an automatic result of a rule which lowers the stress on be. Lakoff (1970), in an attempt to illustrate the validity of global rules, says these rules are phonological, while the rules governing deletion and movement occur in the syntax. These facts illustrate "an interaction between the rules of the syntax and those of the phonology" (1970:632).
Note that we are concerned here with constituents within the verb phrase, as there are any number of examples where material does follow \textit{is} but \textit{is} still cannot be contracted. Labov (personal communication) offers the following data:

(46) a. He's working with my father.
    Is he working?
    Well, he is with my father.
    *He's with my father.

b. Where is he?
    He is with my father.
    He's with my father.

The relevance of this to the copula in HC is that if we find in the data examples in which WH-movement has occurred and the copula is missing, then the copula most likely was not there from the beginning. The reason for asserting this is that, as demonstrated above, contraction and reduction do not occur after WH-movement. Further, if there are instances which exhibit the copula in final position after WH-movement, we might conclude it was there before the transformation took place. This conclusion assumes that the rules governing the copula would apply before WH-movement.

Consider (47-49)

(47) a\textsuperscript{e} dono wa \textsuperscript{e}t \textsuperscript{e}z (14)

'I donno what it is'
"I don't know what it is."

(48) o sām pipo sin wa menehune āz (22)
'oh some people seen what menehune is'
"Oh, some people have seen what a menehune is."

(49) yu no wēh papakalo āz (7)
'you know where papakalo is'
"Do you know where Papakalo is?"

These data would seem to indicate the presence of āz, but a good case can be established for code-switching for them, which would explain the presence of āz.

Ex. (47) was spoken by a teenaged boy in rural Oahu. He also uttered (50-52).

(50) hiz ænədə gəl (14)
'he's another girl'
"He's another girl."

(51) yu wənt lukən ærə'n fo igrə dən (14)
'you weren't looking around for Igy, then'
"You weren't looking around for Igy, then."

(52) igrə in da bæk sət (14)
'Igy's in the back seat'
"Igy's in the back seat."

Exx. (47, 51, 52) were addressed to the subject's younger brother in the presence of his (i.e. the subject's) peers. Ex. (50) was spoken to his peers about his younger brother. It seems apparent from the conversation that the subject is trying to disparage his brother: He is attempting to
show the others what a stupid brother he has. One of
the ways this is done is through the use of a different
speech code—one that is beyond the grasp of someone so
dumb as his younger brother is held to be. We recognize
other SE features beside the copula in these sentences.
For example, (50) is said with SE intonation. There is
SE contraction of the copula in three of the sentences.
In (51), instead of the expected was + negative, there
is SE weren't. Also, in (47) the speaker uses the
pronoun it, one of the very few instances of it in the
data. So what we have in these sentences then is code­
switching from HC to SE.

It is somewhat less easy to establish a case for
code-switching for (48) and (49). Both were addressed to
me, the former by a thirteen-year-old part-Hawaiian boy
on one of the neighbor islands, and the latter by an old
Hawaiian man living in rural Oahu. And so perhaps one
could posit them as instances of code-switching. It
could be argued that it was their intention to use their
most formal style of speaking in order to convince me of
what they were saying.

The old Hawaiian man was telling me about menehunes,
a leprechaun-like people who make nightly appearances and
perform such tasks as building large stonewalls. This
man believes in their existence and it might be possible
to claim that he is using his "best speech" as part of an
attempt to convince me, an outsider, of their existence. Ex. (49) was recorded during an interview with several children ranging in age from eleven to fourteen. The speaker was explaining to me some of the various ghost stories and identifying some of the more haunted places on Maui. The claim could be reasonably made that the topic is one which elicits more formal speech than would otherwise be used.

There is one instance of a form of the SE copula in this Labov-position which cannot be called code-switching. (53) wi dono hu da frændz a*  (25) 'we donno who the friends are' "We don't know who the friends are." This sentence came from a 46-year-old Hawaiian woman, living in Honolulu. She was talking to two people whom she would no doubt consider subordinate in status because they were younger than she. This is based on the assumption that in Hawaiian culture, the older a person is, the more respect he or she commands from those younger. The topic was the problems one encounters in raising children, and what happens to them as they get older and start going out at night. She is an articulate woman, and needs no encouragement to talk story. Ex. (53) appears during a long discourse about a specific incident involving her daughter. No other features of her speech seem to change --to switch--to SE other than the copula. She is
definitely not a speaker of SE. She is the same speaker who used (25), shifting from zero to plus copula discussed earlier in this chapter, so she does have the ability to use at least some forms of SE. To substantiate the argument against the à in (53) being code-switching, let's look at the context in which it appears.

(54) b̄at mebib telē fon ka

'but maybe telephone call'
æn dén fəs tən yu no
'and then first thing you know'
o ma aë gata go səmple
'oh ma I gotta go someplace'
bikaz da frən ka
'because the friend call'
na° wi dono hu da frěnz aə
'now we donno who the friends are'
æn əës weə da trəbə kəm (25)
'and that's where the trouble come'
"But there may be a telephone call and then the first thing you know,
'Oh, Ma, I have to go someplace because my friend called.' Now we don't know who the friends are. And that's where the trouble comes."

Her speech is uninterrupted, and is apparently HC in nature, except for the are. But how else could a speaker
of HC utter this kind of a syntactic structure? There are several ways of working around the need for the copula in this position, and the simplest is merely not to use it.

(55) ӌi noz wa dæt (25)
'she knows what that'
"She knows what that is."

Ex. (55) comes from the same Hawaiian lady who used (54). It occurred shortly after (54), and was said during this woman's presentation of her conception of what life is all about.

(56) ӌi noz wa dæt
'she knows what that'
æn dφn wi gata go bič
'and then we gotta go beach'
gata hʌsl
'gotta hustle'
adawɛz da ʃan stav yu no (25)
'otherwise the children starve you know'
"You know, living has to be a hustle."
You have to go to the beach, you have to
go get taro, you have to go get breadfruit.
She knows what that is. And then we have
to go to the beach. We have to hustle,
otherwise the children will starve, you
know."

Here we see that (55) is sort of an aside from the
rest of the discourse. Mrs. L. was talking to a married
couple, he Caucasian and she Hawaiian. Both are approxi­
mately twenty years her junior. Ex. (55) was directed to
the husband, who might be seen as an outsider to Mrs. L.,
since he was not Hawaiian. Therefore a shift to SE would
not be unexpected. And she does shift: note the third
person singular verb agreement. However, there is no
copula! Did she shift to SE in order to add the third
person singular present tense morpheme to the verb know,
and did not shift for the copula? It seems very puzzling,
especially in light of (53), when there is no apparent
reason for shifting we find a\^.

viii. Imperatives. This is a crucial position,
for if we discovered that some form of the SE copula were
used in imperative constructions, it would be solid evi­
dence for be being in the grammar. As it turns out, there
are only three instances in the data of the type of
imperative constructions which require be.

(57) bi kwa\^ıt (9)
'be quiet'
"Be quiet!"

(58) bi kefu  (11)
'be careful'
"Be careful!"

(59) bi kwat  (8)
'be quiet'
"Be quiet!"

All three were addressed by the speakers to their peers. There were no instances in the data where, in SE, the expected be is missing. I must emphasize that the above three imperatives were the only examples of this type of construction in the data. Even though this is a very small number, I feel that it provides us with good support for the claim that be is in the grammar, and that HC does not lack a copula.

What conclusions can be drawn from all of this? We have seen that in this Labov-position--where WH-movement has occurred--that there are instances in the data where we find a copula: (47, 48, 53). The majority of these can be labelled code-switching, but at least one--(53)---and possibly two others--(48, 49)--do not appear to be examples of code-switching. Then there is one example --(55)--where there is no copula in final position. This apparently does not fit Zwicky's claim for English. Given the data presented above--following another verb
or auxiliary and in imperative constructions—which are solid evidence for be as a HC copula, the findings in this section seem to be contradictory, unless we throw out the code-switching claims and regard (55) as a performance error. If this is done, then the situation is less sticky. The major flaw in this course of action is that there are a number of examples similar to (55) in the data.

(60) a e dono wəh hi (15)
'I donno where he'
''I don't know where he is.''

(61) yu no hu ˈjæk wɪləmz (18)
'you know who Jack Williams'
"Do you know who Jack Williams is?"

(62) a e əʊ yu wəh da lən (3)
'I show you where the lion'
"I'll show you where the lion is."

I feel these examples prove that (55) is not a performance error. Since we, then, do have cases which demonstrate both the presence and absence of the copula in this position, perhaps the generalizations of Labov (and others studying BE) and Zwicky (for English) do not apply to HC. That is, working from the assumption that there is a copula in HC which resembles the SE copula, this copula is not subject to the same constraints as is its SE counterpart. There is nothing to prevent the
copula from being deleted even when the following constituent has been removed. If we posit a rule of **Copula Deletion** which would allow the copula to be deleted in this Labov-position--in elliptical responses and where WH-movement has occurred--but not to be deleted in the other Labov-position--following a verb or auxiliary--and in imperative constructions, then we would be able to account for the data. This constraint is quite easily expressed by restricting the rule to \( \ddot{z} \) (or perhaps to present + be). Such a rule would have to be variable in order to handle (47-49, 53), if code-switching were not used to explain the \( \ddot{z} \). (There is, of course, nothing to prevent us from using both.)

What we have shown is that the HC copula is not a part of the SE system, but this does not lead us to the conclusion that code-switching must be a factor. I feel it indicates the existence of a continuum of overlapping systems.

There is a theoretically possible way of reconciling (55, 60-62) and maintaining the copula constraint claimed by Zwicky and Labov. This would be to have subject-verb inversion apply variably in embedded questions. I will come back to this shortly (p. 69 below).

All of this, however, is made less neat and tidy by the appearance of ste as a copula. This issue is taken up in detail in Chapter IV, but one example is discussed
here because of its relevance.

(63) hi no wgh de\l ste  (27)

'he know where they stay'

"He knows where they are."

This usage of ste as a copula is not at all related to anything in SE; it is a HC construction, and its existence reinforces the case against the SE form of the copula since it is typical of creoles to have several different copulas.\(^{13}\)

I claim that it makes the suggested solutions less neat in that it is another form of the copula which must be accounted for. In addition to somehow indicating the proper kind of variability on the Copula Deletion rule, we must now reformulate our rule so that there are two possible forms of the copula—be and ste. These constraints on the Copula Deletion rule would be in addition, of course, to the one which would prevent it from applying in the second Labov-position—following a verb or auxiliary.

A second solution takes a completely opposite approach from the one offered above. Rather than positing the existence of a copula in HC which resembles the SE copula and a Copula Deletion rule, this solution depends on there being no forms of be in HC. Further, there is a Copula Insertion rule which operates under the following conditions:
1. Invariably inserts *be* following a verb or an auxiliary and in imperative constructions involving nonstative adjectives

2. Variably inserts *be* where WH-movement has occurred

3. Variably inserts either *be* or *ste* where WH-movement has not occurred

4. Does not operate in constructions involving elliptical responses

At this point these two solutions are only being outlined; in the fourth chapter, arguments are given for the correct handling of the copula in the grammar. The point to be made here is that the original hypothesis—the appearances of *iz* in the data are to be regarded as instances of switching from HC to SE—apparently must be modified.

Before turning to the last condition where *iz* is discussed, there is one more occurrence of *iz* in the syntactic construction where WH-movement has occurred. This is illustrated in (64).

(64) a$^o$ teI yu weh *iz* papakalo (7)
    'I tell you where is Papakalo'
    "I'll tell you where Papakalo is."

Other examples involve the use of *what*.

(65) yu no wat *iz* pau (22)
'you know what is pau'

"Do you know what pau means?"

(66)  yu no wat ʻiz lauhala  (25)

'you know what ʻiz lauhala'

"Do you know what lauhala is?"

These examples apparently display subject-verb inversion in embedded sentences. There are more usages of this type of construction in the data so as to prove that it is not a performance error. Ex. (64) was said by the teenager who gave us (49), an ʻiz where WH-movement has occurred. It came after I replied in the negative to (49). Ex. (65) was used by a person I was interviewing right after he had used the word pau, a loan from Hawaiian meaning 'over, finished, done', and is used extensively in the Islands. Ex. (66) was used by Mrs. L., the same person responsible for (53, 25, 55). Here we have the same individual giving us no copula where WH-movement has occurred, ʻiz where WH-movement has occurred, and ʻiz in a construction which is apparently not SE. Ex. (64) is somewhat different from (49) in that the former is a statement, while the latter is a question. But they are similar in the sense that in both WH-movement has occurred.

This question of WH-movement in embedded questions is discussed at length in the fourth chapter. The point to be made here is that (61-63) indicate that we have a
construction which apparently belongs to neither HC nor SE. If such sentences are treated as "You know the answer to the question: What is lauhala?" we still do not have an HC basis. Its origin might have three possible sources. The first is that it could be a direct importation from an English dialect where this happens. The second is that it could be an extension of the SE rules that apply in the formation of independent questions. The third possible source is that creoles delete rules which occur later in the grammar. I feel that the first alternative violates the principle of Ockham's razor (in the absence of evidence that there ever was such a dialect), but that the second and third have credibility.

We began the last four sections of copula support with a study by Anshen. The findings from HC indicate that he was correct in his conclusion that odd things happen to copulas in Labov-positions. In HC, there are funny happenings in that there are appearances of be in various forms in certain Labov-positions but no appearances in other clause-final positions. We also discovered that there is an unusual construction concerning the copula and WH-movement in embedded questions. The case for the hypothesis of coexistent systems was not particularly substantiated, since we have occurrences of SE be which cannot be labelled code-switching. But then
again, the hypothesis cannot be completely discarded since there are concrete illustrations of code-switching. This leads to the conclusion that there is a continuum of overlapping systems.

f) Consistent patterns of contraction and deletion conditioned by grammatical and phonological features. In the initial investigation all of the usages involving ˙az were full forms, not contracted forms. There did appear, though, to be a great deal of contraction involving the word that, which appears in a number of phonological shapes, usually [dæs], as in (67), indicating a present tense context.

(67) dæs spidz yu no

'that's speeds you know
"That's speeds, you know."
be nat tə mi dæs spidz kæz deɪ slo mi daən (3)
but not to me that's speeds, 'cause they slow me down'
"But not to me are they speeds because they slow me down."

There are also usages in which the context is past.

(68) aʊ fak əp##dæs wa wən fak əp da faeɪt (20)
'all fuck up. that's what wen fuck up the fight'
"All fucked up. That was what fucked up the fight."
Because of these examples, another syntactic environment was established: that. The results of the initial study from the three areas are given in Table 3. This table illustrates that that + be is realized as a contracted form 94% of the time, regardless of the tense. Because of this, I feel that [dæs] should be viewed as a lexical item, a bound form, an allomorph of that. Thus I no longer considered the that environment.
TABLE 3

Percentage of Occurrences of be in /that_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+past</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>-past</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>full</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contracted</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>absent</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the second investigation, other contracted forms were discovered. Among these are (50) and (52), which are given here again for the sake of convenience.

(50) hiz ænədər gəl (14)

'he's another girl'

"He's another girl."

(52) igiz i'n da bæk sit (14)

'Igy's in the back seat'

"Igy's in the back seat."

When these two examples were first cited above, I showed that, given the number of SE features in each one, they are probably instances of code-switching. The speaker is trying to put down his younger brother in front of his peers.

There are other instances of contraction which occur during speech which is apparently HC in nature. Among
these are the following:

(71) its aœez opën##its aœez opin (16)
    'it's always open. it's always open'
    "It's always on. It's always on."

(72) ši tink šiz k̓u æh (18)
    'she think she's cute, ah'
    "She thinks she's cute, doesn't she?"

(73) ha bojfrén tink hiz hænsâm (14)
    'her boyfriend think he's handsome'
    "Her boyfriend thinks he's handsome."

(74) yu no wæhz ala moana bim (1)
    'you know where's Ala Moana Beach'
    "Do you know where Ala Moana Beach is?"

However, (71) is suspect because of it, an importation, most likely, from SE. But (71) is HC in nature because of the use of opin for on in referring to a light being switched on.¹⁴

Exx. (72) and (73) were uttered in that sequence by two teenage boys in rural Oahu talking about a certain girl. Aside from the appearance and contraction of ʔz, they appear to be HC utterances, as are the sentences immediately preceding and following them. However, they might be considered suspect--as SE--given the topic. That is, the boys are talking about girls, and a not uncommon attitude about HC is that it is rough, masculine; SE is often regarded in the opposite light. Thus, the
argument might be that the boys, when talking about a subject which is [+ feminine], would use a code with a similar feature. It should be pointed, however, that the opposite claim could be made: that the boys would use masculine speech when talking about girls. Whether or not this is sufficient motivation for the boys to switch is difficult to ascertain at this time. But it is sufficient to point out that (72) and (73) could possibly be interpreted as examples of code-switching.

The other instance cited is one of those sentences with the copula in the unexpected and unusual environment explored above. Given the fact that (74) was addressed to the interviewer, a non-HC speaker, it might be another example of code-switching.

On comparing those occurrences of be which are contracted with those which are full forms, we find that the vast majority are full, and only a few are actually contracted. Most of the latter seem to be examples of code-switching. This is important, for if we were to discover a great deal of contraction in the data involving be, it would shed some light on the place of be in the grammar. If we find that there is no evidence for a regular intermediate contraction stage, then perhaps the copula-removal ought to be regarded as morphological. Claiming the existence of a morphological rule which deletes the copula is not very persuasive, I feel, since
there is little, if any, linguistic evidence to support it.

Another or second solution could be to posit a grammatical rule of variable copula insertion. Labov (personal communication) feels that this could be done in the following framework:

grammatical rules (if variable) are best
shown as optional insertion

phonological rules (if variable) are best
shown as optional deletion

Labov claims that this indicates that there are firm underlying forms for words which are then condensed. He feels that there are not firm underlying sentence models; these are elaborated from lexical strings.

Let's look at this matter in greater detail. Labov (1969:721-25), in an examination of how is and are are deleted in BVE, discusses the general nature of a deletion rule and its relation to contraction. He claims that in order for is, for example, to be contracted, the vowel must first lose its stress. Once it has no stress, it can be reduced to shwa, and then contracted. Labov claims this procedure can be handled by two rules formulated by Chomsky and Halle (1968) and an additional rule provided by him which he calls the Weak Word Rule. These rules are given here as (75-77):
The **Nuclear Stress Rule** is cyclical, re-assigning primary stress to the last lexical item within each phrase marker. This assignment, by convention, reduces the stress assignment of all other items by one. The subscript refers to any label except N, A, or V. (For a detailed discussion of the nature of this rule, see Chomsky and Halle 1968: 17-18.) The next rule, (76), reduces the stress in weak words (i.e. those words which can occur with shwa as their only vowel) from \( [3\text{stress}] \) to \([\text{-stress}]\). Then the **Vowel Reduction Rule** operates to reduce the vowel to shwa. This permits contraction, which is the removal of a shwa occurring initially in a word before a single consonant.

So what we have in SE, for example, is the present tense copula \( \sharp \) with primary stress initially. Rule (75) later assigns primary stress to other words which, by convention, reduces the stress on the copula. Rule (76)
then removes the stress, allowing (74) to reduce the vowel to shwa. This allows the copula to be contracted.

From the data given previously in this chapter, we might tentatively conclude that there is no consistent pattern of contraction or vowel reduction in HC. In research in progress with Hawaiian and part-Hawaiian children of kindergarten age, I have discovered that in repetition tests the children who do not omit the present tense copula in the SE sentence usually will respond with the full form, even though it is contracted when they hear it.

Given our tentative conclusion in the above paragraph, one possible interpretation is that there is no underlying form in the grammar for iz. This interpretation rests on weak ground for the following reason. Let us assume for the moment that the claim that only reduced vowels can be deleted in SE contraction. This does not mean that we have to assume that HC will automatically observe the same constraint.

Deletion is a different story. As we have demonstrated throughout this chapter, HC seems to either delete or insert the present tense copula. Whatever the process is which is at work--code-switching, insertion, deletion--it appears to be operating independently of the phonological constraints described above.

In summary, then, we find support for the presence
of ɪz in the grammar. But there is little support for a vowel reduction, contraction, deletion sequence. This must be contrasted with Labov's findings for the copula in Black Vernacular English (1969) in which the constraints are phonological. The general principle is that "Wherever SE can contract, NNE (scil. nonstandard Negro English) can delete 'is' and 'are', and vice versa: Wherever SE cannot contract, NNE cannot delete 'is' and 'are', and vice versa." (1969:722). (Emphasis in the original.) Labov (personal communication) speculates that in HC we might have the situation now which could have preceded the present stage of BVE: optional insertion of the copula. Regardless of whether or not this is indeed the case, it is readily apparent that there is not the same relationship in HC as there is in BVE between contraction and deletion and the copula.

What conclusions can we arrive at from the investigation in the thirteen conditions involving ɪz? Let's look briefly at what has been discovered. Out of these thirteen conditions, only one—elliptical responses—gives any support to the coexistent-systems hypothesis. Two were of no help in deciding—tendency to correct from zero to plus copula, and tag questions. The remaining conditions apparently give no support to the hypothesis, and, in some cases, even offer counterevidence. At the beginning of this chapter, I mentioned that the coexistent
system's interpretation is not completely substantiated by the investigation; but it is apparent that it cannot be rejected out of hand, either. I feel that the notion should be re-examined. One might even ask the question: Are there indeed three systems which coexist? Tsuzaki addresses himself to this issue (1971:334-5):

• • • we should now turn our attention briefly to natural corpora, or specific bodies of data, an examination of which might verify or refute the coexistent interpretation. A cursory inspection of my HE materials, consisting of tapes and texts, suggests an immediate refutation, for there seem to be no convincing examples of the component systems occurring in their pure forms, or as completely discrete systems occurring independently of one another. • • • the problem is complicated further because I find that the initial analysis in terms of coexistent systems still appeals to me. That is, it is a relatively neat and simple explanation of the HE situation which is basically in accord with my native intuition— I feel it is essentially correct and sense a kind of reality to the three-fold scheme . . .

So we see that Tsuzaki has not overlooked the kinds of problems which we encountered. However, rather than rejecting the hypothesis, he attempts to salvage it (1971:335):

• • • I think an empirical accounting for the combinations or intermixtures of the component systems will prove possible, through discovery of the linguistic and social conditions that govern their realization.

I must hasten to agree with Tsuzaki on this last statement. There is no doubt that the variation presented
in this chapter is to a large extent rule-governed. But I do not feel completely comfortable with the base from which the variation is accounted for. Tsuzaki, recognizing the drawbacks of positing completely separate systems, offers a modification (1971:336):

Such a scheme of coexistent systems for HE (now viewed as a hyper or super system) as I envisage it at the present time would consist of a set of three basic overlapping, rather than completely independent, structures. Exactly how the three systems overlap or how great the overlap is or to what extent they are in conflict is not very clear to me.

Throughout this chapter I have sought to demonstrate that something conveniently labelled \([HC]\) is not completely independent from something else called \([SE]\), there is a great deal of overlapping. However, rather than think in terms of two or three basic overlapping systems, I feel that the data are more adequately accounted for if one posits the existence of a postcreole continuum composed of many overlapping systems which are undergoing decreolization. Perhaps such an interpretation is not too different from the hyper or super system mentioned by Tsuzaki above. Once the explanation is given that the things we are looking at are not really separate but are part of the same large overall chain of overlapping systems, then maybe Tsuzaki and I are talking about the same thing. But this is not the case, for Tsuzaki writes (1971:328):
... if the existence of an English 'language
mastery continuum'2 in HE could be demon-
strated or if the use of the so-called 'pan-
dialectal' or 'over' grammar approach (see C.
Bailey [1968], DeCamp [1968], Labov [1968])
indicates a close relationship between HE and
other dialects of English, the position will
be strengthened and consequently should
attract many more adherents. The fact
remains, however, that to date practically
nothing has been done along the lines just
indicated; hence the interpretation still
suffers from the lack of a very fundamental
ingredient--linguistic evidence.

So Tsuzaki wisely withholds acceptance of the con-
tinuum interpretation on very solid grounds--lack of
empirical data. But we must remember that the
alternative he offers--coexistent systems--is far from
being substantiated. Tsuzaki points this out (328):

Like the dialect explanation, however, this
interpretation has suffered from a relative
lack of supporting evidence, particularly
evidence of a linguistic nature. This
deficiency, coupled with my feeling that it
was basically a very good interpretation of
the HE situation, prompted me several years
ago to publish a short note (Tsuzaki 1966),
in which I argued in favor of this point of
view and presented some substantiating evi-
dence. The present article may be viewed
as an elaboration of that note.

Tsuzaki cannot be faulted for this procedure. But
here he runs into difficult for, as quoted above (p. 81),
Tsuzaki himself cannot find the data to support his
interpretation.

Tsuzaki reconciles this lack of data by relying on
his native intuition, as quoted above. He also appeals
to transformational-generative grammar and
sociolinguistics (335-6):

The unreliability of the idiolect as a basis for extracting (a single, coherent) system has been demonstrated quite convincingly by Labov (1966); for the principle of accountability as applied to surface structures alone seems to run counter to the goals of transformational-generative grammar.

From such a vantage point, the inexplicability of a given corpus in its entirety in terms of any single component system of HE becomes relatively unimportant. To the extent that the same corpus, and by extension all other corpora, can be explained in terms of a set of coexistent (very imperfectly documented here but known or at least posited) systems, one has a better model for explaining situations like HE, in which as a result of relatively rapid linguistic changes, coexistent systems emerge from a synchronic analysis. (Emphasis in the original.)

It must be pointed out that Tsuzaki originally presented this paper in 1968. There is no question that the various concepts in linguistic theory have developed and changed a great deal since then. The idea of a linguistic continuum, as detailed in this work, is relatively new. I feel that Tsuzaki was on the right track in his interpretation and that he was most likely correct in rejecting the "pandialectal" concept as expressed when he was writing. It is possible that, given the interpretation of the post-creole continuum offered here, there is room for coexistent systems within it. That is, as I mentioned above in the first chapter, it is still an open question as to just what exactly the basilect in the continuum is. We are not sure when to say the creole which
is undergoing decreolization is no longer a creole. The acrolect is composed of varieties of SE, while the various mesolects could be easily regarded as what Tsuzaki called Hawaiian English.

The remainder of this work attempts to provide evidence in support of the continuum interpretation. I believe that each speaker has available to him any number of varieties or lects of speech. During a conversation he is able to move from one to another and so on, according to his linguistic abilities which define his position on the continuum. The distance from the extreme lect of one end of the continuum to the other is bridged by the mesolects which are ranked implicationally with respect to each other. As is shown in the next chapter, the absence of the SE copula $\mathbf{\#z}$ in one syntactic environment implies its being absent in other environments. If decreolization were an actual fact of the situation, then what we would have would be a series of lects which would display the gradual acquisition of the present tense SE copula, $\mathbf{\#z}$. 
NOTES

1 The transcription which I use throughout is extremely broad, and one should not ascribe to it any claims about the phonological system of the HPC Continuum. Rather, the transcription should only be regarded as a device for conveying information about the syntactic features under investigation. The phonology of the Continuum is an area which warrants a rigorous study. Any variation or inconsistencies in my transcriptions should be taken as an indication of the need for such an investigation. Following each utterance is a speaker number, given in parentheses. Identification of and information about each speaker is given in Appendix A. The utterance which is enclosed in single quotes is a word-for-word translation of the HC utterance; this is followed by its SE equivalent, given in double quotes.

2 I must point out that there may be three possibilities, rather than just two. The third is that there could be a system of many subsystems; this is in contrast to a situation in which there are many overlapping systems. However, at this point in time, it is not clear to me just exactly what the differences between these two interpretations are. I feel that any differences hinge on the notion of a system; lacking such a clear-cut notion, I will leave it to the reader to decide for himself what the differences are. The third possibility is, of course, the
coexistent-systems interpretation.

3 I am indebted to William Labov (personal communication) for pointing out to me these conditions.

4 The only major ethnic group which was excluded from the data is Caucasian, since the majority speaks some form of mainland English. Most of the data were collected during the spring and summer of 1971.

5 My reasons for classifying speaker 12 as a HC speaker and not as a pidgin speaker are due to his consistent use of many HC features. For example, he uses *wenn* before verbs to indicate past tense (see Chapter V); he uses *get* and *ste* as forms of the copula (see Chapter IV). In addition, his speech shows no examples of do-support in either question or negative constructions. Questions were formed by using the intonation pattern described in this chapter.

6 This is a typical example of the phonological variation referred to above in footnote 1. I have transcribed *pau* with a superscripted ɔ̄, but I have also heard the word pronounced with a ʊ. The vowels in particular show variation; words transcribed with ɑ̃, and ɨ̃, are also good examples of the variation. No claims about the nature of the phonology of the HPC Continuum are being made.

7 This observation comes from Labov (personal communication).
I am indebted to Steven Boggs for the use of the data which he collected during the summer of 1970. He hired Hawaiian teenagers to gather data for him. These boys were trained by Boggs and then they interacted with their peers while recording their interactions.

It might be argued that since television brings HC speakers in contact with SE that such speakers would tend to shift to a more formal style when discussing television. Such an argument, I feel, is extremely tenuous. It might be claimed that the speaker is disambiguating, and thus becomes more formal in his attempt to make himself better understood. This is a possibility.

C.-J. Bailey (personal communication) points out that Ralph Fasold has shown how creole grammatically-constrained copula-deletion became phonologically-constrained copula-deletion (a subsystem of English).

Mountainball is a local version of slowpitch softball.

An asterisk before a sentence indicates that it is ungrammatical. By ungrammatical I mean that the form or usage does not occur in my data, and most likely would not, given the information we have about the syntax of the HPC Continuum. Other replies which I feel would be ungrammatical would be: *they, *she, *we; I am not certain at this time about the status of such responses.

I am grateful to Labov for this observation.

However, Michael Forman (personal communication) indicates that this same usage occurs among Filipinos who speak English but do not speak HC. Perhaps this indicates the weak footing of claims based on lexical items.

See above footnote 10.

As Gregory Lee observes (personal communication), however, HC could have an obligatory rule that deletes shwa, thus concealing any vowel reduction there might be.
CHAPTER III
IMPLICATIONAL AND FREQUENCY
ANALYSES OF THE COPULA

In this chapter, I discuss the evidence for the existence and the nature of a post-creole continuum in Hawaii. That the English language situation is best described as a post-creole continuum which is undergoing decreolization is empirically testable. It should be possible to posit the existence of \( n \) number of mesolects for a given variable and then go to the speech community to determine the validity of the hypothesis.

I should point out that if it is indeed possible to study usage directly and to obtain interesting results, this is preferable to a process whereby members of the speech community are questioned about their intuitions of their language. And, as I demonstrate in this chapter, this is possible. As is mentioned in the first chapter, Labov has shown that so-called nonstandard speech skews unpredictably when such speakers are placed in situations which invoke self-monitoring. Therefore the speech that is actually used by individuals in as normal a social setting as possible is the kind of speech which should be preferred for such investigations.

Before going into the results of the investigation, however, it would be fruitful to examine early implicational
studies. One of the first was carried out by DeCamp in 1968 (1971) in an investigation into data variation in the Jamaican post-creole continuum. His study, which has had a great influence on much of my work, was concerned with vocabulary and pronunciation, in addition to grammar. He presents Table 1 (1971:355) to demonstrate the interpretation he feels best represents the Jamaican situation.

### TABLE 1
DeCamp's Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Speakers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+A child</td>
<td>-A pikni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+B eat</td>
<td>-B nyam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+C /θ t/</td>
<td>-C /t/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+D /æ d/</td>
<td>-D /d/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+E granny</td>
<td>-E nana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+F didn't</td>
<td>-F no ben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DeCamp (355) explains his table:

The features +A indicates habitual use of the word child; -A indicates use of pikni or pikini in equivalent contexts. +D indicates a phonological contrast in such pairs as den/then; -D indicates a lack of this contrast. +F indicates the use of didn't in negative past-tense constructions,
-F the use of various alternatives such as no ben, no did.

The data which DeCamp presents in Table 1 can be arranged in an implicational scale, which, as DeCamp (369) notes, is known as the Guttman scalogram analysis. I have done so, and this is demonstrated in Table 2.

**TABLE 2**

DeCamp's data arranged on an implicational ordering so that the various features imply the presence or absence of each other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>+D</td>
<td>-D</td>
<td>-D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>+C</td>
<td>-C</td>
<td>-C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-F</td>
<td>-F</td>
<td>-F</td>
<td>+F</td>
<td>-F</td>
<td>-F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-E</td>
<td>-E</td>
<td>-E</td>
<td>+E</td>
<td>-E</td>
<td>-E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+B</td>
<td>+B</td>
<td>+B</td>
<td>+B</td>
<td>+B</td>
<td>+B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we see that the seven speakers DeCamp used differ from each other by the implicational arrangement of the various features described in Table 1. Speaker Four would be the one whose speech contains the most creole features, while Speaker Five's speech contains none of the six creole features. If a speaker has the feature
--which means that he uses child rather than pikni--then he also uses didn't, granny, and eat. If a speaker uses granny, then he will use eat, and so on. Conversely, if a speaker is [G]C, then by implication, he is [G]D, and so on. This convincingly demonstrates that the six features form an implicational series.

Bickerton (1971) discovered an implicational ordering in the use of tu or fu to mark infinitives after verbs in Guyanese Creole. Bailey (1972), working with data from Labov (1971), illustrates how a change which raises a vowel nucleus spreads to various different environments. Bailey (1972:5) writes:

"... the environments of the change form an implicational series, such that the categorical (non-variable) presence of the change in any of the environments implies that the change is also categorically present in any of ... the heavier-weighted environments on the left. ... The categorical absence of the change in any environment implies its absence also in any (lighter-weighted) environment to the right. ... Any variable change in this particular table implies the categorical presence of the change in any environment to the left and the categorical absence of the change in any environment to the right."

Bailey's Table 1 (1972:123) is reproduced here as Table 3, in order to illustrate how neatly the data form the implicational ordering.
TABLE 3

Schematized illustration of the spread of the change that raises the vowel nucleus of the words like ham to that of hem (and eventually to that of hymn) in the different environments shown (Adapted from Labov 1971)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environments differentiated according to the following consonant:</th>
<th>m</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>g</th>
<th>v</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>l</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)(b)(c)(d)(e)(f)(g)(h)(i)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + + + x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + + + + + + x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ + + + + + + + x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A minus sign denotes the categorical non-operation of the rule for the change; x denotes the variable operation of the rule; a plus sign denotes its categorical operation. An asterisk denotes a thus far unattested, but presumably discoverable, pattern. The change is presumed to originate in locale (10), where it is complete in the vernacular style of speaking—the style illustrated in this Table. (From Bailey 1972:123)
Another experiment of a slightly different nature which resulted in an implicational arrangement of the data was conducted by Elliot, Legum, and Thompson (1969). They presented (1-4) to twenty-seven informants and asked them to rate the sentences on a four-point scale of acceptability.

(1) Sophia was seen by the people while enjoying herself.
(2) The people saw Sophia Loren while enjoying themselves.
(3) Judy was seen by the people while enjoying themselves.
(4) The people saw Karen while enjoying herself.

The results were as the investigators had expected (1969:56): the acceptance of (4) implies acceptance of (3); the acceptance of (3) implies acceptance of (2); and this implies acceptance of (1).

No matter how neat and scalable these implicational arrangements of the data are, it is also helpful if we can comprehend the rules from which they are derived. Bickerton discovered that the privileges of occurrence of verbs in three different types of underlying semantic tree representations affected whether a verb used either tu or fu to mark an infinitive. Elliot, Legum and Thompson hypothesized (1969:56) that the implicational ordering of their data was affected by a
rule-ordering phenomenon, which was not discoverable merely by asking a large number of people about their grammars. Bailey, in an experiment in which an implicational acceptance of various sentences was reported, claims (1972:38):

the value . . . was to show that data variation, so far from being a problem for linguistic analysis, can in fact contribute toward the establishment of highly abstract underlying semantic structures for sentences.

In the investigation reported in this chapter, the same data which I used in the second analysis, reported in the second chapter, were used again. In studying these data, I assumed that if my data-gathering techniques were broad enough, then there would be samples of speech from individuals who controlled a broad range of lects on the speech spectrum in addition to those who might only control a small part of the satellect end. The results of the analysis substantiate this position, for included in the data are such forms of the SE copula as are and am. Further, as Table 4 shows, there are individuals with iz in only one syntactic environment, for example, and there are also speakers with iz in all four syntactic environments. In an effort to establish the various lects in their implicational patterning, I hypothesized that the least likely category or syntactic environment for the appearance of the present tense SE
copula would be before a progressive; then the next least likely environment would be before a locative (house, Maui, down); the next environment would be before an adjective; and the most likely position for the present tense forms of the SE copula to appear would be before a noun phrase. The results of a detailed examination of twenty-three speakers are depicted in Table 4.

It is clear from Table 4 that the predictions are substantiated. We see that if a speaker lacks a form of the present tense SE copula before an adjective, for example, then he must not have any forms in the environments to the right--i.e. before a locative and before a progressive. That is, a non-appearance in a given environment implies non-appearance in all of the syntactic environments to its right. The two deviations are circled, and, as shown later in Table 7, they consist of one occurrence each of two different forms. In addition to the twenty-three speakers shown in Table 4, I have checked at random ten additional speakers from the data, and the same implicational ordering was maintained.

Stewart (personal communication) has informed me that he discovered much the same thing for Gullah, a dying creole spoken on the Sea Islands off the Atlantic Coast of Georgia and South Carolina, and has reported it in
Stewart (1969). He says that the SE copula first made its appearance in predication with a noun phrase complement, while verb phrases did not have the SE copula at the same stage (1969:244).

**TABLE 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>21</th>
<th>16</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>17</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>22</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>19</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>18</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>24</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntactic Environment</td>
<td>_NP</td>
<td>_PA</td>
<td>_Loc</td>
<td>_Ving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>x = at least one occurrence of present tense SE copula</td>
<td>o = non-occurrence of present tense SE copula</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If neither x nor o is present, it indicates that no data were available for the particular environment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Speakers 23 and 25 were not placed in this table because of a lack of occurrences. Speakers 26 and 27 were also not placed since they were not tape recorded.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Looking further at Table 4, it is apparent that there is a graduated series of steps from the speaker who has no present tense forms of the SE copula in his speech to the speakers who have such forms present in the four syntactic environments. What this means is that a speaker does not command various lects at random; as hypothesized, the lects are in an implicational ranking, as shown in Table 5. A speaker who does not have Lect 3 in his grasp, for example, cannot use the forms found in the fourth lect.

Working from the idealized model of a post-creole continuum given above in the first chapter, we would assume that Lect 1 would be the speech variety closest to the basilectal end of the continuum, and that the fifth lect would be located towards the SE end of the spectrum.

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
5 & x & x & x & x \\
4 & x & x & x & o \\
3 & x & x & o & o \\
2 & x & o & o & o \\
1 & o & o & o & o \\
\end{array}
\]

NP PA Loc Ving

Syntactic Environment

---
This does not necessarily mean that the fifth lect is SE. That all depends on what other phenomena Lect 5 happens to be bundled with, which, in turn, will probably be implicationally arranged, as DeCamp's materials were. It is more likely that it is one of the mesolects which approach the acrolectal end of the continuum. The important thing to bear in mind is that this study is only one part of the continuum, and one or two features in this area do not necessarily make SE.

At this point it is worthwhile to consider the possibility that in fact the speech of the twenty-three individuals depicted in Table 4 is the same, grammatical-wise, but that the speakers have different attitudes toward the interview situation. That this is not the situation can be seen by examining the ways in which the data were collected. As explained above in the second chapter, the data came from a number of different sources, and different techniques were used in collecting them. Also, in analyzing the data, no attempt was made to maintain a distinction between the various styles of speaking. Table 4 represents the range of the speakers' usages as represented in the data.

In order to demonstrate further that the technique used to collect the data does not correlate with the lect elicited, let us examine Table 6. The differences shown in Table 4 could be due to either the differences
TABLE 6
Sources of Data for Speakers from Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker #</th>
<th>Tape #</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>MA4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>HI6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HI3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>MA8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>SB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>SB1, 14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>MA4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>C40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>C33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>MA3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>14-15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>SB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MA4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>SB1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>HI10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>HI6, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in speakers' competence, or to a difference in the situation. Table 6 illustrates that the differences in Table 4 are not solely due to the differences in the situations, since we find different speakers from the same situation on different levels. For example, speakers 6, 7, and 8, exhibit different patterns of occurrences of *k*, yet all three were taped together in the same situation. The same is true for speakers 1-4, in which three of the possible five syntactic patterns are shown. We do not know for sure, however, whether or not the differences depicted in Table 4 are due completely to the differences in speakers' competence, since we do not have sufficient data on the same set of individuals in a number of different situations.

One more fact is relevant to the discussion here. I have data from two quite different sources on two comparable groups of teenage boys living in a community in rural Oahu. I claim that the groups are comparable because the seven boys involved were friends and associated with each other. Indeed, one boy was a member of both recording sessions. As mentioned in Chapter II, William Labov collected some data from four boys in a talk story session; in addition, Steven Boggs had earlier recruited two boys to collect speech for an investigation he was conducting. I have used one of these tapes, which is a recording of four boys interacting with each other.
In analyzing the data from these two different sources, I discovered that there are more SE forms of the present tense copula in the data collected by the boys than in the data recorded by Labov. This is shown in Table 7, which gives the percentage of occurrence of SE present tense forms of the copula in four syntactic environments.

**TABLE 7**

Percentage of Occurrence of Present Tense SE Copula

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Environment</th>
<th>Labov</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>__NP</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__PA</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__Loc</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>__Ving</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this table we can see that the percentage of occurrence of the present tense SE copula was greater in three environments in the data collected by the boys than that gathered by Labov. This seems to mean that the boys used more HC in talking to an outsider—a non-HC speaker—than when talking among themselves. Further, we can also say that the amount of SE forms does not increase in the presence of a non-HC speaking interviewer. This finding is
the opposite of what one might expect.  

It must be pointed out that in the tape the boys recorded which I used for my analysis, I feel that they were in no obvious way performing for the tape recorder --a small portable machine with a built-in condenser microphone. The boys were well-trained by Boggs in their task, which was to record naturally-occurring speech.

Exactly why these boys, living in a predominantly Hawaiian community on rural Oahu, would use more SE among themselves and more HC with an adult stranger is a fascinating and worthwhile area of research. As I understand the situation at present, there are at least two possible interpretations. One is that the techniques Labov used in gathering the data from the boys are faulty. Given the success which these techniques have had not only when employed by Labov but also by others in Hawaii, I feel this possibility is somewhat remote.

The second possible interpretation is more complex. It involves the notion of the opposite of hypercorrection which, as mentioned in Chapter II, is the process of overgeneralizing speech in the direction of the more formal, learned style. The opposite of this can be called hypocorrection which is the process whereby speech moves away from one's normal style in the direction of even more casual speech.

Returning to Table 4, we note that the data indicate
that there is one individual--Speaker 12--who has no present tense forms of the SE copula in his speech. With the exception of this speaker, all of the other speakers used at least one form once. In using 'x' and 'o' in Table 4, I do not mean to indicate or imply that a speaker who is marked with an 'x' in a given environment, for example, uses only a SE form in that particular environment. On the contrary, with the exception of Speakers 7, 9, and 15, there were no speakers who used exclusively SE forms in any environment. This is illustrated in Table 8, which shows the percentage of occurrence of present tense SE copula for speakers. It should be pointed out that of the three speakers who showed no variation in a given environment, N is only one for two of them.

Before getting into a detailed discussion of Table 8, there is an additional observation about Table 4 which should be made. There seems to be no obvious way of grouping the speakers in this table, aside from the patterning depicted in the table. They represent no apparent grouping by age, sex, ethnic group, educational level, or geographic space. That this is so may be verified by going over Table 4 with the information given in Appendix A. The four older speakers--12, 22, 21, and 13--do not cluster together. Three of the four females are in the top of the table, but the fourth--speaker 24--
### TABLE 8

Percentage of Occurrence of Present Tense SE Copula for 23 Individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>Syntactic Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>91.6% 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>75.0% 36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>66.7% 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.4% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50.0% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.2% 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.5% 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>20.0% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>83.3% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>66.7% 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>61.0% 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50.0% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>37.5% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>50.0% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>50.0% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>44.4% 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.0% 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>19.4% 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5% 93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>100.0% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>25.0% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.7% 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.0% 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
is near the bottom. Speakers 5 and 21, whose speech patterns are similar in Table 4, do not have much in common: the latter is a Hawaiian male in his late seventies, while Speaker 5 is a twelve year-old Filipino living on the island of Hawaii.

A possible cause of the variation is a syntactic change in progress. However, because of the apparent lack of correlation with other factors mentioned above, this is an unlikely cause. There is a faint possibility, perhaps, that the variation could be construed as a result of a change which is no longer in progress. At this point in time, we can only speculate that when the change did begin, it might have started in the environment before a noun phrase, and then spread in the fashion illustrated in Table 4. Given the fact that there are young people and old people, male and female, various ethnic groups, all who exhibit similar patterning with regards to the present tense forms of the SE copula, we might infer that the change is an old one, having been around for a long time.

This apparent lack of correlation with other factors is significant, for it is contrary to what Labov has found. In New York City, Labov reports (1966) that the variables which he investigated correlated with an individual's education, income, and social position in the speech community. The difference
between Labov's findings and the findings reported here may be due to two factors. The first is that the samples used in the two studies are rather different (see above, Chapter I). The second is that the two speech communities are different. In Hawaii, I feel that there is a post-creole continuum undergoing decreolization; I do not believe that this is the situation which Labov encountered in New York City. Decreolization apparently cuts through or transcends the various social groupings in the speech community.

As I mentioned in Chapter I, decreolization can only come about if two conditions are satisfied in the creole situation. Once these two conditions have been met, there is sufficient pressure and impetus for the creole-speaking part of the population to begin to acquire control over the prestige language. This has already happened in Hawaii. Although there is a certain amount of solidarity attached to speaking HC, there is also a great deal of pressure on children from parents and teachers not to speak HC. Given this, it is not at all surprising that decreolization has begun and that the SE copula appears in the speech of many individuals whose speech is heavily marked with HC features. The introduction of the SE copula is a rather obvious phenomenon which probably was one of the first aspects of decreolization, although this is
speculation and most likely cannot be verified, as far as the situation in Hawaii is concerned. It might be possible, however, to predict that the introduction of the copula is inevitable in decreolization when the matrilect has a copula, and then look for a situation which would parallel as nearly as possible the early scene in Hawaii.

Chapter II demonstrates that the HPC Continuum apparently has free use of the SE copula. The issue is, then, by what grammatical process does the explicit copula arise? Three possible models for the introduction of the copula are:

(1) Mixing of two quite different systems
   (e.g. English and Spanish)
(2) Mixing of related, but different (i.e. overlapping) systems
(3) Chaotic insertion (e.g. Black Vernacular English third person singular -s)

It has been established in Chapter II that neither (1) nor (3) can be considered as plausible models. By process of elimination we are left with (2); however, Table 4 now gives us a positive basis for its selection as the proper model. The exact formalism of the process is taken up in detail in the following chapter. The important thing is that the use of an implicational scale, Table 4, is of great value in helping to
determine the proper model.

Shifting our attention now to Table 8, it should be noted that it is a table which shows frequency, while Table 4 shows implication. Fasold (1970) compares these two kinds of display, and concludes (1970:559) that "the study of variable frequencies leads to deeper insights into the use of language in society than does strict implicational analysis." Given the data Fasold used in his comparison, he apparently draws the proper conclusion. I would like to suggest, though, that this is not always true. As we see above, the use of an implicational analysis can be extremely valuable. Even though Fasold (1970:551) claims these two approaches to be mutually incompatible, I feel that they ought to be utilized together in a linguistic study.4

In examining Table 8, one of the first things we notice is that when a speaker uses the present tense SE copula in the environments before an adjective and a locative, in general he will have a higher percentage of occurrences in the latter than in the former. This is perhaps shown more clearly in Table 9, which illustrates the average occurrences of present tense SE copula for the twenty-three speakers detailed in Table 8. With the exception of the percentages for the environment before a locative, the two tables, 8 and 9,
generally reflect a decreasing frequency moving from left to right, from before a noun phrase to the environment preceding a progressive. There are, nevertheless, cases where occurrence percentages for locatives exceed even those for noun phrases, and, as Table 9 shows, the overall percentage of occurrence is greater for locatives than for noun phrases and for adjectives. Exactly why this is so has no obvious and/or palpable explanation at this time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Environment</th>
<th><em>NP</em></th>
<th><em>PA</em></th>
<th><em>Loc</em></th>
<th><em>Ving</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall occurrence</td>
<td>37.4%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This difference in percentages between the noun phrase and adjective environments and the locative environment could be somewhat misleading if we were to use only a frequency analysis. That is, relying only on a frequency analysis could lead us to believe that the proper hierarchy for the introduction of the present
tense SE copula into the grammar might be the following:

_\text{Loc} \_\text{NP} \_\text{PA} \_\text{Ving}

This, of course, is contrary to what Table 4 leads us to expect.

There is another possible way of examining the percentages given in Table 9. As explained in the following chapter, it may be claimed that the progressive is derived from an underlying locative. Accepting this for the moment allows us to combine these two syntactic environments, giving us an average overall percentage of occurrence of 14.3 for the two environments, which is the lowest of the three. This would give us a decreasing percentage of frequency of occurrence from left to right, as illustrated in Table 10.

\textbf{TABLE 10}

\textbf{Average Percentage of Occurrence of Present Tense SE Copula for 23 Individuals from Table 8 with the Loc and Ving Environments Combined}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic Environment</th>
<th>Loc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_\text{NP} _\text{PA} _\text{Ving}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall Occurrence</th>
<th>37.4%</th>
<th>28.1%</th>
<th>14.3%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\text{N}</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, in this chapter I have tried to give evidence for my claim that the data are best described by positing a post-creole speech continuum which is decreolizing. I attempted to demonstrate that one aspect of decreolization can be seen in the gradual acquisition of the present tense SE copula by various HC speakers. This acquisition is done by implication, and thus can be felt to be rule-governed. In the next chapter, I take up the other copula forms in the data and attempt to formalize the patterns of variation which these forms exhibit.

I would like to close this chapter on a somewhat speculative note. Bailey has offered some tentative explanations (cf. 1972a, 1972) as to why speakers of one lect are able to understand speakers of another related lect, but not vice versa. His explanations revolve around the concepts of neutralization and leveling. That is, Lect A, for example, is leveling in the direction of Lect B. This implies that the speakers of the lect being leveled--A--would be able to understand the lect--B--which their speech is approaching but those speaking the unleveled lect--B--would not necessarily be able to understand the other lect--A. Although this is not yet supported by an investigation, it seems as though speakers of SE can usually be more readily understood by HC speakers, than
vice-versa. If we take the implicational nature of
the continuum to mean that the basilect and the mesolects
are being leveled or decreolizing in the direction of the
acrolect, this would account for the one-way mutual
intelligibility.
NOTES

1. This possibility was pointed out to me by Gregory Lee.

2. This phenomenon is discussed at length in a paper in preparation by Boggs and myself. In addition to the data used in this chapter, we are examining a tape recording the boys made in which they tell the same stories among themselves as they told Labov at his recording session. Preliminary results apparently substantiate the finding presented here, which is that the boys use more SE features when talking among themselves than when talking with Labov.


4. Sankoff, in a paper given at the Conference on the Ethnography of Speaking at the University of Texas in April 1972, incorporates the two models.

5. For an interesting paper which has some bearing on the discussion, see Ferguson (1971).
CHAPTER IV
THE NATURE OF THE CONTINUUM

In this chapter I take up the other forms of the copula which are contained in the HPC Continuum. This is done in an attempt to illustrate the nature of a post-creole continuum which, as I claimed in Chapter II, is composed of a series of systems which are decreolizing in the direction of the acrolect. In addition, I present some data from the Continuum in support of the claim that progressives have locatives as underlying structures.

The first examples which we will discuss involve *ste*. In Chapter II, I gave examples to illustrate that *ste* apparently is a copula. It appears before prepositionless names of location, as in (1)

\[(1) \text{hi ste ma}^{0}\text{i (10)}\]

"he stay Maui"

"He is in Maui."

Further investigation has revealed instances of *ste* such as the following, where prepositions are sometimes present:

\[(2) \text{w}^{\text{eh}} \text{da h}^{\text{el}} \text{de}^{1} \text{ste (25)}\]

"where the hell they stay"

"Where the hell are they?"

\[(3) \text{o me}^{1}\text{bi de}^{1} \text{ste w}^{\text{it}} \text{influns a}^{\text{f dis ka}^{\text{e}} \text{drag (25)}}\]

"o maybe they stay with influence of this"
kind drug'
"Oh, maybe they are under the influence
of this kind of drug."

ste also appears in the progressive:

(4) as ste ple\textsuperscript{\textdagger}n be\textsuperscript{\textdagger}sba\textsuperscript{\textdagger} ova hia (11)
'us stay playing baseball over here'
"We were playing baseball over here."

(5) ŝi ste ranan (16)
'she stay running'
"She is running."

In (2), ste appears in what was referred to in the second
chapter as a Labov-position--clause-final environment.
However, it should be noted that there are some major
differences between (2) and other Labov-position sen­
tences. The Labov-position occurrences cited in the
second chapter are instances of embedded clauses, while
(2) is an unembedded WH-question sentence. Further, some
of the examples in Chapter II exhibit the copula in the
final environment in both the SE and the HPC Continuum
sentences; however, this is not true in (2)--in SE they
is the clause-final element. But if an utterance from
the Continuum were to take the form ste + N, it would be
ungrammatical.

(6) *weh da h\textlone hia ste de\textdagger
'Where the hell are they?'

What then is the source of (2)? Since the hell in this
sentence has no final bearing on the discussion, we can safely disregard it, and offer (7) as a rough underlying structure for (2).

(7) de\textsuperscript{i} ste WH+pro

The WH-fronting transformation moves WH- to the left, yielding (8).

(8) WH- de\textsuperscript{i} ste

No further syntactic transformations are required at this point in order for this string to be generated into the proper surface structure (2).

This is not the case, though, with the SE counterpart to (2). Underlying (9a) is, roughly, (9b) which, when the WH-fronting transformation is applied, gives (9c).

(9) a. Where are they?
   b. they be WH-locative
   c. WH-locative they be

Then, of course, a further transformation which moves certain auxiliaries, be or have, to a position immediately following the WH-element is required.

(9) d. WH-locative be they

This is the same transformation that changes the b's to the c's in the following sentences. (The WH-fronting transformation changes the a's to b's.)

(10) a. you can do what
    b. what you can do
c. what can you do  

(11) a. you are how  
b. how you are  
c. how are you  

(12) a. John is where  
b. where John is  
c. where is John  

An approximation of what these two transformations might look like is given in (13) and (14). Rule (13) is the WH-movement transformation which moves the WH-element to the front, ahead of the first NP; rule (14) is the subject-verb inversion rule.  

(13) WH-MOVEMENT  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>NP_i</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>N_j</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>oblig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition: where NP_j includes a WH-formative

(14) SUBJECT-VERB INVERSION  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>oblig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC:</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Condition: where X includes some QUESTION-formative

It should be noted here that rule (14) is merely a schema for subject-verb inversion. Later, a constraint
necessary for SE is added.

From the data given here and in the preceding chapters, it is apparent that in the HPC Continuum (13) is obligatory since we never find such sentences as (15a):

(15) a. *de i ste wgh?¹

'they stay where'

"Where are they?"

However, from examples such as (2), it is also apparent that in the HPC Continuum rule (14) does not operate. For example, there are no examples such as (15b) in the data:

(15) b. *wgh ste de¹

'where stay they'

"Where stay they?"

So what we have, then, is rule (13)--WH-movement--being utilized in both SE and in the HPC Continuum. Rule (14)--subject-verb inversion--however, apparently does not apply in the Continuum, but does in SE. These observations, I submit, are evidence for the existence of two overlapping systems. They are overlapping in the sense that they both utilize rule (13), but they are separate in the sense that only one makes use of rule (14).

One could speculate that this state of affairs is due to the decreolization process. That is, the system
which has *ste* as a copula has acquired the WH-fronting transformation, but has not yet acquired a later rule, the subject-verb inversion transformation.

I would like to turn our attention away for a moment from *ste* and focus on another difference between SE and the Continuum in the application of rule \((14^+)\). In Chapter II, examples were given to demonstrate how *yes-no* questions were formed in the HPC Continuum. In that chapter we pointed out that, in general, *yes-no* questions are signaled by intonation, and not by subject-verb inversion, rule \((14^+)\). In the following hypothetical examples, \((16a)\) is SE, and \((16b)\) is its HC counterpart.

\[(16)\]
\[
a. \text{Is Leonard a football player?} \\
\text{lēna wān futbaō} \\
b. \quad \text{plei} \\
\]

\[\text{This, of course, concerns only *yes-no* questions which employ the copula in SE. For those which are formed with do-support in SE, apparently rule \((14^+)\) also applies.} \]

Assuming we have arrived at \((17a)\) at some point in the derivation, \((13)\) is applied which results in \((17b)\), and then the application of \((14^+)\) yields \((17c)\).

\[(17)\]
\[
a. \text{Leonard does have what} \\
b. \quad \text{what Leonard does have} \\
c. \quad \text{what does Leonard have} \\
\]

It should be noted that generally the intonation pattern
for the statement, Leonard has a ball, and the question, What does Leonard have, is the same.

In the HPC Continuum apparently rule (14) is not employed. Further, there is no do-support. Questions such as those illustrated by (17) are signaled by intonation—the same pattern as the yes-no questions which are formed like the one in (16). Neither do-support nor rule (14) is used. However, the situation is not quite so easy to describe, for, as we mentioned in the second chapter, there are cases of be apparently moving where WH-movement has also occurred. Exx. (18)-(20) are given in Chapter II as (61)-(63).

(18) a e tēl yu wēh īz papakalo (7)
'I tell you where is Papakalo'
"I'll tell you where Papakalo is."
(19) yu no wat īz pau (22)
'you know what is pau'
"Do you know what pau means?"
(20) yu no wat īz lauhala (25)
'you know what is lauhala'
"Do you know what lauhala is?"

These sentences illustrate the application of both rule (13)—WH-movement—and rule (14)—subject-verb inversion:

(18) a. a e tēl yu papakalo īz wēh
b. a e tēl yu wēh papakalo īz (13) WH-movement rule
c. a$^e$ tel yu wh $^h$ iz papakalo (14) subject-verb inversion rule

(19) a. yu no pau $^h$ iz wat
b. yu no wat pau $^h$ iz (13) WH-movement rule
c. yu no wat $^h$ iz pau (14) subject-verb inversion rule

The strings in (b) for these sentences meet the structural description formulated in rule (14) for subject-verb inversion. The interesting thing here is that their SE equivalent—(18d)—also fit the structural description of (14), but do not undergo the change, presumably because of the presence of the embedding sentence.

(18) d. I'll tell you where Papakalo is.
e. *I'll tell you where is Papakalo.

This indicates that as far as SE is concerned, rule (14) must be constrained in some manner so as to prevent its application for such sentences. Thus rule (14) must be rewritten to reflect the constraint indicated by (18d) and (18e). Rule (14') is a rough approximation of what shape the new formulation might look like:

(14') SUBJECT-VERB INVERSION I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SD: 1 2 3 4 \(\Rightarrow\)

SC: 1 3 2 4

Conditions: i. where X includes some QUESTION-formative
Rule (14') is certainly far from being the perfect formulation of the subject-verb inversion transformation, but it serves our purpose here, which is to block the rule from applying in certain SE structures.

However, as examples (18-20) demonstrate, there are instances within the HPC Continuum when the subject-verb inversion transformation applies. And this happens precisely in those structures in which it cannot apply in SE!! That is, subject-verb inversion happens in sentences in the HPC Continuum which are the very structures in which it does not apply in SE.

What we need, then, is another formulation of the subject-verb inversion transformation which reflects the constraints demonstrated in (18-20). A rough sketch of this is as follows:

(14'') SUBJECT-VERB INVERSION II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>X</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Pred</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>oblig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD:</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC:</td>
<td>1 3 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conditions:  
i. where X includes some QUESTION-formative  
ii. applies only in embedded sentences

The only difference between (14') and (14'') is the
second condition.

Given these observations, I would like to claim that what we have is another system in the HPC Continuum. This system, unlike the other system posited earlier in this chapter which employs ste and apparently does not utilize rule (14), seems to use rule (14'); it also employs the present tense SE copula \( \#z \). Contained in this second system are such sentences as (21) and (22).

(21) \textit{weh sti $\#z$} (25)

'where Steve is'

"Where is Steve?"

(22) \textit{wen de $\#z$ k\text{"a}m\text{"a}n} (27)

'when they is coming'

"When are they coming?"

Let us summarize our observations:

(23) WH-movement, as illustrated by rule (13), is used in both SE and in the HPC Continuum.

(24) Rule (14'), subject-verb inversion, operates in SE.

(25) Apparently there is a system in the HPC Continuum which does not utilize subject-verb inversion, as depicted by rule (14); this system also employs \textit{ste} as a present tense copula.

(26) There seems to be another system in the Continuum which uses another version of the
subject-verb inversion transformation, rule (14'''); this system employs #z as a present tense copula.

I should explain at this point that I am assuming that there is no difference in meaning between ste and #z. I am also assuming that ste is an older form, which represents a less decreolized item than does #z. Thus the system which uses ste would be assumed to be located more towards the basilectal end of the HPC Continuum than would a system which employs #z.

I should also point out that the question intonation mentioned above in (16) remains constant in both systems; this observation offers additional support to the claim that the systems found in the HPC Continuum are overlapping. Further, tense apparently does not affect intonation either. If (16b) were past tense, the intonation would remain the same:

(16)  lëna waz wən futba⁰
b'.  plei
a

Let us return now to the earlier discussion of ste, for it was this that served to launch the investigation into the subject-verb inversion transformation. It is with ste that we notice the lack of such a transformation. This lack of the subject-verb inversion rule also holds true for those utterances which have embedded sentences.
(27) hi no wən de^i ste  (27)
'he know where they stay'
"He knows where they are."
(28) æs wən k^i u kuʃin ste  (2)
'as where Cue Cushion stay'
"That's where Cue Cushion is."

Note that this is the same constraint as in SE; this is why rule (14) had to be reformulated to rule (14'). Sentences such as (29), which display subject-verb inversion, do not appear in the data.

(29) *hi no wəh ste de^i
Thus our previous claim about the system which utilizes ste appears to be correct: There is no subject-verb inversion transformation.

Another interesting observation about ste is that it is apparently tenseless; or, to put it another way, it can denote either past or present tense. That this is true is shown by the following sentences. Example (30) is past because of its context—speaker (22) was telling me about an experience he had while fishing one day, and he uttered (30):

(30) da la^en ste dæt we^i æn da bo
'the line stay that way and the boat
gorn dis we^i
going this way'
"The (fishing) line was that way and
the boat was going this way."

Another example involving ste in the past shows one speaker using waz and then the next speaker using ste.

(31) hi waz an wan tik (18)
  'he was on one chick'
  "He was on top of a chick (girl)."
  da faka ste lae daet (14)
  'the fucka stay like that'
  "The fucker was like that."

Example (32) demonstrates the use of ste in a past tense context which displayed habitual action. The speaker gave this sentence when he was describing some people who used to live near his house.

(32) evstaem de1 ste faetxn ova hia (11)
  'everytime they stay fighting over here'
  "They were fighting over here all of the time."

There is also (4) above, also said by speaker (11), which was given in a context which was past in nature.

As noted above, ste appears before progressives. 3 Why ste would appear before a locative and before a progressive would be a mystery were it not for arguments regarding the -ing of the progressive as a prepositional phrase from which the preposition has been deleted--an adverbial nominal. It is my contention that this finding--demonstrated in (4) and (5) above--is another argument in favor of this interpretation.
Let's look at these arguments. Ross (1967) proposes that (33a) has the underlying structure shown in (33b):

(33) a. Bill was writing.

\[
\begin{align*}
    &S \\
    &\quad NP \\
    &\quad \quad \quad VP \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad V \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{was} \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad at \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad N \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{NP} \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad S \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{NP} \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad VP \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{Bill} \\
    &\quad \quad \quad \quad \quad \text{write a letter}
\end{align*}
\]

C.-J. Bailey (personal communication) offers the following examples:

(34) Sam was chortling this morning and he's still at it.

(35) They're a-singing and a-dancing!!

The a in (35) can be regarded as an abbreviated form of at. Bolinger (1971a, b) advances a number of arguments in support of this position, three of which suggest a close relationship between the progressive and what I have called locatives in this work. These three arguments run as follows (1971a:248-49):

1. Sentences with progressives and locative prepositional phrases which employ the intensifier all are acceptable to the degree they are not literal.
(36) He's all in a dither.
(37) *He's all in New York.
(38) She's all bubbling with enthusiasm.
(39) *She's all singing with happiness.

2. Progressives can use to be constructions in conjunction with prepositional phrases and other adverbs.

(40) All the players're in line and waiting to begin.
(41) Humphrey's back again and talking as loudly as ever.

3. A where-question can be answered responsively with either a locative adverb or a progressive.

(42) Where's Dick?
    He's eating./He's over there.

Note that this observation is supported by (3), which came after the speaker said that she never knew where her children were.

Examples (4) and (5) add further support to the argument. Ex. (43) is a rough approximation of the underlying structure of (4).

(43)

```
S
  NP us
  V stay
    NP
    at
      S
      NP
      play
        NP
        baseball over here
```
The three observations detailed above from Bolinger (1971a) demonstrate a close connection between those phrases which actually denote location and the progressive, as Bolinger noted. The data from the HPC Continuum bolster his arguments, and add more evidence that the progressive is derived from an adverbial nominal.5

An interesting issue which is removed from the focus of this work is the possible origins of ste. It is difficult to overlook the claims that point to Portuguese (cf. Knowlton 1961). It would appear to be more than fortuitous that the patterning of ste described here parallels that of estar; estar does not appear before noun phrases. In this environment, another verb is used. Further, estar may be omitted from the three environments -- PA, Loc, Ving -- in which it appears. However, as attractive as this is, its discussion would go beyond the scope of this work.

Before turning to other forms of the copula, I should mention that the use of ste is not, of course, invariant. This was demonstrated in the third chapter where we saw that there is an alternation between iz and zero in the syntactic environments in which ste appears.

Another verb which displays copula features is get. It is often used to express what the phrase there is/are expresses in English.

\[(44) \text{ova hia get le} \]

\[(6)\]
'over here get ledge'
"There is a ledge over here."

(45) get fo mo nēva tēl (5)
'get four more never tell'
"There are four more who didn't tell."

(46) get (1)
'get'
"There is."

A variety of get which is not uncommon is haēv; it apparently has the same meaning and scope, and at this point I am unable to discern any differences between the two. Get is also used in similar fashion to have in SE. Example (46) may be taken to mean I/we have. Another example is:

(47) get prablam laēk dæ (21)
'get problem like that'
"I have/there is a problem like that."

There are several things which must be noted about get. To begin with, its use in the Continuum is not invariant. That is, it alternates with its equivalent SE forms. A striking example of this is (48), spoken by a thirteen year-old girl of Filipino descent, living on Maui. In general her speech to me can best be labelled as something approaching the acrolect, with occasional features of the mesolects used when she got excited.

(48) deiær æ--deiær bæn³n tri æn--uh--
'there's a--there's a banyan tree--uh--hæv æn hæv greɪvz ova deɪə (8) have and have graves over there'
"There's a--there's a banyan tree and, uh, there, there are graves over there."

Here we see her start off a sentence about spooky places with deɪəz in addition to several other SE features, and then shift to hæv which, as mentioned above, is an alternate form of get.

Further, get and deɪə+bi are not freely substituted for one another; get has the same semantic domain as deɪə+bi has, but when it is not used, we do not automatically find deɪə+bi. Rather, what we discover is a variety of usages, from deɪə—in several phonetic realizations—to only iz to both deɪə and iz.

At this point I would like to turn our attention to the relationships that exist in the usages of ste and get. Table 1 illustrates an implicational patterning in the use of ste. We see that in the two environments in which my data show that ste occurs, before locatives and progressives, there is an implicational patterning. That is, if a speaker uses ste before a progressive, then he will also use ste before a locative. We also see that if a speaker has ste in only one of the two environments, that environment must be before a locative.

Another implicational patterning is depicted in
Table 2. This table shows that the presence of $de^{-}\sigma$ (with or without $bi$) implies the presence of $get$, but not vice versa. Both Tables 1 and 2 indicate that some of the logical possibilities for the system involving $ste$ and for the system involving $get$ do not exist in my data. That is, the chance of $ste$, for example, appearing before a locative is not independent on the chance of it appearing before a progressive. Thus, in addition to the implicational patterning of $\sigma z$ alternating with zero in four syntactic environments detailed in Chapter III, we have two more implicational relationships.

I would now like to attempt to put the preceding observations together in order to demonstrate how they form a number of overlapping systems. What we have to account for are the following:

(49) the system described in the third chapter which concerns the $\sigma z$ in four syntactic environments

(50) the system described in this chapter which concerns $ste$ before locatives and progressives

(51) the system concerning $get$ and $de^{-}\sigma$ ($bi$)

Our next task is to label the three systems, and then assign the various speakers to these systems. It should be noted that the systems overlap, but they cannot be put together in a hierarchy.
TABLE 1

Occurrences of ste before Locatives and Progressives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ste</th>
<th>Loc</th>
<th>Prog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x = at least one occurrence of ste
o = non-occurrence of ste
TABLE 2

Occurrences of *get* and *de³er* (*+bi*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>get</th>
<th>de³er (<em>+bi</em>)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x$ = at least one occurrence  
$	ext{o} = $ non-occurrence
Figure 1 illustrates the three systems under discussion. The third system represents the observations made in the third chapter about the occurrence of \( \pm \) in four syntactic environments. What we now have to do is to assign the appropriate lects to the speakers. This is done in Table 3. Speaker 12, for example, is designated B, \$, 1. Speaker 13, his wife, has the designation C, \&, 5. Speakers 9 and 10, who are brothers, are B, \$, 4, and C, \$, 3, respectively. We can readily see how the systems overlap. Out of a possible thirty combinations
of lects \((3\times 2\times 5)\), sixteen are represented in Table 3. What this shows, then, is that there are indeed overlapping systems in the HPC Continuum.

TABLE 3
Assignment of Lects to Speakers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>System</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaker</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Our next task is to address ourselves to the entry of the copula into the Continuum. Bach (1967) proposed a transformational insertion of the copula, which could
be taken as support for the existence of such a rule in 
the HPC Continuum. However, Ross (1967) offered the claim 
that the copula be should be treated as a main verb in 
underlying structure with the features [+Verb, +Aux, 
+Stative]. One of the effects of this proposal is to get 
rid of the category Aux. What we have, then, is a verb 
node for each verb or auxiliary.

Bach's analysis also shows a flip relationship 
between have and be, which is important in light of the 
data presented above from the HPC Continuum. As insight­ 
ful as Bach's findings are, though, the more widely 
accepted treatment has proved to be Ross's.

In a very interesting article on the copula, Darden 
(1969) accepts Ross's proposal that be is a main verb 
but rejects the presence of be in deep structure. 
Darden's rejection is that if "deep structure is semantic, and if the copula has no semantic function, then 
the copula cannot exist at the level of deep structure" 
(1969:34). Darden's conclusion is based on two condi­ 
tions, both of which are open issues. Certainly tradi­ 
tional theory would not accept the claim that "deep 
structure is semantic." How Darden reconciles the 
proposal that be is a main verb and that it does not 
exist in deep structure is by making use of higher, 
abstract pro-verbs. This makes available any number of 
nodes on which be could be placed. His proposal is to
posit a rule which changes a pro-verb to be if the next lower predicate is marked [verb]. The conclusion that Darden arrives at is that be is a "surface neutralization of an underlying distinction in stativity" (1969:35).

Bickerton (1972), in his investigation into the copula in Guyanese Creole, apparently goes along with Darden's analysis. He further submits that a bundle with the features [+verb, +pro] be inserted under one of the higher predicate nodes proposed by Darden. This would occur when a lower predicate is featured [-pro]; this lower predicate might be nominal, adjectival, or verbal. The bundle of features in the higher predicate node is later spelled be by lexical insertion (1972:14). Bickerton's Figure 1 (15) is shown here as (52) in order to illustrate how his proposal looks.

Deep structure of John is angry, John is a mammal, John is leaving.
What we need in order to get the features attached to the highest P in (52) is a rule to the effect that the features [+verb...+pro] are added to a P which has no features, if the next lowest P has the feature [-pro].

I can see no good reasons why the analyses offered by Bickerton and Darden should not be used in this work. Indeed, in doing so, investigations of the copula in both the HPC Continuum and Guyanese Creole can be more readily compared.

Since we are concerned here only with the various manifestations of the copula, I will not go into the rules in the grammar which are necessary to bring the derivations to the stage where the rules governing the copula are brought into play. Such an effort is, of course, extremely important but is somewhat removed from my main concern. What we need at this point are some spelling rules which reflect the observations presented in this chapter.

Let us begin with ste. In order to formulate a rule reflecting Table 1, I will use an implicational weighting system wherein the stacking order of the features implies their frequency of usage. The higher the feature is stacked or placed, the more likely the output of the rule is realized in relation to the other stacked features of the same rule. This use of weights is not dissimilar to the system used by C.-J. Bailey (cf. for example

(53) Spelling Rule for ste

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{[+verb} \\
&\text{[+pro} \\
&\text{[+continuative]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\rightarrow \text{ste} / \left[ \text{[+locative} \\
\text{[-nominal]} \right]
\]

The angled brackets around the outcome of the rule are used to indicate its variability. More use is made of this convention in the spelling rule dealing with *z.

Rule (53) means that ste is realized more often in a locative environment than in a progressive environment.

A potential area of difficulty might lie in what happens when ste is not realized. This can be handled by a convention which will delete any higher predicate node which is not covered by a spelling rule.

(54) The complex symbol \[ \text{[+v} \\
\text{[+pro]} \] is deleted if it doesn't dominate a lexical item in superficial structure.

Rule (54) will also account for the zero forms of the copula, since they can be treated as 'nonspellings.'

The final four spelling rules are concerned with the introduction of *z. We will make use of the angled brackets introduced in (53) to indicate a variable output of the rule. These rules are formulated to reflect the facts about *z presented in Chapter III.

(55) \[ \begin{align*}
&\text{[+verb} \\
&\text{[+pro} \\
&\text{[-past]} \\
&\text{[+nominal]}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\rightarrow *z / P_L \text{[[-pro} \\
\text{[+continuative]]}
\]
This shows that \( \hat{z} \) may appear before a noun phrase variably. The next spelling rule shows that it may appear variably before both a noun phrase and a predicate adjective.

\[
(56) \begin{bmatrix}
+\text{verb} \\
+\text{pro} \\
-\text{past}
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \hat{z} / \text{PL} \begin{bmatrix}
-\text{pro} \\
+\text{nominal/} \\
+\text{pred.}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

The diagonal bar is used in rules (56) and (57) to indicate that at least one of the two features connected by it must be present for the rule to apply.

\[
(57) \begin{bmatrix}
+\text{verb} \\
+\text{pro} \\
-\text{past}
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \hat{z} / \text{PL} \begin{bmatrix}
-\text{pro} \\
+\text{nominal/} \\
+\text{pred./} \\
+\text{locative}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
(58) \begin{bmatrix}
+\text{verb} \\
+\text{pro} \\
-\text{past}
\end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \hat{z} / \text{PL} \begin{bmatrix}
-\text{pro}
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Rule (57) allows \( \hat{z} \) to occur variably before locatives, in addition to the other two syntactic environments. The final spelling rule allows \( \hat{z} \) to appear variably in any of the four syntactic environments.

There are many difficulties to the solution offered here in this chapter. For example, I feel that an adequate formalism has not yet been achieved in that in the rules above; it is odd that the usage closest to SE and perhaps the one that is (or was) in some sense hardest to acquire has the rule with the fewest restrictions—(58). In spite of such problems, what we do have
is a rough, crude sketch of the systems in the Continuum, and some of the rules needed to account for the data presented in this work. I hope to have described what a post-creole speech continuum is, and that it may well be regarded as being composed of many overlapping systems.
NOTES

1 I am aware, of course, of such SE sentences as in (i):

   (i) You were *where?* (accent on *where*)

I have not yet heard or recorded a similar construction in the HPC Continuum.

2 I regard all instances of *don't know* as examples of a bound form since there are no other examples in my data of the *do + not + verb* construction.

3 William Peet, who is investigating relative clause deletion in the HPC Continuum, informs me that he has come across *ste* before adjectives denoting a temporary state. This finding is awkward for my claim in this chapter that progressives are from underlying locatives.

4 For a further observation on the correctness of the claim under discussion here, see the final note in C.-J. Bailey (forthcoming).

5 Elwood Mott points out (personal communication) that in certain varieties of Chinese, speakers in informal styles use the locative marker in progressive constructions. S. Hayasaka has told me that the same is true for Finnish.

6 I should point out that, as in Table 3 in Chapter III, Speakers 23, 25-27 have been omitted. See above, page 98.
CHAPTER V
TENSE NEUTRALIZATION

This chapter is concerned with a slightly different variety of variation than was covered in the previous chapters. We are not dealing with variation of a number of different forms between systems in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum, but a single pattern of variation. In this chapter, I hope to provide support for McCawley's (1971) proposal that the past tense is an intransitive verb. I also hope to provide evidence for the correctness of Kiparsky's (1968) claim that the present in early Indo-European is in some cases an underlying past. I propose that there is a process, widely used in the Continuum, which I call tense neutralization. By this term I mean the neutralization of the past tense to the unmarked, or present, tense. This occurs in conjunction with another past tense or a past time adverbial in a clause which usually precedes, in the surface structure, the tense which is neutralized.

Before getting too far into the discussion, it is necessary to explain the usages and formation of the present and past tenses in the HPC Continuum. The present tense is unmarked; its formation requires the simplest form of the verb morphologically, since there is no affixation (or morpheme which might carry tense),
even in the third person singular. Its usage, with the exception covered here, is the same as the present tense in SE.

The preterit in the HPC Continuum is formed by placing the past tense marker $\text{wen}$ before the verb. The past tense copula is, of course, $\text{waz}$. The pattern of $\text{wen} + \text{verb}$ is illustrated in the following examples.

(1) a$^e$ $\text{wen}$ slæp hiz hed (9)
'I wen slap his head'
"I slapped his head."

(2) da ga$^o$z $\text{wen}$ çro rops (9)
'the guys wen throw ropes'
"The guys threw ropes."

(3) hi $\text{wen}$ h$^t$ s$\text{am}$ stonz (10)
'he wen hit some stones'
"He hit some stones."

(4) s$\text{am}$ h$\text{ipi}$ $\text{wen}$ te$^i$k əm (12)
'Some hippie wen take 'em'
"Some hippie took them."

(5) b$\text{at}$ $\text{wen}$ ta$^{e}$$\text{m}$ a$^e$ $\text{wen}$ go ĭn kona (12)
'but one time I wen go in Kona'
"But one time I went to Kona."

(6) a$^e$ $\text{wen}$ d$\text{ig}$ da æ$\text{s}$ (20)
'I wen dig the ass'
"I dug her ass."

(7) dei $\text{wen}$ pok yu (17)
'they wen poke you'
"Did they poke you?"

(8) "i wen græb æm (5)
'she wen grab em'
"She grabbed him."

These sentences, then, demonstrate the general pattern of past tense formation. We see *wen* used as a past tense marker with verbs that take *ed* in SE and with the stems of verbs that show ablaut and other vowel changes in SE.

This pattern, however, exhibits variation. There are instances when the expected past tense, either *waz* or *wen*, is missing. That is, the verb apparently is present tense, even though the context is past.

Let us look at (9), which I offer as a typical example of tense neutralization in the Continuum.

(9) so hi wen da^on de^ æn opin da
'so he went down there and open the
  do^ æn tra^n tæ dræg da ga^ a^t (19)
  door and tryin' to drag the guy out'
"So he went down there and opened the
door and was trying to drag the guy out."

None of the verbs in this utterance has the expected pattern of either *wen* or *waz*. In the first line, we find a past tense, *wen*, but it is not what we should expect to find, which is *wen go*. The explanation for this comes later, but I should point out at this point that it is
not related to tense neutralization. The next verb, opin, is not preceded by wen, and the last verb, which is a progressive, does not have waz before it. The SE equivalent forms display past tense verbs. The lack of past tense markers in the last two verbs would be a mystery were it not for tense neutralization. I submit that the second verb in (9), although it appears to be present tense, is derived from an underlying past tense structure which has undergone a rule that neutralizes the underlying past to a surface present. Thus we have opin instead of the expected wen opin.

Tense neutralization is also at work with the progressive traen, 'trying'. Given the past tense context, the expected form is the past progressive, waz traen. I claim that through tense neutralization, the past tense has been neutralized or reduced to the present or unmarked tense. Since there is no surface realization of either ste or iz (possible forms of the present tense copula), we can assume that the speaker was operating in one of the lects which either variably used iz or ste, or that the speaker did not have the spelling rule in his grammar (see Chapter IV).

What we have in (9), then, is a surface structure with the sequence of verb tenses as past, present, present. I propose that the sequence that underlies this is, at some point in the derivation: past, past, past;
and that, through a process called tense neutralization,
the last two tenses are neutralized to the unmarked or
present tense. That is, the underlying sequence of
tenses is reduced or neutralized to the unmarked tense,
with the exception of the first verb in the sequence,
which in the Continuum is the present tense.

There are cases when tense neutralization can take
place without the underlying sequence of past, past.
This occurs when there is a past time adverbial in the
derivation, as demonstrated in (10).

(10) ʻın doz deĩz in hana
    'in those days in Hana
    wən aʻe get oni wən tu beĩbi
    when I get only one two baby
    aʻe go wɪt papa a⁰ ova (25)
    I go with Papa all over'
    "In those days, in Hana, when I had only
one or two babies, I went with Papa all over."

Here is an utterance which is obviously in the past tense
because of the expression ʻın doz deĩz. However, none of
the verbs has a past tense marker; each verb is unmarked,
or in the present tense. It is my claim that the time
adverbial ʻın doz deĩz carries the reference to past time,
and allows tense neutralization to take place. That is,
the underlying structure sequence of past time adverbial,
past, past, undergoes tense neutralization to give the
That tense neutralization can occur with either a preceding past tense verb or a past time adverbial is very significant. It can be proposed that time adverbials and tense belong to the same grammatical category. From this it follows that perhaps we have some evidence for McCawley's (1971) claim that the past tense should be represented as a predicate in the underlying structure.

My proposal offered here of tense neutralization and the representation of adverbials and tense in the same grammatical category corresponds closely to Kiparsky's (1968) claim concerning what the present is in early Indo-European. He does not call the process tense neutralization, since it also neutralizes modes, but refers to it as conjunction reduction. In describing the process, Kiparsky (1968:35) says:

\[
\begin{align*}
& \ldots \text{the sequence} \ldots \text{Past and} \ldots \\
& \text{Past} \ldots \text{is reduced to} \ldots \text{Past} \ldots \\
& \text{and} \ldots \text{zero} \ldots \text{, and since it is the present which is the zero tense, the reduced structure} \ldots \text{Past} \ldots \text{and} \\
& \ldots \text{zero} \ldots \text{is realized morphologically as} \ldots \text{Past} \ldots \text{and} \ldots \text{Present} \ldots
\end{align*}
\]

From this it is quite clear that Kiparsky and I are indeed talking about the same phenomenon; tense neutralization is a form of what he calls conjunction reduction.

It is Kiparsky's claim that the historical present
in early Indo-European is syntactically past but is realized on the surface as present. He feels that it is an underlying past which has undergone tense neutralization, or, in his term, conjunction reduction. He claims that it optionally reduces occurrences of the past to the present. It is interesting to note here that tense neutralization is also an optional process in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum.

It is important to bear in mind that Kiparsky is discussing early Indo-European. As he remarks (1968:32), "In general, however, conjunction of past and historical present is quite untypical of modern languages." To my knowledge, there is nothing in the literature which posits tense neutralization as a fact of present-day English. However, as is demonstrated by (9) and (10), it is alive and well in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum, for which English is one of the major donor languages.¹

Kiparsky's explanation for why tense (and mood) was subject to, in his term, conjunction reduction, is that it was an adverbial constituent in the underlying structure; tense and time adverbs thus belonged to the same grammatical category and were in complementary distribution. It is from this stage that the ancestors of modern Indo-European languages began copying the features of the referents of time adverbs on the verbs; this was first
done optionally, and later became obligatory. The
general adverb ended up as the 'augment' on indicative
verb forms in Indo-Iranian and Greek.\textsuperscript{2}

The very interesting thing here is that the facts
from the HPC Continuum presented here apparently sub­
stantiate the correctness of Kiparsky's claim. It is
as if a partial history of the English language were
repeating itself in the Hawaiian Post-Creole Continuum.\textsuperscript{3}
It appears as though tense and time adverbs in the HPC
Continuum are members of the same grammatical category;
past tense is not marked by affixation, but by what can
be construed to be an adverb—\textsuperscript{a}nen. Moreover, there are
a few verbs which optionally use either \textsuperscript{a}nen or mark past
tense the same way as they would be in Standard English.
These verbs are the so-called strong and the irregular
weak verbs. This explains why in (9) above we find \textsuperscript{a}nen
instead of \textsuperscript{a}nen go. I feel that these facts provide strong
support for Kiparsky's proposal.

The treatment of \textsuperscript{a}nen as a past tense adverb also
lends support to McCawley's (1971) argument about tense in
English. He refines Ross's (1967) treatment of auxiliaries
and proposes that tenses should not be features, as claimed
by Chomsky (cf. 1957, 1965), but are in fact underlying
verbs. McCawley (1971:111) contends that:

\textsuperscript{... the past tense morpheme is an
intransitive verb, that it is a two-place
predicate meaning 'prior to' in the same
sense in which she is a predicate meaning 'female', that is that pronouns both stand for things and express presuppositions about the things they stand for.

Finally, I would like to refer to Postal's principle of anaphoric islands and tense neutralization. Postal (1969) proposes that there is a constraint against the formation of anaphoric constructions across word boundaries. This would predict that past tense could be deleted with respect to a preceding occurrence of past tense if past tense is realized as a word, but not if it is part of a word. Thus we have

\[
\begin{align*}
(11) & \quad [\text{past}] \quad X \quad [\text{past}] \\
& \quad \text{word} \quad \text{word} \quad \text{word} \\
& \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \\
& \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad \emptyset
\end{align*}
\]

but not

\[
\begin{align*}
(12) & \quad [\ldots \text{past}] \quad X \quad [\ldots \text{past}] \\
& \quad \text{word} \quad \text{word} \quad \text{word} \\
& \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \\
& \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad \emptyset
\end{align*}
\]

In closing I should point out that our investigation of variation in what some linguists might term a marginal system—a post-creole speech continuum—has turned up important evidence for linguistic theory. We have also seen that it is indeed possible to use language in its social context as a source of data.
NOTES

1 Tense neutralization may also be present in Black Vernacular English to some extent. In an interesting article on what he terms Negro Non-Standard English, Dillard (1971:397) cites (i) from Stewart (1968a).

(i) We was eatin'--an' we drinkin', too.

2 I am grateful to C.-J. Bailey for this observation.

3 It might be speculated that this is a general process of natural languages.

4 I would like to thank Gregory Lee for pointing out to me the relationship between Postal's anaphoric islands and tense neutralization.
APPENDIX A
DESCRIPTION OF SPEAKERS

This appendix contains a description of the speakers used in this work. Each speaker has been given a speaker number for purposes of identification; in order to preserve confidentiality, neither the names nor the initials of the speakers is given. Immediately following the speaker number is the sex, age, place of birth, ethnic group, occupation, schooling (highest level attained) if not a student, and residence if different from place of birth. Other relevant information may follow, whenever appropriate.

1. m; 13; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student
2. m; 12; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student
3. m; 12; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student
4. m; 13; California; part-Hawaiian; student; Oahu; moved to Hawaii at the age of 5
5. f; 12; Hawaii; Filipino; student
6. f; 13; Maui; Portuguese-Hawaiian; student
7. m; 13; Maui; part-Hawaiian; student
8. f; 14; Maui; Chinese-Hawaiian; student
9. m; 10; Oahu; Chinese-Hawaiian; student; brother of #10
10. m; 11; Oahu; Chinese-Hawaiian; student; brother of #9
11. m; 12; Maui; Portuguese; student

12. m; 70; The Philippines; Filipino; retired sugar cane worker; lower elementary school; Hawaii; immigrated to Hawaii in early teens; married to #13; also speaks Ilocano

13. f; 56; Hawaii; Polynesian-Chinese-Portuguese; housewife; elementary school; married to #12

14. m; 15; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student

15. m; 15; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student

16. m; 14; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student

17. m; 15; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student

18. m; 16; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student

19. m; 17; Oahu; Chinese-Hawaiian; student

20. m; 16; Oahu; part-Hawaiian; student

21. m; 73; Maui; Hawaiian; retired; elementary school

22. m; 67; Oahu; Hawaiian; retired; elementary school

23. f; 12; Hawaii; Portuguese; student

24. f; 12; Hawaii; Puerto Rican; student

25. f; 46; Maui; Hawaiian; housewife; elementary school; Oahu

26. m; 29; Oahu; Japanese; athletic director; high school graduate

27. m; 33; Oahu; Japanese; salesman; high school

Speakers numbered 1-24 were recorded by William Labov
during a car trip. Labov also recorded speakers numbered 14, 17, 19, and 20, together in rural Oahu. Speakers 14-16, and 18 were recorded by speaker 18, who had been trained by and was working for Stephen Boggs. Speaker 25 was recorded twice, once by Violet and Michael Mays, and the second time by myself. I would like to express my gratitude to the Mays's, Boggs, and Labov for allowing me to use their recordings. The remainder of the speakers were recorded by me, with the exception of speakers 26 and 27 who were not recorded but whose speech was carefully noted by me during the course of sixteen months of weekly mountainball games.

Speaker 22 was recorded in two separate interview sessions at his home in Waimanalo, Oahu. Speaker 21 was also recorded at home in Maui with his daughter, my wife Terry, and me present. Speakers 9 and 10 were recorded by me at a school playground in Honolulu. Speakers 6-8 were recorded by me near their homes in Wailuku, Maui. I interviewed speaker 11 together with two of his friends at his home in Happy Valley, Maui. Speakers 12 and 13, and 23 and 24, form two groups, respectively, and were recorded by my wife and me at their homes. Speaker 5 was also recorded by my wife and me at her home in a plantation town in Hawaii. Also present were her two younger sisters.
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