Birds of a Different Feather: Tok Pisin and Hawai'i Creole English as Literary Languages

Suzanne Romaine

Pigdins and creoles are widely varied with respect to their uses and functions, whether officially recognized or not. Throughout their history most of these languages have not had any official status in the countries where they are spoken, even though they are often widely used by the majority of the population. The low status of pidgins and creoles is more generally a consequence of their being regarded not as full-fledged languages, but as corrupt and bastardized versions of some other (usually European) language. Most of them are not written and therefore, not standardized, a situation that also fuels popular ideas that they are not “real” languages.

My purpose here is to compare two English-based Pacific pidgins/creoles that differ dramatically in terms of their functions and status: Tok Pisin and Hawai'i Creole English. *Tok Pisin* ‘Talk Pidgin’ is a de facto official language in Papua New Guinea spoken by more than half of the population of 3.5 million. English, however, is the official medium of education. In practice, having official status means that Tok Pisin may be used in the House of Assembly, the country’s main legislative body. In fact, most business is conducted in Tok Pisin, the most widely shared language among the members. By contrast, Hawai'i Creole English, spoken in the Hawaiian Islands by somewhat less than half the population of just over a million, has no official status.

In the first section I present brief historical sketches of both languages in order to situate them in their sociohistorical context. Historically, Hawai'i Creole English represents, at least for the Pacific region, a more abrupt case of creolization than does Tok Pisin (see Romaine 1988).
Structurally, it also represents a much more decreolized variety than other Pacific creoles. In all these respects and many more, they are indeed “birds of a different feather.”

A contrastive sociolinguistic analysis of the kind I am attempting here can be carried out along a number of interesting dimensions such as these. Nevertheless, I have focused on only one of them, the use of these two languages as a literary or poetic medium. Although I recognize that all major literary forms were originally oral, and therefore that a language need not be written in order to fulfill literary functions in a society, my discussion in the second section will center primarily on literary elaboration of the written medium. Because writing is a more recent historical development, literary uses of the written medium are later than those of the spoken. The earliest uses of writing were for lists and bookkeeping rather than for purposes we would today designate as literary.

Exploitation of the written mode has occurred gradually. A glance at the history of English as a literary language reveals that although English has been written since the seventh century, some genres such as drama were not well established until 1600, while others such as the novel did not appear until the eighteenth century (Watt 1957). One of the exciting prospects offered by pidgin and creole languages to those interested in language change is the opportunity to witness the rise and expansion of new forms and genres within a short period (see, eg, Romaine 1993). Tok Pisin has a rather short history of about seventy years as a written language, while Hawai‘i Creole has never been written as a language with its own orthography. Tok Pisin is one of the few pidgins and creoles to be reduced to writing and to undergo some degree of standardization. Despite the lack of written norms and standardization in Hawai‘i Creole English, however, some writers have attempted to use it as a medium for poetry, short stories, and drama by adapting English spelling. Their works form the basis for comparative discussion with some of the modern literary works written in Tok Pisin.

By contrast with Hawai‘i Creole English, Tok Pisin has both what Kloss (1967) called Abstand ‘autonomy/distance’ (in this case with respect to English) and Ausbau ‘elaboration’ (that is, norms for use as a written language). The lack of Abstand in Hawai‘i Creole English presents certain technical problems for writers and acts as a barrier to further Ausbau in the literary domain, particularly the novel. Because it has no writing system of its own, it is represented as if it were a deviant or non-
standard variety of English. In other words, it is forced to be a literary dialect rather than a literary language. Popular belief in Hawai‘i has it that “pidgin” (the name given locally to Hawai‘i Creole English) cannot be written. In the third section of this paper I look at some of the practical problems connected with the elaboration process, such as standardization, and theoretical issues associated with narrative perspectives.

Despite its standardization, Tok Pisin too has yet to be seen as a language fully appropriate for certain literary genres like the novel, and even within drama, the authorial voice writes stage directions in standard English. More extreme examples of this practice are visible in the literature written in Hawai‘i Creole English. Because the novel is a late literary development, it represents the last stronghold for the voice of the master and of colonial authority. Genres such as the novel and expository prose rely more heavily on the printed medium than others and can in this respect be considered less speech-based than others such as personal letters, which are closer to everyday stereotypical modes of speaking.

The creole voice has found it easier to penetrate the literary domain in speech-based genres that are composed primarily to be performed, for example, drama and poetry. In certain respects the use of Hawai‘i Creole English and Tok Pisin has been fuller and easier in these genres because of conventional associations between them and modes of narration. As a genre, drama is heavily oriented to the first person present, a narrative form associated with subjective experience and inner feelings. By contrast, the modern novel is a technically demanding literary form not intended to be read aloud, but aimed at individual readers as a private performance. The printed medium permits deployment of a number of different narrative perspectives, such as the omniscient authorial voice writing in the objective third person past and individual characters revealing their inner thoughts and conversations in dialogue form.

More generally, the use of minority dialects and languages for the conventional third person narration associated with the modern novel violates certain expectations readers have about the role of these varieties in everyday life. Creoles, like other minority languages and nonstandard varieties, are symbolic of familiar, intimate, and solidary relations among in-group members as opposed to the more formal, public, and distant connotations of the colonial or standard language. Their use in more subjective, colloquial, and proximal mode of narrations typical of drama, poetry, and dialogue is in keeping with their role in affirming a particular
cultural identity in opposition to mainstream values. If such intimate languages are used for third as well as first person narration, they become languages of public rather than private discourse and lose that identity of "otherness." The further elaboration of Hawai'i Creole English, particularly in third person narration in the novel, presents problems that will not easily be overcome without impetus toward standardization.

The use of creole languages in literature also raises the issue of whom one writes for and why. People do not normally choose to write in a language they feel no emotional attachment to or feel expresses their sentiments less clearly than some other without a particular aim. The use of creole languages in literature displaces the more powerful colonial language, standard English, from its privileged place at the center of mainstream as well as literary discourse. The very act of writing in a marginalized language whose status as a language is denied by the mainstream is symbolic of the appropriation of the power vested in the written word. At the same time it is a challenge to one of the key features of colonial practice, in which language policy was used as a means of social control and discrimination (see, eg, Romaine 1992b). Writing in creole languages becomes, in Le Page and Tabouret-Keller's (1985) terms, an "act of identity," a counterdiscourse in which a different reality of "otherness" is constructed (see also the discussion in Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1989, 38–77, on the use of language in postcolonial literatures).

Here I show how literary activity has been connected with cultural and political nationalism in the two contexts. As Mazrui has observed, poetry has important points of contact with politics (1968, 183). In both Papua New Guinea and Hawai'i, as well as elsewhere, reaction to these new postcolonial literatures has been mixed. Not all critics accept them as legitimate. Ramchand noted a similar resistance by the colonized middle class to a native West Indian literature that was not the English literature they had been brought up to consider the only literature possible (1970, 12).

In the postcolonial literature of Papua New Guinea, whether in Tok Pisin or English, cultural defensiveness in the face of European colonization has manifested itself in at least two very different ways: one is by imitating European culture in an attempt to validate oneself as racially equal, while the other is by rejecting it to renew interest in traditional indigenous culture. With respect to imitation, acquisition of the colonial language functions as an important sign of status achieved through western education.
Finally, I will argue in the last section that the sociopolitical conditions do not currently exist for standardization that would foster further literary elaboration of Hawai'i Creole English. These differences do indeed make Hawai'i Creole English and Tok Pisin "birds of a different feather" as far as their literary possibilities are concerned. With respect to status, however, it is not likely that either language will receive further recognition.

**Brief History of Tok Pisin**

The time frame in which Tok Pisin developed from its jargon roots to an expanded pidgin, then creole, and now postcreole, has been compressed into a period of one hundred to one hundred fifty years. It is a young creole by comparison with most of the Atlantic Creoles such as Jamaican or Haitian Creole. Nevertheless, decreolization is already well under way in urban areas (see Romaine 1992b).

Modern Tok Pisin is descended from a variety of Pacific Pidgin English first learned by New Guineans working as contract laborers on plantations in Queensland, Samoa, Fiji, and later in Papua New Guinea itself. The typical pattern of acquisition was for Melanesian workers to learn the jargon or pidgin and then bring it back to villages, where it was passed on to younger men and boys. While it was originally a language used for instrumental purposes in vertical, hierarchical, communicative encounters between Europeans and indigenous people, an expanded local variety of pidgin later came to serve an integrative function at the horizontal level of communication among villagers.

Amid a highly linguistically diverse scene with more than seven hundred languages, the language today called Tok Pisin stands as a lingua franca that cuts across the linguistic and social spectrum. It is known by villagers and government ministers. Most government and church communication at the grassroots level is in Tok Pisin. Tok Pisin was the language used to make the public aware of voting, elections, and independence in 1975. In 1982, 90 percent of the candidates campaigned in Tok Pisin. When the New Guinea legislature was established in the mid 1960s, Tok Pisin was accepted for use in the House of Assembly. In the first four years of its use it was restricted to certain topics and specific purposes. Now any business arising in the House can be and usually is discussed in Tok Pisin.

One of the most important aspects of the expansion of Tok Pisin as a
spoken language has been the emergence of socially determined varieties and new registers. Mühlhäuser, for instance, identified three major sociolects of Tok Pisin: rural Tok Pisin spoken by the majority of people living outside towns, bush Tok Pisin spoken in areas where Tok Pisin has only recently penetrated, and urban Tok Pisin spoken in the major towns since the late 1960s, when indigenous people were allowed to reside there more freely (1979, 140-154). Tok Pisin has in the past few decades become the main language of the migrant proletarian and the first language of the younger generation of town-born children. The dichotomy between pidgin and creole varieties of Tok Pisin is largely coincident with rural versus urban areas (see Romaine 1992b).

After years of development under German administration of the colony of New Guinea, when Tok Pisin had no direct contact with its superstrate, the language suddenly became subject to the influence of English again, particularly in urban areas. This has led to increasing anglicization. The most heavily anglicized Tok Pisin is spoken by those with the highest education residing in towns, who have access to English speakers and better educational facilities. The urban environment has now become perhaps the most important one in terms of understanding future trends in the language and the country. The Melanesianization of the town has gone hand in hand with the nativization of Tok Pisin. Tok Pisin has become no one’s language in no one’s land. Rural Tok Pisin is also now seen by many as the “real” Tok Pisin, while the urban variety is stigmatized as mixed and impure.

Until the last few decades Tok Pisin was only a spoken language. Its development as a written language for use by Melanesians began in the 1920s, when Catholic missionaries realized its potential as a valuable lingua franca for proselytizing among a linguistically diverse population and began using it for teaching. Almost all of the early written materials in Tok Pisin, and the majority of published works today, are religious in nature.

The orthography used in the Nupela Testamen ‘New Testament’ has come to serve as a de facto standard for Tok Pisin since its publication in 1966. It is based on Hall’s (1955a) spelling system, which was approved by the director of education and the administrator of the Territory of Papua and New Guinea and by the minister for the territories in Canberra. A government publication issued by the Department of Education in 1956 recognized it officially and it was used with a few minor changes
in Mihalic's grammar and dictionary (1957). A modified version of this orthography was used in the translation of the *New Testament*. In 1969 an Orthography Committee was set up. It recommended that the spelling system employed in *Nupela Testamen* be recognized as the official orthography, and that the variety of Tok Pisin spoken along the north coast of mainland New Guinea should be the standard. Mihalic's grammar and dictionary of Melanesian Pidgin (1957) was adopted for use in 1963 and made compulsory for the production of written material in Tok Pisin and for teaching the Vernacular Education program run by the Lutheran Church.

*Nupela Testamen* had an initial printing of 40,000 copies, and was the largest issue of any book in Tok Pisin. It has been reprinted many times since and is the best-selling book in Papua New Guinea, with over 450,000 copies. Even those unable to read have probably heard it read aloud in church. This orthography is still followed by the Kristen Pres, the major Tok Pisin publishing house founded in 1969, and Wantok newspaper. The name *wantok* means literally "one language" and is a term widely used throughout Papua New Guinea to express solidarity in reference to those whom one regards as one's fellow clan members. *Wantok* newspaper, begun in 1970 by the Catholic Mission and published weekly, is the country's most important secular publication and the only newspaper appearing today in Tok Pisin. *Wantok* has a circulation of over 10,000 and more than 50,000 readers in Papua New Guinea. Now its staff consists entirely of Papua New Guinea nationals.

The main production of written material in Tok Pisin was started at the beginning of the 1960s to cover the growing demand of the vernacular education program of the Lutheran Church. Today the Kristen Pres still produces most of the written material, both religious and more generally educational. The Summer Institute of Linguistics, a religious organization, also publishes in Tok Pisin. While written Tok Pisin was originally used by expatriates for teaching the indigenous population, the contribution of indigenous authors writing for a Papua New Guinean audience has been steadily increasing. The past twenty or thirty years have seen the appearance of a number of manuals on health, hygiene, agriculture, carpentry, cooking, and so on. There are already indications that secular publications are setting a new standard for the written language. The language is also written informally by those with little schooling and minimal exposure to the standard form. Such writings usually contain
idiosyncratic spellings. After years of existing only in spoken form, an increasing amount of literature is now published in Tok Pisin.

**BRIEF HISTORY OF HAWA'I CREOLE ENGLISH**

Although varieties of Hawai'i Creole English are locally called Pidgin, most of them are technically forms of creole English, insofar as they function as the native language of most of their users rather than as a second language. Pidgin English in Hawai'i was the outcome of contact between Hawaiians, Europeans (primarily English speakers, who contributed most of the vocabulary to the pidgin), and the various immigrant groups (eg, Chinese, Japanese, Filipinos, etc) brought to Hawai'i to work as indentured laborers on plantations. While Hawai'i Pidgin English still exists, it is spoken only by the oldest generation of immigrants to the plantations and is now dying out. Its descendant, Hawai'i Creole English, is the first language of probably the majority of children in Hawai'i. Nevertheless, the language has no de jure official status now. Nor has it ever had any, despite the recent acknowledgment on the part of the State of Hawai'i's Department of Education that Hawai'i Creole English constitutes a language in its own right with a structure distinct from English (see last section).

Within fifty years of the coming of Captain Cook in 1778, English speakers had begun to gain influence and control over both religious and secular affairs. The Hawaiian islands quickly became an important stopover and winter port for trading ships, particularly for whalers. The foreign population, mainly American, grew rapidly, while the indigenous population declined dramatically to 70,000 in 1853 from an estimated minimum in the 1770s of between 100,000 and 300,000 to a maximum of as high as one million. The decline was caused by many factors, among them spread of foreign diseases to which Hawaiians had no immunity, and dispossession from their homeland. At the start of the twentieth century pure native Hawaiians accounted for only 19 percent of the population of 150,000. The 1990 United States Census gives the number of Hawaiians as 138,742 among a population of 1.1 million, with fewer than 8,000 full-blooded Hawaiians. The Hawaiian people today fare far worse than any other ethnic group on most statistics relating to health, social welfare, education, and the like. For example, they have the shortest life expectancy in a state which has the highest life expectancy for
the whole United States. They have the highest incidences of heart disease, diabetes, and cancer, the lowest incomes, and the highest unemployment. Only 5 percent of students at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa are of Hawaiian ancestry.

Once it became possible for foreigners to purchase and own land outright, American economic interests, especially those of sugar producers, came to dominate the local scene and dictate economic policy. Land ownership provided security for foreign capital and the Treaty of Reciprocity with the United States government in 1876 guaranteed a market for Hawaiian sugar. Although Hawaiians worked on the sugar plantations in the early years, a boom in the industry necessitated massive labor importation from China, Japan, Portugal, and later, the Philippines. Between 1872 and 1890 the proportion of Hawaiians working on the plantations dropped from 85 percent to 11 percent.

During the first half of the nineteenth century some form of makeshift communication drawing on Hawaiian and English, referred to as *hapa haole* (Hawaiian: "half foreign"), was used for trading purposes by foreign sailors and traders during their brief stopovers in search of sandalwood, and later whales. *Hapa haole* was probably also used during the early years of the plantations when most of the workers were Hawaiians. However, the period of foreign immigration in the 1880s was of great importance in the formation of a more stable language variety with input from languages other than Hawaiian.

On these plantations, workers were segregated by ethnic groups into camps. However, they needed a means of communication with the overseers and other workers, and in this context Hawai'i Pidgin English, which preceded today's creole, emerged. The Portuguese, in particular, appear to have played a major role in extending the use of Hawai'i Pidgin English. As Europeans, they were given better positions than Asians and often served as plantation *lunas* or overseers. A much expanded and more complex language, Hawai'i Creole English, developed out of this pidgin to become a native language among the children of the plantation workers during the early part of this century.

Today the language is far more decreolized than Tok Pisin or indeed any other pidgin or creole language in the Pacific region due to the greater and more rapid metropolitanization of the Hawaiian Islands. This process has occurred largely through the influence of the United States, which annexed the islands not too long after white planter interests suc-
ceeded in overthrowing the Hawaiian monarchy in 1893. Although the number of speakers of mainstream varieties of English had long been higher in Hawai‘i than in other places where pidgins and creoles are found, until 1930 most people still had little contact with speakers of standard English. During and after the Second World War, however, great numbers of military and civilian personnel arrived from the United States mainland. Nowadays, tourism rather than sugar dominates the economy. All these factors together with improved telecommunications have meant that most people are much more exposed to standard English than ever before. The most decreolized varieties are found on the island of O‘ahu, which has three quarters of the state’s population and is the location of the capital, Honolulu, and the main US military base, Pearl Harbor. The outer islands of Kaua‘i and Hawai‘i (locally called the Big Island) are the least decreolized.

Unlike Tok Pisin, Hawai‘i Creole English was never used as a language of education and the state Department of Education has actively campaigned against it for many years in an effort to eradicate it completely. For various reasons missions in Hawai‘i did not teach in Hawai‘i Pidgin or Creole English. The first schools set up in the islands used the indigenous language, Hawaiian, written in an orthography devised by missionaries. English was not used as a medium for education until 1849, but by 1896 English was used for instruction in all public elementary schools. There is no official orthography for Hawai‘i Creole English and therefore no standard, although many linguists have adopted a phonemic orthography developed by Odo (1975).

As the emerging middle class increasingly adopted and identified with standard English, at least within the context of the school, the use of Hawai‘i Creole English began to be perceived as a liability on the job market because it indicated low social status. It was a reminder of plantation origins that many wanted to leave behind. Speakers of Hawai‘i Creole English have been discriminated against through education in a school system which originally was set up to keep out those who could not pass an English test. In this way it was hoped to restrict the admission of nonwhite children into the English Standard schools set up in 1924, which were attended mainly by Caucasian children. By institutionalizing what was essentially racial discrimination along linguistic lines, the schools managed to keep creole speakers in their place and maintain distance between them and English speakers until after World War II (see
Sato 1985; 1991). Ironically, as Sato has pointed out (1985, 265), the relative isolation of creole speakers from speakers of mainstream varieties of English actually strengthened Hawai‘i Creole English for a time. Normally, schooling in the colonial language accelerates decreolization as it is doing now in Papua New Guinea (see, eg, Romaine 1992b).

While many opponents of Hawai‘i Creole English believed and hoped that the language would gradually be absorbed into English through continuing decreolization, this is not happening. Hawai‘i Creole English is being maintained, and even strengthened, particularly among certain groups of young people, as a symbol of local identity in the face of inundation from mainland norms.

TOK PISIN AS A LITERARY LANGUAGE

In May 1953 the United Nations Trusteeship Council sent a mission to New Guinea to report on the Australian administration of the territory. They urged Australia to take “energetic steps” to stop the use of Tok Pisin as a language of instruction in the schools. The UN report was the subject of much controversy in the Australian media. One writer of a letter to the Sydney Morning Herald said “the greatest objection to pidgin is that it has no literature and never can have any” (reported by Hall 1955b, 103). At the time, most of what was written in Tok Pisin was written by missionaries and government officials. While indigenous people used Tok Pisin for writing letters, they had not yet appropriated the written language as a means for literary expression.

Nowadays, virtually anything can be written in Tok Pisin, from political broadsides to plays. In the past twenty-five years there has been a fair amount of creative writing in Tok Pisin, primarily in the form of poems and plays. Ulli Beier, a German who did much to stimulate creative writing while at the University of Papua New Guinea between 1969 and 1971 and at the Institute for Papua New Guinea Studies from 1974 to 1978, claimed that Papua New Guinea was the last of the colonial countries in which indigenous people accepted their fate unquestioningly (1973, xii). Not until quite recently have they asserted their rights and identity in writing. While there has been a continuous outpouring of writing by missionaries, government officers, travelers, and explorers, Papua New Guineans remained silent. Albert Maori Kiki, whose autobiography, Ten Thousand Years in a Lifetime, was published in 1968, was the first Papua
New Guinean to tell the world what it was like to grow up in a remote area of Papua New Guinea, to be educated in a mission school, and to take part in the politics of an emerging nation. Maori was founding secretary of the Pangu Party and the Port Moresby Trade Union Congress. Australian reaction to the book was mixed. Some did not believe a Papua New Guinean had been able to write the book. Others thought it was aggressive and bitter.

It is no accident that Maori’s book was written in English. As in Africa, most of the classics of the emerging literature of Papua New Guinea have been written in English. The earliest anticolonial sentiments expressed in literature were also written in English. The first indigenous writers to publish their works were for the most part university students who had been educated in English. For them, English and Tok Pisin serve the function of lingua francas. Beier’s collection (1973), which documents the first phase of Papua New Guinean writing, contains stories and poems that are almost entirely in English apart from a few token phrases of Tok Pisin, Motu, and a few other indigenous languages. Although Tok Pisin had the potential to become a powerful symbol of nationalism in the pre-independence period, it has not figured prominently in any nationalist rhetoric, despite its grassroots support. Unlike in other countries, independence in Papua New Guinea was not the product of an overt struggle against Australia and there was no prominent or intense nationalism as a force driving revolt. It is often said that there is no national ideology in Papua New Guinea. Postindependence governments have been loose coalitions within which there has been a minimal consensus of opinion with regard to almost all aspects of policy development. Votes of no confidence have been frequent and disruptive to continuity of policy.

At the time of independence in Papua New Guinea there were no national symbols of the type commonly involved in European nationalism, no glory of past empire, no unifying ancestral language, or epic such as the Aeneid. When a motion adopted by the House of Assembly on 21 November 1968 declared that national unity was essential to the progress of Papua New Guinea as a modern state, no mention was made of language. The Pangu Party, led by Michael Somare, who became the first prime minister after independence in 1975, stood for “one name, one country, one people,” but significantly, not “one language.” It did, however, advocate the use of Tok Pisin as the language of everyday communication, along with economic development and localization of the
Public Service. By then, of course, Tok Pisin was already well established in daily communicative practice at a variety of public and private levels.

The question of whether Tok Pisin should become the national language of Papua New Guinea has engendered considerable discussion (Romaine 1992a; 1992b). The national constitution contains no mention of the status of Tok Pisin and Hiri Motu (a pidgin based on one of the indigenous languages), which are frequently claimed to be national languages, but knowledge of one or the other is one of the indispensable prerequisites for the granting of citizenship by naturalization (Papua New Guinea Constitution article 67, section 2c). At the moment Tok Pisin has “official” status, along with English and Hiri Motu. The designation “official” means the language is accepted for use in the House of Assembly, where since independence it has become the preferred language.

This is not to say, however, that Tok Pisin has had no place in the country’s emerging literature or in the expression of nationalist sentiment. It often figures in the novel, for instance, in the same way as it does in local literature from Hawai‘i, used to construct parts of the dialogue of certain characters, as in John Kasaiwalova’s fragment of a novel entitled Bomana Kalabus O Sori O (Bomana Prison, O Sorry; 1980). This story was based on the author’s experiences while in prison. Kasaiwalova gave up his studies at the University of Papua New Guinea to start a grassroots political movement in the Trobriand Islands, which got him into trouble with the central government. He was accused of misappropriating a grant given to him by the National Cultural Council and sentenced to two years in prison. Although he ultimately won his appeal, he had by then served eight months.

In this extract the chief speaks in Tok Pisin to the prisoners. Kasaiwalova provided his own gloss in footnotes throughout the text (Beier 1980, 64).

When everybody stopped swearing and making fun at us, the chief gave down his decision and our punishment. We didn’t say anything because our ACO has already finished reporting and making court with the chief, and now we are just going to get our punishment. ACSO always right. Prisoners always wrong. “OK, olgeta, harim gut! Yu wokim rong ausait na lo i putim yu long kalabus. Yu man nogut. Yu man bikhet. Yu ‘kriminol’. Brukim lo na yu kalabus samting nogut.”
“Listen well, all of you. You did wrong outside, and now the law has sent you to prison. You are bad men. You are stubborn people. You are ‘criminals’. You broke the law, now you are in gaol; that’s no good.”

In the period leading up to self-government many felt that they were using literature to express nationalist sentiment and to help create a national identity. Many playwrights became politicians. Rabbie Namaliu, one of Papua New Guinea’s recent prime ministers, is the author of the plays, *The Good Woman of Konedobu* (1970), in Tok Pisin despite the English title, and *Maski Kaunsil* (Never Mind Council, 1975). Leo Hannett, a Bougainvillean and author of the play, *Em Rod bilong Kago* (The Road to Cargo, 1969), has been involved in the Bougainville crisis. The journal *Kovave*, in which all these plays were published, was founded by Beier, who was also founding editor of another outlet for creative writers, the Papua Pocket Poets Series. These and other publications provided an important forum for Papua New Guinean writers, whether writing in Tok Pisin or in English.

In the first issue of *Kovave*, John Waiko argued for vernacular education and literature as a means of destroying the colonial basis of the education system in which villagers are alienated from their own cultural tradition (1972, 43). Similar sentiments have begun to be expressed in Hawai‘i too, where a state-funded program called Poets in the Schools has been created to promote the use of local literature in the school curriculum, though not all of it makes use of Hawai‘i Creole English. In Africa also, Kenyan intellectuals such as Chinweizu and Madubuike saw radical changes in language and literature as an effective way of “decolonizing the mind” and ridding oneself of the hegemony of the colonizers (1983).

Waiko went on to note that only a very small amount of Papua New Guinean literature was being written in Tok Pisin or vernacular languages (1972, 48). He argued that in using English the new indigenous writers were creating a new elitist literature. This issue has been of wider concern throughout the Pacific region. Nevertheless, Waiko continued:

> the diversity of languages forces them [New Guinean writers] to use English (a language that does not really reflect their cultures) as the alternative form which gives them a wider audience than their own group. . . . However, there is a need for creating an acceptable Niuginian English just as there is an American English. . . . On the other hand, Pidgin and Motu must not be disregarded; nor must local languages.
Waiko also maintained that literature should be used to create national unity and consciousness. While English literature has played an important part in the genesis of political consciousness in former British Africa (Mazrui 1968), it does not seem to have had as strong an effect in Papua New Guinea, perhaps because the number of people who had access to English has been much smaller there until very recently. Writing before independence, Hank Nelson said that nationalism would strongly reduce the importance given to English by the educational system (1972, 186–187). This, however, never happened.

In the absence of any single indigenous or other imposed language that can command a majority of users, this role has fallen to Tok Pisin. Written material of any kind in Tok Pisin has a potential of reaching a far greater audience than materials written in English or vernacular languages. No doubt this was an important factor in writers’ choice. Nevertheless, the young writers of the pre-independence generation were not native speakers of Tok Pisin. Most were educated in mission schools, and some, later, abroad in Australia. Both Tok Pisin and English were second languages to them. Rabbie Namaliu, for instance, a Kuanua speaker, learned Tok Pisin at Kerevat High School at around the age of fourteen. Other playwrights such as Leo Hannett learned it in childhood. We have yet to see a flourishing literature written by those for whom both languages are native. There is also variation in the Tok Pisin used by different writers. In Namaliu’s The Good Woman of Konedobu the Tok Pisin is more urban in character, while in Hannett’s Em Rod belong Kago it is more rural (Powell 1978).

Since independence the literary climate in Papua New Guinea has changed. In his second collection of works from postindependence Papua New Guinea, Beier observed that the University of Papua New Guinea’s role in fostering a supportive climate for creative writing had declined (1980, xi–xii). However, other institutions, such as the National Theatre Company and the National Broadcasting Company, have stepped in to fill the gap. When the journal Kovave went out of print, another outlet for writers was gone. In its stead the Institute of Papua New Guinea Studies has emerged as a kind of publishing house for writers.

The theme of cultural identity is still present. Although there is ongoing resentment of the Australian colonial government and Australian expatriates, antagonism is now also directed at the new government and the new indigenous elite that took their place. This can be seen particularly in Nora Vagi Brash’s play, Which Way, Big Man? (1980) produced on stage
by the National Theatre Company and first broadcast by the National Broadcasting Commission in 1977. In the following extract from Scene One, Gou and Sinob Haia, a public servant and his wife, are conversing. Gou Haia (Go Higher) has just been made the director of National Identity. Sinob (Snob) Haia is issuing orders to their servant, Peta. Brash glossed the Tok Pisin used by certain characters in footnotes (1980, 149).

GOU I'd like to hear the news.

SINOB Oh, you don't want to hear that gibberish in Pidgin and Motu. Why not wait till the main news at seven o'clock in English? [Sighs] Gosh, I'm feeling peckish—haven't had a thing since afternoon tea. [Calling off] Peta! What's for dinner? Come in here.

PETA [moving on] Yesa misis! Nau mi wokim rais, na kaukau, na pis na kokonas.
Yes, missus. I made rice, sweet potato, fish and coconut.

SINOB Yuck! You eat that! Make us a salad and grill the T-bone steaks. There's plenty of lettuce and tomatoes in the fridge. Hurry up now!

PETA Yesa misis. Mi go nau.
Yes missus I'm going now.

SINOB Wait a minute. I haven't finished yet, Now Peta, next time you ask first what I want for dinner, before you cook native food. I can't stomach it. Now, take these glasses. We'll go out on the patio. [Moving off] Come on Gou, darling, let's sit on the new white iron chairs. [Fade] They're so gorgeous. Bring us new drinks outside, Peta.

[Sound of door opening and closing]

What kind of woman is this? She is sitting down and shouts "Peter, Peter!" Ah this bush woman has become exactly like a white woman."

Even though Papua New Guinea has been an independent country only since 1975, an indigenous urban elite is already well established (despite Australian desire not to cultivate one). The modern elite are the products of western-style education, many of them educated in Australia. They live mostly in towns, which were originally the preserve of Europeans, who
allowed indigenous people in only as servants. As is evident from this scene, the lifestyle of the elite is modeled on that of the Europeans they replaced. In most cases the elite are children of individuals who were already in prominent positions during the Australian colonial administration. They are able to sit on both sides of the fence in that they maintain traditional links with villages but also have values and attitudes that are western. They are mainly politicians, entrepreneurs, educators, and high-ranking civil servants who acquired their power through status within the church, political activities, or links with the colonial administration. They often built on the traditional channels of Melanesian big-man status in their villages. It is to the changing role of the big-man figure transferred to an urban setting that Brash refers in the title of her play.

As is also evident in this scene, the urban elite are fluent in English as well as in Tok Pisin and sometimes in one or more vernacular languages. Their children often attend English-speaking play groups and schools run largely for the children of expatriates rather than the local community schools. In the play, Gou and Sinob even speak English to one another at home, while their servant and Gou’s father, who appears later, speak in Tok Pisin.

Peta resents the fact that Sinob puts on airs, affects white customs and tastes, and tries to distance herself from traditional culture and language. He calls her *kanaka meri* ‘native woman’ both to insult her and to remind her of her place. The term *kanaka* (Hawaiian: “human being,” “person,” “man”) occurs in both English- and French-based pidgins and creoles throughout the Pacific, although its meaning and in particular, connotations, vary somewhat from language to language. It was originally a term used by Europeans to refer to the indigenous population of the Pacific, often pejoratively, and it has these negative overtones in Tok Pisin today. To refer to someone as a *kanaka*, especially a *bus kanaka* ‘bush native’, is insulting because it implies they are backward and unsophisticated.

A similar theme of cultural alienation, changing identities and allegiances in postcolonial society is expressed in a poem by Benjamin Peter Nakin that laments the rejection of traditional culture by some Papua New Guinean women (1982, 44-45). The code-switching between English and Tok Pisin in the following extract underlines the contrast between the traditional life of the village and the anglicized urbanity of modern life in the town. The translation of these two verses, the first and the last, is mine.
Niupela Meri
O! meri wantok
Yu no tok ples long me
Yu lukim mi olesm man bilong narapela hap.
Tasol, mi bikpela wantaim yu!
Bilong wanem na yu laik lusim mi.
Asde tasol na yu tok “I know you not and your customs.”
Yu kamap wanpela wait-skin pinis
O! meri wantok
Yu wasim yu yet planti taim long sop.
Yu tok “I wanna be white.”
Tasol, hamas taim yu waswas long sop na bilak yet.
Bilong wanem na yu laik kamap wait.
Hap-asde tasol na yu ting bai yu kamap wait.
Ha! meri wantok—sori tru
Yu bin bilak asde, hap-asde, tete moning
tumora bai yu bilak yet.

The New Woman
O clanswoman
You don’t speak our language to me.
You look at me like a man from another place.
But I am just as good as you are.
Why do you want to leave me?
Yesterday you said “I know you not and your customs.”
You’ve become a white-skinned person.
O clanswoman
You wash yourself a lot of times with soap.
You say, “I wanna be white.”
But how many times have you washed yourself with soap and you’re still black.
Why do you want to be white?
The day before yesterday you thought you would become white.
Ha clanswoman. Very sorry.
You were black yesterday, the day before yesterday, this morning and
Tomorrow you’ll still be black.

In recent years drama in Tok Pisin has been popular thanks to the formation of groups such as the Raun Raun Theater in Goroka. Addressing themselves to village audiences and carrying on the tradition of oral literature, they use Tok Pisin exclusively and do not rely on scripts. The “folk
opera” style developed effectively by the Goroka-based group had a great influence on the Kas Theater Group originally started by Jeff Siegel, who was then a lecturer in the Department of Language and Social Science at the Papua New Guinea University of Technology (Unitech). In the early 1970s Siegel had been at the University of Hawai‘i, when Kumu Kahua, a theater group committed to performing local plays, was formed in Hawai‘i (see next section).

The following extract is from a play called Traim Paspas ‘Try Arm­band’, devised and performed by the Kas Theater Group. Geoff Smith (1986) compiled this written version based on traditional stories from Western Province, and songs and dances from various parts of Papua New Guinea and the Solomons. The original ideas were loosely based on ancient folktales collected from the mouth of the Fly River some seventy years ago by the anthropologist Gunnar Landtmann. The stories were dramatized and combined with songs and dances the members of the group knew from their own areas and taught to other members. Members of the group were students and staff at Unitech, together with some students from Busu High School and other young people living in Lae, who held rehearsals and performances during spare time. Although an amateur group, it was possible to present performances in a variety of locations, such as schools and public halls around Lae, and also at Ramu Sugar, Madang, Aiyura, Goroka, and Mount Hagen. The object of the activity was mainly to have fun, but also, among students engaged in modern technological studies, to play a small part in the preservation of cultural traditions in the country. Like the Raun Raun Theatre Group, the Kas Group does not rely on a fixed script but improvises.

Despite the use of Tok Pisin for the dialogue, the stage directions are given in English. This convention is also followed by other Papua New Guinean playwrights who have written in Tok Pisin. The gap between the authorial voice and that of the characters is not entirely closed when the stage directions in the voice of standard English intrude (at least in the printed version of the play). In this extract from Scene 4 entitled Meri Tru, O? ‘Is this a real woman?’ an old man, his son, and his daughter are seated (Smith 1986, 17–20). The daughter is weaving a pandanus mat, which covers the lower half of her body. A father and son, Novare and Badiba, enter the scene in search of a bride for the son. The son is taken with the daughter and wants her to accompany him back to his village as his wife. However, when she puts the mat aside and her father and
brother pick her up, Novare and Badiba are surprised at what they see.
The English translation is mine.

NOVARE  _E wanem samting ia?_
Hey, what’s that?

BADIBA  _Em pis o meri?_
Is it a fish or a woman?

YOUNG MAN  _Em pis meri. Yupela longlong a? Yupela no lukim meri olsen bipo a? Olgeta meri long ples bilong mipela igat tel olsen._
It’s a mermaid. Are you crazy? Haven’t you ever seen a woman like this before? All the women in our village have tails like that.

NOVARE  (To Badiba)  _Papa, mi les long dispela meri ia. Yumi go._  (To Old Man)  _E tambu mitupla go pastaim na givim sampela brus long yu. Haus bilong wampela tambu istap klostu. Mipela go hariap na kam tumoro._
Papa, I’m not enthusiastic about this woman. Let’s go. Hey, brother-in-law. We’ll go first and give you some tobacco. The house of one of our brothers-in-law is close by. We’ll hurry and come tomorrow.

[They leave in a hurry.]

GIRL  _Papa, man ia i no laik maritim mi. Bilong wanem em i lusim mi? Olgeta taim ol man save lusim mi olsen ia._
Papa, that man doesn’t want to marry me. Why did he leave me? The men always leave me like this.

OLD MAN  _Pikinini bilong mi, yu no ken wari. Ol man bilong dispela hap maunten ia, bipo iet ol i longlong, na ol sa longlong na longlong iet. Kam. Mama bilong yu i wetim mipela long raunwara._
My child, don’t worry. The men from this part of the mountain were crazy before and they’re still crazy. Come, your mother is waiting for us at the lake.

[They lift her into the canoe and paddle off to “Save Rawi Rimango.” Lights fade.]

HAWAI‘I CREOLE ENGLISH AS A LITERARY LANGUAGE

In Hawai‘i the literary establishment has been slow to recognize the value of works written in Hawai‘i Creole English. Until recently, the prevailing opinion was that Hawai‘i had no literature of its own. Insofar as there
was a literary tradition, it amounted to the writings of those outside Hawai‘i dealing with Hawai‘i, eg, Robert Louis Stevenson, Mark Twain, and more recently James Michener. Indeed, Michener’s best-selling novel, *Hawaii*, published in 1959, the year that Hawai‘i became the fiftieth state, came to be known as the novel of Hawai‘i. In the same year, A Grove Day and Carl Stroven published *A Hawaiian Reader*, an anthology of thirty-seven selections from thirty authors who had written about Hawai‘i. It also achieved worldwide fame, although nothing of local authorship appeared in it. Beginning with an extract from Captain James Cook’s journal about the discovery of the Hawaiian Islands, it offers a portrait of Hawai‘i painted by outsiders. At the end is a section, almost an afterthought, entitled “Ancient Hawaii,” containing five pieces representing ancient Hawaiian myths in translation.

Stephen Sumida’s work on Asian American literature in Hawai‘i has begun to reverse the general neglect and even denial of a local literary tradition (1991). His book was the first serious scholarly treatment of the genre called local literature. I use the term *local* here in its generally accepted meaning in Hawai‘i to refer to those persons (and cultural artifacts) belonging to Hawai‘i by residence or birth, but not of Hawaiian ethnic origin. The term *Hawaiian literature* would thus refer primarily to literature written by those of Hawaiian ancestry. As in Papua New Guinea, a burst of literary creativity over recent decades has illustrated how a new generation emerging from colonization would write themselves into being on their own terms in their own voices as subjects of their own experience rather than as objects. Local literature in Hawai‘i can thus be seen within the larger context of postcolonial writing more generally, particularly in the Pacific region, where concerns with colonialism, cultural fragmentation, individual and ethnic identity are very much to the fore (eg, Subramani 1985; Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin 1989).

In 1978 a new organization called Talk Story, Inc. held a conference that brought together for the first time the younger and older generations of writers in Hawai‘i at the same time as it attracted participants nationwide (Chock 1978). This gathering led to the publication of a journal called *Bamboo Ridge: The Hawaii Writers’ Quarterly*, edited by Eric Chock and Darrell Lum. Other literary events followed. The first issue of *Bamboo Ridge* was released in December 1978 and was financed by the two authors. Fifteen years later, in 1993, the fifty-seventh issue was published. Bamboo Ridge Press has also published nineteen books, three of
which have won Book of the Year Honors from the Association for Asian American Studies. The journal is now only one of three components of Bamboo Ridge Press, in addition to a Writers’ Workshop and the state-funded Poets in the Schools Program, in operation since 1970, which teaches public schoolteachers how to use local literature in the classroom.

Lum, Chock, and their contemporaries, however, were not the first to use pidgin and creole varieties of English for literary purposes (see Romaine 1994 for a more complete historical account). As early as 1936 members of the University of Hawai‘i drama writing class employed “pidgin” for more than merely comic effect in their work. Until that time Hawai‘i Creole English was not really seen as a vehicle for serious artistic expression; its main use was in popular songs and comic entertainment and it is still used to great effect in the comic domain. James Grant Benton, for instance, whose adaptation of Shakespeare’s *Twelfth Night* (*Twelf Nite O Wateva, 1983*) was a great success, was part of a comic group called Booga Booga ‘oil, grease’, who performed “pidgin” sketches satirizing island life in the mid-1970s. The group was reformed in 1982. One of the most popular written works today is *Pidgin to da Max*, a collection of cartoons illustrating some common local expressions (Simonson 1981).

Not until after World War II did Hawai‘i’s local writers begin to feel confident enough in their own experience to rely on local settings and local speech to convey their message. The emergence of Hawai‘i Creole English as a literary medium is a sign of the vitality of a language coming of age. Sumida suggested that the hallmark of authenticity for local writers was and in some respects still is the skillful use of Hawai‘i Pidgin and Creole English (1991). “Pidgin” became a badge that separates the locals from the tourists as well as from resident middle-class haoles. Where “pidgin” is used, it is often the voice of the male characters, as in Edward Sakamoto’s play, *In the Alley*, first performed in 1961. In the play a group of local young men confront a *haole* male who is attached to a local woman (1983, 136–137).

BEAR Eh, haole, wat you tink you doing?

JOE Huh?

BEAR [belligerently] You no going answer me? I said, wat you tink you doing?
JOE  Well, just having a little fun—if it’s any of your business?
CABRAL  Cocky bastard, eh?
MANNY  He tink he so hot.
CHAMP  Wat you expect from one haole?
JOE  Real tough guys, huh?
CHAMP  Tough enough. You like test us out, o wat?
JOE  [smiles weakly] I didn’t mean nothing. I was just kidding. Forget it.
CABRAL  Wea you pick her up—on Hotel Street?
GIRL  Eh, watch dat crack, eh. Wat you tink me?
CHAMP  One little old slut.

After the war a few locally widespread publications began carrying stories containing dialogue in Hawai‘i Creole English. One of the earliest examples is the story “The Forgotten Flea Powder,” written by a then-recent high school graduate, Philip K. Ige. However, it was Milton Murayama’s novel, All I Asking for Is My Body (1959), published some years later, that used local varieties of Hawai‘i Pidgin and Creole English and later received wide acclaim for its authenticity of language. Arguably one of the best literary treatments of the plantation experience for Hawai‘i’s immigrants, the novel tells the story of a Japanese family living on a Maui sugar plantation during the 1930s and later the war years after the bombing of Pearl Harbor in 1941.

Editors at various publishing houses objected to the title since they regarded it as “ungrammatical” with its missing copula and wanted it “corrected” to “All I’m Asking for Is My Body.” Because Murayama wanted to reach the broadest possible audience of standard English readers, he deliberately limited his use of “pidgin” to the conversational parts of the novel. To this end, he recalled in a newspaper interview two strategies he employed for representing the pidgin dialogue. One was to use phonetic spelling on only a few words that didn’t occur too often, and the second was to use the syntax and rhythms of “pidgin” in the dialogue.

While the book did not break radically from the expected conventions for the use of nonstandard speech in the English novel more generally, it was praised by some critics for reflecting the cultural and linguistic diver-
sity of Hawai'i through its use of language varieties ranging from standard English to "pidgin." The novel is written in the third person, with the events seen through the mind of Kiyoshi, a young Japanese boy; he is the main character in the novel, and the story unfolds from his perspective. Kiyoshi explains to the reader: "We spoke four languages: good English in school, pidgin English among ourselves, good or pidgin Japanese to our parents and the other old folks" (Murayama 1988, 5). In addition to its role in carrying the main line of the story, standard English is also employed at times in the dialogue to represent the Japanese spoken by the older generation.

The next extract shows how Murayama alternates between telling readers what languages are being spoken and showing some of their features.

"Kiyoshi, you understand, you're not to eat anymore at Makoto's home," Father said evenly, now his anger gone.

I was going to ask "Why?" again but I was afraid. "Yes," I said.

Then Tosh said across the table in pidgin English, which the old folks couldn't understand, "You know why, Kyo?" I never liked the guy, he couldn't even pronounce my name right. "Because his father no work and his mother do all the work, thass why! Ha-ha-ha-ha."

Father told him to shut up and not to joke at the table and he shut up and grinned.

Then Tosh said again in pidgin English, his mouth full of food; he always talked with his mouth full, "Go tell that kodomo taisho to go play with guys his own age, not small shrimps like you. You know why he doan play with us? Because he scared, thass why. He too wahine. We bust um up!"

"Wahine" was the Hawaiian word for woman. When we called anybody wahine it meant she was a girl or he was a sissy.

"Mama, you better tell Kyo not to go outside the breakers. By-'n'-by he drown. By-'n'-by the shark eat 'um up."

"Oh, Kyo-chan, did you go outside the breakers?" she said in Japanese.

"Yeah," Tosh answered for me, "Makoto Sasaki been take him go."

"Not dangerous," I said in pidgin Japanese; "Makato-san was with me all the time."

"Why shouldn't Makoto-san play with people his own age, ne?" Mother said.

He's a kodomo taisho, thass why!"

Kodomo taisho meant General of the kids. (Murayama 1988, 4-5)
It took somewhat longer before local writers dared to depart more completely from this strategy of alternating between telling and showing their readers how their characters spoke to rely more on showing. One of the first was Darrell Lum. In the next extract, from his story, "Primo Doesn’t Take Back Bottles Anymore" (1986, 184), the narrative is again in the third person written in standard English grammar and spelling, but the quoted speech as well as the internal thought of the main character, Rosa, are in Hawai‘i Creole English. We are shown by modifications in grammar, spelling, and word choice when a character is speaking or thinking in Hawai‘i Creole English.

Harry checked the cases and smiled as he filled the empty slots in Rosa’s last case with some empty bottles he always saved for Rosa. He remembered the first time Rosa had come in all shabby and ragged, a pair of tattered jeans buttoned underneath his pot belly and a silken aloha shirt with hula girls and Diamond Head and “Honolulu Paradise” written all over it.

“Sorry man, read the sign, can’t refund any amount less than three dollars. Come back when you have seven cases,” Harry had said.

“Look Bruddah, I no can carry all dis back home, I nevah know about the rules. C’mon give a guy a break. As means I no mo’ busfare home.” (Lum 1986, 184)

In this story the literary development of creole in the novel is taken one step further: Hawai‘i Creole English becomes the language of consciousness. Lum gives his readers none of the other visual signposts Murayama uses to tell them that a particular language is being spoken, eg, “X said in Japanese,” or what a particular non-English word means, eg, wahine means “woman.” In those parts of the novel where it appears, Hawai‘i Creole English stands as a language requiring no special comment or glossing that would disrupt the flow of the story.

The transition from occasional use of Hawai‘i Creole English in dialogue in the novel to more full-blown use is accomplished by shifting the mode of narration from the third person past to the first person present tense. The use of first person dialogue presents a means of closing the gap between the standard English of the narrator and the Hawai‘i Creole English of the fictional characters, and melding the two voices into one. The language of the main character becomes in effect the language of narration and is the voice of the participating author.

In later work Lum often narrates in the first person from the point of
view of a schoolboy. The voice from “small kid time” provides a natural
medium for the use of Hawai‘i Creole English. His collection of stories,
Pass On No Pass Back (1990) is a good example. In this extract the
schoolboy narrator recalls one of his classmates.

I hate Alfred. He so stupid. Everytime he catch it from everybody and jes
because him and me get the same last name, da guys all tell dat he my brud­
dah. But he not. He get the same last name as me but he stupid and he kinda
fat and when he breathe he make noise wit his nose and his mout. J’like one
horse. J’like he no mo nuff air.

Lum has also used both Hawai‘i Pidgin and Creole English for some of
the dialogue in plays. In the following extract, from Oranges are Lucky
(1983, 74), Ah Po, an eighty-one-year-old Chinese woman, grandmother
of Ricky (Ah Jiu) and Dane (Ah Gnip), is expressing her wish for her
grandsons to marry. She speaks in Hawai‘i Pidgin English, as is evidenced
by the simple grammatical structure and use of features characteristic of
a second-language speaker. Her children and grandchildren speak in
Hawai‘i Creole English. In this extract she switches from Hawai‘i Pidgin
English to standard English as the scene moves from the present time to
the past, where she reminisces about her own marriage. As in Mura­

AH PO He no like Chinee girl? He no marry? Wassamalla him? Chinee girl
good fo Ah Jiu. She cook fo him, she make plenny children fo him. Why he no
like? Ah Goong name Hoong Jiu. Dat mean “successful businessman,” and all
da grandchildren have da Chinese name “successful.” Ah Jiu, everytime he
quiet boy, no talk, him.... Aie, I no bring coconut candy fo Ah Jiu. Maybe
next time he tell me he get married. You tell him no need be Chinese girl. Now
modern days, okay marry Japanese, maybe haole, anykine girl okay. Ah Jiu
get married be happy, den Ah Gnip get married. I go temple and pray for Ah
Jiu. Maybe da Buddha help me find one nice girl fo Ah Jiu. Bumbye no marry,
no have children fo da family name ... [Lights dim]. Mama, who is that man
who came to talk to Daddy? Am I to marry him, he is old! That is Chew
Mung’s father? Am I to marry Chew Mung? What is he like? Why cannot I see
Chew Mung?

Other Hawai‘i writers have also used creole in drama, sometimes in
translation, as in James Grant Benton’s Twelf Nite O Wateva (1983).
Kumu Kahua ‘Original Stage’, affiliated with the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa’s drama department and founded in 1971, is the only theater group in Hawai‘i dedicated to producing local plays.

Poetry has also been a popular genre for the use of Hawai‘i Creole English with themes ranging from comic to serious. One of the younger generation of Hawai‘i’s writers to use Hawai‘i Creole English in her work is Lois-Ann Yamanaka, whose first collection appeared in 1993. In this extract from her poem “Sista: Boss of the Food” (1990, 67), she follows Lum’s strategy of using an adolescent voice who speaks in the first person.

Befo time, everytime my sista like be the boss
of the food. We stay shopping in Mizuno Superette
and my madda pull the oreos off the shelf
and my sista already saying, Mammy,
can be the boss of the oreos?

As in Papua New Guinea, poetry in creole has also been used to express the theme of cultural identity, as in Kenneth Ono’s poem, “The Soliloquy of Hamlet Yamato,” which treats this issue with respect to Hawai‘i’s Japanese American population.

Be o’ no be, as da queschen.
I Japenee o’ I Ameriken?
In Inglish dey wen name me,
but ma face look Japane!
Eh, mo noble for me suffa
O’ fight da haole oppressa?

The following poem in Hawai‘i Creole English was composed by Joseph Balaz, a local writer who is the author of Ramrod, a literary publication. “Da History of Pigeon” takes its motivation from what he calls the “phonic” association between the linguistic term *pidgin* and the bird *pigeon*. The poem was written for oral presentation at a colloquium on pidgin and creole languages at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa in Honolulu in 1986 (published in Romaine 1988, 153).

*Da History of Pigeon*
(in phonic association to pidgin)

Like different kind words, da world was full of different kind birds: yellow birds, blue birds, red birds, love birds—and den came da pigeon.
Da history of da word pigeon is li' dis—Wen da French-speaking Normans wen conquer England in da year ten-six-six, dey wen bring along wit dem da word pigeon, for da type of bird it was. Da resident Anglo-Saxons used da word dove, or D-U-F-E, as dey used to spell 'um, to mean da same bird. It just so happened dat terms in Norman-French wen blend wit Old English sentence structure, to form what we know as Middle English. In da process, da French word became da one dat referred to da pigeon as food. Today in England, if you look for dem, you can find recipes for pigeon pie.

Food for taught, eh—Even back then, da word pigeon wen blend wit pigeon for get some moa pigeon. So now days get pigeon by da zoo—get pigeon on da beach—get pigeon in town—get pigeon in coups—and no madda wat anybody try do, dey cannot get rid of pigeon—I guess wit such a wide blue sky, everything deserves to fly.

A number of the phonological features specific to Hawai'i Creole English have been represented in Balaz's spelling, eg, da 'the', dis 'this', den 'then', dey 'they', dem 'them', dat 'that', wit 'with', taught 'thought', everyting 'everything' illustrate the tendency for the English interdental fricatives to become stops in the creole. Spellings such as moa and madda indicate the absence of post-vocalic /r/ in creole. Hawai'i Creole English does not mark case, gender, or number, so 'um (probably from a phonetically reduced form of him or them) can mean 'him', 'her', 'them', or 'it'. There are also some syntactic features specific to the creole such as the use of wen (from English went) to mark the simple past as in wen conquer. The construction for get moa pigeon is also characteristic; other English-based creoles use for where English would use to or in order to. Another feature is the use of get in existential constructions, for example, get pigeon by da zoo 'there are pigeons at the zoo'. This phrase also illustrates the lack of plural marking. This means that the plural form of pigeons and the term for the language, pidgin, are homophonous. This allows Balaz to make the humorous point that because both pidgins and pigeons are everywhere, they are hard to get rid of.

The problem of representation of pronunciation features of Hawai'i Creole English is particularly difficult for creative writers who wish to use it in their work. Since there is no officially accepted orthography for writing Hawai'i Creole English, their main dilemma is how to make the creole look different from standard English. While syntactic differences come across in standard English orthography, pronunciation is more problematic. The orthographies used so far by writers have relied heavily on English spelling conventions and been inconsistent. Murayama, for
instance, spells the form pronounced /bambai/ as by-'n'-by, while others like Lum spell it as bumbye. This sometimes makes it difficult for readers to decode the text. In preparing his collection of local drama, Carroll (1983, viii) was faced with the problem of how to standardize the various versions of Hawai‘i Pidgin and Creole English appearing in some of the plays (see Romaine 1994 for further discussion of this problem and other issues relating to spelling).

Normal English orthography, of course, accommodates a wide variety of pronunciation. The pronunciation of both rhotic and non-rhotic speakers is encompassed by spellings that retain post-vocalic /r/. When as readers we see words such as father, car, and so on, we interpret them in terms of how we would say these words ourselves. However, we can also, if we wish, form different mental acoustic images of how particular individuals might have said these words. John F Kennedy, for instance, would have said fatha for “father” and Cuber for “Cuba,” while a Philadelphian would say Cubah and father, and so forth. When writers such as Kenneth Ono write suffa and oppressa, we are asked to attune our ears to a non-rhotic speech form. In such cases authors are consciously exploiting the phonetic power of standard orthography to guide the reader (see Macaulay 1991). More speech-based genres produced for performance need not worry as much about the problem of representation. The novel, however, is highly dependent on print, which is impersonal compared to the human voice.

The pattern of using Hawai‘i Creole English to animate the speech of characters, but reverting to standard English for the main story line is often the starting point from which many local dialects and minority languages get a foothold in literature. Shakespeare, Chaucer, and countless other authors like Mark Twain used regional English dialect for special effect, though it was most stereotypically used for comic effect or to portray the speech of someone of lower social status. Nonstandard speech in the novel carries those connotations today, as pointed out by Preston, who has shown that readers evaluate the social status of nonstandard spellings and grammar negatively (1985). He goes so far as to say that nearly all such respellings are a defamation of character because they make the character appear uneducated, comic, boorish, rustic, or even gangsterish (1985, 328). The use of Hawai‘i Creole English even for the treatment of serious subject matter does not entirely escape these stereotypical associations.

Alterations to standard orthography of whatever kind are visual sig-
nals to the reader that something is significant. However, it is not always obvious that each nonstandard spelling represents some significant phonetic feature. Literary dialects sometimes also incorporate “eye dialect,” that is, nonstandard spellings that mean nothing phonetically because they convey no phonological difference from the standard. These include forms such as *wat* instead of *what*, *doan* instead of *don’t*, *thass* instead of *that’s*, and the like, or overuse of apostrophes suggesting elided consonants and vowels, such as *c’mon* for *come on*, *’um* for *him* or *them*. This can be overdone on occasion to give rise to what Preston has called the “Li’l Abner effect” (1985). (Li’l Abner is a comic strip character who speaks a US southern mountains dialect.) The heavy use of eye dialect seems intended to convey not so much the actual features such a person would use but serves as a strong visual signal that the character is not literate. At other times, it is intended to convey nothing more than the contracted forms common to most casual conversation, for example, *wanna* instead of *want to*, *gonna* instead of *going to*. The use of elided consonants also fosters the view that the language being represented is simplified and reduced.

Jozuf Hadley has perhaps been the most innovative poet to use Hawai’i Creole English. In the following extract from his poem, *ma kat stanlee*, he has created his own quasi-phonetic orthography. The publication is in the format of a school composition book, and the poem appears in handwriting on ruled pages.

```
ma kat stan lee
  da blu cross wen sen om
  wan creesmess cod ah
  he no ste now bot he ste free aswai
```

The orthography originally used by Hadley in the 1972 publication underwent revision after consultation with and assistance from linguist Michael Forman at the University of Hawai’i at Mānoa, who wrote a foreword to the 1974 publication of Hadley’s work. In the extract below, Hadley’s newer version is more consistently phonemic and less dependent on the conventions of standard English orthography. For instance, he now spells with a *<k>* all instances where the sound corresponds to /k/, as in the words *cat, cross, Christmas*, and *card*. In the 1972 version only *cat* was spelled with *<k>* and the rest of the words retained *<c>* as in English. In the second published version of the poem, a handwritten creole text of
the poem appears on pages illustrated by Patty Henock, and a standard English gloss, rather awkward in places, was inserted by the publisher in small print at the bottom of each page. No other writers have followed Hadley’s lead in departing so radically from English orthography.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tok Pisin</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ma ket stenle</td>
<td>My cat Stanley—the Blue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da blu kraws wen sen om</td>
<td>Cross sent him one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wang krismes kad e</td>
<td>Christmas card, yuh?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hi no ste nau bat</td>
<td>He’s not here now but—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he ste fri eswai</td>
<td>he’s free that’s why.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PRACTICAL AND THEORETICAL ISSUES IN THE LITERARY USE OF PIDGINS AND CREOLES**

The existence of a codified standard spelling gives Tok Pisin more autonomy than it might otherwise have if it had to rely entirely on English orthography. As a result of these perceived similarities between creoles and their lexifier languages, writing systems based on the latter often did the creoles a disservice in suggesting that they were inferior and amusing versions of European languages. The point can be illustrated by rewriting the Tok Pisin extract from Kasaipwalova’s *Bomana Prison* in English orthography using the nearest English equivalents.


Having sufficient autonomy or Abstand facilitates Ausbau or elaboration. Standardization is particularly important in fostering the idea of autonomy for language varieties that are very similar linguistically, as pidgins and creoles generally are with respect to their lexifier languages, at least in vocabulary. The existence of grammars, dictionaries, and published material supports the notion that a pidgin or creole is a “real language.” Decreolization of course decreases autonomy as it minimizes Abstand. The considerably greater extent of decreolization in Hawai‘i Creole English is immediately apparent in the texts I have quoted here, which most English speakers find more readily intelligible without the
extensive glossing required for Tok Pisin. It would nevertheless be interesting to obtain reactions from nonlocal readers to see just what they need in the way of glossing.

Hawai‘i Creole English currently has the status of what Ives called a “literary dialect” (1971). Inevitably, however, literary dialect is a compromise. It is a composite of features associated with a group of people. Each author has to work out how much can profitably be represented without running the risk of what Cole called “code noise” (1986, 6). Writers do not normally introduce too much noise without purpose. As Ives pointed out, this means that if the dialect the author is trying to represent is very different from standard English, the author’s selection of features to represent it will be proportionately restricted and necessarily less complete than a representation of another speech variety that is closer to the standard (1971, 155). Thus, any attempt to render the most basilectal forms of Hawai‘i Creole English, or for that matter any creole language, will impose more constraints on an author than an attempt to render, say, the speech of working-class New Yorkers. At the practical level, forms such as *I seen him* pose fewer difficulties than forms such as *I wen see om.* Hadley’s poetry could be described as too noisy for many readers, particularly for those with no knowledge of Hawai‘i Creole English. Arguably, however, it is precisely this kind of bold departure from English orthographic conventions that will be required for Hawai‘i Creole English to be a full-fledged literary language rather than a dialect.

Even within the English literary tradition, it took considerable time before authors explored the possibilities of writing whole novels in Black English. Alice Walker, for instance, like Darrell Lum, adopted the strategy of writing first person narratives. The main voice of Walker’s novel, *The Color Purple* (1982), is that of a young girl who writes letters to her sister and to God. It is therefore natural for this voice to be in Black English. The literary uses of Black English provide an insightful parallel to those of Hawai‘i Creole English. Like Hawai‘i Creole English, Black English is heavily decreolized and has not been standardized. For some time, scholars were reluctant to recognize the creole origins of Black English because of the extent of decreolization that obscured its structural affinities to other creole languages.

At least one local writer in Hawai‘i was influenced by the use of Black English as a literary language. One poet said it had taken her a long time to understand that Hawai‘i Creole English was “a legitimate voice
because of that whole history—the colonial history. And then some peo-
ple called it—‘oh this is a bastardization of the English language’. You
hear that. ‘Oh you’re all so stupid, so ignorant.’ After going back to
school at the age of twenty-seven, she was encouraged by a teacher after
writing two lines in “pidgin.” The teacher told her “I want one whole
page with this voice.” After trying, however, she came back to the teacher
almost in tears and said “I cannot do it because I will be showing my
ignorance to the whole class. I don’t want them to think of me as stupid
because of the way we talk everyone thought we were stupid.... She
made me read the black poets—women. And then what happened is I
found this kind of artistic freedom because I saw the history. I started see-
ing history as opposed to this ... island mentality” (Pianta 1993, 22-23).
For writers such as this woman, having works accepted by US mainland
publishers was a litmus test of the acceptability of this creole voice.

From a comparative literary perspective, Hawai’i Creole English and
other minority varieties often make their breakthrough in literature by
appearing first in the form of quoted speech within the novel, and later in
first person narration, particularly when the point of view is that of a
child or adolescent who can be expected not to speak standard English.
The earliest novels in eighteenth-century England began by making use of
first person narration, either in the form of letters written by the main
character or semi-autobiographical narration (see Watt 1957). The first
novelists, Defoe and Richardson, are participating narrators. Richard-
son’s, Pamela, for instance, is epistolary in form, comprising a series of
letters from the heroine to her parents. Defoe’s Moll Flanders is written as
an autobiographical memoir. A more sophisticated reorientation of narra-
tive perspective that incorporates both internal and external points of
view came slightly later. Fielding, Austen, and later novelists develop
more complex narrative strategies combining first and third person narra-
tion. The freeing of the author from participation allows objective analy-
sis of events to appear from a detached point of view. This authorial voice
has minimal involvement of the narrator. Historically speaking, until the
modern period it would appear that the English novel has become less
rather than more speech-based.

In discussing the notion of “point of view,” literary theorists have
sometimes referred to the distinction between what is said as opposed to
what is narrated in terms of discours ‘discourse’ versus histoire ‘history’
(eg, Todorov 1966) or besprochene ‘discussed or discoursed’ versus
erzählte Welt ‘told or described world’ (eg, Weinrich 1971). In general, \textit{histoire} has been associated with third person narration in the past tense, while \textit{discours} is a more subjective and intimate voice associated with the first person present tense.\footnote{Seen in these terms, Hawai‘i Creole English has not yet been fully exploited by writers as a language appropriate for \textit{histoire}. This situation raises speculations about why that is so, and whether it reflects some fundamental limitation of the medium or is simply a technical problem that can be remedied by standardization.} In his discussion of the development of the West Indian novel, Ram-chand observed that Samuel Selvon has managed to write in a language which is at the same time that of both the characters and the implied author (1970, 102). This is as far as any West Indian author has gone toward closing the gap between the language of narration and the West Indian Creole–speaking characters. A brief extract from Selvon’s story \textit{Brackley and the Bed} (1957), where the opposition between standard English and creole is neutralized, shows how this is done.

Brackley hail from Tobago, which part they have it to say Robinson Crusoe used to hang out with Man Friday. Things was brown in that island and he make for England and manage to get a work and was just settling down when bam! he get a letter from his aunt saying Teena want to come to England too. . .

“What you doing in London?” Brackley ask as soon as Teena step off the train. “What you come here for, eh? Even though I write home to say things real hard?”

“What happen, you buy the country already?” Teena sheself giving tit for tat right away. “You ruling England now? The Queen abdicate?”

Selvon’s prose shows that while it is technically possible to adopt a nonstandard variety for third person narration, theoretical problems still arise from the fact that dialects are generally used to create a point of view in literature that exists in opposition to the one conveyed by standard English. Interestingly, Selvon does not try to represent pronunciation features by resorting to nonstandard spelling. The distinctiveness of the style resides primarily in his attempt to use grammar and vocabulary typical of West Indian speech varieties.

As Traugott (1981) observed, the normal convention of using standard English in third person narration in the novel and nonstandard speech to create some special effect reverses the everyday meaning assigned to the
standard versus nonstandard. In other words, within literature, the standard is proximal, and the nonstandard, distal. Seen in these terms, the task of the writer who wants to use a minority language in literature is to change the literary establishment’s identification of the standard with proximal and to make the nonstandard serve this function. However, when third person narrative is itself in a nonstandard variety, the identification of that variety with “other” becomes blurred.

Given the dilemma pointed out by Traugott, it is not surprising that the use of third person narrative in dialect is extremely restricted. As far as I know, there is none in Hawai‘i Creole English. Traugott even went so far as to claim that insofar as a nonstandard variety indexes and reaffirms a particular cultural identity in opposition to mainstream values, it will of necessity be at odds with itself as a minority dialect if it comes to be used as a new standard language capable of use for written third person narration or nonliterary prose (1981). In the latter case, it becomes a language of public rather than of private discourse. In others words, if Hawai‘i Creole English is used for such purposes, it loses that identity of “otherness.”

I think it is to the difficulty of this transition from being a language of discours to becoming one appropriate for histoire that one writer alludes when she talks about the shift in character or voice between her early poetry in Hawai‘i Creole English and her later fiction in standard English (Pianta 1993, 24).

I couldn’t do it anymore because that was a voice I couldn’t appropriate anymore.... So in my second work... I have thirty... thirty five short stories. They’re all in Standard English.... It dies in adolescence. Because you learn in adolescence or soon after that you cannot use it. Because you can only use it in certain places and you better learn where those places are because you get looked down upon.... you don’t take it into adulthood. You leave it.

Conclusions

Nothing prevents the codification of a standard orthography for Hawai‘i Creole English or for that matter, any other language. This is a purely technical problem that is easily remedied. The provision of a standard orthography for the Somali language and its declaration as the sole official language of Somalia in 1972 provides a dramatic example of how within a few years written genres of all kinds will appear. However, the
emergence of standard languages, as well as literary forms, is intimately connected with sociopolitical context. No language, literary or otherwise, can flourish without support. Most cases of language revitalization are associated with political movements. The fates of Tok Pisin and Hawai‘i Creole English are dependent on political strategies for development being pursued in the postcolonial era in Papua New Guinea and Hawai‘i respectively.

Cultural and political nationalism are at present potent forces in Hawai‘i, particularly at the time I wrote this in 1993, which was the one-hundredth anniversary of the overthrow of the Hawaiian monarchy and the United Nations’ Year of Indigenous People. On 23 November 1993 President Clinton signed a Congressional Resolution acknowledging that the invasion of Honolulu by US Marines responsible for the overthrow of Queen Lili‘uokalani on 17 January 1893 was illegal. Many Hawaiians are involved in various sovereignty movements. Not surprisingly, language and culture are playing important roles in the struggle to reclaim the land (see, eg, Trask 1993). However, nationalist attention is being focused on the Hawaiian language and its revitalization as the indigenous language of Hawai‘i rather than on Hawai‘i Creole English. In fact, some Hawaiian language activists see Hawai‘i Creole English in the same negative light as they do English, and would not want to see the status of creole increased. Given Hawai‘i’s political incorporation into the United States, it is unlikely that Hawai‘i Creole English will ever be designated an official language. Even when the state did recognize a language co-official with English in 1978, that language was Hawaiian.

It remains to be seen how far the momentum gathered by events in 1993 is translated into the alteration of the present political structure of Hawai‘i, and in particular, what impact this might have on language policy vis-à-vis Hawai‘i Creole English. While there have been some initiatives in support of Hawai‘i Creole English in the classroom with some educational programs designed for creole-speaking children (see Watson-Gegeo 1994), so far the schools have not provided a context for discussion of standardization.

The prospect of a further increase in Tok Pisin’s status is similarly unlikely, though for somewhat different reasons (see Romaine 1992a; 1992b). Significantly, Tok Pisin’s codification and elaboration had been carried out primarily for pragmatic purposes by missionaries, rather than to serve the needs of indigenous political and cultural nationalism, as was
generally the case in Europe. Beyond that, however, the new elite has simply perpetuated language policies that reflect colonial practices and attitudes. In doing so, they followed a pattern set by other newly independent nations elsewhere. Today in Papua New Guinea, the Solomon Islands, and many of the former British colonies in Africa, the official medium for education is English. This policy has facilitated the acquisition of ready-made institutional aids to development. Because control of English was seen as essential for participation in national development, modernization of vernacular languages and Tok Pisin was not encouraged. In the present circumstances any plan to give English a reduced role and an increased status to Tok Pisin will be seen as an attempt to undermine the position of the elite and to keep the masses in their place.

I WOULD LIKE TO THANK Michael Forman for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. I am also grateful to Vilsoni Hereniko for suggesting that I submit this article to The Contemporary Pacific. A related paper, written after this one, focuses in more detail on the development of Hawai‘i Creole English as a literary language (see Romaine 1994).

Notes

1 Prior to Independence in 1975, the southern half of the country was an Australian colony and the northern part was administered by Australia under a mandate from the United Nations given after World War I, when New Guinea ceased to be a German colony in 1914 after only thirty years of German rule.

2 Much controversy surrounds the question of how large the indigenous population was. The higher estimate of 800,000 to one million Hawaiians on the eve of Western contact is Stannard’s (1989) and is based on somewhat different evidence from the more conventional figures found in such sources as Nordyke (1977). If one accepts Stannard’s figures, then the resulting postcontact decline is even more dramatic and horrific. Equally controversial are the US Census population statistics. In 1960, the first census after statehood, the US Census Bureau listed Hawaiians under the category of Others. Blaisdell (1992, 183) considers it probable that the most recent census in 1990 left approximately 34 percent of the Hawaiian population uncounted.

3 This generalization overlooks a number of instances of organized protest as
well as passive resistance. There were revolts against the German colonial administration in 1904 and 1914, and many were exiled as a result of rumored plots to attack the white community. The peoples of Astrolabe Bay and the Rai coast in present day Madang Province were noted for what German Governor Hahl called “passive resistance” to the demands of Europeans. Few people offered themselves freely for contract labor, and road-building crews frequently deserted and had to be recaptured. Some scholars have also interpreted various so-called cargo cult movements as a form of political resistance.

4 By contrast, Hiri Motu ‘trade Motu’, an indigenous pidgin based on Motu, and one of the languages of what used to be the Territory of Papua, has become for some a symbol of Papuan separatism.

5 The crisis, which has its origins in a dispute over land use by international mining companies, erupted when the Bougainville Revolutionary Army took over the island in 1989 and declared an independent republic. The matter has not yet been resolved, although a ceasefire was declared in September 1994.

6 The word kanaka is also found in non-European-based varieties such as Chinook Jargon, a trading language used along the Pacific Northwest coast, where it and other items spread after the development of the fur trade along the northwest coast of North America in the late eighteenth century. In the French overseas territory of New Caledonia the term is used as a symbol of Melanesian unity and pride in the face of the continuing French colonial administration. In 1984 Melanesian activists declared an independent state to which they gave the name Kanaky, but independence has yet to be recognized by France. Similarly in Hawai‘i, the label kanaka maoli ‘true people’ as the name for the indigenous people of the Hawaiian Islands carries positive connotations.

7 The dichotomy between discours and histoire is in many respects an oversimplification, as is generally the case with such polarities. In the postmodern period there has been a rejection of the conventions of realist fiction marked by a descent into subjectivity. The “action” of the postmodern novel, if one can call it that, is located in the mind’s time and the narrator seeks not to represent an external world, but an interior one of consciousness. Along with it has come a reaffirmation of the present tense, with some critics going so far as to say that the present (rather than the past) is the new narrative center of the language of fiction. It becomes the favorite time zone of modern novelists like Virginia Woolf, who try to synchronize narration with experience, a form of narration that is contemporary with what it narrates (see the discussion in Cohn 1978).

References

Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin

Beier, Ulli, ed  

Benton, James Grant  

Blaisdell, Richard Kekuni  

Brash, Nora Vagi  

Carroll, Dennis, ed  

Blaisdell, Richard Kekuni  

Chinweizu, Onwuchekwa J, and Ihechukwu Madubuike  

Chock, Eric, ed  

Chock, Eric, and Darrell H Y Lum, eds  

Cohn, Dorrit  

Cole, Roger W  

D’Arcy, T Kevin, ed  

Day, A Grove, and Carl Stroven, eds  

Hadley, Joe  

Hall, Robert A, Jr  

Hannett, Leo


Ige, Philip K


Ives, Sumner


Kasaipwalova, John


Kiki, Albert Maori


Kloss, Heinz


Le Page, Robert B, and Andrée Tabouret-Keller


Lum, Darrell H Y


Macaulay, Ronald K S


Mazrui, Ali A


Michener, James


Mihalic, Frank


Mühlhäuser, Peter

Murayama, Milton

Namaliu, Rabbie

Nelson, Hank

Nordyke, Eleanor C

Nupela Testamen . . .

Odo, Carol

Pianta

Powell, Kirsty

Preston, Dennis R

Ramchand, Kenneth

Romaine, Suzanne


Sakamoto, Edward


Sato, Charlene J


Simonson, Douglas


Smith, Geoff P


Stannard, David


Subramani

1985 *South Pacific Literature: From Myth to Fabulation*. Suva: University of the South Pacific.

Sumida, Stephen H


Todorov, Tzvetan


Trask, Haunani-Kay


Traugott, Elizabeth C


Waiko, John

Walker, Alice  

Watson-Gegeo, Karen Ann  

Watt, Ian  

Weinrich, Harald  

Yamanaka, Lois-Ann  

Abstract

This paper compares the use of two Pacific creole languages, Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea and Hawai‘i Creole English in the Hawaiian Islands, as written languages in a literary or poetic function. Although both languages are widely used in their respective territories, their sociolinguistic status and functions differ dramatically. In Papua New Guinea, Tok Pisin has existed about seventy years as a written language with a codified standard. Hawai‘i Creole English has, by contrast, never been written as a language in its own recognized orthography.

Because it has no writing system of its own, Hawai‘i Creole English is represented as if it were a deviant or nonstandard variety of English. In other words, Hawai‘i Creole English is forced to be a literary dialect rather than a literary language. I look at some of the practical problems connected with the elaboration process such as standardization and related theoretical issues associated with narrative technique. Neither language has been used for extended third person narration in the novel. I will show how literary activity has been connected with cultural and political nationalism in the two contexts. The paper concludes by considering the likelihood of successful resolution of these problems within the current political situation in the Hawaiian Islands and Papua New Guinea.