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ABSTRACT

This dissertation research project explores narrative discourse in Hawai'i Creole English seeking evidence to support both of the two principal theories of creole genesis: universalist and substratist theories. The investigation is carried out within the framework of Verse Analysis (VA). In previous research on narrative discourse, several researchers have claimed that discourse units are generally distinguished into two main categories, that is, those units which are smaller, and those which are larger than the sentence. These are named interpretation units and coherency units by the present author respectively, and the corresponding units in VA are called lines and verses. Dell Hymes has discovered that narrative discourse in Native American (NA) languages as well as Chinook Jargon (CJ) presents a structurally patterned construction in their narratives. Moreover, the lines and verses in these two languages show a particular favored numbering in their patterning of narrative structure. It is found that lines and verses constitute the core part of the hierarchical discourse organization formed together with the other three peripheral discourse units: stanzas, scenes, and acts.

As Hymes has stated, patterning and numbering are found not only in NA languages and CJ but also in other pidgin and creole languages. In this study, two creoles are investigated: Guyanese Creole (GC) and Hawai'i Creole English (HCE). The narratives in these two creole languages demonstrate patterning that are described by five characteristics: (1) the organization of discourse in five hierarchical levels, i.e., the levels of interpretation, coherency, episodes, lower junctures, and upper junctures; (2) short interpretation units (eight words or less); (3) measured verse; (4) a clear division between interpretation units and coherency units; and (5) a correspondence of prosodic units and coherency units. These characteristics are claimed to be part of
universal principles in narrative discourse shared by poetic-oriented languages, as opposed to prosaic-oriented languages. Nonetheless, it is not certain whether these principles derive from the innate properties or the functionally-motivated factors. Further research is needed in order to arrive at more explicit answer to the question regarding those two possible sources of universality.

Besides some characteristics in patterning which can be explained by the universalist theory, it is also a goal of this research to provide an account for culturally specific properties. These properties can be further investigated and connected to substratal influence from one of the "ancestral" languages (i.e., the native languages spoken by immigrants), Japanese. It is hypothesized that Japanese is a strong donor in providing a linguistic basis for constructing a discourse frame with a certain numbering preference in the process of pidginization and creolization. The argument of Japanese substratal influence will be supported from three indispensable sources of arguments: sociohistorical facts, linguistic evidence, and a scenario for an explanation for linguistic transfer (Bickerton 1994). These arguments, therefore, comprise the most important part of this dissertation as summarized below:

To begin with the first argument, demographic figures are presented to draw a picture of how the plantation scenes looked during the creolization periods in Hawai’i between 1890 and 1920. It is found that the population of Japanese immigrants constituted the majority group from the early stage of the plantation days. The second source of an argument involves particular features in HCE and Japanese discourse. It is discovered that narrative structures in HCE spoken by people of Japanese descent (JHCE) are patterned in preference to 3-numbering in both lines and verses. They, moreover, make more use of the Verse-Final Markers (VFM) in their narratives than the speakers of HCE from any other ethnic group (OHCEs). And it is these three characteristics -- i.e., 3-numbering in lines; 3-numbering in verses; and VFM, that are shared exactly by the Japanese language as well. Furthermore, 3-numbering in
particular appears to have derived from the underlying cultural layer inherited from the traditional verbal arts. The third source of an argument, that for a scenario of substratal influence, illustrates a complicated process of language transfer in which particular regional varieties of Japanese -- that is, Hiroshima and Yamaguchi dialects (HYD), are considered to be the fundamental donors. In addition, other Japanese dialects and Japanese-framed Hawai'i Pidgin English (HPE) are also regarded as strong donors in the substratal transfer. The Matrix Language-Frame model predicts that the Matrix Language in pidginization in Hawai'i must have been Japanese, and then the Verse-Projection Strategy explains a process by which the three substratum features are transferred from HYD through HPE to JHCE, or from HYD directly to JHCE.

The present dissertation is offered as a contribution to the field of pidgin/creole linguistics as well as to that of discourse analysis. There are three aspects: First, this study illustrates that discourse processes in HCE comprise two factors in creole genesis: universal principles and substratal influence. It is implied, therefore, that discourse organization in creolization seems to be in accord with Mufwene's Complementary Hypothesis in which all three possibilities on creole genesis -- i.e., universalist, superstrate (or possibly adstrate), and substrate theories -- need to be taken into account. Second, this study is the first attempt to argue that the Japanese language was the leading contributor in terms of substratal influence on JHCE. There has been no previous evidence presented for such a language transfer from Japanese, despite the apparent numerical dominance of its speakers. Third, it is argued that some of the characteristics in creole discourse are not necessarily pan-ethnic or homogeneous but rather are heterogeneous depending on what kind of linguistic, ethnic, and cultural background a given faction of creole speakers has inherited. This phenomenon occurs because each of the ethnic groups seems to receive idiosyncratic linguistic characteristics from their ancestral language when the first-generation creole children are acquiring their mother tongue. This phenomenon may serve to differentiate creole
languages from other natural languages as far as discourse processes are concerned, suggesting a need for further extensive research to see whether the attribute is shared by other creoles as well.
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PREFACE

John E. Reinecke once mentioned what kind of student would be qualified to investigate language in the Islands of Hawai'i. He wrote (1969: xvii):

The ideal student of language in Hawaii would be trained in linguistics, especially in phonetics; he would be acquainted at least with Hawaiian, Japanese, Chinese, and Portuguese in addition to English; he would have a grasp of Hawaiian history and of Hawaiian social and educational conditions; he would also have a firm grounding in sociology.

If I had seen the above passage before beginning research on the creole in Hawai'i, this dissertation might not have come into existence. Aside from being a student of linguistics, I am far from being a well-qualified or trained student in the languages Reinecke named aside from English and Japanese, let alone the other disciplines he has stated. My quest in research of Pidgin or Hawai'i Creole English (HCE) started with rather an interesting experience. It is when I was acquainted with the local boys and girls in Youth Association of Shinnyo-en Hawaii, one of the Buddhist organizations in Honolulu, that I first got in close contact with HCE. As an international student, the only variety of English that I had ever been familiar with until then was the one spoken in central California. Upon being exposed to "the local language" here in Hawai'i, a linguistic question has occurred to me: Where such particular features in HCE have derived from, if there are any establishable sources. This curiosity has made me take the first step for the study of pidgins and creoles not only in the inquiry of linguistics but in the investigation of Hawai'i's society, culture, and history as well. My interest has grown in touch with warm-hearted local people in this speech community, and such an experience really helped me understand and be interested more in these Pacific islands.

xviii
I was aware that pidgin and creole languages in general are stigmatized and gradually came to know that HCE is not an exception. I found later, however, that the issue is totally political and social but not linguistic. It is because there is no theoretical basis to state that HCE is linguistically inferior to another language since it possesses an independent representation and communication system. It is neither correct nor fair to say that pidgins and creoles are destructured varieties of their standard counterparts, pointing to some single linguistic phenomenon or variable (Masuda 1993, in press-b). Such a claim is a biased misunderstanding held by even some linguists as well as a majority of lay people who do not really know what pidgins and creoles are. Furthermore, the prejudice is linguistically far from the truth. Although those languages may demonstrate some differences from other natural languages, pidgins and creoles possess newborn and/or restructured autonomous linguistic systems, and thus, should not be regarded as corrupted versions of some other forms.

I am afraid that lack of deep concern will ultimately destroy our respect toward any marginal languages and cultures which differ from our own or those which do not fit a given criterion for the standard. We must not tell, whatever language it may be, that a mother tongue which he/she acquires from their parents or beloved people is a form of "bastard speech." It is my belief that the study of pidgins and creoles is one of the fields in which linguists can contribute to tackling the problems existing in the real world like the prejudice against the certain varieties of language. Although there is no obligation or necessity for any academic research to be carried out with such an objective, it is undoubtedly delightful for linguists if this discipline can ultimately benefit the people in our society. And that is exactly what I pursue in working in this field and it is also what my dissertation undertakes as its ultimate goal.

I cannot but recall now my enjoyable and academically very informative times when I had chats or deep discussions with my local friends at a diner, a coffee shop, someone's house, occasionally on a street, and somewhere in the City. These
"... theorists have the obligation to study extant descriptions carefully, and thus to be accountable at least to the published and otherwise available data, if not to the languages themselves."
Michael L. Forman (1993: 165)

1.1. INTRODUCTION

It is the principal task of this dissertation research to explore how the two embattled theories on the origin of creole languages in the field of syntax are related to another important field of linguistics, i.e. discourse analysis. The two embattled theories I refer to are UNIVERSAL versus SUBSTRATUM theories. Rickford (1992: 226) states, in his introduction to pidgin and creole linguistics, that 'a characteristic feature of pidgins and creoles is that the lexicon comes primarily from the superstratum language, with substratum influence manifesting itself primarily in the phonology and grammar.' Furthermore, he also introduces Bickerton's Language Bioprogram Hypothesis (LBH, hereafter) by saying that 'the hypothesis has generated considerable discussion, especially insofar as it attributes creole similarities to universals rather than substratum influences.' Bickerton's LBH (1981, 1984, 1988)\(^1\) has been the most influential framework of the research on creole genesis, which has obtained enormous attention from researchers in not only pidgin and creole linguistics but also in such fields as sociolinguistics, psychology, and language acquisition research. For some creolists, the word substratum might be tightly connected to the monogenesis theory. However.

---

\(^1\)Most recently in his articles (Bickerton 1991, 1992), he does not use the term LBH any more but calls it BIOPROGRAM THEORY or LEXICAL LEARNING HYPOTHESIS.
in the present study, the technical term in question refers mainly to feature transfer (Odlin 1989) or cross-linguistic influence (Kellerman 1987/78, 1989) of a certain language on another language or influence among several different languages.\footnote{This approach is called the COMPLEMENTARY HYPOTHESIS. Mufwene (1993b: 23, note 4) explains that the term was used for the first time at the International Round Table on Africanisms in Afro-American Language Varieties, patterned after his (1986a) title "The Universal and Substrate Hypothesis Complement One Another." The position is that neither the LBH nor any version of the substrate hypothesis (subH) can account fully for the systems of individual creoles. There are, however, differences among proponents of the CompH regarding whether substrate influence becomes effective during or after the crystallization of a creole (Mufwene 1991a).\footnote{Goodman (1993: 64-5) draws attention to the usage of the term substratum. He points out that there is a practical discrepancy in the way in which the term is customarily used in historical linguistics and in creole linguistics. He cites three agreed characteristics of the term substratum in the traditional usage as follows: 1) a language which has in some way influenced the referent language; 2) its ultimate replacement by the referent language in the area under consideration; and 3) a language spoken substantially earlier than the referent language in the territory under consideration. In contrast, many creolists use the term in a broader sense. He points out: 'In this respect creolists use the term rather more broadly, since the African "substrata" were introduced even later (and certainly no earlier) than the European languages in most creole-speaking regions. On the other hand, they obviously were introduced before the European-based creoles had evolved. Thus, if one considers creoles to be evolutions of their European base languages, then one cannot view the languages of African immigrants as substrata in the strict traditional sense of the term.'} Recent work in this field, endeavoring to unite the theories of universals, superstrate, and substrate, leads one to wonder if there is any possibility of finding evidence of the existence of the two factors operating at the same time in creole origins and development in the area of discourse processes. Mühlhäusler (1986: 128-9) touches on the disciplines of pragmatics/discourse in relation to creole genesis in the following words:
As a general principle, it can be postulated that the more arbitrary an area of grammar, the more readily can languages borrow from one another. With regard to the formation of developmental continua such as the pidgin-creole continuum, this implies that substratum influence will be most pronounced in the areas of lexical semantics, prosodic phonetology, some segmental phonetology, and pragmatics.

Connecting the field of discourse analysis to pidgin and creole linguistics, this dissertation research aims at establishing the source of discourse structures in Hawai'i Creole English (HCE, henceforth). This is to be achieved by analyzing and describing linguistic units beyond the sentence level. The thesis explores a discourse/textual approach mainly because of the present writer's special concern in narrative structure and ways of talking in the language. It also implies that the analysis of linguistic units beyond the sentence level should be attended to more, particularly when the fundamental nature of language is investigated. The study of pidgin and creole genesis, furthermore, should be regarded as one of such basic areas of research in general linguistics. We may obtain insights into the origin and the development of those languages by investigating larger linguistic units, that is, units of discourse. Essentially, this project will investigate how universals and substratum are involved and how they are manifested in the process and the structure of HCE narratives.

The three following quotes are cited to emphasize the significance of research on discourse as a new wave of investigation in pidgin and creole linguistics, though it is still at a very exploratory and unestablished stage.

Studies of creolization have concentrated on what is sometimes called 'hard-core grammar'. Consequently many aspects of these languages remain ill described. Examples of serious gaps in our knowledge include ideophones, discourse grammar, speech acts and many other areas of 'higher-level grammar' and language use. (Mühlhäusler 1986: 236)

Only a handful of studies within creolistics have dealt with pragmatics, conversation and discourse analysis, or the analysis of speech acts or events, although these aspects have become more central within sociolinguistics over the past decade. (Rickford 1988: 55)

Similarly, although perhaps "pragmatics" is not the most appropriate rubric for this area, I would urge the study of creole and African discourse structures, including the structure of extended monologues such as folktales, the sort of utterances not likely heard often from Europeans..... In general, I believe the structure of discourse, as opposed to that of words,
It is, therefore, expected that future work will deal with discourse structures as well as the socio-cultural contexts of pidgins and creoles. Moreover, Romaine (1990: 253), in her review of Hymes and Zenk (1987), attempts to open a door to the above mentioned research domain. She writes:

The paper by Hymes and Zenk on narrative structure in Chinook Jargon also opens the possibility for potentially fruitful comparative work at the pragmatic/discourse level.

Finally, it is appropriate to quote Watson-Gegeo (1994: 113) to draw attention to Hawai‘i in particular. She argues the necessity of research at the discourse level of linguistic analysis in Hawai‘i where the coming demographic and economic changes are likely to have an impact on its language situation.

Third is need for research on discourse forms in Hawai‘i Creole English, together with the relationship of these forms to acquiring literacy in standard English.

It is the study of language in use or the communicative competence in which such a research on discourse forms should have a basis.

1.2. COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE

Another aspect that this study cannot ignore is the insights and the approach that the ethnography of speaking emphasizes. That is, it is linguistic analysis in cultural context. It should be kept in mind that discourse analysis requires a researcher to be familiar with the cultural values of a given community under investigation. That is to

---

4Pragmatics is the study of the way in which the meaning of a sentence is interpreted relative to the context in which it is spoken; Discourse analysis looks at the way in which sentences are combined in the larger stretches of narrative or conversation.' (Nunberg, no date, the Linguistic Society of America brochure for the field of linguistics) The ethnography of communication is an approach to discourse that is based in anthropology, and it shares with much traditional anthropology a concern for holistic explanations of meaning and behavior.' (Schiffrin 1994: 8) (italics by the present author)
say, the framework of the present research does not suppose that the human ability to acquire discourse grammar is realized without influence from external (i.e., nonlinguistic) factors. On the contrary, the ability to construct a discourse or a narrative is established in the interaction between an inner ability such as the innate grammar and external factors such as cultural specifics. In other words, this investigation will be based on the theory of COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE, that is, 'its (child's) ability to participate in its society as not only a speaking, but also a communicating member' (Hymes 1974: 75) and 'the ability of a speaker which involves knowing not only the language code, but also what to say to whom, when, where, and how to say it appropriately in any given situation.' (Saville-Troike 1989: 21) Saville-Troike (ibid.: 2-3) goes on to say that 'the requisite knowledge includes not only rules for communication and shared rules for interaction, but also the cultural rules and knowledge that are the basis for the context and content of communicative events and interaction processes.' Additionally, Forman (personal communication 1/6/95) points out that communicative competence might be described as including the knowledge of when not to talk at all.

Nevertheless, communicative competence should not be equated to performance in the sense that generative grammarians use to distinguish it from linguistic competence. This is because communicative competence is not something which is affected by accidental interferences or performance errors. Communicative competence has to be developed in its relation to external factors such as contexts (cognitive, cultural, and social; cf. Schiffrin 1987: 4, for definitions). However, the notion is something that should be regarded as a central part of the language faculty. The concept of the

---

5 Mühlestäbler (1986: 236) associates this stream of discipline with creolistics: 'Recent work in linguistic functionalism (for example, Duranti 1981) has provided interesting support for the idea that the speech situation can crucially influence the language associated with it, and there can be little doubt that environmental/external factors interact with historical and/or biological factors in shaping the nature of creoles.'
language faculty, therefore, should refer not merely to the sentential grammar but to overall human ability to develop and establish linguistic/communicative competence as well. This overall language faculty co-ordinates syntax and discourse grammar with other pragmatic and external (socio-cultural) factors.

As is implied in the above discussion, one of the goals of discourse analysis and the study of communicative competence can be understood as an investigation of the mechanism of interaction between the innate linguistic competence and a speech event, and particularly, of how the latter influences the former. For instance, a base rule in syntax divides a sentence into Noun Phrase and Verb Phrase. Nevertheless, in formal types of speech, a lengthy pause is often made after but not before a predicate verb (e.g. What I want you to keep in mind is // to see.....; My brother in law said // that .....). Grimes offers additional argument (1975: 276):

Some writers punctuate by information blocks, though my experience is that most editors punctuate by surface grammar more often than by information blocking. (Example: Some writers, punctuate by information blocks, though my experience is, // that most editors, punctuate by surface grammar, more often than by information blocking.). (A double slash // is added)

This argument shows that a phrase boundary between NP and VP does not necessarily coincide with an utterance caesura in actual speech. If such a post-predicative caesura is just a coincidental phenomenon which is caused by a certain sporadic external factor in performance, it should not be taken seriously. However, if making a caesura after a predicate turns out to be a general tendency in a formal speech to make a pause after a predicate verb, we should not dismiss the fact any more by just saying that it is a coincidental datum but may have to suppose that there might be a kind of operating principle. This operating principle is part of discourse grammar in our language faculty, to perceive and process a certain fragment of a narrative as an underlying

6The Prague School used the terms theme and rheme, and associated these concepts with subject and predicate.
structural unit to convey cohesive information. That is, this claim can be illustrated in the following example: While a structural sequence of \{1, 2, 3\} is described as a structure of \{NP (1)--VP (2, 3)\} in syntax, that sequence may also be understood in a discourse process as in \{X (1, 2) -- Y (3)\}. Then it is an open and interesting question to ask and investigate what kind of structures or units consist of X and Y. This type of approach in which linguistic units are analyzed within a broader level of linguistic structure seems to be one of the inquiries that the contemporary discourse analysis can offer as a new field of studies.

With respect to the argument so far, Hymes's (1992b: 51-2) discussion is evocative to dismiss the simple dichotomy of grammar & use or competence & performance. He argues that it is necessary to work with at least three levels of organization. The first level which is termed resource grammar refers to form/meaning covariation at the sentence level or syntactic structure, while the second level called discourse grammar in Hymes's usage denotes 'the contrasts common in conversation' implying the paradigmatic sets at such levels as diction, informality, politeness, and style. The third level is form/meaning covariation which is related to its speaker/hearer and is called performance. It is mentioned that 'the quality and form of a performance may be emergent, in the sense that it is a product of interaction among participants.' Moreover, he introduces a metaphor from music to explain the three distinctions in discussion (52):

To consider music, one can distinguish the 'grammar' of the classical style within which Beethoven wrote a sonata; the 'text' of the score; and the approaches of different performance traditions and of pianists of differing training, temperament and taste. Just so with language.

1.3. THE UNDERLYING POETIC ORGANIZATION

In this research, Dell Hymes's VERSE ANALYSIS is applied, with some modification, to investigate narrative structures of GC, HCE, and Japanese. Narrative
in this study refers to a monologue type of discourse which is explained in the following words: A narrative is based on a story (Schutz 1976, cited in Gulich & Quasthoff 1985: 170), and refers to a 'series of real or fictional actions or events that take place in the past relative to the time of the narration.' (Gulich & Quasthoff ibid.: 170) When the term underlying representation is used for narrative; however, it involves an underlying abstract unit of discourse organization which is not influenced by any accidental interferences such as interruptions and performance errors. Incidentally, Labov & Waletzky (1967) associate the underlying semantic representation of narrative with the most explicit temporal sequence of a given story.

Many scholars have tried to demonstrate that there are several different structures in discourse which reflect cognitive coherence. Among those are two fundamental categories, that is, those units which are smaller (INTERPRETATION-UNITS), and those which are larger (COHERENCY-UNITS), than the linguistic unit that syntacticians usually call a sentence. What those discourse analysts try to investigate is if there are such units or components that can be identified when language is looked at from a broader structural level above syntax. In fact, they do find such units in discourse and some similarities can be discovered among those units as well. Following are some of the names for the discourse structures in question: INTERPRETATION-UNITS -- Hunt (1966): T-units; Loban (1966): C[ommunication]-units; Halliday (1967): information units; Grimes (1975): information blocks; Kroll (1977) and Chafe (1980): idea units; Sato (1988): utterances; Callow & Callow (1992): propositions; Jordan (1992): clauses, COHERENCY-UNITS -- Chafe (1980): extended sentences; Tedlock (1983): strophes; Crooks & Rulon (1985) and Shewan (1988): utterances; Sato (1988): multi-propositional utterances; Gee (1986, 1990): stanzas; Callow & Callow (1992): configurations; Linde (1993): narrative clauses. And it seems that the level of line and
verse in Verse Analysis appear to be correlated with the above introduced discourse units, the units of interpretation and coherency, respectively.\textsuperscript{7}

As will be discussed fully in Chapter three, Verse Analysis does not exist in complete independence of those previous studies in the field, but parallels them to a great extent. Thus, when we look at the overall picture and history of the discipline and research outcomes produced by those scholars, we find some general tendencies among them. Upon encountering the similarities, it can be deduced that there should be certain kind of universal principles for constructing a discourse. In addition, a series of works by Gee (Gee 1985, 1986, 1989, 1990, 1993, Gee & Grosjean 1984, Gee & Kegel 1983) supports the claim that there exists a narrative grammar (Labov & Waletzky 1967, Labov 1972, Rumelhart 1980, Hymes 1982, Romaine 1985) in natural languages.

With respect to the correlation to the above-mentioned traditional stream of discourse analysis, Hymes's Verse Analysis and Gee's Stanza Analysis have shown that there are both universal and cultural specifics in narrative discourse. Gee (1990: 117) states:

My claim is that lines and stanzas\textsuperscript{8} are universal, the products of the mental mechanism by which humans produce speech. At the same time, how different people organize language within these lines and stanzas is socially and culturally variable.

For the evidence of the former, a series of Hymes's and others' works showed that Native American (NA, henceforth) languages and creole languages, or languages in oral cultures (OC, hereafter) in Gee's terminology, present a restricted set of patterned and numbered narrative structures that Gee calls poetic.\textsuperscript{9} This poetic narrative structure contrasts to a prosaic structure, possessed by languages in literary cultures, that shows

\textsuperscript{7}Nonetheless, principal cues to identify these interpretation units and coherency units vary, scholar to scholar, in different linguistic levels such as prosody, structure, and proposition.

\textsuperscript{8}Gee's stanzas are equated to Hymes's verses.

\textsuperscript{9}This is not to equate NA and creole languages directly to languages in oral cultures because some of those (NA and creole) languages may not appropriately be called 'languages in oral cultures.'
other varieties of patterning and numbering in its narrative. Close examinations of their research outcomes have revealed that poetic narratives present, as shared characteristics, five hierarchical sub-levels of narrative structure, lines (interpretation units) that are quite short, a restricted number of verses (coherency units), and a clear boundary between lines and verses. On the other hand, prosaic narratives show rather long lines, varied number of verses per the larger unit, and an obscured boundary between lines and verses.

At the same time, Verse Analysis also indicates particular characteristics unique to HCE, which are not shared by other NA, creole, and OC languages. For instance, HCE exhibits a different numbering preference in narrative structures generated by speakers of Japanese ancestry and those of non-Japanese ancestries. What this study implies in particular is that the substratal influence can be exerted directly from ancestral languages during creolization (Romaine 1988). This fact, that HCE reveals some feature variability depending on what ethnicity a speaker belongs to, reveals a distinctive nature of creole languages, since in non-creole languages, those ethnicity-particular characteristics are not likely to be found. Nevertheless, as Sato (personal communication 4/5/94) points out, youngsters in Hawai‘i might have more crystallized pan-ethnic creole features than those elderly speakers who were born and raised on the plantations in which many ancestral languages were spoken.

Furthermore, if HCE has inherited some features of verse structure from Japanese, another complicated issue arises. The Japanese language belongs not to an oral culture but to a literary culture. Yet, it still reveals a poetic narrative rather than a prosaic one, and can be a counterexample to Gee's claim that poetic narrative is a characteristic of languages in oral cultures. This suggests that it will be necessary to consider another explanation for the distinction between oral and literary types of languages. Although such an oral vs literary dichotomy does not seem to work well for the Japanese case, this study supports Gee's claim to the extent that there are two different forms of
narratives which he calls poetic and prosaic. This issue is discussed in detail in Chapter seven. The present study, therefore, distinguishes two categories of features in discourse from the viewpoint of pidgin and creole linguistics. One of those categories can be explained by the universalist theory, and the other can be accounted for by a theory of substratal influence from one of the ancestral languages, Japanese, which is transferred in the process of creolization. A good amount of evidence and discussion of cross-linguistic feature transfer from Japanese to HPE can be found in previous works such as Reinecke (1969: 42), Bickerton & Odo (1976: 123-162), Nagara (1972: 3-22), and Sato (1985: 250), and these will be discussed in Chapter two. Evidence for Japanese substratal influence on HCE in both linguistic and sociohistorical aspects will be presented in Chapter eight.

1.4. ORGANIZATION OF THE DISSERTATION

In this dissertation, narrative discourse in three languages is investigated: Guyanese Creole; Hawaiian Creole English; and Japanese. Discourse data in GC have been excerpted from Rickford (1987). Two texts, made by two narrators, are analyzed in Chapter four. Discourse data in HCE have been obtained from the interview tapes in the research projects completed by the Center for Oral History, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i. There are fifty-seven narratives analyzed, and these narratives are produced by nineteen narrators. The analyses of HCE are presented in Chapter five and seven. Discourse data on the Japanese language have been elicited by the present researcher. The data have been obtained from seven narrative discourse made by three native speakers of the language. The analysis of Japanese is carried out in Chapter eight.

Chapter two opens the discussion by exploring some background of languages in the state of Hawai'i. Beginning with explaining basic terms for varieties of pidgins and
creoles, the chapter illustrates what kind of historical stages HCE has come through, what linguistic attributes the language has, and how it looks in the contemporary society of Hawai'i. Especially, the debate over the status of HPE has been drawing attention from many creolists. However, it seems that Bickerton & Wilson (1987), and Roberts (1992, 1993, in press), are much more convincing than Holm (1988, 1989), Goodman (1985), and McWhorter (1994), in terms of both historical facts and linguistic evidence. That is, HPE does not seem to be a continuation of Pacific Pidgin but a relexified descendant of Pidgin Hawaiian.

Chapter three devotes itself to a description of the analytical framework. First of all, a discussion over the past research on discourse units is provided. Second, this chapter also introduces a modified framework of Verse Analysis which is applied in the present study. Although there are several approaches to the analysis of narrative discourse, it is emphasized that a meaning-based approach is adopted in this study, based on the theoretical ground that the underlying representation of discourse is semantic (Labov & Waletzky 1967; Labov 1972; Callow & Callow 1992; Mann & Thompson 1987, 1988a,b; Mann, Matthiessen, & Thompson 1992). Chapter four explores narrative structure of Guyanese Creole to show that the well known creole presents a quite typical verse structure in its poetic narrative. Chapter five proceeds to the analyses of narratives in HCE, and in Chapter six, a comparison between GC and HCE narrative is made in search for universal discourse principles in poetic narrative structures in contrast to prosaic narratives in Gee's terms. It seems obvious that there exist these two different types of narrative, and poetic narrative presents five principle characteristics. A quantitative analysis is also provided to support the existence of the numberings in HCE narratives, which are identified in Chapter five.

In Chapter seven, the hypothesis of influence from the Japanese substratum on discourse organization in HCE is introduced. The chapter presents three features discovered in HCE of Japanese descent (i.e., JHCE). These features make an explicit
contrast with verse structure of other non-Japanese HCEs (i.e., OHCEs). In Chapter eight, it is strongly argued that the Japanese language has the highest possibility of being the donor of substratum features to HPE and HCE despite the fact that there were three other major languages, Hawaiian, Chinese, and Portuguese, spoken in the plantation setting. The chapter argues that those three features found in JHCE derive from the Japanese language. When substratum theory is discussed, it is usually not inquired whether such transferred features differ or not, depending on the ethnic background of creole speakers. As stated earlier, however, this issue seems to be raising a very crucial question as far as the particular case of Hawai‘i is concerned. This comment relates to the assumption that there are possibly two forms of substratal influence or feature transfers in discourse processes. One is a process in which features are handed down from ancestral languages through a given pidgin language, and finally to a creole. The other is a process in which substratal influence is exerted directly from surrounding ancestral languages to a creole in a linguistic contact situation.

Chapter nine explores the possibility of combining both universal principles, especially those expressed in poetic narratives, and substratal influence from Japanese to explain the features in HCE discourse organization and processes. This attempt follows the COMPLEMENTARY HYPOTHESIS (Mufwene 1986, 1993b) which tries to unite the three principal theories on creole genesis, i.e., universalist, superstratum, and substratum theories. However, as stated in note three, the study of creole genesis in relation to that of discourse does not necessarily coincide with theoretical aspects of the hypothesis since there has not traditionally been a branch of discourse study within creole linguistics. Chapter nine also summarizes the discussions in the preceding chapters, and makes a conclusion for this dissertation study. In the final subsection, perspective for future research is offered.
"Now the input received by children of the first creole generation was radically ill-formed and impoverished to a degree, as well as being highly variable. It seemed therefore that the subsequent acquisition of grammars with a high degree of similarity could be explained only if there was some preferentially favored form of language that emerged when input was inadequate."

Derek Bickerton (1992b: 103)

2.1. JARGON, STABLE PIDGIN, AND EXPANDED PIDGIN

It will be helpful to discuss briefly the basic terminology for several types of pidgins such as jargon, stable pidgin, and expanded pidgin in general, before getting into the illustration of Hawai'i situation in particular. According to Hall (1962), pidgins are considered to have a life-cycle which includes several stages of development such as a jargon, a stable pidgin, and an expanded pidgin. Mühlhäusler (1986) and Romaine (1988) proffer features of each of the stages in the following way. Mühlhäusler (ibid.: 135), first of all, explains JARGON as follows:

Jargons, as we have already said, are individual solutions to the problem of cross-linguistic communication and hence subject to individual strategies, the principal ones being lexicalization or holophrastic talking; pragmatic structuring; grammaticalization by transfer; and universals.

He goes on to quote an example of such an interlingual contact during labor recruiting in the Pacific in the nineteenth century. This example was reported by Ribbe, cited by Mühlhäusler.
Melike boys' the white man says to the black man, 'plenty kaikai (food)'. 'No fight (corporal punishment)? asks the black. 'Yes, plenty kaikai and no fight', the white replies. 'What you pay me?' the owner of a slave or a village chief asks. 'One fellow anikow (an axe)' the recruiter replies. (Ribbe 1903: 223, cited and translated by Mühlhäuser, ibid.)

The JARGON phase, according to Romaine (1988), involves quite a few individual variations. The sound system is very simple while a sentence is constructed with just a one- or two-word structure. Lexicon is limited. The use of jargons is bound to domains which seem to be extremely referential such as trade, labor, and recruitment.

Bickerton's (personal communication) term EARLY-STAGE PIDGIN, moreover, refers to a type of contact languages which has developed a little further than Romaine's jargon stage. Bickerton (1984: 174-6) also states that HPE's lexicon was very unstable and it also lacked models for complex structures. Nagara (1972: 288) presents the following utterance in HPE, which coincides with Bickerton's description.

> Oh, yeah. Come here contract, sugar cane. Yeah, hapaiko nandemo (anything) yarimashita (did), Japanese no more school go, so only work.

> "Oh yeah. We came here under a contract to work on a sugar cane plantation. Yes, cane carriers did anything. Japanese did not go to school, so they just worked."

A STABLE PIDGIN, on the contrary, seems to possess complex sentences as well as simple ones. Mühlhäuser (ibid.: 147) describes stabilization of a pidgin as the result of the development of socially accepted language norms, which is followed by the description below.

Generally speaking, stabilization implies the gradual replacement of free variation and inconsistencies by more regular syntactic and lexical structures. In the former area, a pragmatic mode of speaking begins to give way to a grammatical one, whereas in the latter lexical dependency on outside resources is supplemented with internal means of lexical expansion. Most important, the new grammatical devices are independent of a speaker's first language or other individual language-learning strategies. Thus a stable pidgin acquires a stable language community and social norms to which its members conform.

---

1She does not explain exactly what a 'simple sound system' means here. Generally speaking, the concept seems to refer to two things: 1) a small number of phonemes and 2) ease of sound articulation.

2It should be noted that socially accepted norms held by pidgin speakers on Hawai'i plantations must have varied depending on their social networks.
Romaine (ibid.) also claims that it is more important that there are social norms and a consensus concerning linguistic correctness. A stable pidgin is utilized mainly for (a) communication in a fixed number of domains; (b) social control; and (c) to a small extent, self expression. She says an interesting example of a pidgin which belongs to this category is Russenorsk (Russo-Norwegian), a trade pidgin that was used in northern Norway by Russian merchants and Norwegian fishermen during the Pomor trade. Romaine (ibid.: 128) provides the following example of this stable pidgin.

moja pa anner skip nakka vin drikkom, sa moja nakka lite pjjan. moja ska stiu grot lygom. kak ju vina trinke, Kristus grot vre.

[me on other ship some wine drink, so me some little drunk. me shall say: you much lie. if you wine drink, Christ much angry.]

"I drank some wine on another ship, then I got a little drunk. I must say that you lie a lot. If you drink wine, Christ will be very angry."

Compared to the previous example of an early-stage pidgin, i.e., HPE, the above stable pidgin, i.e., Russenorsk shows ampler word-collocation and complex sentences. However, it still remains at a primitive level in syntax if it is compared to other natural languages. Romaine (ibid.: 128), for example, remarks that 'the syntactic possibilities of Russenorsk are quite limited. Sentences are generally paratactic without embedding or subordination. Coordination is achieved by juxtaposition or the use of sa.' Following is a translation of a fragment of a conversation in the language (Bickerton 1990b: 121):

R: What say? Me no understand.
N: Expensive, Russian -- goodbye.
R: Nothing. Four half.
N: Give four, nothing good.
R: No brother. How me sell cheap? Big expensive flour on Russia this year.
N: You no true say.
R: Yes. Big true, me no lie, expensive flour.
With regard to the above text, Bickerton (ibid.) concludes that this type of pidgin acquires structure from neighboring developed languages, but may remain at a primitive level for several generations.

Romaine points out that an EXPANDED PIDGIN is marked with three main features: (a) a complex grammar; (b) a developing word formation component; and (c) an increase in speech tempo. This pidgin is used in almost all domains of everyday life. For instance, it is used for self-expression, some form of word play, literature, and is adopted as a communicational tool among heterogeneous groups. The best known expanded pidgins are West African Pidgin English and Tok Pisin. Romaine offers some utterances from Tok Pisin (1988: 147).4

Orait, i go long rannwara, pukpuk i ken kisim em, na bikpela snek i slap long warn, em i ken kisim em. Orait, 01 i kisim i kam, smokim pinis, em i ken kisim em. “Well, they go to the pond, they can get crocodiles, and the big snakes that live by the water. They get them, smoke them, put them aside and go back.”

Incidentally, Mühlhäusler (1986: 5) uses slightly different terms for Romaine’s categories: PRE-PIDGIN for jargon, PIDGIN for stable pidgin, and EXTENDED PIDGIN for expanded pidgin. Both of the words extend and expand imply that a given pidgin exists in a community for a long period of time and its structures do not merely exceed those of a stable pidgin, the usage of the pidgin is applied to varieties of social situations and settings so that it becomes multifunctional.

---

3Bickerton (p.c. 12/10/93) says that this variety of pidgin is probably a repidginized creole.
4Romaine (p.c. 7/9/93) used the term nativization as an initial criterion to differentiate pidgins and creoles though, she remarked, the linguistic elaboration of a well-developed expanded pidgin and that of a creole do not crucially differ. Moreover, she indicated that there are both pidgin and creole varieties in Tok Pisin by showing the following examples. In a creole variety, a predicate marker /i/ is not present.

Pidgin: Yi laik i go we? Creole: Yu la go we? SE: Where do you want to go?
2.2. PIDGIN HAWAIIAN

In 1835, the first plantation was established on Kaua'i, Hawai'i, to operate the sugar industry, which had been expected to rise as the major business entry in the islands of Hawai'i (Beechert 1985: 21-2). Although the dominant population around that time on the islands was Hawaiian (71,019 in 1853), quite a few foreign immigrants were gradually imported from China (56,700 in 1852-1897), Portugal (17,000 in 1872-1887), Japan (70,000 in 1885-1917), Puerto Rico (2,600 in 1900-1901), Korea (3,500 in 1904-1905), Spain (1,500 in 1907-1913), and Philippines (63,000 in 1907-1930), to plantations in Maui and Hawai'i (the Big Island) as well as Kaua'i. The native Hawaiians and the first three large immigrant groups, that is, Chinese, Portuguese, and Japanese, were major populations in the contact situation. Language contact on the plantation produced a makeshift language which was used as a communicational tool among the different ethnic groups described above.

Now when the linguistic status of contact languages in the early stage is stated, there are two arguments. One is the argument which claims that HPE derived from a type of Pacific Pidgin originated in the South Pacific. Scholars such as Goodman (1985) and Holm (1988, 1989) believe that the early-stage pidgin between the late eighteenth and the middle nineteenth century was derived from an English-based Pacific Pidgin that was spoken by traders, seamen, Hawaiians, and South Islanders, and that gradually came to be used on Hawai'i plantations. HPE, according to them, was developed from this variety of Pacific Pidgin (See Keesing 1988 for more discussion of that variety of pidgin and others), and later, it stabilized when the children of plantation laborers began to acquire the parents' pidgin as their first language in Hawai'i. Their

---

5 Bickerton (p.c. 4/94) pointed out that there were in fact earlier plantations at first. Grove Farm was the first to survive.

6 These figures are based on Reinecke (1969: 42) and Beechert (1985: 86). Schmitt (1977: 97-8) offers much smaller numbers for these two ethnic groups: Chinese 37,873 (1852-1899); Portuguese 10,559 (1878-1888).
hypothesis argues that HPE grew into a stable pidgin and further into HCE in the latter part of the nineteenth century.

On the other hand, it is claimed by Bickerton and Wilson (1987), and Roberts (1992, 1993a, 1993b, in press), that HPE was a relexified version of Pidgin Hawaiian, and had never reached a stage of stability before it was creolized. Bickerton and Wilson (1987) explicitly state that the earliest pidgin in Hawai'i during the early nineteenth century was not English-based but Hawaiian-based. That is to say, they argue that the original lexical source language for the Pidgin in Hawai'i was not English but the Hawaiian language. According to them (ibid.: 61), 'Pidgin English in Hawai'i was a late development and, in large part, a relexification of Pidgin Hawaiian that was, indeed, never entirely completed.' They argue that 'not only all Hawaiians but also all part-Hawaiians (no matter how small the Hawaiian fraction) routinely learned Hawaiian if they were born prior to 1900 (ibid.: 72),' and Pidgin Hawaiian was spoken by immigrant groups (ibid.: 65) as a communicational tool in talking with Hawaiian-speaking people or among themselves inter-ethnically. Hawaiians also contributed to the formation of the Pidgin by simplifying their language. Pidgin Hawaiian, they go on to state, was spoken by members of most, if not all, immigrant groups. As Bickerton and Wilson (ibid.: 72) point out, it seems obvious that immigrants would have been absorbed into the Hawaiian community if Hawai'i had been able to remain as an independent state. They show some data of Pidgin Hawaiian in their argument. Following is one of them (ibid.: 66).

| Pidgin Hawaiian: | Nuinui pii ma loko kela kai. |
| Hawaiian: | Nui na i'a ma loko o ke kai. |
| English: | There are a lot of fish in the sea. |
They point out, however, that it is hard to determine whether some examples of immigrant speech are Pidgin Hawaiian or Pidgin English (but not Pacific Pidgin). So it is sometimes not possible to draw a clear line between those two varieties of pidgins because both of them definitely coexisted, were spoken simultaneously during some periods, and were likely to be mixed to some extent. Here is an example of such a vague or fuzzy variety of utterance (ibid.: 69).7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pidgin:</th>
<th>No caen moemoe, tumach kanikani.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English:</td>
<td>You can't sleep, there's so much noise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later, English influence increased. In 1893, the Hawaiian monarchy was overthrown by a conspiracy of *haole* (lit. foreign, which implies white) businessmen, which led to annexation by the United States in 1898. After this incident, English immediately replaced Hawaiian as the official language and gradually came to be used as a colloquial language in the islands not only by Anglo-Americans but by native Hawaiians and immigrants as well.

The above description of Pidgin Hawaiian seems to have support from sociohistorical evidence. Reinecke (1969: 42) shows that in 1853, Hawaiians marked 71,019, which was 97% of the population of Hawai'i. This number did not drastically decrease until 1878 in which Hawaiian still constituted 76% of the total population. Moreover, Bennett (1976: 17) indicates that some 2,400 people were introduced from the South Pacific (Gilbertese and New Hebrideans) to Hawai'i by the Labor Trade around 1880.8 Nevertheless, the Pacific Islanders did not stay long in Hawai'i because

---

7There has been no comparative research of PH and HPE attempted so far.
8Schmitt (1977: 97) indicates that the total number of South Sea Islanders imported was 2,444 between 1865 and 1885.
they did not fit the work on the plantations. It is also recorded that 'there had been only six babies born, of which four died,' since their arrival in 1878, 1879, and 1880. She concludes that 'this probably reflected their intention not to stay in Hawaii but to return home before having children.' (Bennett ibid.: 22) Around that time, the Hawaiians still contributed the largest group in the population, numbering 44,088 in 1878 (Reinecke ibid.: 42). In such a situation, it is more plausible to hypothesize that a type of makeshift Hawaiian (Reinecke ibid.: 24) or even Pidgin Hawaiian, rather than the Pacific Pidgin, was spoken together with rudimentary HPE on the plantations. During the period prior to creolization, it is obvious that Hawaiian was quite dominant in terms of the number of people who used it, and must have been the major language of the community.9

Roberts (in press), furthermore, gives a number of citations documenting the use of Pidgin Hawaiian by four different ethnic groups: Anglo-Americans, Chinese, Portuguese, and Japanese. First of all, he (ibid. 8) opens a discussion over historical incidents of Pidgin Hawaiian by saying that 'twelve P[idgin] H[awaiian] lexical features were first attested in the period preceding 1810.' He goes on to say that 'the formation of PH was precipitated by the earliest contacts between Hawaiians and Euroamericans following the "discovery" of Hawaii in 1778.' According to him (ibid.: 18), it is not certain how long it took to form Pidgin Hawaiian, however, it already came to be used by non-natives such as Chinese in the mid-1850s. The introduction of Chinese to the Island, he claims, may have established the setting for tertiary hybridization among Hawaiians, Anglo-Americans, and the immigrant group. It is his conclusion (ibid.: 22) that 'the utility of English among Hawaiians and immigrants rapidly expanded in the 1880s and 1890s, precipitating a shift from Hawaiian to English as the principal lexifier language.' Incidentally, he (1993b, in press) points out

---

9This overwhelming demographic majority of Hawaiians, however, came to be replaced by Japanese around 1900. This issue will be discussed in detail in Chapter eight.

2.3. HAWAI‘I PIDGIN ENGLISH

Going back to the question 'What stage did HPE reach?,' it seems that HPE remained in the early stage of pidgin, and was creolized before it developed sufficient linguistic sophistication to be called a stable pidgin. First of all, this pidgin language is considered to have emerged after both Chinese and Portuguese immigrants came to the plantations in 1852 and 1872 respectively. Reinecke (1969: 35) states:

All kamaaina (old time) Islanders whom I have asked have said that a "pidgin English" did not arise until after the Chinese and Portuguese immigration.

Historically speaking, it was in 1876 when the Reciprocity Treaty was established by which Hawai‘i was granted the right to export sugar, exempted from taxation, to the United States. This incident promoted the plantation industry drastically which created more interethnic interactions among immigrants. Roberts also mentions (in press: 1):

Available evidence actually indicates that a pidginized variety of Hawaiian (which began to develop almost immediately after first contact) formed the original plantation language, and began to be displaced by pidgin English only in the 1880s and 1890s.

Thus, these deliberations assume that the English-based pidgin creation must have been not earlier than 1880, which was confirmed in Masuda (in press-a).¹⁰ Before and

¹⁰Sturdevant (1898: 23) comments on a variety of pidgin spoken around this time period as follows: 'The language in general use between different nationalities is a corruption of English and Hawaiian commonly called hapa haole (half white).' This also shows that HPE was not stable enough around 1880s and 1890s.
around this period, as Roberts points out above, Pidgin Hawaiian including a type of makeshift Hawaiian had been spoken not only by Hawaiians but other groups as well, as discussed in the previous section. Then, Pidgin Hawaiian came to be relexified by English and was converted into HPE. Moreover, that time is also a turning point when the use of Hawaiian decreased and that of English increased.11

Some leading scholars in HCE give the creolization timeline in Hawai'i as the following years. Reinecke (1969: 166): 1876-1925, Bickerton (personal communication): 1890-1920, Sato (1992): 1900-1920. Moreover, the most recent work by Roberts (1993) provides evidence that there were already early HCE speakers around in 1913, which presupposes that the first creole speaking generation began to be born in the early 1890s. Decamp (1971: 25) mentions that the extensive structural and lexical expansion of a pidgin may take place within a few decades when a creolization can be initiated, and if this is applied to the Hawai'i situation described above, the pidgin input that the first generation of creole speakers in Hawai'i obtained seems not to have been linguistically very sophisticated. Bickerton (1984: 175) discusses how a pidgin language around those periods was linguistically insufficient by showing that the language did not have a TMA system, anaphora, sentence structures, or case relations. He states that a major part of the input to children learning language around the time of creolization (1890 - 1900) was degenerate because 'parsing of pidgin has to be based almost exclusively on semantics and pragmatics.' (ibid.: 175) He also provides data of utterances by pidgin speakers suggesting that pidgin languages belong to a primitive linguistic representation system called PROTO LANGUAGE, which differs by nature from creole and other natural LANGUAGES. This protolanguage, he claims, is fundamentally a primary representation system identical to the language spoken by children under the age of two, that of adults who have been deprived of language in early years, and signs

11Roberts (ibid.: 22): 'The utility of English among Hawaiians and immigrants rapidly expanded in the 1880s and 1890s, precipitating a shift from Hawaiian to English as the principal lexifier.'
made by trained apes. He points out the typical characteristics of protolanguage as "'guesswork' identification of null elements, variant orders unrelated to function, the absence of structural mechanisms for expansion, and random absence of subcategorized arguments." Some such features are identified in the following HPE data. (Bickerton 1990b: 120 and 169)

If laik meiki, mo beta make time, mani no kaen hapai [If like make, more better die time, money no can carry].

"If you want to build (a temple), you should do it just before you die -- you can't take it with you!"

Aena tu mach churen, samawl churen, haus mani pei [And too much children, small children, house money pay].

"And I had many children, small children, and I had to pay the rent."

Now it seems necessary to make a conclusion to what processes HPE went through. It seems tenable to assume that HPE was a relexified version of at least a makeshift Hawaiian and possibly a Pidgin Hawaiian, and not a continuation of Pacific Pidgin. Later, HPE was acquired by children before it had attained linguistic stability. Therefore, at this stage, the scenario presented by Bickerton & Wilson (1987), and Roberts (1992, 1993a, 1993b, in press) seems preferable to that of Goodman (1985) and Holm (1988, 1989). There are five reasons: (1) No sociohistorical data has been presented that shows the number of sailors who came to Hawai'i and spoke a Pacific Pidgin (which, G & H argue, became the basis of HPE); (2) there has been no evidence presented by Goodman and Holm for the extensive existence of such Pacific Pidgin in Hawai'i; (3) on the contrary, it is clear from sociohistorical facts that Hawaiian was dominant when the plantation system was initiated; and (4) there exists considerable evidence of makeshift and Pidgin Hawaiian provided by Bickerton & Wilson, and Roberts, whereas there is no evidence that Pacific Pidgin was ever used in Hawai'i at least, and finally; (5) it is impossible for the makeshift jargon or relexified pidgin which
had started around 1880 (Section 2.2 above) to have already 'stabilized within 1880s,' which Holm (1989: 522) claims to be possible. The following section discusses HCE, a linguistic system different from its predecessor, HPE.

2.4. HAWA'I CREOLE ENGLISH

As discussed in the preceding sections, HCE was born when the children of the plantation laborers utilized their parents' HPE as one of the linguistic inputs to create their first language during the 1890s. It seems appropriate to ask, however, if HCE is really a creole language, or if it is a dialect of English, considering the contemporary linguistic situation in the state of Hawai'i. Particularly, if one puts an emphasis on the contemporary sociopolitical situation that Hawai'i is one of the states in the U.S., it may be described with the overall cover term English since a kind of English spoken in Hawai'i can be one of the sub-varieties of American English which are politically and socially equated to other regional dialects such as the southern dialect, Boston dialect, and so forth. The fact that the classification of languages is usually determined not by linguistic factors but by sociopolitical ones is frequently pointed out in sociolinguistic literature (Cobarrubias & Fishman 1983, Fasold 1984, Edwards 1985, Appel & Muysken 1987, Cooper 1989, Wardhaugh 1992). Moreover, a creolist like Hall (1966) is a strong defender of an assertion that creole languages are affiliated to their superstratum languages (122). That is, HCE should be classified as a dialect of English if one follows Hall's argument. Yet, if one takes into consideration the sociohistorical fact that HCE has come thorough the process which many creole languages have undergone, we realize that it is necessary to give another argument for the discussion from the standpoint of pidgin and creole linguistics.

12Mufwene (1994a: 24), however, agrees with Thomason and Kaufman (1988: 3) that classifying creole languages into a genetic tree is inadequate since 'language genealogical tree' assumes an existence of a single parent language.
HCE presents itself more as a creole language than a dialect of the English language if the issue is examined from the diachronic point of view. When it is said that a variety is a dialect (regional), the statement is already assuming that there existed a single mother language. Then, this mother variety of language X diverges into some regional sub-varieties, and they are isolated or separated because of population movement or geographic factors such as rivers, valleys, mountains, and so on. Those subdivided varieties are called dialects of the mother language. It seems that this kind of historical assumption is made (very often, but not always, of course) when linguists use the term dialect. For instance, if one takes the example of American English, it can be described that the language in question developed along a long history of almost fifteen hundred years as in the following series: the Anglo-Saxon --- Old English --- Middle English --- Modern English in the British Isles --- Present-day American English --- regional dialects of American English, e.g. southern dialect, Boston dialect, etc. (Pyles and Algeo 1982).

On the other hand, a creole language goes through a completely different history. Its history begins when two or more mutually unintelligible languages together meet a lexical source language which has higher status in their power relationship. This incident happens typically in a linguistic contact situation such as a plantation. From the contact of those several, at least two (Schumann 1978) or three (Whinnom 1971) languages generally, a mixed linguistic code for a means of minimum communication is created. This mixed variety of language is called pidgin. Then, if this pidgin is nativized by children in a single generation (i.e., an abrupt process or nativization, Bickerton 1991) or stabilized after existing for some decades (i.e., a gradual process or stabilization, Goodman 1985, Mühlhäuser 1986), it becomes a creole language. The case of HCE shows that there are just some hundred years of history in the following linear chronology: a makeshift and/or expanded Pidgin Hawaiian --- rudimentary Hawai'i Pidgin English --- Hawai'i Creole English. Therefore, while a dialect is a
divergent form of language caused by geographical separation or isolation, a creole is a newborn language produced in a very short time span or in several decades at most by the children of pidgin speakers in a linguistic contact situation.\textsuperscript{13}

If the synchronic viewpoint is taken, as opposed to the diachronic standpoint, it becomes a more complicated issue since it is obvious that some varieties of HCE are mutually intelligible with the standard variety of English while others are not. Thus, it may be necessary to say that HCE has two distinct aspects: English and Creole. Tsuzaki (1971), observing the situation of Hawai'i, classified the speech of local people into three fundamental varieties. These are: (1) an English-based pidgin, i.e., Hawaiian Pidgin English; (2) an English-based creole, i.e., Hawaiian Creole English; and (3) a dialect of English, which is further divided into two subcategories. Those are: (3a) Non-standard Hawaiian English, and (3b) Standard Hawaiian English. Carr (1972), on the other hand, makes five types of arbitrary sets of speech: 1) the 'pidgin-talk' of the plantations and the speech of immigrants who came to Hawaii with native languages different from English; 2) the early creole; 3) neo-pidgin or local language; 4) Hawaiian near-standard English; 5) Hawaiian standard English. Furthermore, if one attempts to describe a general classification of the contemporary \textit{post-creole continuum} in Hawai'i, it can be integrated into three different varieties: the \textit{basilectal}, \textit{mesolectal}, and \textit{acrolectal} variety of HCE.\textsuperscript{14} It is understood by many that the average HCE

\textsuperscript{13}There are several arguments that creolization can possibly be initiated by not only children but also adults. For example, Lefebvre (1986: 282) raises the following questions: 'if there are well documented cases of pidgins evolving into creoles, (e.g. Tok Pisin), on what basis do we assume that all creoles have evolved from a pidgin? Is it not possible that some other processes, such as RELEXIFICATION, have taken place in the genesis of creole without involving a pre-creole phase?' If such a process is possible, then it is conceived that the creolization can be achieved by adult speakers as well. Bickerton (1988) offers his critique to Lefebvre's above mentioned article (1986), and shows his skepticism about her scenario for the relexification process in Haitian Creole French. Robertson (1993: 312) takes up the definition of \textit{nativization} made by Hall (1966: xiii) to argue that the view of nativization 'does not exclude a priori adults, who, by force of circumstances, may need to adopt a new mode of communication.' Then, he concludes that 'the B[erbice] D[utch] evidence suggests that it is necessary to reconsider the role of adults in the creolization process.' Valdman (1983: 214), on the other hand, assumes that \textit{vernacularization} is a more important factor than \textit{nativization} for creole genesis.

\textsuperscript{14}Rickford (1987: 288, note 3): 'Building on Stewart (1965), Bickerton (1975: 24) provided the following definitions, which have become fairly standard in the field: *basilect* will be used to refer to
speakers code switch among the varieties. In other words, their speech alternates between varieties of HCE in the continuum. Some might make a distinction even between acrolect and mesolect HCE while others only speak basilect HCE. In sum, therefore, diachronically speaking, HCE is a creole language; however, from a synchronic point of view, it should be put in a continuum.\textsuperscript{15}

The following discussion describes some characteristics of HCE for each of the linguistic levels. There is not much research on HCE phonology. The most standard and classic works are Bickerton & Odo (1976), and Vanderslice & Pierson (1967). The former is a general description of segmental phonology and phonetics in HCE. The latter presents six salient prosodic features of HCE from the suprasegmental point of view (p.166): (1) Syllable-timed rhythm, modified by emphatic drawl; (2) Wide tessitura; (3) Special registers: rhapsody voice, falsetto; (4) Scoop on the rise-fall statement and special-question tune; (5) Fluid word-stress and non-information-pointing accent placement; (6) Specific characteristic intonations, especially a general-question pattern with sharp pitch drop contrasting with GAE (General American English) rise. The only research carried out recently is Takano (1992) whose results that variety of Guyanese Creole most distinct from English, acrolect to refer to educated Guyanese English, and mesolect to refer to all intermediate varieties.’ Bickerton shows an example for each of the varieties as follows: basilect ‘mi tel am”; mesolect ‘a tel ti, etc’; and acrolect ‘ai tOuld him.’ He also mentions that the acrolect variety ‘differs from other standard varieties of the language only in a few phonological details and a handful of lexical items.’

\textsuperscript{15}Le Page & Taboure-Keller (1985) argue that the concept of a linear or unidimensional creole continuum can not adequately describe complex linguistic situations of a creole community, and suggest that the multidimensional model should be applied. Rickford (1987: 15-39), however, supports the concept of a linear creole continuum as described in the following words (38): ‘The diachronic assumptions of the early continuum model are the ones most weakened by recent research, but the non-discrete character of creole-standard variation in communities such as Guyana, Jamaica, and Hawaii provides the fundamental rationale for their characterization as continua.’ Incidentally, Mufwene (1994b) argues that pidgins and creoles are not new but \textit{restructured} languages and that they should be classified as one of the New Englishes in the world because there is no clear boundary between these varieties. He states (23): ‘Although there are still ethnographic differences between these new varieties, which I discuss below, it is noteworthy that the term “pidgin”, “creole” and “indigenized/nativized/non-native English” have been used for varieties of new Englishes spoken primarily by non-Europeans, especially in former exploration or non-settlement colonies.’
are different from those of Vanderslice & Pierson (ibid.) in their analyses of WH-Question. He also adds some additional findings in Tag Question and Declaratives.

As Tsuzaki states (ibid.: 332), the strongest type of evidence that allows us to interpret a variety as a creole 'lies in the similarities between HCE and other creole languages of the world,' i.e., morpho-syntax. He provides the following categories (Additional examples are given by the present author): (1) Negative -- no, neva, no mo; (2) Auxiliary -- kæn, yustu; (3) Past tense -- bin, wen, hæd; (4) Future or contingent mood -- go, gon; (5) Progressive aspect -- ste; (6) Habitual aspect -- (ø [=unmarked stem]); (7) Verb stem, nucleus, or base. An extensive investigation of morpho-syntax in HCE has been carried out by Bickerton (1977), which led him to produce the influential bioprogram theory in the field of pidgin and creole linguistics (Bickerton 1981, 1984, 1988, 1991, 1992b). Romaine (1993) illustrates TMA (tense-mood-aspect) system in three major creoles (Hawai'i Creole English, Haitian Creole French, and Sranan) as in Table 2-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ENGLISH</th>
<th>HCE</th>
<th>HCF</th>
<th>SRANAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>He walks</td>
<td>Hi wak</td>
<td>Li mache</td>
<td>A waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He walked</td>
<td>Hi bin wak</td>
<td>Li te mache</td>
<td>A ben waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He will walk</td>
<td>Hi go wak</td>
<td>L' av(a) mache</td>
<td>A sa waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He is walking</td>
<td>Hi ste wak</td>
<td>L'ap mache</td>
<td>A e waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was going to walk</td>
<td>Hi bin go wak</td>
<td>Li t'ap(a) mache</td>
<td>A ben sa waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was walking</td>
<td>Hi bin ste wak</td>
<td>Li t'ap mache</td>
<td>A e waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He will be walking</td>
<td>Hi go ste wak</td>
<td>L'av ap mache</td>
<td>A sa e waka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He was going to be walking</td>
<td>Hi bin go ste wak</td>
<td>Li t'av ap mache</td>
<td>A ben sa e waka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the area of discourse/pragmatics, the study of pidgins and creoles is just at the beginning stage of development, and as one of the examples discovered so far, Escure (1988) claims that topic-comment structure is universal in creole languages, while Sato & Watson-Gegeo (1992), and Masuda (1992) provide the data to demonstrate that HCE shares this characteristic. Moreover, Grimes & Glock (1970) discuss a particular
phenomenon in Saramaccan, which is described as follows: 'Repetition takes the form of a sentence-initial clause introduced by di "with reference to".' In the di clause, the previous sentence is repeated. Bickerton (personal communication) and Romaine (personal communication) point out that there is a similar phrase/clause-repetition in some of the Caribbean Creoles and Tok Pisin respectively. Following are phrase/clause repetitions in three creoles.

(A) Saramaccan (Grimes & Glock 1970: 410)

hEn-a-dou n[a]-En a-mama dan. di-a dou-n[a]-En-a mama dan, hEn-de lai boto tE-fa de-laba.
"Then-he-arrived to-him at-Mama Dam [a falls on the Suriname River]. WITH-REFERENCE-TO-HIS ARRIVING-TO-HIM-AT MAMA DAM, then-they loaded the-boat until they-finished."

(B) Hawai'i Creole English (COH 1988a: 365)

Its nat oni insaid da fiild. INSAID DA FIILD, wii hæd sevro laDæt, ranawei kaz.
"It may not be only inside the field. But inside the field, we had several runaway cars like that anyway."

(C) Tok Pisin (Romaine, personal communication 7/12/93 and 8/6/94)

mi pikim plaua pinis. PIKIM PLAUAPINIS, mi go long ples.
I pick flower finish pick flower finish, I go to village
"I picked the flowers. After I had picked the flowers, I went to the village."

It is obvious that those repetitions function as a coherency construction device, and these similarities found in several creoles imply further possibility of universal features at the discourse level.

Other work on creole discourse includes Forman et al. (1973), who analyzed the usage of some particular words in HCE such as nomo 'no more', neva 'never,' and as 'us' in various discourse contexts, drawing on these details to point out that '[a] very intricate and sophisticated grammar will be required to account for the full range of these children's speaking skills.' Watson (1972) synthesizes Kenneth Burke's rhetoric theory with William Labov's narrative analysis. She demonstrates that there are two types of narrative traditions; one in Standard English and the other in HCE. Purcell-
Komenaka's (1979, 1984) work illustrates an aspect of linguistic variation and code-switching among school-age speakers of HCE. Watson-Gegeo & Boggs (1977) found that some HCE children are very skillful in story-telling, and they have a special type of joint narrative construction that may be compared to what Reisman (1970, 1989) calls *contrapuntal conversations*. In the structure, comments made by a single speaker are denied, complemented, challenged, or contradicted by another. As a result, the speaker and the interlocutor unintentionally but cooperatively perform together a compound narrative in an interaction. It should be noted that the narrative of this type is achieved by particular HCE speakers in a particular speech event. The following text is one of the instances (Watson-Gegeo & Boggs 1977: 79):

A: You know ova deh? My dad was walkin op da mountin, æ?
P: Who? CHALLENGE
A: He saw one mountin lion. A followin him climb op da mountin, eh? He seen one mountin--
P: Who climb da mountin? CHALLENGE
A: My fa'ær, he cotchin one mountin lion.
P: Oh, cannot. CONTRADICTION
A: Yes he did! I betchu dolla.
P: He cannot. CONTRADICTION

In addition to a culturally specific feature in HCE described above, Lee (1990) provides an explanation for another particular phenomenon in HCE discourse. She investigates the speech act (illocutionary act) of *compliments* and *responses* in HCE, and compares them to those in SE from the standpoint of Cross-cultural Pragmatics (Levinson 1983, Green 1989, Kasper 1992) to show the difference between these two languages. What is interesting is the difference in responses to compliments in each of the languages. While SE takes 'Acceptance' as the most general response (56%) together with 'Acceptance with amendment' (30%) as the second most popular one, HCE marks very frequent use of 'Denial' as the major way of responding to a compliment (28.2%) in contrast to SE (only 7%). Lee explains that the fact that HCE prefers denial is because many ancestors of HCE speakers came from Asia. She
demonstrates that both Chinese and Japanese make very frequent use of denial as compliment responses. Her conclusion suggests that those characteristics of HCE might have transferred from their ancestral languages as substrate features.

So far, several features have been illustrated in each of the linguistic substructures (phonology, morpho-syntax, and discourse/pragmatics) in HCE. In addition, however, it seems necessary to comment on another variety of language in Hawai'i, considering the overall creole continuum in the state. It is mainland Standard English, i.e., SE, which is spoken mainly in the north-western part of the U.S. mainland. If we follow Bickerton's definitions, it seems possible to differentiate even acrolectal HCE from this variety of SE because of slight phonological discrepancies between them.

2.5. SOME IMPLICATIONS FOR THE STUDY OF HCE GENESIS

In sections 2.3. and 2.4., it was mentioned that HPE does not seem to have been stabilized yet when the first creolization took place in 1890s, and HCE emerged as early as in 1913. Recall the chronological creolization timeline (in 2.3.) made by four scholars for the present discussion: Reinecke (1969: 166), 1876-1925; Bickerton (personal communication), 1890-1920; Sato (1992), 1900-1920; and Roberts (1993, personal communication), 1890-1910 (Figure 2-1).

The fact that HPE was not stable might reinforce the universalist theory which regards the innate linguistic ability of children as the most important factor for creole genesis. This might imply that language may attain its structural sophistication and elaboration not only through diachronic gradual development but also through abrupt linguistic evolution achieved by the innate human ability to create language. This line of thought has been strongly supported by universalists in the field, and may be
strengthened if one takes into consideration how much early HPE and HCE differ though their age difference is just a few decades.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creolists/Years</th>
<th>1880</th>
<th>1885</th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1895</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1915</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1925</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reinecke 1969</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickerton 1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sato 1992</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roberts 1993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 2-1.** The creolization timeline for HCE

Moreover, what the above timelines indicate additionally is that creolization took place quite recently in the Hawai‘i islands. Bickerton (1981: 1) states: 'We can say that before 1530, there was no Sao Tomense; before 1650, no Sranan; before 1690, no Haitian Creole; and before 1880, no Hawaiian Creole.'

We see how young HCE is compared to other creoles mentioned above. The fact that HCE is young makes it possible for researchers to have access to the data of the earliest stages of HCE, which was produced by the speakers born at the time when creolization first occurred around roughly 1890 - 1900. HCE is about 90 years old now. In fact, the data that have been used for recent research included several subjects who were above 80 years of age and those tapes were recorded between 1980 to 1990. This implies that the subjects must have been born in early 1900s, which was not distant in time from the period when creolization was in an active process. Although HCE is so young, it is also true that **DECREOLIZATION** (or **METROPOLITANIZATION**, Hancock 1993) has been taking place in rather a rapid manner, which has been making HCE converge into SE 'at the societal, although not necessarily at the individual, level.' (Sato 1985: 265) The acceleration of decreolization, according to Sato (ibid.: 265-6), involves several factors.

---

16 According to Goodman (1985: 110), '[t]he island of S. Tome in West Africa was first colonized by Portugal in 1485 and there were a significant number of slaves there before 1500 (Ivens Ferraz 1979: 15-17, cited in Goodman ibid.). He also mentions that 'by 1681 there were already over 4,000 whites and 2,000 slaves.' (Vaissiere 1909: 21, cited in Goodman ibid.)
such as (a) the shift of working places from the plantations to the urban areas; (b) nationalism during and after World War II; (c) aspiration to higher socioeconomic status and middle class, suppressing HCE and ancestral languages; (d) escalation of tourism; and (e) more contact with mainlanders. It is natural, therefore, to think that some (but not all) varieties of HCE have undergone some linguistic changes toward more SE forms. Despite the existence of these varieties of HCE, it is fortunate that we are still able to have access to the speakers who were born in the early creolization period in Hawai‘i.\textsuperscript{17}

The creolization in Hawai‘i discussed so far works mainly in favor of the universalist hypothesis. Nonetheless, Hawai‘i offers some evidence which can support the SUBSTRATUM HYPOTHESIS on creole origins as well, especially in the area of discourse. One thing that can be investigated besides the input or linguistic trigger from a pidgin predecessor is whether there is any possibility that creole children received some influence directly from their parents' ancestral languages. First of all, it seems reasonable to assume that creole children can possibly utilize such background languages as a model to construct a discourse or narrative structure. A similar argument can be found in Romaine (1988: 293). For instance, in the case of Hawai‘i, early creole speakers were often bilingual, and sometimes even trilingual (Bickerton 1984, Sato 1985). In particular, the Japanese immigrants were conservative enough at the time to establish the Japanese language schools so that their children could preserve their culture and language (Huebner 1985: 35). This kind of thinking mainly came from parents' expectations that they would go back to their country when they became successful and earned enough money after working on the plantations for a certain

\textsuperscript{17}This does not imply that elderly speakers are free from being under the influence of younger speakers at all. Moreover, it is not the present author's intention to get into a rather classic debate regarding dialectologists' versus variational sociolinguists' views on the methodology of data elicitation or other forms of data collection. What should be understood here is merely the fact that it is possible to have access to the speakers who MAY retain some features closer to the original creole variety in Hawai‘i and then MAY BE analysts can isolate these.
period. This is not to deny the fact that pidgin languages such as Pidgin Hawaiian and HPE were spoken among different ethnic groups as a common means of communication. However, it is quite natural to suppose that the Japanese language was also principally used in some domains of their lives and working places, from the fact that half, or more than half of the population were the speakers of the language in question. (Detailed sociohistorical arguments will be offered in Chapter eight.)

Nagara (1972: 13) remarks on the strong influence of the Japanese language on the speech of Pidgin (HPE) speakers, by commenting that 'when Japanese predicate words occur, Japanese-ness of the structure supersedes Englishness of the same sentence, because the informants inevitably relied upon some basic rules of Japanese grammar.' Following is the example he proffers: You study suru [to do]-ka [Question particle]? or 'Do you study?' In this utterance, the verb study is used as a noun followed by a Japanese verbal suru. That is, this utterance has a SOV structure, which is the syntax of Japanese. In addition, Nagara's Appendix IV (ibid.: 287-322) includes many such utterances. The following text is adopted from Nagara ibid: 290 (English translation by the present writer):

But no. Anybody Japanese no, all same make, see. All same, all a kwauka (?), yeah. All church go.

"But, right?. Any Japanese, you know, all of them make the same thing, see. Everybody is the same, right? Everybody goes to the church."

So, us Japane come...wakaran. Any kind wakaran.

"So, we Japanese come, I don't know. I don't know anything."

Yeah. Store make. Me two store get.

"Yeah. I made store. I got two stores."

Anybody know. Look see. Look see nara, any kind look see.

"Anybody knows it, look and see. If I look and see, I look and see everything."

35
Moreover, Bickerton & Odo (1976: 126) point out that 'there was no Japanese pidgin speaker who did not include either Japanese lexical items, or grammatical morphemes, or both,' and go on to discuss three main syntactic phenomena that have been powerfully influenced by the Japanese language: 1) SOV word order, 2) temporal expressions, and 3) relativization. First of all, as coincides with Nagara's claim, SOV is the most salient feature of Japanese syntax that is distinguished from the word order in English, i.e., SVO. This SOV word order can also be found in HPE. Bickerton & Odo state (ibid.: 133):

> SOV sentence order is, to the speaker of English, perhaps the single most striking feature which distinguishes the syntax of Japanese pidgin speakers from that of, for example, Filipino pidgin speakers, and all creole speakers without exception.

Second, they argue that the temporal adverbial phrases/clauses of the pattern in X-time in HPE, such as 'mil-hapai-taim' (When I took [the coffee] to the mill) or 'bat mikam-taim' (But when I came), were derived from the Japanese temporal expression X-toki as in 'miru e hakonda toki' (When I took [the coffee] to the mill) or 'watashi ga kita toki' (When I came). This structure is similar to the third category of syntax, that is, relativized sentences. Nonetheless, relativized sentences are much rarer than temporal sentences in the speech of pidgin speakers, which led to the conclusion that 'they (i.e., temporal and relativized sentences) are not "psychologically" the same.' (Bickerton & Odo ibid.: 137) In other words, 'it is more important, or perhaps important more often, to specify the time of an occurrence than to establish the precise identity of some person or object.' In the case of relativized sentences, one can conclude that non-use of relative clauses in HPE can be understood as an influence from Japanese because of rare use of the clauses in question. Finally, they state that 'the three areas surveyed by no means exhaust the scope of that (Japanese) influence.' (144)
Furthermore, in addition to the above illustration on HPE syntax, Masuda (in press-a) follows a similar line of discussion, and claims that there is evidence of Japanese substratal influence on HCE discourse as well. The main concern of that paper is a particular type of utterance structure in HCE named by the author the DOLLAR UTTERANCE\textsuperscript{18}, and this structure might be regarded as deviant in terms of SE syntax and semantics despite the fact that the present lexifier is SE. Nonetheless, such an utterance seems to reflect a certain discourse process called TSR FORMATION. In TSR formation, three discourse representations -- THEME, SCHEME, RHEME -- interact. These representations exist either in the discourse itself, or in speaker/hearer's background knowledge about the real world, society, and culture (i.e., SCHEMA). Tannen (1979) claims that such a linguistic phenomenon is caused by the human cognitive activity that she calls UNDERLYING EXPECTATIONS. Furthermore, from the viewpoint of pidgin and creole linguistics, it is argued that the discourse process, TSR formation, could have come from the Japanese language as a substratum when HPE was becoming established. This feature in discourse processes, then, seems to have been handed down to HCE. That is to say, the Japanese language could have affected the way creole children constructed cohesive narratives and conversations. Chapter eight will suggest that the Japanese substratum must have influenced HCE. The following chapter describes the framework of Verse analysis and discusses its relationship with other models of discourse theories.

\textsuperscript{18}The name DOLLAR UTTERANCE comes from the example utterance: 'Planteishen waz stil dala a det.'
CHAPTER 3
THE FRAMEWORK:
VERSE ANALYSIS

"Questions as to the origin, development, and role of pidgin and creole languages include questions about the patterning of discourse in them. Some languages have been found to show patterning of a sort that has been called measured verse."
Dell Hymes (1990b: 71)

3.1. MEASURED VERSE AND NARRATIVE DISCOURSE

The research in narrative analysis begun by Dell Hymes has significance for pidgin and creole linguistics in general, from both theoretical and descriptive standpoints (Hymes 1981, 1983, 1987, 1990a, 1990b, 1992a; Hymes & Zenk 1987; Virginia Hymes 1987). Hymes has originated a model of analysis that he calls VERSE ANALYSIS. In this analytical model, he hypothesizes that narrative discourse manifests grammatico-semantic recurrence within a frame as its base which is called MEASURED VERSE. A narrative is broken into a hierarchy of five substructures depending on both linguistic (e.g., predicates, particles, content, etc.) and pragmatic features (e.g., reference of time, location, person, and topic) to construct a structurally organized and rhetorically coherent underlying representation. These five substructures are called LINE, VERSE, STANZA, SCENE, and ACT, respectively. According to Hymes (1990b:

1These works of Hymes have influenced anthropologists more than linguists. Exceptions are James Paul Gee and Nancy H. Hornberger, who have been applying Hymes's framework in research on Black Vernacular English and Quechua, respectively. This model may be able to unravel the complex fabric of discourse organization in creole languages.
2Acknowledging Sapir (1917, cited in Hymes 1981) and Corman (1976, cited in Hymes ibid.), Hymes (ibid.: 178) characterizes his use of the term measured verse as 'grammatico-semantic repetition within a frame as its base.'
single lines or short sequences of lines, are found to be marked as units (i.e., verses) that enter into patterned relationships each other. In traditional narratives there is typically a hierarchy, such that sets of verses (i.e., stanzas) form larger sequences (i.e., scenes), and one or more scenes may constitute an act. As he indicates in the above quotation, the second level, i.e., verse, is regarded as the basic level in a narrative structure which is expected to take a certain pattern number. And he also points out that 'the number of units in a stanza, scene, or act typically is that of one or the other of a pair of pattern numbers. Where five is a pattern number, it is associated with three. Where four is a pattern number, it is associated with two.'

Hymes analyzed narratives in Native American languages to find that their structures follow a restricted pattern of numbering such as unmarked preference of 3-5 in Chinookan and Kalapuya, and unmarked preference of 2-4 in Tonkawa. Furthermore, he goes on to state that a patterned and numbered verse structure is a potential universal principle in pidgin and creole languages as well, though preference of number totally relies on each cultural background. He comments (1990b: 101-2):

I have detected similar patterning of lines and groups of lines in two languages of the Pacific: Hawaiian Pidgin English (in a paragraph published by Bickerton 1981: 13), and Kriol, a language of Australia (see Hymes 1988c). Such a wide and independent distribution of a restricted set of alternatives suggests something inherent and universal.

The above remarks suggest that the features which Hymes claims to be inherent and universal might be part of narrative grammar (Labov & Waletzky 1967, Labov 1972, Rumelhart 1980, Hymes 1982, Gee & Kegl 1983, Gee & Grosjean 1984, Romaine 1983).

3 The practice of investigating the relation among subsegments of a narrative or a text structure is quite common in linguistic discourse analysis, and several different proposals have been made so far to identify such units. Longacre points out (1992: 114): 'No one who works for long and in detail with text analysis can avoid positing a set of relations to explain how the segments of the text relate to each other.' Following are some concepts of internal discourse structures in recent research: (1) propositions - configurations - messages/discourse (Callow & Callow 1992); (2) micropropositions - macropropositions - top-level structure (Meyer 1992); (3) the microsegmentation - the macrosegmentation - the schema/superstructure (Longacre 1992).
1985) in any natural language. Or there may possibly be particular common features that exist uniquely in pidgin and creole languages. Then, the narrative grammar can be determined from either of two sources: innate or functional properties. For the former explanation, Gee (1985: 11) states:

Because language is acquired early and rapidly, without training or instruction, linguists argue that human beings are biologically equipped to develop language, given the appropriate triggering experiences. I would suggest that the same model can be applied to the human ability to narrativize experience. Thus, no human, under normal conditions, fails to make sense when narrativizing his or her experience.

The latter explanation of the two, a functional factor, is related by Hymes to his Verse Analysis as follows (1990b: 102):5

A functional explanation, however, is possible as well. One might reason in the following way. If discourse is to be infused with recurrent relationships, capable of organizing successive levels, from line and verse through stanza, scene, and act, pairs and triads are the minimal alternatives. If the patterning is to be flexible, sustaining interest rather than dulling it, style woven fine with the possibility of personal voice, options are desirable.

In any case, it is assumed that there may be universal principles that can construct cohesive discourse. Those universal principles can be applied to any languages including pidgins and creoles, or be the principles such as the ones compared to TMA system or bioprogram (Bickerton 1981, 1984, 1988, 1991, 1992b) in syntax, which only apply to pidgin and creole languages. Nevertheless, Hymes concludes at the end of the same article as follows:

The presence of such patterning in pidgin and creole languages need not be evidence for a biological basis of such languages, but may be evidence for historical continuity of cultural traditions. (103)

---

4 The term narrative grammar here covers broadly the senses which are conveyed by these scholars: the linguistic competence to construct a structure beyond the sentence-level, the ability of narrativizing experiences, and story grammar. Gee (1990: 125) introduces the term the human narrative/discourse competence to refer to these concepts above.

5 Givón (1984) and Newmeyer (1991) are also interesting discussions, dealing with linguistic universals from the functional point of view. A discussion on universality is given in Chapter six in this dissertation.
This conclusion might follow from a hypothesis that such structural patterning involves both universal and cultural elements of narrative patterning. In other words, we may ask what features of structural patterning are part of universals and which aspects come from distinct cultural properties or substratal influence. Essentially, this aspect of inquiry is exactly what is focused on in the present research. The mere fact that there exists such restricted sets of lines and verses might be a universal feature. On the other hand, there may be other characteristics that are culturally specific, such as preference of a certain numbering, existence of particular devices to signal subunits of discourse, or some differences in a patterning of level structures (i.e., line, verse, stanza, scene, and act) and content structures.6

Gee (1985, 1986, 1989, 1990, 1993), for example, has been utilizing another applied model called STANZA ANALYSIS in his investigation of Black Vernacular English (BVE henceforth). His model includes only four levels of structure: LINE, STANZA (Hymes's verse), SECTION (This term covers both 'stanza' and 'scene' in Hymes), and ACT. Gee (1986) argues that a type of narrative in oral culture which is not influenced by written literature, tends to manifest explicit verse patterns that he calls POETIC narratives.7 Gee (1990: 124-5) claims that there is a great deal of similarity between the structures found in a BVE speaker's stories and those found in oral narratives from oral cultures. Such poetic characteristics, however, do not express

---

6Grimes (1975: 107) comments on the substructural discrepancies of text units among different languages as follows: 'There are variations on the main pattern; for example, in many languages of Papua New Guinea there is no useful distinction between the sentence and the paragraph, in some of the Mayan languages of Middle America it is difficult and probably structurally unnecessary to tell a word from a phrase, and in some languages of Vietnam, clauses and sentences are not sharply differentiated.'

7McLuhan (cited in Finnegon 1977: 259) defines oral culture as follows: 'Oral culture is culture in which written literature has been relatively recent and the traditional forms of communication are dependent on "oral" not "visual" means.' Ong (1982: 11), in addition, identifies two different types of oral cultures: 'I style the orality of a culture totally untouched by any knowledge of writing or print, "primary orality." It is "primary" by contrast with the "secondary orality" of present-day high technology culture, in which a new orality is sustained by telephone, radio, television, and other electronic devices that depend for their existence and functioning on writing and print.' Gee's usage of the term oral culture seems to be based on that of McLuhan though its meaning parallels also to primary orality in Ong's sense.
themselves very overtly but are obscured in literary narratives which he calls PROSAIC narratives. In other words, oral narratives, Gee argues, are poetic, whereas literary narratives are likely to be more prosaic. At the same time, he also mentions (1990: 125) that there are some different characteristics in surface performance in different cultures. This comment can be explained in terms of cultural tradition and continuity in Hymes's term, or the technical term substratal influence (that each language has inherited) might be appropriate when discussing creoles. Furthermore, by carrying out structural and content analysis of such patterns, it might be discovered that there is a certain cultural layer in rhetorical organization which is totally specific to a given creole language. In fact, Hymes & Zenk (1987: 446) say that 'What is particularly striking in the (Chinook Jargon) text is that it displays the kind of "verse" patterning found in the Indian languages.' Hymes also remarks (1990b: 71) that 'Chinook Jargon texts show patterns of the same kind as found in the speaker's respective Indian languages.' He goes on to say that he found both 3-5 and 2-4 numberings in Chinook Jargon. The 3-5 numbering is found in CJ narrative made by a native speaker of Chinookan and 2-4 is found in that made by a native speaker of Nootka (72). These comments imply substratal influences, and this in turn suggests that Hymes's narrative analytic approach, Verse Analysis, is a promising framework to distinguish universal and substrate characteristics in creole languages in general as well as in HCE in particular.

Turning back to the issue of HCE, it seems necessary, first of all, to seek the characteristics of discourse structure which coincide with what Hymes claims to be universal and inherent. Then, the distinction between poetic and prosaic narratives

---

8In a sense, this approach seems to be in a different direction from Hymes's. That is to say, Hymes is interested in extending his idea of universality of measured verse to other natural languages including SE, while Gee limits his notion of poetic structure to what is shared only by languages in oral cultures.
suggests that some differences could be found between HCE narrative and that of Standard English (SE).\(^9\) Sato (1989: 274) explicitly points out:

> The studies of linguistic minority students' classroom experiences that have been reviewed thus far indicate the existence of systematic differences at the discourse level between BEV (Black English Vernacular) and SE and between HCE and SE. Such differences undoubtedly exist for other varieties of English as well but have yet to be extensively studied.

Those characteristics may be accounted for, according to the discussion in the preceding texts, by making reference to three different factors: (1) the features that may be unique to pidgin & creole languages; (2) common characteristics of languages in oral cultures in Gee's terms;\(^{10}\) and (3) some non-universal characteristics that exist in HCE as a cultural tradition or a substratal influence from its ancestral languages.\(^{11}\) Characteristic (3) has been explored by some in the study of HCE such as Forman et al. (1973), Watson (1972), Watson-Gegeo & Boggs (1977), Purcell-Komenaka (1979, 1984), and Lee (1990) as described in Chapter two, and in addition, Sato & Watson-Gegeo (1992), and Masuda (in press-a). Before embarking on the issue it seems desirable to introduce the narrative levels that Hymes proposed in his Verse Analysis, and illustrate how those levels are related to pre-existing investigation of discourse units carried out by other scholars. The next section also introduces a modified version of Verse Analysis. This modified version will be the main framework utilized in this research.

---

\(^9\)See Chapter 2, 2.4, for the discussion on the linguistic status of HCE.

\(^{10}\)There may be some different features between creole oral culture and non-creole oral culture. However, there is not enough evidence to claim such a distinction at this moment, and the answer to the question has to rely on future research.

\(^{11}\)In addition to Gee's explanation, Michaels & Collins (1984: 232) mention that BVE or an oral discourse style relies on 'more prosodic cues such as duration and special contouring to signal agent focus, causal connections, and so forth' while SE or a literary discourse style uses 'a wide variety of lexical and syntactic devices to signal agent focus, causal connections, old vs new distinctions and coreference relations.' They use the term oral discourse style on the ground that 'prosodic cues such as duration and contouring, although essential for oral communication, are precisely what is not available in written language.'
3.2. DISCOURSE UNITS

As mentioned earlier, Hymes's framework will be modified in this study because of the following three reasons: 1) to facilitate analytical devices that can deal with particular features which are found in a) GC, b) HCE, c) Japanese, and/or d) all of the three; 2) to present an explicit description for the technique of analysis so that non-experts in this type of approach can follow discussions more clearly; and 3) to seek a meaning-based analysis. It is the principal task here, however, to first introduce Hymes's definition of each of the five levels of discourse units in his original Verse Analysis. Then, those levels are compared to some of the other related concepts of discourse organization proposed by other scholars, in order to demonstrate that those different concepts of discourse units, in fact, share something in common. This comparison seeks to identify universal subcomponents in an underlying discourse structure and the representation of it. Finally, the revised version of the framework of Verse Analysis is introduced in section 3.4. Let us first examine the five units (i.e., lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts) that Hymes characterizes in the following words (1990b: 90):

LINES are identified in terms of predicate phrases, and indicated by Arabic numerals.

VERSES are groups of lines, discerned in terms of certain markers and sequential relationships; they are indicated by lower case English letter (a, b, c, etc.). 'And' frequently occurs as the first word of a verse. Verses are also marked at certain points by paired lexical repetition.

STANZAS are groups of one or more verses, discerned in terms of certain kinds of sequential patterns, and are indicated by upper case English letters (A, B, C, etc.).

SCENES are groups of one or more stanzas, often associated with change of scene (time, location) and/or participant, and here, often, a marker: they are indicated by small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii, etc.).

---

12Hymes model, as mentioned earlier, has been designed in the course of working principally on narrative in Native American languages.
ACTS are groups of one or more scenes and are indicated by large Roman numerals (I, II, III, etc.; cf. Hymes 1981, chapter 4).

First of all, the first level of Verse Analysis is called LINE, and it belongs to the interpretation units proposed in Chapter one. A line is signaled by a predicate phrase. The closest notion to this discourse unit is idea units, designated by Kroll (1977), and elaborated by Chafe (1980). Kroll (ibid.: 89-90) defines the concept as 'a chunk of information which is viewed by the speaker/writer cohesively as it is given a surface form.' She provides the following criteria to identify the unit (90). Let us compare these criteria to Hymes's to see what is similar and what is different.

1) a subject and verb counted as one idea unit together with (when present) a (a) direct object, (b) prepositional phrase, (c) adverbial element, or (d) mark of subordination

2) full relative clauses counted as one idea unit when the relative pronoun was present

3) phrases which occurred in sentence initial position followed by a comma or which were set off from the sentence with commas were counted as separate idea units

4) verbs whose structure requires or allows a verbal element as object were counted with both verbal elements as one idea unit

5) reduced clauses in which a subordinator was followed by a non-finite verb element were counted as one idea unit

6) post-nominal -ing phrases used as modifiers counted as one idea unit

7) other types of elements counted as idea units were (a) absolutes, (b) appositives, and (c) verbals

13Kroll (ibid.: 89-90) mentions that 'it (an idea unit) is related more to psychological reality for the encoder than to a grammatical analysis of its form.' (a parenthesis added) This remark seems correct; however, extensive work still has to be done to elaborate operational definitions in discourse to be called universal rather than particular features in the English language.

14The original idea units analysis in Kroll (ibid.) is applied also to written texts.
These operational criteria seem to be morpho-syntactically determined, and to the extent that she takes grammar as a main factor to identify discourse units, her approach parallels that of Hymes's who regards a *predicate phrase* as the principal definition of a line.15

Chafe (ibid.: 14), on the other hand, shows six characteristics of the idea units. He found those characteristics in the analysis of the well-known *Pear Stories*: 1) clause-final intonation; 2) pausing; 3) clause-predicate verb; 4) conjunction *and*; 5) a two-second period; and 6) a sequence of six words. Notice that the initial and second criteria that Chafe sets are intonation and a pause respectively, rather than the structural/meaning factors which are favored by Kroll. Tedlock (1983, 1987, 1992) has strongly supported this line of argument which tries to capture discourse units in terms of prosody and paralinguistic elements (e.g., pitch, voice quality, pause, etc.) rather than grammatical/semantic cues. He comments (1983):

While it may be that past translations of Zuni narratives have suffered somewhat from neglect of the "linguistic" features of style discussed above, they have suffered much more from neglect of "oral" or "paralinguistic" features such as voice quality (tone of voice), loudness, and pausing. (45)

At the outset it is necessary to introduce what I like to call "lines," which cut across patterns of stress and pitch. Each line is an uninterrupted sequence of sounds, falling between two silences. (180)

So far we have been placing parallel units one beneath the other, which certainly gives full visual display of their syntactic construction, but listening to tape-recordings of actual oral delivery suggests a different approach. (226)

Scholars such as Brown & Yule, however, challenge the rationalization behind a prosodic/paralinguistic approach, though they appear to support pausing analysis. They claim: 'A number of people working on intonation in discourse have found a problem with the principled identification of tone groups by phonological criteria alone.

---

15 The numbers 3 and 6 in Kroll's operational definitions do not necessarily parallel Hymes's criterion for line. It is because of her approach to treat independent and subordinate clauses equally when she identifies idea units (ibid.: 80-1).
and have resorted to working with units bounded by pauses in the stream of speech.' (Brown & Yule 1983: 160-61) Hymes, in addition, downplays the importance of the paralinguistic criteria: 'From a linguistic, theoretical point of view, there is a problem with determining the organization of lines by pauses.' (Hymes 1982: 125) One of the examples which favors the latter has been presented by Chafe himself (ibid.: 23-5). He introduces a narrative discourse in German which consists of forty lines but has only one sentence-final intonation at the very end. If the prosodic factor only (i.e., a sentence-final intonation) is taken into consideration for that German narrative to identify an unit, a researcher is obliged to conclude that the narrative consists of just a single discourse unit. However, it is not likely that a narrative which consists of forty lines does not have any internal structures. It is likely, on the contrary, that the structure/meaning approach can reveal other internal structures in the narrative in question.

Halliday (1967) and Grimes (1975), moreover, use the terms information units and information blocks, respectively, to discuss the notions which are parallel to lines. Grimes (ibid.: 274) defines those concepts as 'the package of information that the speaker thinks his hearer can take in at one time.' Then, he goes on to say that 'in English its extent is signaled by a single intonation contour, while in Oksapmin it is delimited not only by intonation but by verbal inflection as well.' The first factor that he takes here, i.e., prosody, is shared by Chafe, whereas the second one, morphosyntax, is by Hymes as the principal features to determine the units, that is, idea units and lines, respectively.16 Sato (1988: 83-4)'s term an utterance or 'a stream of speech under a single intonation contour boundary by pauses' should, according to her (personal communication 3/16/95), be conceptually distinguished from a component

---

16 Please recall again (chapter 1) that the cover term interpretation units is used in this research to refer to these units: T-units; C-units; idea units; information units; information blocks; and lines.
that is semantically determined. Therefore, it may by appropriate to classify it not as a coherency unit.

The second and the basic level, a VERSE, as Hymes states, is the heart of the matter, which consists of a group of lines, and is one of the coherency units. A verse seems to be the immediate substructure larger than a sentence. The most related concept to verses seems to be Chafe's extended sentences, which, he claims, represent a coherent mental image. This mental image described also as a center of interest is the scanning process in the speaker's cognitive model, and it acts as the intermediate unit between idea units and the whole memory for a narrative. He explains (1980: 26):

We are in some sense able to remember stories as wholes, and we are able to focus our consciousness on small pieces of information within such memories. It therefore makes sense that we should sometimes find speakers giving closure to an entire memory, and sometimes to a single focus. But are there other kinds of cognitive units, intermediate between single focuses and entire memories, to which closure can also be given? That intonational sentences in the pear film narratives have a mean length of about three idea units suggests that there are such units.

Chafe (ibid.: 27) provides the following example, and states that it is the mental image of a scene that a speaker has at the moment of narration. Moreover, it is also the focus of the narration conveying several things which are simultaneously true. According to him, extended sentences are usually signaled with sentence-final intonation and completed with syntactic closure (26).

(a) The movie opened up on this [.3] nice scene,
(b) [.35] it was in the country,
(c) . . . it was oaks,
(d) . . . it was seemed like West Coast.17

He goes on to say that 'sentences per se, whether intonationally or syntactically defined, are less expressive of cognitive interests than are extended sentences.' (36)

---

17The numbers in brackets are pauses described by 1/10 sec.
Incidentally, there is an interesting observation Chafe has made that there might be a good reason for making a fundamental qualitative difference between idea units and a center of interest or extended sentences. He (ibid.: 39-40) states that, while idea units are constrained by processing limitations, 'a center of interest is not a unit of information processing -- not a unit of perception, storage, or recall. Rather, it appears to result from variable intellectual judgments -- the kind of judgments that may be made on the spot during the ongoing process of verbalization.' Nonetheless, it will turn out in Chapter six, although it works for SE, that this explanation is not able to account for the facts of poetic structure in HCE, in which a unit of information processing seems to exist in verse level (i.e., the intermediate level or the extended sentences in Chafe's concept). 18

Furthermore, Crookes & Rulon (1985), and Shewan (1988) use the term utterances (Sato's multi-propositional utterances) describing units of discourse similar to verses. Crookes (1990: 187) draws attention to a definition for the term: Crookes & Rulon (ibid.: 9), 'an utterance [is] defined as a stream of speech with at least one of the following characteristics -- [1] under one intonation contour; [2] bounded by pauses; and [3] constituting a single semantic unit.' This definition considers prosodic and paralinguistic features as the principal factor to identify utterances, which parallels Tedlock's approach. 19 The concept of a single intonation contour adopted by Crookes & Rulon coincides with Chafe's a sentence-final intonation.

As can be seen later in this section, however, [3] is regarded as the most fundamental signal of a verse pattern in the present version of Verse Analysis. Labov & Waletzky (1967), and Labov (1972), classic but pioneer works in narrative analysis, 18Chafe's distinction between information process and intellectual judgment in discourse seems to be associated with the dichotomy of reference and evaluative functions of narrative which was proposed by Labov & Waletzky (1967).
19Forman (p.c. 3/94): 'An utterance is always context-particular, context-specific.'
take semantics as the underlying form of a narrative. They state (Labov & Waletzky ibid.: 29-30):

The definitions we have given for narrative units are deliberately applied to the linear sequence presented by the narrator. This linear sequence may be considered the surface structure of the narrative; there are often many narratives with rather different surface structures, but with equivalent semantic interpretation. (emphasis added)

According to them, the surface form of narrative is related to its *evaluative function* by which the speaker shows how s/he narrativizes the past event. On the other hand, the underlying semantic interpretation is associated with the *reference function* of narrative by which the temporal sequence is maintained through the narrative based on the facts of a given story. Most recently, in addition, Callow & Callow (1992) take meaning as the most essential factor in identifying discourse units, and adopt the term *configurations* as the intermediate level between *propositions* and *messages*, which roughly correspond to lines and acts respectively in Verse Analysis. Since configurations can include any of the intermediate levels, their sizes are 'immaterial.' Nonetheless, the notion of configurations seems to share the characteristic that can be compared to verses (and possibly stanzas) in Verse Analysis. Callow & Callow (ibid.: 9) explain as in the following words:

Related propositions constitute a configuration. The clauses *Mary blushed* and *Simon laughed*, do not, as they stand, realise a configuration, because their relationship is not clear. But *Mary blushed because Simon laughed*, does realise a configuration. *When Mary blushed, Simon laughed*, realises a different configuration: the units are the same but the coherence relation is different.

Here it is understood that a configuration connects propositions by manifesting their coherent relation. This function parallels that of a verse, a coherency unit as defined in 3.4., which packs some lines or predication units. Verse Analysis comes up to the following structural arrangement for the two configurations discussed in the above quotation.

---

20 Please recall again (chapter 1) that the cover term *coherency units* is used in this research to refer to these units: utterances; extended sentences; configurations; strophes; and verses.
Mary blushed, because Simon laughed. However, the first sequence of propositions given prior to the above two does not, as Callow & Callow claim, realize a configuration. Thus,

?/* V L Mary blushed,
L Simon laughed.

The third level, STANZA, is associated with Longacre's (1979, 1983, 1992) paragraphs which is the intermediate level of organization between a sentence and a discourse according to his classification. If his definition is kept, it is possible for the notion of paragraph to cover all of the intermediate levels which are larger than a sentence and smaller than a discourse. Nonetheless, Grimes implies that there are next higher levels than paragraphs as explained in his quote below. The fourth level, a SCENE, seems to be related to Wrigglesworth's (ms, cited in Grimes 1975: 109) episodes and incidents. According to Grimes (ibid.: 109-110), these levels 'are not simply strings of paragraphs, but which have their own characteristics.' He further cites Wrigglesworth's explanation as in the following quote:

Episode settings always involve a change of participant orientation and scene from the previous incident in the story...While the opening incident of an episode takes its temporal setting from the speech of the participant thematized in the episode setting, settings for subsequent incidents are defined by their motion away from or their return to the previous setting... Incidents nearly always conclude with evaluative paragraphs.

From the comment above, it seems reasonable to propose the linear order of paragraphs -- episodes, which might parallel stanzas -- scenes. The ACT level is identified by identical features with scenes. Yet, it is a broader unit which consists of a group of scenes. An act is the analytical unit which constitutes the maximum level of organization within a single narrative. It is the case that, while some narratives may consist of just a single act, within the narrative, others might be composed of several of
those acts. The concept of acts is shared by Callow & Callow's (1992) messages, and Meyer's (1992) the top-level structure.

In sum, each of the substructural levels in Verse Analysis can be compared with each of the other concepts of discourse units. First, lines are categorized as one of those interpretation units which usually stand for discourse units smaller than sentences in syntax, and manifest speakers' minimal mental representation for an event or an idea. Verses belong to coherency units which represent the next larger cohesive structural unit beyond sentences. Stanzas and scenes seem to be the intermediate levels between coherency units and the maximum level of a narrative or a text in a given framework of analysis (e.g., see note 2). Acts are understood as to be parallel to such maximum levels in analyses. Although researchers take different approaches to identify those discourse units by taking into consideration a variety of indicators such as paralinguistic factors, prosody, particles, predication, meaning, and pragmatic junctures, the outcomes of analyses do not crucially differ in identifying the units, but resemble one another. Bright writes (1982: 173-4):

Building on the work of Tedlock and Hymes, I have attempted in earlier publications (Bright, 1979, 1980) to identify units of poetic structure in the myths of the Karok tribe of California, and to produce English translations in a corresponding poetic form. Studying a tape-recorded text both with the approach of Tedlock -- focusing on the expressive features of performance -- and with the approach of Hymes -- identifying verses etc. in terms of linguistic structure -- I find that the two approaches coincide 90 percent of the time in their identification of basic units. This gives me confidence that occasional ambiguities of one approach can be resolved by reference to the other.

The version of the Verse Analytical framework to be used in this dissertation is presented in section 3.4.

3.3. POETIC VS PROSAIC NARRATIVES

In section 3.1., it is mentioned that Hymes claims that the existence of patterning and numbering in narrative structure is universal. He has not merely presented
evidence in Native American languages but also mentioned the further possibility of finding evidence in pidgin and creole languages. He also implies that the feature may be shared by other natural languages, too (Hymes 1987: 18-9). On the other hand, Gee prefers to make a distinction between languages in oral cultures (e.g., Black Vernacular English, Gee 1986) and those which are in literary cultures including Standard English, and argues that there are apparent differences in their narrative organizations. Although it seems inappropriate to make a dichotomy in two discrete types of languages, it is of interest to see what Gee means by the concept of poetic.

Thus, this section illustrates, first of all, what kind of characteristics the narrative construction called POETIC narrative presents in terms of an organization which both Hymes and Gee recognize. Then, secondly, what Gee means by PROSAIC narrative is examined by comparing some data of Standard English to the first type of poetic narrative in the two examples of Chinook Jargon that Hymes has provided. To start with, let us look at some narratives in Chinook Jargon from Hymes & Zenk 1987 in (1), and Hymes 1990b in (2). Those narratives have been translated into English. The notations used in the texts are as follows, according to Hymes (ibid.: 90): lines = Arabic numerals (1, 2, 3); verses = lower case English letters (a, b, c); stanzas = upper case English letters (A, B, C); scenes = small Roman numerals (i, ii, iii); and acts = large Roman numerals (I, II, III). The presentation of the texts and the tables has been slightly modified from the original ones for the purpose of the present discussion.

(1) MRS. RIGGS’S TEXT
WHEN I WENT DOWN THE CREEK TO THAT OLD LADY’S

[1] [First visit]
[a] Well, my father always said, 1
"Never are you to go there.
Great supernatural power.
Never."

[b] Well, I think, 5
I will go see
myself 6

53
[i]  a. Well, later take off all my things,  
    my shoes I hang.  
    I hang them by the creek.
    
b. Now I go down to the creek,
    
c. Now I go in the water,
    
d. Now I arrive there.
    

[B]  a. I do like so [gesture of pulling aside] to the quilt
      over that door;
      Not does she see what happens;
      now she beckons with her hand:
      "Come".
      I go (in).
      

[C]  a. Now I sit, like so [turned away from her].
    
b. And she makes fire-toasted bread.
    
c. Now she makes fire-toasted.
    
d. I think,
    
e. "If I should eat this,
      "Then my mouth will turn every which way
      [it will turn crooked]"
      

[D]  a. Well, she breaks it into several pieces.
      She says,
      "Here you eat this."
      
b. Ohh indeed I could think of just nothing (to do).
      
c. Now I take that bread,
      I put it into my mouth.
      
d. Now I eat.
      
e. Now I put my hand to my mouth:
      (in) no way (is anything wrong with) my mouth.
      

[E]  a. Now I sit the same as she [turned to be with her].
    
b. Now I eat,
      I eat until it's gone:
      never (did a) thing happen.
      
c. I do some thinking:
      "Oh, they just lied."
THOMAS PAUL'S SAMETL

SAMETL PREPARES

Samuel was really fast

a. He was a powerful man long ago.
   No way at all they could beat him.
   Really knew how to go fast.
   He would come to this side,
   come to some one village,
   want to fight,
   mean

b. And people come together:
   "Good we hurry to that man's house.
   "And then we fight his people."

c. And the people hurry,
   two canoes go back,
   full of people.

d. And they hurry,
   go to the other side,
   not far from shore:
   Sametl is waiting.

That's enough

He decides to get a small wolf, and prepares

a. Sametl saw a small wolf

b. And he thought,
   he would get that small wolf.

c. And Sametl ran on home,
   he went to his house.

d. And he fixed his house well,
   he made his house strong.

Well, enough of that

He took a small canoe,
ran to his canoe,
and waiting in the canoe was his paddle.

b. He hurried to Mill Bay,
   and he reached Mill Bay.

c. And he saw the water,
   it would run (out).

d. And he stayed waiting for that tide,
   it would go (out), that tide.
Table 3-1 and 3-2 show that both of the Chinook Jargon texts above, Mrs. Riggs's and Paul's, reveal the patterning in five substructures of lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts, indicated by the cues proposed by Hymes. Mrs. Riggs's text (1) described in Table 3-1, first of all, consists of 3 acts, which are composed of 3, 1, and 3 scenes, respectively. Those seven scenes include 1, 5, 1, 3, 3, 3, and 3 stanzas for each of them in that order. Moreover, eleven out of the total nineteen stanzas show a preference for 3 verses as the most frequent number (58%), together with 5 as the next frequent number (21%). That is, 79% of verses follow 3-5 numbering. Line levels, however, do not seem to show as explicit a numbering preference as verses do. Out of the total sixty-two verses, twenty four consist of a single line (39%), twelve 2 (19%), thirteen 3 (21%), six 4 (9%), three 5 (4%), two 6 (4%), one 7 (2%), and one 9-line (2%). As far as lines only are concerned, the most frequent number is 1 whereas the next frequent number is 3. From the above-described number preferences in which
verses go in triads and quintuplets, this text of Mrs. Riggs's seems to show 3-5 numbering as a whole.

On the other hand, Paul's text (2) in Table 3-2 demonstrates a slightly different narrative structure in numbering from Mrs. Riggs's. The text consists of 2 acts, which are composed of 4 scenes in each of the two. Those eight scenes include 1, 2, 1, 2, 2, 2, and 1 stanzas for each of them in that order. Moreover, eleven out of the total thirteen stanzas show a preference for 4 verses as the most frequent number (85%) with a single 2 and a single 8 as the next frequent number. Out of the total fifty-four verses, nineteen consist of a single line (35%), twenty-four 2 (44%), eight 3 (15%), two 4 (4%), and one 7 (2%) line. As far as lines are concerned, the most frequent number is 2 whereas the next frequent number is 1. From those number preferences in which verses go in quadruplets and doublets, this text of Paul's seems to show 4-2 numbering preference.21 Based on the illustrations so far, it can generally be stated that Poetic

---

21 According to Hymes (1990b: 102), a patterning tends to be either pairs or triads as the minimal successive alternatives. He also mentions (Hymes ibid.: 72 or see p.1 of the present chapter) that it is
narratives are described in terms of four general characteristics: (1) the text can be divided into five basic levels, i.e., lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts; (2) Lines are rather short (some six words, according to Chafe's idea units' analysis), which are sometimes grouped in the restricted number, usually the same as that of the verse or the other of the pair number; (3) verses present either 4-2 or 3-5 as the minimal alternatives for numbering preference; and finally, (4) the distinction between lines and verses can clearly be observed.

Contrary to the poetic narrative structures analyzed in the preceding discussion, there are some other narratives that do not manifest poetic structure in question. Gee argues (as mentioned in section 3.1.) that in literary narratives such as those of Standard English, the poetic characteristics do not appear overtly but are obscured, and he calls these prosaic narratives. Gee states (1986: 403):

The amount of structural parallelism across lines and stanzas will be culturally specific, though the phenomena itself is quite pervasive across cultures. Where it exists, it will be a crucial marker of line and stanza structure. Where it doesn't exist, we may be tempted to believe that the above units do not exist, as they will somewhat hidden. In fact, I still suggest a distinction between "poetic" narrative performance and "prosaic" narrative performance in terms of this (and related) features. Narratives that mark out these units with structural parallelism, I will refer to as "poetic"; those that do not, I will refer to as "prosaic."

The following texts are fragments of discourse data excerpted from Gee 1990: 118 and from 1986: 406 to illustrate a poetic narrative in BVE in (3), and a prosaic narrative in SE in (4), respectively:

(3) THE PUPPY STORY
SECTION 1: HOME
Section 1A: Opening Scene: Breakfast
Stanza 1
1 Last yesterday in the morning
2 there was a hook on the top of the stairway
3 an' my father was pickin' me up

verses that take a certain patterned number. Thus, it seems tenable to say that this text is 4-2 rather than 2-4 because of the fact that verses, which are the basis in Verse Analysis, show a preference for number 4 but not 2.
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an I got stuck on the hook up there

Stanza 2 5 an' I hadn't had breakfast
6 he wouldn't take me down
7 until I finished all my breakfast
8 cause I didn't like oatmeal either

Section 1B: The Puppy and the Father

Stanza 3 9 an' then my puppy came
10 he was asleep
11 he tried to get up
12 an' he ripped my pants
13 an' he dropped the oatmeal all over him

Stanza 4 14 an' my father came
15 an' he said 'did you eat all the oatmeal?'
16 he said 'where's the bowl?'
17 I said 'I think the dog took it'
18 'Well I think I'll have t'make another bowl'

(4) [NEW HAMPSHIRE]
Introduction
1) Probably the funniest was when I was first teaching in New Hampshire (.670 ms)

Stanza 1
2) There were many interesting but (.770ms)
3) Funny happenings (.660 ms)
4) I think one of the most interesting (.600 ms)
5) I taught in Woodstock my first year (.810 ms)
6) And uh had a grow of children -- there were eight grades in all with two teachers (1.150 ms)

Stanza 2
7) And on Christmas, on the day before Christmas (.770 ms)
8) At that time you could celebrate Christmas with presents and trees and so on (.680 ms)
9) And the other teacher and I lived about a mile from the school (1.546 ms)

Stanza 3
10) and about (.760 ms)
11) an hour before school began we heard a lot of children (.980 ms)
12) shouting and so on and they had pushed an old-fashioned sleigh (.950 ms)
13) to our house (1.180 ms)

Stanza 4
14) and had us get in it with all our presents and pushed us (.760 ms)
15) to school that morning.
Gee's criterion for lines is based on the concept of Chafe's *idea units* \(^{22}\) which was introduced in section 3.2. (i.e., interpretation units). Stanzas are identified by 'a quite narrow topic or theme' (i.e., coherency units in Gee's analysis). It should be given attention that, while the poetic narrative (3) shows a patterned and numbered structure which is composed of rather short lines, the prosaic narrative (4) reveals a variety of lines per stanza and different lengths of lines. That is to say, the second and the third characteristics of the poetic narratives are not shared by the prosaic narrative in question. Moreover, while (3) keeps hierarchical substructures with a clear boundary between lines and stanzas, that distinction does not seem to be clear in a couple of long lines such as 1), 6), 8) in (4). In other words, in prosaic narratives, *interpretation units* might sometimes take the features of *coherency units*; a single line occasionally conveys a *narrow theme* in Gee's term whereas in poetic narrative, it does not. Thus, the first and the fourth features of poetic narratives are not shared with prosaic narratives, either.

Chafe, furthermore, provides a discussion which turns out to support Gee's claim. Chafe (1980: 38) mentions that 'the number of words in extended sentences in SE ranged from 1 to 153.' As explained earlier, extended sentences are similar to verses in Verse Analysis. If the text in question in Chafe (ibid.) is a typical poetic narrative, however, it should manifest a patterned and numbered verse structure as demonstrated in 3.3. Following are two pieces of narratives presented by Chafe (ibid.: 38-9). The excerpt (5) is provided which seems to look less *prosaic* than (6), but it is not an overtly typical poetic narrative either, taking into account the first feature of poetic narrative introduced earlier. The excerpt (6), he states, 'contains two centers of interest that differ greatly in length. The first is expressed in (a-k), the second in (l). The first

\(^{22}\)Please recall that Chafe (1980) takes *pause* as the principal factor to identify the units while Kroll (1977) considers predication to be the basic characteristic of the unit.
is eleven idea units long, the second only one.\(^{23}\) (The figures in the brackets are pauses made between utterances.)

(5) 1) (a) And then [5.2] tsk so, then we switch to the boy riding on the bicycle,
(b) and he's riding down the gravel path.
(c) [1.4] (clears throat) A--nd [1.0] we see it,
(d) ..the gravel path,
(e) from his point of view,

2) (f) [.8] and then we see.. a girl riding a bike,
(g) coming the opposite direction.

3) (h) [.9] And then,. the camera's backed up
(i) and you see them going like this.
(j) ..And then you see it from his point of view again.

4) (k) ..And [.3] his hat blows off,
(l) [.55] when they cross,

5) (m) [.25] and [.65] his bike hits into a rock,
(n) ..and he falls down,
(o) the bike falls down,
(p) and all the pears scatter.

(6) 1) (a) [.75] And [.25] on his way,
(b) riding,
(c) he comes across another [.3] bicyclist, [.25] bicyclist,
(d) it's a young woman,
(e) [.5] and [1.15] for some reason she catches his attention,
(f) and he's [.4] turning his head,
(g) ..behind him,
(h) looking at her,
(i) and [.2] there's rock in the road,
(j) and he [.25] hits with his bike,
(k) and falls,


These two texts in Chafe also indicate that they do not follow the features (1) and (2) of poetic narratives. Nevertheless, it should be noted that Chafe's criterion for extended sentences here does not necessarily coincide with that of Gee's for stanza. Although it is the case that length of extended sentences varies to a great extent if

\(^{23}\)Please recall that extended sentences are typically signaled with sentence-final intonation and syntactic closure (Chafe ibid.: 26).
Chafe's criterion is taken, the texts given above do not fulfill Gee's criterion for stanza, that is, 'a quite narrow topic or theme.' For instance, it is observed that the extended sentence (6).1) can be further decomposed into three smaller units in (a)-(c), (d)-(h), and (i)-(k) if we follow Gee's criterion. Put another way, it can be stated, at least from Chafe's analysis, that 'a quite narrow topic or theme' in Standard English or in prosaic narrative is not necessarily signaled by a sentence-final intonation or a particular prosodic cue. This issue will be related to the features of verse structure discussed in the following section 3.4, and it seems that in poetic narrative, such 'a quite narrow topic' is typically signaled with a certain prosodic cue or sentence-final intonation in Chafe's terms.

From the discussion so far, it seems that there are two different organizations which have been described as poetic and prosaic by Gee as the fundamental distinction in narrative discourse of language. There are four differences indicated earlier between the two, and it may be helpful to recapitulate those four here.

(1) Poetic narrative is broken down into five hierarchical substructures or discourse units in general terms. Those substructures are named lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts.

(2) While poetic narratives present small amounts of words per line in the restricted line-numbering, prosaic narratives occasionally contain many words per line with varieties of line-numbering.

(3) The former manifests the patterned and numbered verse structure but research in the latter does not present such restricted sets of verses per stanza.

(4) The distinction between lines and verses (stanzas in Gee's analysis) is clear in the former whereas in the latter, it is obscured.

In addition, another difference mentioned above is also described in the following words as the fifth feature:

(5) Prosodic and semantic cues for coherency units usually coincide one another in poetic narrative whereas in prosaic narrative, that is not always the case.
Still, it should be noted that verses present clearer numbering preference than lines at least in the poetic narratives introduced so far. Although there are obviously two different forms of narrative organization, Gee's claim that poetic narrative and prosaic narrative are found in languages in oral cultures and languages in literary cultures respectively is difficult to sustain as stated in light of materials to be discussed in Chapter eight.

3.4. VERSE STRUCTURE

Verse Analysis in the present dissertation seeks poetic characteristics in three languages: Guyanese Creole (GC); Hawai'i Creole English (HCE); and Japanese. Chapter four examines that verse structure can be found in one of the well-known creole languages, GC, by applying Verse analysis. In Chapter five, an analysis is carried out to determine whether HCE shares universal tendencies with other pidgin and creole languages in Hymes's analysis, while in Chapter six, a comparison is made to find similarities between GC and HCE. Chapter seven introduces particular characteristics discovered only in HCE of the Japanese ancestry, and in Chapter eight, the possibility of Japanese substratal influence is investigated for such unique characteristics. As mentioned in Chapter one, the present study introduces a modified alternative to Hymes's framework for the sake of: 1) facilitating analytical devices for research of GC, HCE, and Japanese; 2) providing a detailed and objective methodology in analysis as clearly as possible; 3) presenting a meaning-based approach to Verse Analysis.24 Presented below is the modified version of the Verse Analytical

---

24Callow & Callow (1992), a recent study on discourse organization, strongly influenced the meaning-based approach followed in this dissertation. They state (ibid.: 5): 'Discourses primarily realise meanings, and only secondarily realise language-structures: to reverse this order is to let the tail wag the dog. It is important not to view the verbal forms of a discourse as independent and self-subsistent. Rather, verbal forms are signals, signals of the meaning which the speaker or writer wishes to convey.'
framework. Please note that the criteria and the formula for patterning and numbering are different from those in Hymes. The constituents of verse structure are defined as follows.

**VERSE STRUCTURE**

VERSE STRUCTURE refers to the organization of a narrative discourse which is characterized by a particular discourse process called VERSIFICATION. Versification covers two distinct features identified by Hymes: PATTERNING and NUMBERING.

The **patterning** is observed in terms of five hierarchical discourse levels—lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts. Moreover, each of the levels represents the concept of interpretation, coherency, episode, the lower juncture, and the upper juncture, respectively. These levels are identified by semantic representations for all of the five levels. In addition, pragmatic factors are also taken into consideration to determine scene and act levels. It might be the case that they are signaled by other features as well, which are identified by the three basic linguistic representations in discourse: prosody, structure, and proposition.

The **numbering** refers to a preference of a certain number of units principally at the levels of line and verse (and possibly other higher levels, i.e., stanzas, scenes, and acts). A numbering formula in a brace shows two or three numbers in the order of its frequency. However, the most frequent number is called the **primary number** if and only if it appears sixty percent or more of any other numbers. The next frequent number is called the **secondary number** if and only if it appears thirty percent or more of any other numbers. Otherwise, they are just called 'the most frequent number' and 'the next frequent number' respectively.

A **numbering formula** described by a brace {} includes the following notations: the primary and the secondary numbers are indicated by a bracket []; the order of frequency is shown by a hyphen -; Accordingly, the primary/most frequent numbers and the secondary/next frequent numbers are connected by hyphens. Thus, {}{[3]-5} is read as 'the numbers 3 and 5 appear in this order of frequency. 3 is the primary number and 5 is the next frequent (but not the secondary) number. {}{2, 4}is '2 and 4 appear in the same frequency, therefore, there is no order relationship. There are neither the primary nor the secondary numbers, either.'

The definitions and features for each of the five levels are described in the following way. (A small number in the braces below stands for a note number which shows related concepts for a given notion that is numbered. These notes are provided at the end of each level structure in the following.)

---

25Iwasaki (in press: 1) uses the terms the physical order, the grammatical order, and the semantic order for the three respectively.
A *line* is defined as an *interpretation unit* which represents a block of ideas constituting the minimum amount of information. A line is identified by any one of the following features.

**Feature 1: Predication**

(No notation in the texts)

[Predication here refers to both coordination and subordination and covers the following operational linguistic structures:]

(a) Predicate verb with or without adverbials

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Da tu gaiz WEN WRK, æ?} \]

(b) Predicative phase: Even if there is no predicate such as a copula and a verb, another predicator (Hurford & Heasley 1983) is able to show a predicative phase. Such a predicative phase makes a line

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Eh, hau kam NOMO SODA in da ais baks!} \]

(c) Verbals, such as participles and infinitives

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Æs ap tu mii,} \]
\[L \quad \text{FO FAIND sambadi.} \]

**Feature 2: Parallelism**

(Underlined)

[A structurally paralleled phrase (i.e., occurrence of the identical word in the identical position in a line) is considered to be a single line.]

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Da tiimstrz iz,} \]
\[L \quad \text{Awlweiz bringin kaz, æn,} \]
\[L \quad \text{Awlweiz teikin aut, sii.} \]

**Feature 3: Independence**

(Italicized)

[A sequence of words is counted as a line if there is a clear boundary in meaning which separates it from the preceding and the following groups of words:]

(a) A long topic (More than five words)

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Bat diiz gaiz in da mil, no?} \]
\[L \quad \text{Krezii dakain,} \]
\[L \quad \text{Enibadi kæn du dakain.} \]

(b) Post-posing or afterthoughts

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Mawning taim, gud, æ?} \]
\[L \quad \text{Fishing.} \]

(c) Switch of utterances

\[\text{e.g., } L \quad \text{Bat nau wen da mashiin...} \]
\[L \quad \text{Wen da kaDa go,} \]
\[L \quad \text{.....} \]

Related concepts:
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Verse The second and basic level in VERSE STRUCTURE -- A group of lines

A Verse is defined as a COHERENCY UNIT which represents a minimal mental picture or image conveying a certain cohesive message.

Feature 1: FOCUS OF CONTENT (No notation in the texts)
[A given verse is identified by at least a single proposition which is distinguished as the focus of content from the preceding and the following groups of lines. Thus, each verse can be shown to have a focal meaning like below (A line does not necessarily constitute a proposition.)]

   e.g., V No, da ka get in wan long lain,
          Samtaim in wan long lain,
          Meibii get fifti sikst iz kaz, yeah.  {One Line}

   V Æn' den, its nat oni wan lain,
       Dei get sevro mo aDa lainz,
       Dei get sam mo kaz, tu, æ?
       {Some More}

   V Ænd, da timstriz iz,
       Awlweiz bringin kaz, æn
       Awlweiz teikin aut, sii.  {Always}

Feature 2: INITIAL PARTICLE (Bold)
[A verse is usually signaled by a single line-initial particle such as conjunctions (e.g., Ænd, Bat, So, If, Bikawz), adverbials (e.g., Den, Nau, LeiDa), and interjections (e.g., Y'no, Oke, Amiin). A zero particle is indicated by XX.]

   e.g.,  V Ænd, da tu lodaz togeDa, sii,
           Æs hau yu gat,
           BilDom ap, æ?
           {Seconds in parentheses}

   V Æn'den, if nomo patnr awredi,
      Hii no kæn help.

   V Eh, yu go bihain,
      Yu nomo kampani,
      Yu gon hold ap da lain dea, yæ.
[Each verse may have post-sequential interval, usually half second or longer. It may also have a prosodic cue to be identified as a unit.]

e.g., V If aim a hapai ko mæn,  
Æ'En' hiiz wan hapai ko mæn,  
Bot av as, da pila mæn moemoe, awrai! (1.0)

V XX Wii puDom tu wan kampani,.....

Feature 4: FINAL MARKER (Small caps)
[A verse may be terminated by one of the particles such as yæ, æ, no, yo, and sii.]

e.g., V Awrai nau, if get fifti kaz,  
Æ'End if awl av dem get parruz,  
Y'no æs hanjred men awreDi, NO.

V Den, wen yu get yo men awl set,  
Den, yu gat tu kaunt hau meni kaz, YO.

Related concepts:

(versicle) Sub-components of a verse
A lower case v in parentheses stands for a versicle, based on Hymes proposal (1987: 21). This sub-component is provided to represent 'small groups of lines within verses.'

Stanza The third level in VERSE STRUCTURE -- A group of verses{5}

A Stanza is defined as an EPISODE UNIT which contains thematic information (e.g. who, what, where, and when) within a broader topic of a given scene.

Feature 1: RHETORICAL DESIGN
[Each stanza takes a functional role as a part of events that occur under a single scene. There are four functions: Exposition (Ex) or 'introduction'; Complication (Cm) or 'development'; Climax (Cl) or 'elaboration'; and Denouement (Dn) or 'conclusion.'][6]

e.g., SN1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST1</th>
<th>Ex: FIRST VISIT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST2</th>
<th>Cm: FRIENDSHIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST3</th>
<th>Dn: HARMONY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feature 2: **THEME**

[A certain theme ought to be identified for each of the stanzas which should be maintained through the unit.]

e.g., **SN1**

ST1.....

ST7 Cl: **CARS**

ST8 Cl: **MY JOB**

Related concepts:

6 This is a direct application of Brooks & Warren 1949, cited in Hymes 1981: 106 and 225.

**Scene** The fourth level in VERSE STRUCTURE -- A group of stanzas(7)

A **Scene** is defined as a **LOWER JUNCTURE UNIT** which is marked by transition of pragmatic factors related to the content of the narrative.

**Feature 1: TEMPORAL, LOCATIVE, AND SITUATIONAL JUNCTURE**

[A scene is associated with change of time, location, and participants in a given narrative. Participants here refer to both animate and inanimate objects. The three junctures, however, are not associated with contextual variables in the real world, i.e., a time, place, and situation in which a narrative is taking place.]

e.g., **ACT**

SN1 **AT THE HOUSE** [Location]

ST1

ST2

SN2 **THAT EVENING** [Time]

ST3

ST4

SN3 **UNCLE GEORGE** [Participant]

ST5

ST6

**Feature 2: TOPIC**

[A scene has to have a coherent discourse topic which consists of several episodes.]

e.g., **ACT**

SN1 **AT THE HOUSE** [Location]
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Related concepts:

**Act**

The maximum level in VERSE STRUCTURE -- A group of scenes

An Act is defined as an UPPER JUNCTURE UNIT which is marked by transition of pragmatic factors in the narrative beyond the scene level.

Features: The Act level shares the above two features of scene. Nonetheless, it is sometimes the case that the single act constitutes a whole narrative. In such a case, an act is regarded as a unit of analysis. When there is only one scene in a single narrative, the scene can also be a title of Act.

\[\text{e.g., WAN KÆT STORI} \]
\[\text{ACT} \quad \text{OR} \quad \text{ACT1} \]
\[\text{ACT2} \]
\[\text{ACT3}.....\]

Now it seems necessary to discuss an issue which is crucial to this type of discourse analysis: subjectivity and objectivity. Mann, Matthiessen, & Thompson (1992: 59-60) show their concern about the possibility of ending up with several alternative analyses for a single text when using their text analytical framework, Rhetorical Structure Theory (RST, henceforth). Although the model which is utilized in the present study is different from RST (Mann & Thompson 1987, 1988a, b), it is helpful to see what kind of criteria can be applied here. They provide five causes for the multiplicity of analysis (Mann, Matthiessen, & Thompson 1992: 60):

1) Boundary Judgments -- results of forcing borderline cases into categories.
2) Text structure Ambiguity -- comparable to many other varieties of linguistic ambiguity.
3) Simultaneous Analyses -- multiple compatible analyses.
4) Differences Between Analysts -- especially, differing plausibility judgments.
5) Analytical Error -- especially by inexperienced analysts.

The first cause is something that an analyst has to be aware of when he/she gives a boundary between lines and verses. Analysts might tend to force borderline cases into the grouping which has the numbering that he/she prefers to go by in a given analysis. The second cause does not seem as crucial as the first one in Verse Analysis. Although RST and Verse Analysis share as their principles a meaning-based approach, the former focuses more on rhetorical aspects of written documents whereas the latter concentrates on the content structure of spoken narratives. In other words, while RST typically deals with relationships between abstract ideas in a text, Verse Analysis deals with a sequence of more concrete events which have really happened in the world or fictionally occurred in a speaker's mind. However, even Verse Analysis cannot escape from the danger of the third cause since semantics and pragmatics are fundamental analytic criteria. This is related to the fourth cause which suggests that it is not possible to present a satisfactory analysis if meaning is taken as a basic factor to identify units. This is one of the reasons that meaning-based approaches are occasionally criticized that the results of analyses after all are the ones which have been achieved by receivers, i.e., analysts, but not senders or narrators (Brown & Yule 1983). Nevertheless, to refute the meaning-based approach on the grounds that the approach is based on analysts' interpretations rather than narrators' intentions can only imply that language is merely a system of structure and not a means of communication. Language can be used as a tool of communication because speakers can interpret each other's codes as common property. If the above refutation were correct, then we would have to ask speakers every time they made an utterance, what they had intended to convey by the utterance produced, in order to interpret it properly even in a basic conversation.
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The fifth cause should also be noted. Not only does RST require a lot of discipline and commitment for analysts to become skillful investigators; Verse Analysis as well needs time and effort for the analyst to be deeply acquainted with the underlying structure and content of a narrative text. Hymes explains this point as follows (1981: 151):

In short, a satisfactory solution emerges only after several tries. One plunges in *media res*, making a trial segmentation by hand, and reconsider and adjusts it in the light of the principles of consistent structure and form-meaning covariation. As one gets more deeply into a text, one gains a deeper sense of its inner logic and form, its particular integration of content and expression, and one's sense of inconsistency or arbitrariness of analysis grows finer.

In general, then, the analysis is guided by two principles, taken as inter-dependent: that there is a consistent structure, and that it is to be found in terms of form-meaning covariation, taking form here to be linguistic form. (Approaches that can recognize only one [form or meaning] are rejected.) These principles entail that one is not free to make ad hoc decisions as to the status of a feature; an apparent exception must be explained in a principled way, or a broader, more adequate hypothesis of structure found.

In any case, it has to be remembered that Verse Analysis does not aim to provide perfect rules that can explain all the phenomena and structure of narrative discourse organization. What it tries to achieve, however, is to find general principles of narrative construction, in other words, to present features and a prototype of a model by which the greater part of narrative structure can be explained.

### 3.5. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

In practicing Verse Analysis identifying each of the five levels, the procedure described by Hornberger (1992: 448) is fundamentally adopted:

After I broke the narrative into lines, I began the process of grouping the lines into verses, verses into stanzas, and so on, by moving back and forth between a bottom-up and top-down analysis. In the bottom-up analysis, I sought to establish equivalence by identifying markers signaling a new unit (verse, stanza, scene, or act) and looking for patterns among lines to form a verse. In the top-down analysis, I sought to identify the major plot units of the story being told.
Essentially, a bottom-up analysis is taken for the first two levels, that is, lines and verses. On the other hand, a top-down analysis is principally taken for the last two levels, that is, scenes and acts. Both bottom-up and top-down analyses are taken for identifying the stanza level.

Discourse data on Guyanese Creole (GC) have been excerpted from Rickford (ibid.: 229-241). Two texts are analyzed in the present study. The speaker of the first text, Dhanish, according to Rickford (ibid.: 225), is a retired cane-cutter, female, Indo-Guyanese, and seventy years of age at the time of recording. She is from Bush Lot, 'a primarily Indo-Guyanese village in the West Coast Berbice region,' and 'perhaps the most distinguished basilectal speaker' in his volume (i.e., Rickford 1987). Dhanish frequently uses the four tense-aspect markers (don, bina, bin, and a) as well as other grammatical subsystems. On the other hand, the second speaker, Basil, is male, Afro-Guyanese, and seventy years of age. He was born and raised in Wakenaam, Essequibo, and engaged in several jobs such as prospector for gold and diamonds, woodcutter, practitioner in a religious tradition, and village cricketer. His speech is basically basilectal, however, he sometimes shifts back and forth between the basilect and the mesolect varieties of GC due to the presence of his acquaintance, who was speaking the mesolect at the time of the interview.

Discourse data on HCE have been obtained from the interview tapes in the research projects completed by The Center for Oral History, Social Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa. The purpose of the projects, according to the introduction of one of the volumes (Center for Oral History 1988a), is 'to document, through research and interviews, the histories of communities in Hawai'i undergoing rapid and large-scale social, economic, and environmental changes.' Thus, the interviews focus mainly on the lives of the interviewees in the pioneer days on the islands of Hawai'i. The interviewers are trained and skilled research associates in the
center. Following are the projects which have been used for the purpose of the present research.

- COH 1984. a, b, c. Kalihi: Place of transition.
- COH 1988. a, b, c. Kōloa: An oral history of a Kaua'i community.
- COH 1989. a, b. Lana'i Ranch: The people of Ko'ele and Keomuku.
- COH 1991. a, b. 'Ualapu'e, Moloka'i: Oral histories from the east end.

According to the director of the research center, Mr. Warren Nishimoto (personal communication), the details of the transcriptions in their projects are sometimes not accurate enough for the purpose of technical linguistic analyses. He mentioned that his transcribers sometimes need, in an editing process, to eliminate some portions of transcribed data. Therefore, it is sometimes necessary for researchers to examine the recorded tapes to see if such editing was done or not. Thus, please note that some of the texts described in this research may include expressions that are not found in the published materials by COH.

Speakers of interest are the basilectal (and/or possibly, mesolect) type of HCE speaker including six different ethnicities (i.e., Hawaiians, Part-Hawaiians, Chinese, Portuguese, Puerto Ricans, and Japanese). In order to provide quantitative support and argument, three narratives from the same narrator are analyzed. There are nineteen narrators are studied in this research. Thus, there are fifty seven narratives analyzed. All the tapes of the above projects have been listened to and examined by the present writer. Selection of narratives is based on the length and the topic so that those which are uniform in length and clear in meaning can be studied. Moreover, the total numbers of lines and verses will be counted and compared with one another.

Generally speaking, some HCE speakers code-switch among the levels in a creole continuum, that is, basilect, mesolect, and acrolect. Yet, although it may not be an easy task, it is quite possible to choose appropriate text data of particular types. Such selection of texts or speakers can be achieved by finding and examining 'creoleness' in
them, in terms of: (a) linguistic structures such as phonology, morphology, and syntax; (b) social criteria; and (c) other people's judgment. The first criterion, a linguistic feature, has been extensively discussed in Chapter two, section 2.4. There are also some external social factors which can be taken into consideration. Background information of speakers such as birthplace and the environment in which he/she has grown up is helpful. These criteria might not be a decisive factor to determine which continuum level the linguistic variety he/she speaks is classified. However, it is surely used as supplementary information. Moreover, other people's judgments are also considered as one of the criteria to use. As is the case of any variety of social and regional dialect for which the speakers are able to identify particular features of the language, many of the local people's impressions about Pidgin (i.e., HCE) and localness in Hawai'i are a common shared feeling and are acknowledged by almost anybody who was born and raised in the islands. This does not mean total reliance on others' judgments but the utilization of final judgments as supplemental or supportive evidence for the selection of materials.

In the present study, three persons helped the present writer in selecting materials: Professor Charlene J. Sato, Mr. Warren Nishimoto, and Mr. Kent Sakoda. Prof. Sato is one of the doctoral committee members of the writer, and Mr. Nishimoto is the director of Center for Oral History and also the principal investigator in the Center. Kent is one of my good friends and colleagues, who is working in the field of language acquisition research. All of them were born and raised in Hawai'i.

Discourse data on the Japanese language have been elicited by the present researcher. The data have been obtained from seven narrative discourses made by three native speakers of the language. All three were born and raised in Tokyo, Japan, female, and in their 50s and 60s. They are native speakers of standard Japanese. Two of them have been living in Hawai'i since adulthood. One was recorded in 1990 at her residence in Mililani, Hawai'i, and the other two were recorded in 1994 in offices at the
University of Hawai'i. Nobody else was present at the time of recording besides the interviewer and the interviewee. The subjects were asked to tell stories about several different topics such as trips, holidays, recent experiences, and so on. It is expected that their narrative discourse in Japanese will present the three characteristics (i.e., the most frequent number 3 in lines, the primary number 3 in verses, and verse-final markers) as poetic structure-constructing devices. The following table shows in brief the sum of data source used in the dissertation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3-3. Data analyzed for three languages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyanese Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawai'i Creole English</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Center for Oral History: 1984a, b, c; 1985a, b; 1988a, b, c; 1989a, b; 1991a,b, as well as the corresponding recorded tapes

All three languages, i.e., GC, HCE, and Japanese, have been analyzed in the same methodology in Verse Analysis. The following chapter, Four, plays a role of opening a series of analyses in this study, devoting itself to actual Verse Analysis of GC to illustrate how and to what extent the language presents verse structure.
CHAPTER 4

THE FORERUNNER:

VERSE STRUCTURE DISCOVERED IN GUYANESE CREOLE

"The diachronic assumptions of the early continuum model are the ones most weakened by recent research, but the non-discrete character of creole-standard variation in communities such as Guyana, Jamaica, and Hawaii provides the fundamental rationale for their characterization as continua."

John Rickford (1987: 38)

4.1. PRELUDE

In Chapter four, the philosophy, the methodology, and the analytical techniques of Verse Analysis presented in Chapter three are applied to the study of narrative texts in G[uyanese] C[reole]. It is the principle task of this chapter to put forward a substantiation that the features of poetic narratives found in C[hinook] J[argon] also exist in GC. It should be made clear again that the focal point of the investigation is to search for two characteristics that Hymes emphasizes: patterning and numbering in verse structure. These two features can be observed in four different aspects of poetic narratives which are recapitulated here as: 1) existence of five hierarchical levels of discourse units; 2) short lines; 3) measured verse; 4) clear distinction between lines (interpretation units) and verses (coherency units).

One of the aims in introducing GC in this research is to discern if the four common characteristics identified above are found in the language. If such characteristics are found in GC, the fact would reinforce a hypothesis that verse structure exists in pidgin

---

1 In addition to these four, the unification of prosodic and semantic cues as 5) is also examined in Chapter five in dealing with HCE narrative discourse for which tape-recorded discourse data are available.
& creole languages in general. Moreover, the outcome of the analysis in this chapter can be compared to that of HCE to find both similarities and differences between those two creole languages. The whole discussion in GC which follows will be based entirely on the text data and their translation, published in Rickford (1987).

This chapter consists of five main sections. Section 4.2. provides a brief background on GC and a description of the analyzed texts based on Bickerton (1975), Rickford (ibid.), and Holm (1989). What follows the background description is two narrative texts that are presented in creole orthography with some notes related to the texts. In 4.3., translation for each of the preceding texts is offered in standard (English) orthography. Section 4.4. includes a profile of the texts described in outline formula, and tables are provided. This profile illustrates the patterning and the numbering of the verse structures in the texts. In section 4.5., a discussion is proffered on the two narrative texts to identify what features the language, GC, is presenting in terms of poetic narrative verse structure. The discussion is not made independently for each of the two texts but attempted in a combined manner so that similarities as well as differences between the two narrative texts in GC can be emphasized and illustrated.

4.2. GUYANESE CREOLE AND ITS TEXTS

Before starting an analysis, it is useful to describe briefly the linguistic and sociohistorical background of GC. The following discussion is based on Bickerton (1975: 1-23 and 208-12), Rickford (1987: 41-77), and Holm (1989: 329-35, 461-66). GC appears to be a descendant of Caribbean Creoles that were previously spoken in Barbados and the Leewards (Holm ibid.). At the same time, the English-based creole which came from the West Indies could also have been mixed to some extent with an English-relexified variety of Creole Dutch in South America, which had been spoken by African slaves until the beginning or the middle of the nineteenth century (Rickford
Looking back at its history, a linguistic contact situation in Guyana seems to have begun with the settlement of the colonies achieved by Dutch planters in 1600s (Bickerton, personal communication 12/94). Around this time, it is known that some African languages, native vernaculars of the slaves, were spoken together with Dutch as their master's language. In addition, Rickford (op. cit.) endorses a speculation that the slaves may have had some knowledge of a pidgin or creole variety of English spoken back on the African continent (Hancock 1986). Later, in the 1740s, British planters came from Barbados, and they brought in slaves from the British West Indies. After this incident, a contact language emerged among people previously residing there and the new settlers and slaves newly arrived. This English-based contact language overwhelmed the use of Creole Dutch and came to be used widely and to be known as G[uyanese] C[reole] English.

From the middle of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century (1835-1917, Holm ibid.), a huge number of Indian immigrants had been imported. After the importation of Indians, GC was influenced to some extent by their ancestral languages such as Hindi and Bhojpuri. Rickford (op. cit.: 68) discusses four types of Indian (Bhojpuri) features found in the contemporary GC. Those features include: 1) lexicon (Gambhir 1981, cited in Rickford op. cit.); 2) slang (Gambhir ibid., cited in Rickford op. cit.); 3) object-verb word order (Devonish 1978, cited in Rickford op. cit.); and 4) a transitive verb marker (Devonish ibid., cited in Rickford op. cit.). Some of the features in the areas of phonology and grammar are difficult to determine whether they are due to influence from Indian languages or from other factors (Gambhir ibid., cited in Rickford op. cit.). The fact that GC has been under strong influence from the Indians makes this one of the unique characteristics which draws a dividing line between the language and other surrounding creole varieties such as Saramaccan and Sranan. In present-day Guyana, it is perceived that the acrolect variety (standard
English) and its basilect counterpart constitute a creole continuum (Rickford op. cit.: 22).

The two texts in GC which are analyzed in the present study have been excerpted from Rickford (op. cit: 229-241). The speaker of the first text, Dhanish (DH, henceforth), according to Rickford (ibid.: 225), is a retired cane-cutter, female, Indo-Guyanese, and seventy years of age at the time of recording. She is from Bush Lot, 'a primarily Indo-Guyanese village in the West Coast Berbice region,' and 'perhaps the most distinguished basilectal speaker' in his volume (i.e., Rickford 1987). DH frequently uses the four tense-aspect markers (don, bina, bin, and a) as well as other grammatical subsystems. On the other hand, the second speaker, Basil (BS, henceforth), is male, Afro-Guyanese, and seventy years of age. He was born and raised in Wakenaam, Essequibo, and engaged in several jobs such as prospector for gold and diamonds, woodcutter, practitioner in a religious tradition, and village cricketer. His speech is basically basilectal, however, he sometimes shifts back and forth between the basilect and the mesolect varieties of GC due to the presence of his acquaintance, who was speaking the mesolect at the time of the interview. Following are two narrative texts in GC in discussion. The texts taken originally from Rickford 1987 have been analyzed according to the modified Verse Analytical method and are here re-presented with notations introduced in 3.4.

DH's Text: A HASSAR JUMBIE (GHOST) STORY
Rickford 1987: 229-230

ACT WAN JOMBII
SN1 WEN NA OOL MAAN DEED [Time]
ST1 Ex: Beriyian
V1 L1 Wel, wen dis ool maan, mi ool maan ded
L2 Wel wen na ool maan ded
V2 L3 An, ii a gu fi beriyian an ting,
L4 Mii taak se,
L5 "Ool maan, duu, yu mosn kom fraikin awii,
L6 Le awii sii yuu.

ST2 Cm: Yu Hous
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V3 L7 Wen awii gu sii yu,
    L8 Awii gu fraikin.

V4 L9 XX Yu ken kom,
    L10 Bikaaz dis a yu hous,
    L11 Bot awi mosn si yu."

ST3 Dn: Wan Mont
V5 L12 Wel, so, a trii dee wuk don.
    L13 Ten dee wok don.
    L14 Tottin dee wok don.
    L15 Wel, ii don bot wan mont an ting.

SN2 HASA [Participant]
ST4 Ex: Goo a Shap
V6 L16 Wel, waan dee, mii tuu gyal dem a daab batm hous.
    L17 An mii goo a shap.

V7 L18 XX Mi se
    L19 Mi a gu gu--bai lil bit eniiing a shap.

ST5 Cm: Wan Leedi
V8 L20 Bot, wail mi a gu,
    L21 Mii sii wan leedi
    L22 A sel hasa,

V9 L23 An, mi bai dis hasa,
    L24 An, mi put am pon wan bukit.

V10 L25 An mi tek wan beesn
    L26 An mi kubr am.
    L27 Mi koba--a hasa.

ST6 Dn: Kom Kwik
V11 L28 An mi gu wee a shap.
    L29 Wel mi bai an ting

SN3 DEM PKNII [Participant]
ST7 Ex: Wan Big Naiz
V12 L30 An kom, soo kwik,
    L31 Dem pknii na don daab yit.
    L32 Dem stil dee a daab.

V13 L33 Soo dem sec--em--
    L34 Mii --mii kom a tap.
    L35 Mi heer wan big naiz
    L36 A mek.

ST8 Cm: Paasl
V14 L37 XX Dem tuu gyal a daab batam ous a batam.
    L38 An mii heer,
    L39 Won big naiz mek.

V15 L40 XX Mi taak,
    L41 "?e?-e?-e?!!"
    L42 Mi gu,
    L43 Mi put mi paasl.
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ST9 Cm: Ageen
V16 L44 XX Mi taak--
L45 Mi na taak nom.
L46 Mi put mi paasl
L47 Wo mii gu bai.
V17 L48 Wen mi a kom bak a kichin,
L49 Dis naiz meek ageen.

ST10 Cl: Na Rait
V18 L50 XX Mi se,
L51 "Au, ool maan, mii na bina til yu,
L52 See yu mosn kom,
L53 See--em--awii gu fraikin,
V19 L54 An luk hou hai hi deetim
L55 Yu a fraikin mi.
L56 Da na rait, yu no."
L57 An mi kom donga a batam.

ST11 Cl: Brekfos
V20 L58 Su den gyal a taak see,
L59 "Maa, yu goo a tap,
L60 Yu iit brekfos?"
L61 Se, "yu kyaan iit brekfos su kwik yit!"
V21 L62 XX Mi se,
L63 "Noo, baab.
L64 Mi no iit brekfus."
V22 L65 Se, "mii kom se,
L66 Le mii help ayu--
L67 Daab!"

ST12 Dn: Fraikin
V23 L68 Bot dis taim mi fraikin.
L69 Mii taak se
L70 "Le mii help ayu
L71 Daab.
L72 Den, aal awii gu goo wan taim."

SN4 A TAP [Location]
ST13 Ex: Goo Op
V24 L73 Su mi help dem
L74 Daab an ting, an aal--
L75 Aal awii wash awii han an fut an ting
L76 An awii goo op a tap.
V25 L77 Bo mii an tel dem,
L78 Bikaaz dem gu fraikin moo an mii!
INT. (Moo dan yuu, m-hm.)

ST14 Cm: Bihin
V26 L79 Wel, awii goo a tap.
L80 Ho--ou! dem piknii dee fos fos.
L81 Mii de bihin bihin.
B.S.’s Text: THE JUMBLE (GHOST) STORY “TONIGHT WE WILL BURY OUR NANA”
Rickford 1987: P240-241

ACT DI JOMBII
SN1 WANG MAAN [Time]
ST1 Ex: Wen di Nait Kom
V1 L1 Wel, aa. wan maan yuuztu waak leet at nait,
L2 Evri nait a ii kostom--

DON
L3 Waak leet.
V2  
L4 XX Mi na noo
L5 If ii doz gu a ii switaart ar wo,
V3  
L6 Bot ii o maan
L7 A waak out leet
L8 Wen di nait kom.

ST2 Dn: Yu Masn Waak
V4  
L9 Wel it opeer laika
L10 Dem waan shoo dis maan sortn--aa--tookin,
V5  
L11 Se yu mosn waak su leet,
L12 An awii gu stap yu
L13 From waak leet a nait....
L14 Dat abii gu profaarn az jombii.
L15 Abii jombii gu stap yu....

SN2 MUNNLAIT NAIT [Tune]
ST3 Ex: Piipl Kom
V6  
L16 XX Bina muunlait nait, jentlmen.
L17 Dis maan gaan.
V7  
L18 An wen ii lef ii...
L19 Di plees we ii kom fram.
L20 ii a kom hoom.
V8  
L21 Wen ii a kom hoom,
L22 E--e? wails waakin, waakin, waakin,
V9  
L23 Wen ii luk--
L24 Tuwadz we ii a gu hoom,
L25 Yu noo, ii sii wan grup o piipl
L26 A kom....

ST4 Cm: Berin
V10  
L27 XX "Tunait awii gu berin awii naana.
L28 Tunait awii gu berin awii naana.
L29 Tunait awii gu berin awii naana."
V11  
L30 XX Li se,
L31 "Wel, livin piipl kyaan de a dam
L32 Fu gu kyai kaafn
L33 A berin grong dis taim a nait.
L34 Dis...mos bii o jombii, ar goos."

ST5 Cl: Tuwordz Hii
V12  
L35 XX "Tunait awii gu berin awii naana.
L36 Tunait awii gu--"  
V13  
L37 Wel hii goowin tuwordz dem,
L38 Dem komin tuwordz hii.
V14  
L39 Wel biifoor di miit ii,
L40 Deer wuz o brij.
ST6  Dn:  Haid
V15  L41  Wel ii se,
     L42  "Fu seev miself from diiz piipl dem--
     L43  Diiz piipl--dis a spirit."
V16  L44  XX II gu aniiit di brij
     L45  An haid de.
V17  L46  XX II se,
     L47  "Wel dem gu paas
     L48  An dem no gu sii mii."...
V18  L49  XX Dem piipl dis nou, jombii a piipl
     L50  A sii, yu noo?
     L51  Wen, wen--di noo
     L52  Wo a hapn.

SN3  BRIJ  [Location]
ST7  Ex:  Kaafn
V19  L53  Wel dem kom
     L54  An dem res dem kaafn pan di brij.
V20  L55  Wen dem res dem kaafn pan di brij:
     L56  "Oo, ii de a batam de?
     L57  Oo, ii de a batam de?"
     [Mumbled jumbie conversation: ...]

ST8  Cm:  Paas
V21  L58  XX "Tunait awii gu berin awii naana.
     L59  Tunait awii gu berin awii naana.
     L60  Tunait--."
V22  L61  Wel wen dem don
     L62  Dem pik op di kaafn nou.
V23  L63  Wel... di maan se
     L64  li fill dat
     L65  Diiz piipl dem gu paas am.
     [Jumbies speak among themselves:]

ST9  Dn:  Rait Andaniit Dis Brij
V24  L66  XX "Rait andaniit dis brij hee tunait.
     L67  Rait andaniit dis brij hee tunait.
     L68  Rait andaniit dis brij hee tunait."
V25  L69  XX Noowin dis maan de de a haid fram dem.
     L70  "Rait andaniit dis brij hee tunait."

SN4  BRIJ KONTINYUD [Location]
ST10  Ex:  A Waak Wid
V26  L71  Wel wen di maan sii diiz piiple dem
     L72  Kontinyu fu kom
     L73  We li a de,
     (v)27  L74  XX li pik--yu noo,
     L75  li a waak wid
     L76  li stik fu daag.
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4.3. TRANSLATION

Following is the translation in the standard (English) orthography for the two texts analyzed in the preceding section. Please note that Verse Analysis which has been carried out in 4.2. is based on Rickford's creole orthography and the linguistic structure
described in it. Thus, whenever it is necessary to examine or be concerned about the characteristics of verse structure, patterning and numbering, please always refer to the texts in the creole orthography, not the standard (English) one.

Translation of DH's Text: A HASSAR JUMBIE (GHOST) STORY
Rickford 1987: 230-231

ACT  A JUMBIE
SN1  WHEN THE OLD MAN DIED
ST1  Buried
V1  Well, when this old man, my old man died—well, when that old man died
V2  And he was going to be buried and so on, I said, "Old man, please, you mustn't come and frighten us, or let us see you.

ST2  Your House
V3  When we see you, we'll be frightened.
V4  You can come, because this is your house, but we mustn't see you."

ST3  One Month
V5  Well, the three-day post-burial formalities were completed, the ten-day formalities, the thirteen-day formalities. Well, about a month had gone by.

SN2  HASSAR
ST4  Go to a shop
V6  Well, one day, my two daughters were daubing [with mud and cow dung] the yard under the house. And I went to the shop.
V7  I said I was going to—buy a little something from the shop.

ST5  A Lady
V8  But while I was going, I saw a lady selling hassar [fish],
V9  And I bought this hassar, and I put it in a bucket.
V10  And I took a basin, and covered it, I covered -- that hassar.

ST6  Come back quick
V11  And I went away to the shop. Well, I bought [the things] and so on

SN3  THE CHILDREN
ST7  A Big Noise
V12  And came back so quickly that the children hadn't finished daubing yet. They were still daubing.
V13  So they said—em—I—I came upstairs. [Laugh]. I heard a big noise!

ST8  Parcel
V14  Those two girls were downstairs daubing the yard under the house. And I heard a big noise!
V15  I said to myself, "Eh—eh—eh!" I went and put down my parcel.
I said--I didn't say anything. I put down that parcel that I'd gone to buy.

As I was coming back into the kitchen, I heard this noise again.

I said, "Ow, old man, didn't I tell you that you mustn't come, that--am--we would be frightened,

And [yet] look how in the broad daylight you're here scaring me! That isn't right, you know." And I came downstairs.

So the girls said, "Ma, you went upstairs, did you eat breakfast?" They said, "You couldn't have eaten breakfast so quickly!"

"No, dears. I haven't eaten breakfast."  
"I said, 'Let me help you--daub!'"

But actually I was afraid. I said, "Let me help you daub, then all of us will go [to eat breakfast] at the same time."

So I helped them daub and so on, and all--all of us washed our hands and feet and so on, and we went upstairs.

But I didn't tell them[what had happened] because they would be more frightened than me!

Well, we went upstairs. Ow! The children went in front, I went behind. 

But they didn't know what had happened. 

Well, they heard this noise too. That hassar was jumping in the bucket! They didn't say anything. 

But I was thinking to myself. I said no--

"Ow, old man, all three of us have come upstairs and if you're going to do that, the children will be scared,

And then I'll really be in trouble. Because everything will fall on me!

They won't--they'll be scared, they won't want to do this chore, then won't want to do that chore, 

And we don't have anybody else to do the work." This boy was small.
Well, while they were putting out breakfast, we heard this noise again. But I didn't say anything.

Then she said, "Ma"--she said--"Ah"--she said--am--"The hassar is jumping in that bucket!"

And I started to laugh. I said, "That's true, my daughter. Oh my God, that hassar is really jumping!"

But I didn't say what had happened.

BS's Translation: THE JUMBIE (GHOST) STORY: "TONIGHT WE WILL BURY OUR NANA"
Rickford 1987: P242-243

ACT THE JUMBIE
SN1 ONE MAN
ST1 When the Night Come
V1 Well, ahh. A man used to walk late at night. Every night it was his custom—to walk late.

V2 I don't know if he would go to his sweetheart or what,

V3 But he was a man who would walk late when the night came.

ST2 You mustn't walk
V4 Well, it appears as if they wanted to teach this man a lesson, to tell him

V5 that you mustn't walk so late, and we are going to stop you from walking late at night...that we are going to perform as jumbies. Our jumbies will stop you.

SN2 MOONLIGHT NIGHT
ST3 People Come
V6 It was a moonlight night, gentlemen. This man had gone out.

V7 And after leaving his...the place he had come from, he was coming home.

V8 While he was coming home, eh—eh [surprise!] While walking, walking, walking,

V9 As he looked--toward the place where he was going, toward home, you know, he saw a group of people coming....

ST4 Burying
V10 "Tonight we will bury our nana. Tonight we will bury our nana. Tonight we will bury our nana."...

V11 He said, "Well, living people couldn't be on the dam carrying coffin to the cemetery at this time of night. This...must be a jumbie, or ghost."

ST5 Towards Him
V12 Tonight we will bury our nana. Tonight we will--"

V13 Well, he was going toward them, and they were coming toward him.
Well, before they reached him, there was a bridge.

Well, he said, "To save myself from these people--these people--these are spirits."

He went underneath the bridge and hid there.

He said, "Well, they will pass by and they won't see me."

These people now, jumbies are people who can see [through anything], you know? When, when--they knew what was going on.

Well, they came and they rested their coffin on the bridge.

After resting their coffin on the bridge: "Oh, he's underneath there? Oh, he's underneath there?"

Tonight we will bury our nana. Tonight we will bury our nana. Tonight--."

Well, when they were finished, they picked up the coffin now.

Well...the man felt that these people would pass him by. [But then he hears them continue:]

"Right underneath this bridge here tonight. Right underneath this bridge here tonight."

Knowing that this man was there hiding from them. "Right underneath this bridge here tonight."

Well, when the man saw these people continuing to come toward where he was,

He picked--you know, he used to walk with his stick to fend off dogs. He has a stick--

He said, "Well, let me tell you something:

Nothing of the sort is going to happen here! Tonight? Goddamit!" He rushed in on them.

When he rushed them--Aie! They started to run!

He said, "Look, you jumbies!

You think I'm scared of you? Tonight? Here you'll bring nana?"
He said, "Come, let's go!"

He fired, he was lashing out wildly!

If you see how the jumbies went down--he was right behind them!

"Tonight this nana will be buried there? No way can Nana be, he can't be buried there tonight!--Nana can't be buried, not yet!" He ran them to hell!

[The story is] finished there, buddy.

(Arrangement by the present author.)

4.4. PROFILE: PATTERNING & NUMBERING

The following outlines and Table 4-1 and 4-2 provide profiles for patterning and numbering, respectively, of DH's and BS's texts. The words listed in the final column are verse-initial particles.

DH's A HASSAR JUMBIE (GHOST) STORY: Profile--Patterning:

ACT  WAN JOMBII

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN1</th>
<th>WEN NA OOL MAAN DEED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ex: Beriyian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>L1-L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>L3-L4-L5-L6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST2 Cm: Yu Hous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>L7-L8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>L9-L10-L11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ST3 Dn: Wan Mont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>L12-L13-L14-L15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SN2  HASA

| ST4 | Ex: Goo a Shap         |
| V6  | L16-L17               |
| V7  | L18-L19               |
|     | ST5 Cm: Wan Leedi      |
| V8  | L20-L21-L22           |
| V9  | L23-L24               |
| V10 | L25-L26-L27           |
|     | ST6 Dn: Kom Kwik       |
| V11 | L28-L29               |

SN3  DEM PIKNNII

| ST7 | Ex: Wan Big Naiz       |
| V12 | L30-L31-L32            |
| V13 | L33-L34-L35-L36        |
|     | ST8 Cm: Paasii          |
| V14 | L37-L38-L39            |
| V15 | L40-L41-L42-L43        |
BS's THE JUMBIE (GHOST) STORY: "TONIGHT WE WILL BURY OUR NANA": Pattern-——

**ACT DIJOMBII**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN1</th>
<th>WAN MAAN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>Ex: Wen di Nait Kom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>L1-L2-L3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>L4-L5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>L6-L7-L8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SN2 MUNNLAIT NAIT**

| ST3 | Ex: Piipl Kom |
| V6  | L16-L17 |
| V7  | L18-L19-L20 |
| V8  | L21-L22 |
| V9  | L23-L24-L25-L26 |

| ST4 | Cm: Berin |
| V10 | L27-L28-L29 |
| V11 | L30-L31-L32-L33-L34 |

| ST5 | Cl: Tuwordz Hii |
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4.5. DISCUSSION

Let us explore now the above-described texts to examine what characteristics can be found in them. It is notable that each of the texts is a *jombii* or 'ghost' story. It should also be noted that DH's text contains a hundred and thirteen lines whereas BS's has a hundred and four lines. This indicates that these two texts run approximately the same
length, which makes it possible to compare closely the two texts with respect to their organization of verse structure.

First of all, it is important to recall that a LINE is defined as an INTERPRETATION UNIT, representing 'a block of ideas constituting the minimum amount of information.' In DH’s text, there are a hundred and nine lines (96%) which are identified by predication, i.e., Line Feature 1, out of a total one hundred and thirteen lines. Besides those ninety-eight lines (87%) which have a predicate verb (i.e., Feature 1a), eleven lines, L12, L13, L14, L15, L56, L67, L71, L74, L92, L99, and L110, do not contain any such verbs. However, they seem to manifest certain ways of indicating predication. L12-L15 contain a post-clausal perfective marker don (Bickerton 1975: 40), which indicates that a certain action or state has been completed. L56 and L110, moreover, are adjective clauses which manifest a covert zero-copula. L92 also seems to be a zero-copula with a predicator trobl. Thus, the seven lines above are classified as Feature 1b, predicative phase. L67, L71, L74, and L99 are infinitive phrases, each of which can be counted as a separate line by Feature 1c: verbals. The lines L1-L2, L12-L14, L26-L27, L80-L81, and L96-L97 are structurally paralleled. However, they are counted as Feature 1 but not Feature 2 since all of those lines contain a predicate verb and a higher feature overrides lower ones in classifying the level features. L41, L63, L105, and L106 do not show any predication but are rather structurally independent interjections which are distinguished cohesively from both the preceding and the following lines. Because of that characteristic, those four phrases are considered to be lines by Feature 3: independence.

In BS’s text, ninety-four (91.3%) out of one hundred and three lines are identified by predication (Feature 1). Among them, eighty-seven (84.5%) out of a total lines contain a predicate verb, Feature 1a. L16, L56, L57, and L99 do not have a predicate verb. Bickerton (1975) claims that these adjective clauses are 'in fact surface stative verbs in Guyanese basilect.'
verb but show predicative phase (Feature 1b). *Bina* in L16 is a combined form of an anterior marker *bin* and a non-punctual marker *a*. According to Bickerton (ibid.: 37), the word in question resembles 'the past continuous tense.' Moreover, while *de a* in L56 and L57 indicates 'temporary states,' *de* in L99 marks 'permanent states.' (ibid.: 35) L3, L32, and L42, are infinitives, the last two of which are initiated by Guyanese infinitive marker *fu*. It is because of Feature 1c, verbals, that these three are regarded as lines. L36 and L60 structurally parallel L35 and L58-L59 respectively, therefore, they are considered to be separate lines on account of Feature 2, structural parallelism. L66-L68 and L70 are also parallel structures to be treated as separate lines despite the fact that these lines are in fact not predicate phrases at all but just locative adverbial phrases. Moreover, those of L81, L82, and L90 are independent interjections which can be classified as lines by Feature 3. Table 4-3 is a summary of Line Features in DH's and BS's texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DH</th>
<th></th>
<th>BS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. of lines (%)</td>
<td>No. of lines (%)</td>
<td>Total Lines</td>
<td>No. of lines (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1 (a)</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>(87)</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>(84.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1 (b)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1 (c)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3.5)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Lines</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>(100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VERSES** are the basic forms for the other levels and are defined as COHERENCY UNITS. A verse 'represents a minimal mental picture or image conveying a certain cohesive message.' Verses provide the pattern number in a given language. In other words, a verse is the next larger structure than a line in which a lowest acceptable proposition at least is conveyed (A line does not necessarily contain a proposition). The verse levels have been determined by focal meaning of information, that is, Verse Feature 1. There are almost the same number of verses found in DH's (thirty-seven
verses) and BS's (thirty-six verses) texts. Nonetheless, there is a slight difference in occurrence of verse-initial particles (VIP, hereafter) such as wel, wen, an, bot, su, and den (Feature 2). In DH’s text, twenty-nine verses (78.4%) begin with one of those particles while in BS’s text, only sixteen (44.4%) contain such initial particles (versicle 27 is excluded from counting).

Moreover, it is interesting to know how many of line-initial particles (LIP, henceforth) there are, and what ratio they account for in the total line number. Out of a total one hundred and thirteen lines, there are forty-eight LIPs in DH’s text. Thus, the ratio of LIP for all the lines is 42.5% (48/113 lines), which is much lower than the ratio that VIP (twenty-nine) has for all of the verses. In BS’s text, the ratio of the line-initial particles for all is 25% (26/103 lines), which is also much below the ratio of VIP for the total verses. Furthermore, if the number of VIPs is compared to that of the LIP, it is 60.4% in DH’s and 61.5% in BS’s. This indicates that more than half of the LIP in fact appear at the beginning of verses in both texts in GC. This finding should be kept in mind for reference which will be necessary when HCE is discussed in the following chapter. Feature 3, pauses and contours, is not identified since the present analysis of GC is based on the transcribed narrative texts. Given below are Verse Feature 1 and 2 in both of the texts:

DH
V1: dead; V2: burying; V3: frightened; V4: your house; V5: one month; V6: two girls; V7: go shopping; V8: one lady; V9: hasa; V10: cover; V11: come back; V12: not yet; V13: top; V14: one big noise; V15: parcel; V16: parcel again; V17: kitchen; V18: mustn't come; V19: not right; V20: breakfast; V21: don't eat; V22: help; V23: go together; V24: wash; V25: more than me; V26: forth and behind; V27: don't know; V28: jumping; V29: myself; V30: children; V31: trouble; V32: this work; V33: nobody; V34: the noise again; V35: jumping again; V36: true; V37: don't say.

BS
V1: one man; V2: sweat heart; V3: walk late; V4: lesson; V5: stop; V6: moonlight; V7: left; V8: walking; V9: people; V10: bury; V11: ghost; V12: Nana; V13: towards each other; V14: bridge; V15: save; V16: hide; V17: don't see; V18: see; V19: rest; V20: there at the bottom; V21: Nana again; V22: coffin; V23: feeling; V24: right underneath me; V25: know it; V26: continue; V27: stick; V28: tell you; V29: rush; V30: run; V31: Look!; V32: tonight?; V33: come; V34: fire; V35: behind; V36: can't bury.
Additionally, it is rather strange that there are no verse-final markers (Feature 4) found in GC texts. This fact appears to be a significant finding, which will be related to the hypothesis made in Chapter seven.

**DH**


**BS**


**STANZAS** are defined as **EPISODE UNITS**, which have to provide a certain episode within the broader topic of a given scene. Therefore, each stanza consists of a short cohesive story, and a theme must be shown that is maintained through a given stanza, i.e., Feature 1: The stanza levels in both of the texts follow a regular sequence of Exposition-Complication-Climax-Denouement in the respective scenes although there is some variation in its structure depending on the length and organization of each scene. Let us take a look at each of the stanza topics and structures (i.e., Feature 1 and 2) below:

**DH**

ST1=Beriyian; ST2=Yu Hous; ST3=Wan Mont; ST4=Goo a Shap; ST5=Wan Leedi; ST6=Kom Kwik; ST7=Wan Big Naiz; ST8=Paasli; ST9=Ageen; ST10=Na Rait; ST11=Breksos; ST12=Frainkin; ST13=Goo Op; ST14=Bihein; ST15=Taak; ST16=Trbl; ST17=Dis Naiz Agin; ST18=Laaf.

**BS**

ST1=Wen de Nait Kom; ST2=Yu Musn Waak; ST3=Piel Kom; ST4=Berin; ST5=Tuwords Hii; ST6=Haid; ST7=Kafin; ST8=Paas; ST9=Rait Andanit Dis Brij; ST10=A Waak Wid; ST11=Ron; ST12=Luku; ST13=Piuva; ST14=Nat Yet.
It is sometimes not easy to draw a clear line between Complication and Climax.\(^3\) However, it seems useful to apply the Climax category in order to observe the stanza structures as accurately as possible in terms of their rhetorical designs. For example, in SN3 of DH's text, Cm and Cl differ in that the former is about the scene before she goes shopping whereas the latter is about the situation when she returns from shopping. Yet, these two are within the same scene in which the children are daubing. In SN4, Cl shows that the big noise was made again at the end despite the fact that she, the narrator, repeatedly begged the *uncle spirit* not to frighten her and the children.

In BS's text, SN2 and SN4 contain Cl stanzas. In SN2, ST5 can appropriately be called *Climax* since the stanza in question describes a quite exciting and scary scene where the man and the jumbies are approaching each other. SN4 has ST13 as Cl, in which the man got mad and was finally emotionally fired up at the end. This stanza is actually the concluding episode in the man's series of actions, which is followed by the final stanza representing the epilogue.

**TABLE 4-4. Rhetorical design of stanzas in DH's text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st ST</th>
<th>2nd ST</th>
<th>3rd ST</th>
<th>4th ST</th>
<th>5th ST</th>
<th>6th ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4-5. Rhetorical design of stanzas in BS's text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1st ST</th>
<th>2nd ST</th>
<th>3rd ST</th>
<th>4th ST</th>
<th>5th ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\)Hymes (1981: 225) states: 'Notice that Climax can now be treated as an aspect of Complication, as intended by Brooks & Warren (ibid.[1949]: 278). He also indicates the use of Climax by saying: 'If, indeed, one were to apply the traditional categories just once to the whole narrative, then the way it was done in the earlier analysis would seem necessary.' In the present research, Climax is retained for all the analyses.
The next structural level in Verse Structure is a SCENE, which is defined as a LOWER JUNCTURE UNIT. In both texts, there are four scenes. In DH's text, the three scenes are marked by change of participants with the final scenes as transition of location, that is, participant-participant-participant-location. BS's text takes a sequence of participant-time-location-location. Both texts consist of only one act, which indicates that the narratives themselves are the UPPER JUNCTURE UNITS. This can be explained partly because of the rather short length of the texts.

**TABLE 4-6. Junctures for each of the scenes in DH's text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>JUNCTURES</th>
<th>KEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>ool maan (an old man)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>hasa (hassa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>dem pikini (children)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>a tap (the top floor)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 4-7. Junctures for each of the scenes in BS's text**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>JUNCTURES</th>
<th>KEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>wan maan (a man)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>munnlait nait (a moonlight night)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>brij (a bridge)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>brij kontinvud (a bridge continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regards to numbering in lines (See Tables 4-1 and 4-2), DH's has twelve equally for doublets, triplets, and quadruplets, whereas in BS's, there are fifteen doublets, thirteen triplets, six quadruplets, and two quintuplets. This indicates that DH's text manifests a balanced distribution of these three numbers, 2, 3, and 4. On the other hand, BS's text prefers 2 to the other numberings. Both of the texts reveal that verses go in doublets most of the time. In DH's, there are eleven doublets, four triplets, and three single verses. There are no verse quadruplets and quintuplets in DH's. In BS's, eight verses go in doublets, four triplets, and two quadruplets. There are no verse singles and quintuplets in BS's text. It appears that no preferred stanza
numbering has been discovered in either of the two texts in question. Each of the DH's scenes contain 3-3-6-6 stanza numbering, and that of BS's consists of 2-5-3-5 stanzas. Looking over the above described numbering preference as a whole, it seems reasonable to conclude that BS's but not DH's text prefers 2 as the most frequent number in lines. In verses, on the other hand, both texts take 2 as the most frequent number. Yet, number 3 also appears very frequently, which should be regarded as the next frequent number. There is neither primary nor secondary numbers. The numbering formula in lines, therefore, are \{2, 3, 4\} in DH's and \{2-3-4\} in BS's. The numbering formula in verses are \{2-3\} in DH's and \{2-3\} in BS's.

Now it is necessary to raise the question of whether the two texts above which have been analyzed in the framework of Verse analysis, DH's and BS's texts, are manifesting the four characteristics of poetic narratives that have previously been proposed. The answer to that question seems to be positive. First of all, the texts can be perceived in five levels of discourse units in the narrative texts which coincide with those described earlier: lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts. This means that the texts in question are analyzable according to linguistic concepts and criteria determined to identify each of those five levels above. That is to say, discourse units in GC's texts are structured by such hierarchical levels of conceptual meaning as interpretation, coherency, episode, lower juncture, and upper juncture. The second question will be: Are the lines short? Out of a total one hundred and thirteen lines in DH's text, as few as five lines include more than eight words, out of which only two lines exceed ten words. In BS's, there are only four, out of one hundred and four lines, which contain more than eight words, and there are no lines which have more than ten words.

Regarding the third question, can measured verse be observed?; in other words, is there any grammatico-semantic recurrence in coherency units showing any numbering preference? As can be seen in the above illustration, it is clear that the narrative texts are composed of recurrence of small discourse units which are identified as verses.
Moreover, both DH's and BS's present 2 & 3 as the verse number though the division between the most frequent and the next frequent numbers (i.e., 2 versus 3) is more salient in DH's. The fourth question 'if the distinction between lines and verses is clear or not' is challenging as it is necessary to look carefully to see if interpretation units or lines, also take the features of coherency units or verses. Put it in another way, it is the point of issue here to find any single line which establishes a minimal coherent mental picture or information process by itself as explained in 3.4.

In DH's text, only L16 will possibly be completely independent in meaning of the preceding L15 and the following L17 as information, although it should be kept in mind that L16 and L17 represent a single sequence of process which consists of two different actions a daab 'are daubing' and goo 'go.' In BS's text, L1, L27-9, L35-(L36), and L58-L59-(L60) may convey a coherent message by themselves as L1 serves as an introduction to tell that there is a man who used to walk late at night. Three groups of repetition in L27-9, L35-(L36), and L58-L59-(L60), in fact, have the identical utterance. The utterance tells that they will bury their Nana that night. As indicated thus far, it seems that these examples of lines expressing the verse character scarcely occur in poetic narratives. It will be observed more clearly if the GC texts in discussion are compared to the fragment of the prosaic SE narrative (introduced in 3.3) provided by Gee. It is convenient to recapitulate this here by arranging the narrative according not to Gee's criteria (i.e., pauses) but to that in the present framework proposed in 3.4. (i.e., Line Feature 1: predication) so that a more accurate comparison can be pursued under identical criteria.

L1 Probably the funniest was when I was first teaching in New Hampshire,
L2 There were many interesting but funny happenings,
L3 I think one of the most interesting,
L4 I taught in Woodstock my first year,
L5 And uh had a grow of children,

4That is to say, the two analyzed texts do not manifest a pair of even numbers, 2-4, as Hymes claims. This finding is discussed in detail in Chapter six.
There were eight grades in all with two teachers, and on Christmas, on the day before Christmas at that time, you could celebrate Christmas with presents and trees and so on, and the other teacher and I lived about a mile from the school, and about an hour before school began, we heard a lot of children shouting and so on, and they had pushed an old-fashioned sleigh to our house, and had us get in it with all our presents, and pushed us to school that morning. (Gee 1986: 406)

How many of the above lines or interpretation units can be autonomous coherent information processes or messages by themselves without combining with the preceding and/or the following lines? It seems, at least, that L1, L2, L6, L7, and L8 can well be single verses. L3-L5, L9 & L10, and L11-L13, would be more appropriately combined as coherency units, respectively, rather than be separated each other. Thus, if the framework in 3.4. is applied here, the text above is arranged as in the following verse structure.

V1 L1 Probably the funniest was when I was first teaching in New Hampshire.
V2 L2 There were many interesting but funny happenings.
V3 L3 I think one of the most interesting,
L4 I taught in Woodstock my first year.
L5 And uh had a grow of children.
V4 L6 There were eight grades in all with two teachers.
V5 L7 And on Christmas, on the day before Christmas at that time, you could celebrate Christmas with presents and trees and so on.
V6 L8 And the other teacher and I lived about a mile from the school.
V7 L9 And about an hour before school began,
L10 We heard a lot of children, shouting and so on.
V8 L11 And they had pushed an old-fashioned sleigh to our house,
L12 And had us get in it with all our presents,
L13 And pushed us to school that morning. )

(Arrangement by the present writer)5

5 L1 and L10 can be further divided into two lines if the present Verse Analytical framework is applied. But it is off the point which the present argument is emphasizing.
The discrepancy between the two texts in GC and the fragment of narrative discourse in SE appears to be very crucial. In the former, there are only a few lines (only one in DH's and nine in BS's) out of more than a hundred lines which carry the feature of verses. In the latter, however, there are five such lines out of only thirteen lines. From this brief comparison, it is very likely that much more line-verse units so to speak (i.e., interpretation & coherency units combined) will be found if a whole narrative discourse in SE is investigated (Future research is desirable). This fact shows again that there is a notable difference between poetic and prosaic narratives. In the former, interpretive units and coherency units are distinguished. In the latter, on the other hand, the distinction is not as clearly apparent as it is in poetic narrative. Put another way, interpretive units in prosaic narrative carry the features of coherency units as well.

In sum, it seems reasonable to argue that at least two narrative texts in Guyanese Creole analyzed here manifest poetic narrative and a salient verse structure has been discovered in patterning and numbering. Moreover, four general characteristics of poetic narrative have also been identified. Although much more study should be accomplished before making a general conclusion about what characteristics GC possesses in its narrative discourse, these analytical outcomes found in the present chapter function as an important prelude for the main discussion on Hawai'i Creole English which will take place in the next chapter. Are there any such general tendencies found in HCE narratives? Or are there any idiosyncratic features unveiled in the language, apart from those discovered in Chinook Jargon in Hymes's study and Guyanese Creole in Rickford's texts as uncovered here? It is the foremost task of Chapters five and six to answer those questions.
CHAPTER 5

THE APEX:

VERSE ANALYSIS OF HAWAII CREOLE ENGLISH

"We can see, therefore, that HCE may not follow the path of decreolization as laid out in the 1970s. No doubt HCE will play an important role among in-migrating non-English speakers, who may be living in heavily HCE-speaking areas. Moreover, HCE may well acquire some new linguistic characteristics from the speakers in what will be an altered local speech community."


5.1. PRELUDE

In this chapter, a qualitative analysis of narrative discourse in HCE is provided to describe in detail its characteristics. The analysis is carried out in comparison to the outcome of the investigation in GC, attained in the preceding chapter. It has been demonstrated that two texts of the language, DH's and BS's, present four fundamental characteristics of poetic narratives. It is the immediate concern now whether it is possible to find such characteristics of narrative discourse in HCE as well. In addition, it is also the aim of this chapter to touch on some differences that HCE demonstrates which are not shared by GC.

The present chapter follows an order similar to that of Chapter four although some modifications are made for the organization of the sections. Section 5.2. provides a brief background to the analyzed narrative discourse. Section 5.3. introduces two narrative discourse data, WK's and ER's narratives, transcribed in Odo orthography. These texts are accompanied by some related notes. Section 5.4. offers translation for each of the narrative texts in standard (English) orthography. In 5.5., profiles for the
patterning and the numbering of the verse structure in each of the narratives are presented so that the overall structures of the narratives can be observed more clearly. Section 5.6. focuses upon a detailed discussion of the narratives starting from the minimal line level to the maximum act level. Section 5.7. discusses poetic characteristics of HCE. The analysis that follows is based on the framework of VA discussed in Section 3.4 above.

5.2. A DESCRIPTION OF THE HCE NARRATIVES

In the present section, two narrative discourse texts are investigated: WK's and ER's. Both of the narrators have Hawaiian ancestry, and are native speakers of HCE. Although WK's text as a whole is mesolectal (or less basilectal than ER's), both of them retain basilectal features of the language. The basilectal aspects of HCE, according to Bickerton (1977), are identified typically by TMA (tense-mood-aspect) markers such as wen/bin (anterior), gon/go (irrealis), and ste (non-punctual), as well as preverbal negative markers, no/neva [+V]. WK has wen, go [+V], ste [+Adj], no [+V], and neva, and ER has wen, gon, no [+V], no kaen, and neva. Neither of the texts show 'non-punctual' ste. In addition, there are many Hawaiian words used in both of the narratives because of the speakers' cultural background.

WK's narrative has been excerpted from C[enter] for O[oral] H[istory] 1991b Vol.2. The text has been examined along with the corresponding recorded tape. The speaker is a native speaker of HCE, male, of Hawaiian ancestry, and forty-nine years of age at the time of recording. COH (ibid.: 511) describes the speaker, WK, as follows:

WK was born April 9, 1942 in Honolulu, but was raised in Manawai, Moloka'i. .... Through his father, WK learned much about fishing. After attending schools on Moloka'i, WK eventually became manager of the Moloka'i Fisherman's Association, a subsidiary of Lokahi Pacific of Maui, a fishermen's co-op. WK learned marketing skills since he often dealt with fish markets on Moloka'i, Maui, and O'ahu. Using skills he acquired from his father and uncle, WK today is actively helping his son, WK Jr., restore 'Ualapu'e Fishpond. He lives in
Kaunakakai with his wife, P, and his children. (The personal names have been initialized by the present author.)

This narrative text runs approximately the same length of pages (three pages) as two of GC texts introduced in Chapter four, and WK also tells ghost stories. It is interesting to learn, through his talk, how the spiritual or supernatural entity and power would be understood and interpreted in the Hawaiian Kapu System. WK tells a story that offers a piece of the aspects of the traditional Hawaiian culture preserved in the present times. There is no external intervention during his talk. This keeps a good quality as a monologue narrative or 'talk story.' Right before the narrative begins, the interviewer WN asks the speaker whether he finds any conflict between his Christian upbringing and the Hawaiian Kapu system. WK explains what he felt in detail by introducing an anecdote about a supernatural experience. The end of the text is immediately followed by another, related story about Christianity.

ER's narrative has been obtained from COH 1989b Vol.2. The corresponding tape has been examined along with the published narratives. The narrator is seventy-eight years of age, male, and of Hawaiian ancestry. The narrator ER is described in the following words in COH (ibid.: 747):

ER was born July 1, 1910 in Lahaina, Maui. As a child he learned to ride horses from his father, a cowboy for Pioneer Mill Company sugar plantation.... In 1926, ER came to Lana'i to work in Hawaiian Pineapple Company's fields, joining his older brother J and uncles and cousins who had arrived from Lahaina earlier. Soon after arriving, ER began working for Lana'i Ranch.... One of the last cowboys on payroll by 1951, the year the ranch closed, ER helped round up the remaining cattle and assisted in the closing up of operations. He then worked as a truck driver for Hawaiian Pineapple Company until his retirement in 1976. (The personal names have been initialized by the present author.)

---

1 Kapu is a Hawaiian word meaning 'prohibited' or 'forbidden.' When the term Kapu system is used, it refers to a body of folk religious habits about dos and don'ts in Hawaiian communities. Kapu system has been handed down from their ancestors over generations. Forman (p.c. 1/19/95) pointed out that the word kapu has derived from English taboo.
His story introduces a fragment of religious customs in the community of Hawaiian people around the time of pioneer days on plantations. The story shows how their religious idols have been worshipped, kept, and handed down to the following generation in the family. While WK's talk focuses on a spiritual aspect of Hawaiian religious tradition, ER's talk concentrates more on the practical habits of worship in Hawaiian lifestyle in connection to his own faith. One thing interesting is that in the two narratives, two kinds of fish, mano (shark) and weke, respectively, play an important role in their stories. Although both of the narrators seem to acknowledge the old Hawaiian styles of worship for those animal spirits, they are obviously inclined to keep distance from such customs of formalism in worshipping idols and to experience more mind-oriented type of religious practice which can work positively and help them in their lives.

ER's narrative also resembles in length the two GC texts as well as WK's text, i.e., some three pages. In fact, the four discourse texts in question, DH's and BS's in GC, and WK's and ER's in HCE, possess nearly the same number of lines and verses: Lines, DH=113; BS=103; WK=110; and ER=112; Verses, DH=37; BS=36; WK=43; and ER=41. This makes it possible to carry out a more accurate and close comparison of the similarities and differences in the four texts.

5.3. NARRATIVE DISCOURSES IN HCE

WK's Narrative: Male, 49, Hawaiian ancestry. Re-transcribed in Odo orthography
Center for Oral History 1991b: 519. (re-examined along with the recorded tape)

WAN GOST STORI

ACT HAWAIAN SPIRITS
SN1 MANO
ST1 Ex: [Participant]
    Prolog -- Kanflikt
V1
    L1 Ah, wel, ai tink,
    L2 Mainz go diipa den, den,
    L3 Da kanflikt wud raiz, spirityuo kain, YÆ. (.)

ST2 Cm: Fitz
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'Kawz, az ai waz groin,
Dea waz wan mano,
Det bilongz tu a famili. (1)

Ænd, dis mano, da famili yustu go daun,
Fiid'om, in sirn taimz. (.5)

Wan Keateka
End, da famili daid,
Da wan hu fed dis mano,
Æn' ai wanted tu bii da keateka fo dis mano. (.5)

End, æt wan taim in mai laif, ai went hed an wid Hawaian,
Hed an!

Ankoz Gift
XX, Mai anko, Jan Kawai Kaket, nyu da preyaz ay famin,
Hii nyu da preyaz ay fishing. (.5)

Ænd, hii hæd da gift,
Tu intrprt jriimz,
Æs waz hiz gift. (.5)

Ænd, so evritin in Hawaian det ai wanted tu no,
Ai, ai, kanseltid wid him, y'no,
Hed'en, hii wud tel mi, YNO. (.5)

Laifstail
Æn'den, ai rimemba,
Wanted tu bii dis keateka fo dis mano daun Keawa Nui Haba. (1)

Ænd, ai wen chrai liv, liv da Hawaian laifstail,
Wea ai did mai preyaz in da mawnin, æt lanch, ænd æt nait. (1)

Ænd, ai neva did mis da preyaz,
Ai waz rial feitfol tu 'om ænd evritin. (.5)

[Time, Location]
Viziruz
Æn' den, wan nait, mai ankol, wii wr stein æt Keawa Nui. (.5)

Den, ai hrd, hrd,
Piipo tawkin. (0)

Ænd, hæd chrri, chrri diferent piipo,
Tawkin tu mai ankol in da rum, awl in Hawaian. (.5)

Lisn
So, ai gat ap mai waif,
Ænd ai tol hr,
Chrai lisn tu dæt. (.5)

So, shii sez,
L37 Huz dæ?
L38 Ai sed shh. (1)

ST8 Cl: Ten Aklak
V17 L39 ÆEnd, wii sliip rii yæ, doz deiz,
L40 Æit aklak, naïn aklak, wii sliipin awredi. (. )
V18 L41 So, dis ting hæpend abaut ten aklak,
L42 Ai hia dem,
L43 Tawkin. (0)

ST9 Dn: Spirits
V19 L44 So, ai no sei natin,
L45 Bat ai awl iksaïed,
L46 Ai laik no,
L47 Huz dis. (0)

V20 L48 'Kawz, ai no
L49 Æs spirits,
L50 Its nat nachro, dis. (.5)

SN3 NEKS MAWNIN [Time]
ST10 Ex: Mæd
V21 L51 So, neks mawnin, mai anko iz ap evri mawnin æt fo
L52 Aklak,
V22 L53 So, ai kam daunsteaz,
L54 Ai laik luk æt him. (0)
V23 L55 ÆEnd, ho, wat iz dis!
L56 Hii ste pist, mæn. (.)
V24 L57 Y’no, yu kæn sii da ikspreshen,
L58 Hii mæd. (. )

ST11 Cm: Wach
V25 L59 Oh, chii, ai dono,
L60 Wat hæpnd. (0)
V26 L61 Bat, eniwei, ai go meik mai kap kafii,
L62 Ai s'daun an da seim teibo wid him,
L63 Ai wachin him. (.5)

ST12 Cm: Kahu
V27 L64 Den, awl av a sadn, hii tet mii,
L65 Yu wanna bï da kahu fo dis mano daun hia? (.5)
V28 L66 So, ai luk æt him,
L67 Ai tel him,
L68 Oh, yæ, y’no,
L69 Ai don, ai don wantu lai tu him. (.)

ST13 Cl: Kupunas
V29 L70 So, ai sed yæ,
L71 So hii tet mii,
L72 Ai tat,
L73 Hau yu no?

V30 L74 XX Hii tel mii,
L75 Yæ, dei keim læst nait,
L76 Tu old Hawaiian kupuna ænd da mano, himself, keim,
L77 Chrii av 'om keim.

ST14 Dn: Kwescbanin
V31 L78 Ænd, dei waz kweschanin mai ankol av,
L79 Hu waz ai,
V32 L80 Y'no, haukam ai muvd fram Manawai,
L81 Ænd ai ste Keawa Nui? Y'NO.
V33 L82 Ænd so haukam ai laik bii da keateka?
V34 L83 So, mai ankl sed, no, no, no, no,
L84 Hii no laik,
L85 Ah, dis boi donno natin,
L86 Dis, y'ho, hii wen send 'om awe.

SN4 AI AWL HÆPPI [Participant]
ST15 Ex: Hæpi
V35 L87 So, ai waz, æ,
L88 Ai ste an klaud nain,
L89 Ai awl hæpi,
L90 Ai figya, æ,
L91 It wrks,
L92 Da Hawaiian staff wrks.

ST16 Cm: Wan Neim
V36 L93 So, da frst tin ai Æsk mai ankl waz,
L94 Wat waz da manoñ neim.
V37 L95 XX Hii luk æt mii,
L96 Ænd sed, wat?

ST17 Cm: No Neim
V38 L97 XX Ai want da neim av da mano,
L98 Hu waz dis mano,
L99 Wat hiz neim?
V39 L100 So, hii donno,
L101 Hii neva æsk.

ST18 Cl: Kahea
V40 L102 SO, ai ges,
L103 Hii nuæ æflawrz.
V41 L104 'Kawz, if wii no da neim,
L105 Wii kud kahea, æ,
L106 Wii kud kawl.

ST19 Dn: Epilog--Iksaited
V42 L107 Bat, wii neva no,
L108 Ai neva no da neim.
ER's Narrative: Male, 78, Hawaiian ancestry. Re-transcribed in Odo orthography
Center for Oral History 1989b: 863. (Re-examined along with the recorded tape)

WAN GAD STORI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>BILIIF</th>
<th>WEKE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>[Participant]</td>
<td>[Participant]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>Ex: Prolog—Hed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1</td>
<td>L1 No, æswai, æswai,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L2 Da ol mæn, hii tel mii,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L3 Ai hia da wan,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | L4 Yu waz telin mii, æ. | (.5)
| V2  | L5 XX Dei sed, | |
|     | L6 Weke, yu no ken iit da hed. | (.)
| V3  | L7 XX Yu get bæd jriim, | |
|     | L8 O yu go sam pleis. | (.)

| ST2 | Cm: Tutu Mæn | |
| V4  | L9 XX Ai æskt da, ai æskt da tutu mæn, | |
|     | L10 Da tutu mæn tel. | (.)
| V5  | L11 Bikawz yu biliiv, | |
|     | L12 Sam gaiz, æ, weke, weke, | |
|     | L13 Ås jalaik dea gad. | (.5)

| ST3 | Cm: Hawaian Gad | |
| V6  | L14 Y'no, old Hawaiian pleis, Hawaiian taim, | |
|     | L15 Dei gat gad, æ, insaid dis kain. | (.)
| V7  | L16 So, da famili, dei biliiv in da weke | |
|     | L17 Yu iit da hed, | |
|     | L18 Yu get dakain, | |
|     | L19 Bikawz yu biliiv. | (.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN2</th>
<th>TOTEMZ</th>
<th>[Participant]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>Cm: Grænparents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8</td>
<td>L20 XX Yo, yo, yo grænparents, y' no, da grænparents,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     | L21 Awl wæn biliiv dis kain. | (.)
| V9  | L22 So, æs jalaik, | |
|     | L23 Hawaian, dei tel makua, æ, | |
|     | L24 Jalaik æs dea gad. | (1)

| ST5 | Cm: Oni Wan Gad | |
| V10 | L25 XX Hii tel mii, | |
|     | L26 Yu no biliiv dakaìn, | |
|     | L27 Bikawz yu biliiv, | |
|     | L28 Get oni wan Gad. | (.5)
| V11 | L29 XX Ås awl da Gad, | |
|     | L30 Yu get. | (.)
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ST6 Cl: Oun Gad
V12 L31 Bikawz hii sed,
L32 Gad, gad, evribadi get oun gad,
L33 Dei kiip dea oun gad. (.5)

V13 L34 XX Æswai,
L35 Yu biliiv. (0)

V14 L36 XX Æswai,
L37 Yu no kaen,
L38 Yu no kaen.
L39 Bikawz yu biliiv. (.5)

V15 L40 An' den gon kam an tap yu,
L41 Genereishen, genereishen, genereishen,
L42 Bikawz yu biliiv. (.5)

ST7 Dn: Biliif
V16 L43 Bat if yu no biliiv diiz tingz,
L44 Natin. (.5)

V17 L45 XX Æswai,
L46 Hii tel,
L47 Yu oni biliiv wan Gad, wan Gad en da San.
L48 Da FaDa en da San. (.5)

V18 L49 XX Æs awl,
L50 Yu biliiv. (.5)

ENIKAIN [Participant]

ST8 Ex: Meni Kain
V19 L51 Bat sambadi get eni kain,
L52 Sambadi get shak,
L53 Sambadi get dakain fish, 'o'io,
L54 Meni kain get. (.5)

V20 L55 XX Hii tel mii,
L56 Pleni gaiz get eni kain. (.5)

ST9 Cm: Kiip
V21 L57 XX Dei kiip,
L58 Y' no da ol piipo, dei kiip. (.5)

V22 L59 So, da ol piipo, meibii, dei neva,
L60 Dei neva kest 'om af.
L61 Dei no kest det tin af,
L62 So det tin gon bai genereishen, genereishen. (.5)

ST10 Cm: Eni Kain
V23 L63 Yë, ës wat,
L64 Hii tel mii, Y'NO. (.5)

V24 L65 XX Æswai,
L66 Nau ai no biliiv nau deiz in eni kain. (.5)

ST11 Cl: FaDa æn San
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V25  L67  XX  Hii  tel  mii,
     L68  Yu  oni  biliiv,
     L69  Yu  get  oni  wan  Gad,  FaDa  æn  da  San,
     L70  Æs  awl.  (.5)

V26  L71  XX  Æs  wat,
     L72  Hii  tel.  (.5)

ST12  Dn:  No  Lisn
V27  L73  XX  Æswai,
     L74  Mii,  enibadi  tel  eni  kain,  Æ.  (.5)

V28  L75  XX  Ai  no  lisen,
     L76  Ai  no  laik  biliiv  dem  gai,
     L77  Wat  dei  tawk.  (1)

SN4  AIDL  [Participant]
ST13  Ex:  Spuk
V29  L78  Bikawz  ai  no  mai  fren,
     L79  Hii  wen  tel  mii,
     L80  Da  gad,  da  gad,  aidol,  jalaik  aidol,  æ,
     L81  Evribadi  get  eni  kain.  (.5)

V30  L82  Samataim  yu  dono,
     L83  Ste  insaid  yo  haus,
     L84  Dei  kiip  dakain,  Æ.  (0)

V31  L85  XX  Tingz  ste  da  haus,
     L86  Gon  get  dakain,  tu,
     L87  Spuk.  (.5)

V32  L88  Bikawz  hii  kiip.
     L89  Hii  kiip.  (0)

ST14  Cm:  Chiliren
V33  L90  An'  den  dei  go  an  da  chiliren,
     L91  An  da  chilirenz  chiliren,
     L92  Bikawz  dei  kiip  dakain.  (.5)

V34  L93  XX  Hii  ñed,
     L94  No  biliiv.  (.5)

V35  L95  Bikawz  yu  biliiv.
     L96  Yu  biliiv.
     L97  Yu  biliiv.  (.)

ST15  Cl:  Shchrong
V36  L98  Den,  gon  bii  shchrong  in  yu,
     L99  Bikawz  da  ting  kæn  wrk,
     L100  Bikawz  yu  biliiv.  (.5)

V37  L101  Bat  yu,  hii  tel  mii,
     L102  No  biliiv.  (.5)

ST16  Dn:  Prei
V38  L103  XX  Æswai,  mii.
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L104  Ai no biliiv enitin.

V39  L105  XX  Ai oni biliiv wan FaDa æn da San,
     L106  Yu pres.
     L107  Yu pres tu da San.

ST17 Dn: Epilog—Tek Kea
V40  L108  If da San, hii oke,
     L109  Hii go tu da FaDa.

V41  L110  Den, da FaDa da wan tek kea,
     L111  Æs wat,
     L112  Hii tel mii. }
     PAU

Notes: kahea < Hawaiian 'to call,' kahu < Hawaiian 'pastor, minister, reverend,' kepalo < Hawaiian 'devil, devilish,' kupuna < Hawaiian 'ancestor,' makua < Hawaiian 'benefactor, provider, the God,' mano < Hawaiian 'shark,' oki < Hawaiian 'to cut, cancel, separate,' tuu < Hawaiian 'grandfather, elderly,' wen < HCE = an anterior marker, gon < HCE = an irrealis marker, no < HCE = a preverbal negative marker, neva < HCE = a preverbal preterit negative marker, fo < HCE = an infinitive particle, pau < HCE = a perfective tense marker.

5.4. TRANSLATION

Translation of WK's Narrative: Transcribed in standard (English) orthography

A GHOST STORY

ACT  HAWAIIAN SPIRITS
     SN1  SHARK

ST1  Prologue — Conflict
     V1  L1  Ah, well, I think,
         L2  Mine goes deeper then.
         L3  The conflict would rise as a spiritual thing, you know.

ST2  Feeds
     V2  L4  Because, as I was growing,
         L5  There was a shark,
         L6  That belongs to a family.

V3  L7  And as for the shark, the family used to go down,
     L8  Feed it in certain times.

ST3  A Caretaker
     V4  L9  And, the family died,
         L10  The one who fed that shark,
         L11  And I wanted to be the caretaker for it.

V5  L12  And, at one time in my life, I went head on with
     L13  Hawaiian,
     L14  Head on.

ST4  Uncle's Gift
My uncle, John Kawai Cockett, knew the prayers of farming.
He knew the prayers of fishing.
And, he had the gift,
To interpret dreams,
That was his gift.
And, so everything in Hawaiian that I wanted to know,
I consulted with him, you know,
And then he would tell me, you know.

And then, I remember,
Wanted to be this caretaker for the shark down Keawa Nui Harbor.
And, I tried to live, live, live the Hawaiian lifestyle,
Where I did my prayers in the morning, at lunch, and at night.
And, I have never missed the prayers,
I was real faithful to it and everything.

And then, one night, my uncle, we were staying at Keawa Nui.
Then, I heard, heard,
People talking.
And, there were three, three different people,
Talking to my uncle in the room, all in Hawaiian.

So, I got up my wife,
And I told her,
Try to listen to that.
So, she says,
Who's that?
I said Shh.

And, we sleep early those days, don't we?
Eight o'clock, nine o'clock, we are already sleeping.
So, this thing happened about ten o'clock,
I heard them,
Talking.

So, I didn't say anything,
But I was all excited,
I wanted to know,
Who's this.
Because, I know,
That's spirits,
It's not natural to have such a thing.

So, next morning, my uncle is up every morning at four o'clock,
He's already drinking his coffee.

So, I came downstairs,
I liked to look at him.

And, Gee, what was this!
He was angry, man.

Y' know, you can see the expression,
He was mad.

Oh, boy, I didn't know,
What happened.

But, anyway I went to make my cup coffee,
I sat down on the same table with him,
I was watching him.

Then, all of a sudden, he asked me,
You want to be the caretaker for the shark down here, don't you?

So, I looked at him,
I told him,
Oh, yeah, you know,
I didn't, I didn't want to lie to him.

So, I said yeah,
So he told me,
I asked him,
How do you know that?

He told me,
Yeah, they came last night,
Two old Hawaiian ancestors and the shark himself came.
Three of them came.

And, they were questioning my uncle of--
Who was I.

Y' know, how come I moved from Manawai,
And I am staying Keawa Nui?, you know.

And, so how come I like to be the caretaker?
So, my uncle said, no, no, no, no, no, he doesn't like, 
Ah, this boy doesn't know anything, 
This, you know, he sent them away.

So, I was, you know, 
I stayed on cloud nine, 
I was very happy, 
I figured out, you know, 
It works, 
The Hawaiian stuff works.

So, the first thing I asked my uncle was, 
What was the shark's name.

He looked at me, 
And said, what?

I want the name of the shark, 
Who is this shark, 
What is his name?

So, he doesn't know, 
He has never asked it.

So, I guess, 
He knew afterwards.

Because, if we know the name, 
We could call, right, 
We could call.

But, we have never known, 
I have never known the name.

But, I was excited about it, 
So that was that. 

Translation of ER's Narrative: Transcribed in standard (English) orthography

A GOD STORY

ACT

BELIEF

SN1 WEREK

ST1 Prologue--Head

V1 L1 No, that's why, that's why,
L2 The old man, he told me, 
L3 I heard the one, 
L4 You were telling me, right.
They said,  
You cannot eat the head of weke.

You will get a bad dream,  
Or you have to go to somewhere.

I asked the, I asked the old man,  
The old man said.

Because you believe,  
Some guys believe in weke,  
That's just like their god.

You know, old Hawaiian place, Hawaiian time,  
They have gods inside this kind of thing.

So, the family believe in the weke,  
If you eat the head,  
You will get that thing,  
Because you believe so.

Your grandparents, you know,  
All of them believed such a thing.

So, that's just like,  
Hawaiian talk about Makua, right?  
Just like that's their god.

He told me,  
You don't believe that thing,  
Because you believe,  
There is only one God.

That's all the God,  
You have.

Because he said,  
Everybody has his/her own god,  
They keep their own god.

That's why,  
You believe.

That's why,  
You cannot,  
You cannot,  
Because you believe.

And then going come on top you,  
Generation, generation, generation,  
Because you believe.
But if you don’t believe in these things, Nothing.

That’s why, He said
You only believe in one God, one God and the Son, The Father and the Son.

That’s all, You believe.

But anybody has any kind of god, Somebody has a shark, Somebody has that kind of fish, ‘o’io, There are many kind of gods.

He said to me, Many people have many kind of gods.

They keep that, You know the old people keep that.

So the old people, maybe, they never, They have never cast it off, They have not cast that thing off, So that thing is going by generation and generation.

Yeah, that’s what, He told me, you know.

That’s why, I don’t believe in any kind of such gods now.

He told me, You only believe, You have only one God, the Father and the Son, That’s all.

That’s what, He said.

That’s why, Anybody tell me anything, right?.

I don’t listen, I don’t like to believe those people and What they say.
Because I know my friend,
He told me,
The god is just like an idol, isn't it?,
Everybody can have anything.

Sometimes you don't know,
What is kept in your house,
They keep that kind of idol, don't they.

Things are kept in the house,
It has such kind of thing, too,
It is spooky.

Because he keeps it,
He keeps it.

And then go on to the children,
On the children's children,
Because they keep it.

He said,
Don't believe it.

Because you believe it,
You believe it,
You believe it.

Then it is going to be strong in you,
Because the thing can work,
Because you believe.

But you he said to me,
Don't believe it.

That's why, me,
I don't believe anything.

I only believe one Father and the Son,
You pray,
You pray to the Son.

If the Son is okay,
He goes to the Father.

Then the Father takes care,
That's what,
He told me.}

(Arrangement by the present author.)
5.5. PROFILE: PATTERNING & NUMBERING

The following outlines indicate the organization or the patterning of Verse Structures in WK's and ER's narratives. The first column presents the structure of each level starting from act to line, the second column provides a verse-initial particle for each of the verses, and the last column shows the length of pause for each of the verses. Table 5-1 and 5-2 which follow describes a clear picture of the numbering preference in each of the analyzed two narrative discourses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WK's WAN GOST STORI: Profile--Patterning</th>
<th>HAWAIAN SPIRITS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT MANO</td>
<td>[Participant]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN1 MANO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST1 Ex: Prolog--Kanflikt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1 L1-L2-L3</td>
<td>Ah (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST2 Cm: Fiiz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2 L4-L5-L6</td>
<td>Kawz (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3 L7-L8</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3 Cm: Wan Keateka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4 L9-L10-L11</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5 L12-L13</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4 Cl: Anklz Gift</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6 L14-L15</td>
<td>XX (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V7 L16-L17-L18</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V8 L19-L20-L21</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5 Dn: Laifstail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9 L22-L23</td>
<td>End'den (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10 L24-L25</td>
<td>End (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11 L26-L27</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2 WAN NAAT</td>
<td>[Time, Location]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6 Ex: Vizirrz</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V12 L28</td>
<td>End'den (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V13 L29-L30</td>
<td>Den (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14 L31-L32</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7 Cm: Lisa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V15 L33-L34-L35</td>
<td>So (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V16 L36-L37-L38</td>
<td>So (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8 Cl: Ten Aklak</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17 L39-L40</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V18 L41-L42-L43</td>
<td>So (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST9 Dn: Spirits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V19 L44-L45-L46-L47</td>
<td>So (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20 L48-L49-L50</td>
<td>Kawz (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3 NEKST MAWNNIN</td>
<td>[Time]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST10 Ex: Mâd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21 L51-L52</td>
<td>So (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V22 L53-L54</td>
<td>So (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V23 L55-L56</td>
<td>End (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V24 L57-L58</td>
<td>Y'no (.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST11 Cm: Wach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ER's WAN GAD STORI: Profile--Patterning

ACT

SN1 WEKE [Participant]
ST1 Ex: Prolog--Hed
V1 L1-L2-L3-L4 No (.5)
V2 L5-L6 XX (.5)
V3 L7-L8 XX (.5)

ST2 Cm: Tutu Mena
V4 L9-L10 XX (.5)
V5 L11-L12-L13 Bikawz (.5)

ST3 Cm: Hawaian Gad
V6 L14-L15 Y' no (.5)
V7 L16-L17-L18-L19 So (.5)

SN2 TOTEMZ [Participant]
ST4 Cm: Graenparents
V8 L20-L21 XX (.5)
V9 L22-L23-L24 So (.1)

ST5 Cm: Oni Wan Gad
V10 L25-L26-L27-L28 XX (.5)
V11 L29-L30 XX (.5)

ST6 Cm: Oun Gad
V12 L31-L32-L33 Bikawz (.5)
V13 L34-L35 XX (0)
V14 L36-L37-L38-L39 XX (.5)
V15 L40-L41-L42 Æn' den (.5)

ST7 Dn: Biliif
V16 L43-L44 Bat (.)
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V17 L45-L46-L47-L48 XX (.)
V18 L49-L50 XX (.)

SN3 ENIKAIN [Participant]
ST8 Ex: Meni Kain
V19 L51-L52-L53-L54 Bat (.)
V20 L55-L56 XX (.)

ST9 Cm: Kiip
V21 L57-L58 XX (.)
V22 L59-L60-L61-L62 So (.)

ST10 Cm: Eni Kain
V23 L63-L64 Ye (.)
V24 L65-L66 XX (.)

ST11 Cl: FaDa en San
V25 L67-L68-L69-L70 XX (.)
V26 L71-L72 XX (.)

ST12 Dn: No Lien
V27 L73-L74 XX (.)
V28 L75-L76-L77 XX (.)

SN4 AIDL [Participant]
ST13 Ex: Spuk
V29 L78-L79-L80-L81 Bikawz (.)
V30 L82-L83-L84 Samtaim (0)
V31 L85-L86-L87 XX (.)
V32 L88-L89 Bikawz (0)

ST14 Cm: Chiljren
V33 L90-L91-L92 Æn' den (.)
V34 L93-L94 XX (.)
V35 L95-L96-L97 Bikawz (.)

ST15 Cl: Shchron
V36 L98-L99-L100 Den (.)
V37 L101-L102 Bat (.)

ST16 Dn: Prei
V38 L103-L104 XX (1)
V39 L105-L106-L107 XX (.)

ST17 Dn: Epillog--Tek Kea
V40 L108-L109 If (.)
V41 L110-L111-L112 Den pau
### TABLE 5-1. The numbering of verse structure in WK's narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS</th>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>STANZAS</th>
<th>VERSES</th>
<th>LINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>V1</td>
<td>[1]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>V2&amp;V3</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>V6-V8</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST9</td>
<td>V19-V20</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 5-2. The numbering of verse structure in ER's narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS</th>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>STANZAS</th>
<th>VERSES</th>
<th>LINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>V1-V3</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>V12-V15</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST7</td>
<td>V16-V18</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>ST13</td>
<td>V29-V32</td>
<td>[4]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.6. DISCUSSION

#### 5.6.1. Line

In this subsection, an analysis is presented for the above-introduced narrative structures from the minimal level, LINE. A line is defined as an INTERPRETATION.
UNIT, representing 'a block of ideas constituting the minimum amount of information.'

(Chapter three, 3.4.) First of all, it is recognized that there are twelve lines (L13, L17, L30, L32, L40, L43, L45, L58, L63, L68, L89, and L99) in WK and nine lines in ER (L12, L14, L20, L41, L48, L80, L87, L91, and L108) which do not have a predicate verb or a be-verb as is expected from the first feature of lines, that is, Feature 1a. However, these six lines; L40=slipin, L45=iksaited, L58=mæd, L63=wachin, L89=hæpi, and L99=neim, in WK, and four lines; L12=weke, L80=aidl, L87=spuk, and L108=oke, in ER, do in fact express a certain predicative phase by an implicit zero copula and a predicating such as an adjective, a noun, or a participle, indicated above.

This phenomenon is a very common syntactic construction in HCE, and thus, following Feature 1b, those utterances are counted as lines. The four lines of L17=tu intrprit, L30=tawkin, L32=tawkin, and L43=tawkin, in WK, are counted as separate lines as they contain either of an infinitive, an absolute present or past participle (Feature 1c). There is no Feature 1c found in ER. (L12)-L13 in WK, and (L47)-L48 and (L90)-L91 in ER, are structurally paralleled respectively (Feature 2). Moreover, L68 in WK, and L14, L20, and L41 in ER, are considered to be separate lines based on Feature 3, independence.

Out of the total of one hundred and ten lines in WK, ninety-eight lines (89%) follow Feature 1a: a predicate verb; six lines (5.4%) follow Feature 1b: a predicative phase; four lines (3.6%) are identified by Feature 1c: a verbal; one line (1%) Feature 2: parallelism, which is underlined; and one line (1%) falls in Feature 3: independence, which is italicized. In sum, 98% of the lines have been identified by predication, i.e., Feature 1(a, b, c). In the total of one hundred and twelve lines in ER's story, one hundred and three lines (92%) are identified by Feature 1a, four lines (3.5%) Feature

---

2 The PREDICATOR of a simple declarative sentence is the word (sometimes a group of words) which does not belong to any of the referring expressions and which, of the remainder, makes them most specific contribution to the meaning of the sentence. (Hurford & Heasley 1983: 44)
1b, no lines Feature 1c, two lines (1.8%) Feature 2, and three lines (2.7%) Feature 3. This shows that 95.5% of all the lines manifest predication in ER's narrative. Table 5-3 summarizes distributions of Line Features in both narratives.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature 1a</th>
<th>WK No. of lines (98) (%)</th>
<th>ER No. of lines (103) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1b</td>
<td>6 (5.4)</td>
<td>4 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 1c</td>
<td>4 (3.6)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 2</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>2 (1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feature 3</td>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>3 (2.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total lines</td>
<td>110 (100)</td>
<td>112 (100)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6.2. Verse

VERSES are the basic forms for the other levels and are defined as COHERENCY UNITS. A verse 'represents a minimal mental picture or image conveying a certain cohesive message,' (3.4.) providing the pattern number in a given language. As explained in Chapter three, Chafe (1980) explains that this mental image represents the intermediate cognitive units between single focuses and entire memories (26). Moreover, a verse is the next larger structure than a line and at least a single meaningful proposition is conveyed in it, whereas a line does not necessarily contain a proposition.

First of all, a cohesive message in question seems to be identified as a focal meaning of a proposition. It is a meaning which is standing out clearly in a given group of lines and can be distinguished from the messages that other groups of lines are conveying.

Following is a suggested focal meaning, i.e., Feature 1, for each of the verses. One thing interesting here is the organization of verses in ER. Contrary to WK's verses in which a variety of focal meaning can be recognized, some focal meanings in ER's verses resemble one another in their propositional contents. That is to say, a focal

---

3The lines which are structurally paralleled are all underlined in the texts. However, if those underlined lines contain any one of the predication features, i.e., Feature 1(a, b, c), the feature overrides Feature 2: parallelism when calculated in classification.
meaning for each of the verses is not diverse but rather is limited and repeated several times, such as God, believe, no believe, and he. These repeated focal meanings are signaled by Greek numbers in the charts above.

WK
V1: a conflict; V2: a mano; V3: feed it; V4: a caretaker; V5: head on; V6: the prayers; V7: the gift; V8: consultation; V9: wish; V10: Hawaiian lifestyle; V11: no miss; V12: Keawa Nui; V13: eavesdropping; V14: three people; V15: wife; V16: silence; V17: sleeping; V18: ten o’clock; V19: excited; V20: unnatural; V21: uncle; V22: downstairs; V23: pissed; V24: expression; V25: don’t know; V26: watching; V27: wish; V28: yes; V29: wonder; V30: visitors; V31: question I; V32: question II; V33: question III; V34: nothing; V35: Hawaiian stuff; V36: name; V37: response; V38: his name; V39: no name; V40: afterwards; V41: call; V42: never know; V43: excited again.

ER
V1: the old man V2: head; V3: dream; V4: tutu man; V5: believe I; V6: god; V7: believe II; V8: believe III; V9: makua; V10: one God I; V11: all the God; V12: own God; V13: believe IV; V14: believe V; V15: believe VI; V16: nothing; V17: one God II; V18: believe VII; V19: many kind; V20: any kind I; V21: old people; V22: generation; V23: he I; V24: no believe I; V25: one God III; V26: he II; V27: any kind II; V28: them guy; V29: idol; V30: dakine; V31: spook; V32: keep; V33: children; V34: no believe II; V35: believe VIII; V36: believe IX; V37: no believe III; V38: believe IV; V39: father & son I; V40: father & son II; V41: he III.

Second, most verses are marked by a verse-initial particle (i.e., VIP), Feature 2, which is indicated by bold letters in the text. Out of all the verses in each narrative, thirty-nine verses, that is, 90.6% in WK, and twenty verses, i.e., 48.7% in ER, contain a VIP at its starting position, as can be seen below.

WK

ER
It is not certain why ER's narrative shows only 48.7% occurrence of particles at the verse-initial position. What can be stated is that, in ER's at least, VIP does not seem to be as salient feature as it is in WK when a minimal cohesive message is indicated as a unit.⁴

Now it is interesting to see how many lines begin with an initial particle and what ratio they account for in the total amount of lines. Out of a hundred and ten lines, forty-eight lines start with a line-initial particle (LIP) in WK's text. Thus, the ratio of LIP for all the lines is 43.6% (48/110 lines), which is much lower than the ratio that VIP has for all of the verses (90.6%, 39/43 verses). In ER's text, the ratio of LIP for all the lines is 26.7% (30/112 lines), which is also much below the ratio VIP has for the total verses, that is, 48.7% (20/41 verses). Furthermore, if the number of the verse particles is compared to that of line particles (i.e., the number of VIP divided by the number of LIP), it is 81.2% in WK's and 66.6% in ER's. This result parallels the finding in Chapter four and indicates again that many of the LIP-prefaced lines appear at the beginning of verses in both texts in HCE as well as in GC.

Third, it should be noted that, in WK's narrative, sixteen verses (38%) are identified by a micro-pause, twelve (29%) half-second, and five (12%) one second pauses. Nine verses (21%) do not receive any pauses at their termination. Most of the verses which are followed by a pause are also terminated with certain prosodic cues such as a contour. As a whole, 79% out of forty-two verses (except the final verse) are signaled by a micro-pause or longer at the termination position (Feature 3; a time is given in parentheses at the end of each verse). A difficult part is [ST14] (V33) L82. The reason for constructing L82 as an independent verse unit is because it constitutes a separate semantic unit by itself, and it can be structurally independent of L81 and L83.

⁴Bickerton (p.c. 1/94) suggests that the absence of VIPs is one of the basilectal features of ER on the ground that both of the two GC texts introduced in Chapter four are also basilectal texts and their use of VIPs are not very frequent (59% and 61%) compared to WK. His hypothesis is highly plausible, and further investigation is expected to see if it is the case in basilectal varieties of other creole languages.
It seems more appropriate to make the verse separate from others than combining it with V34 to make it a single verse. L82 also possesses a VIP (Feature 2). Moreover, it has a micro-pause at the end that distinguishes it from V32 (Feature 3). In ER's narrative, sixteen verses (40%) are identified by a micro-pause, eighteen (45%) half-second, and three (7.5%) one second pause. Only three verses (7.5%) do not make any pauses at their termination. As a whole, 92.5% out of forty verses (except the final verse) are signaled by a micro-pause or longer at the termination position (Feature 3).

5.6.3. Stanza

STANZAS are understood as EPISODE UNITS. This unit has to provide a certain episode within the broader topic of a given scene. Each of the stanzas carries a certain sequential rhetorical function within a scene as described in 3.4., that is, Stanza Feature 1 (i.e., Exposition or Ex, Complication or Cm, Climax or Cl, and Denouement or Dn). Feature 1 of each of the narratives is summarized in Table 5-4 and 5-5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st ST</th>
<th>2nd ST</th>
<th>3rd ST</th>
<th>4th ST</th>
<th>5th ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1st ST</th>
<th>2nd ST</th>
<th>3rd ST</th>
<th>4th ST</th>
<th>5th ST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>Cm</td>
<td>Cl</td>
<td>Dn</td>
<td>Dn</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WK's narrative presents a regular sequence of stanzas in each of the four scenes. In SN1, CI emphasizes the fact that his uncle is gifted in some kind of spiritual power. SN2 has ST8 as its CI and the narrator was described, in that CI, to be listening quietly to what those spirits were saying. CI in SN3 shows the narrator's wonder why his uncle knows his wish, and he is told that those spirits have told his uncle about it. In SN4, ST18 is CI, however, it seems to be more an additional or supplementary explanation than an elaboration for the preceding Cm, serving as an afterthought. Unlike WK's narrative, ER's reveals two varied sequences of rhetorical designs in scene 1 and 4. First of all, it is noted that SN1 is rather short in organization consisting of only three stanzas lacking CI. The next two scenes 2 and 3 follow regular rhetorical designs. On the other hand, SN4 consists of five stanzas and there are two denouements at the end of the narrative. Moreover, each stanza consists of a short cohesive story, and a theme must be shown that is maintained through a given stanza, i.e., Feature 2:

WK
ST1=Prolog--Kanflkt; ST2=Fiiiz; ST3=Wan Keateka; ST4=Anklz Gift; ST5=Laifstail; ST6=Vizitrz; ST7=Lisn; ST8=Ten Aklak; ST9=Spirits; ST10=Mård; ST11=Wach; ST12=Kahu; ST13=Kupunas; ST14=Kweschaniñ; ST15=Häpi; ST16=Wan Neim; ST17=No Neim; ST18=Kahea; ST19=Epilog--Iksaited.

ER
ST1=Prolog--Hed; ST2=Tutu Menc; ST3=Hawaina6 Gad; ST4=Grænpaarents; ST5=Oni Wan Gad; ST6=Oun Gad; ST7=Biliñ; ST8=Meni Kain; ST9=Kiip; ST10=Eni Kain; ST11=FaDa am San; ST12=No Lisn; ST13=Spuk; ST14=Chilñren; ST15=Shchrong; ST16=Pret; ST17=Epilog--Tek Kea.

5.6.4. Scene & Act

The next hierarchical level in verse structure is a SCENE, which is defined as a LOWER JUNCTURE UNIT. Four main scenes are recognized in WK's narrative based on four large and clear transitions of participant, time/location, time, and participant in the narrative. In the first scene (L1-L27), the narrator talks mainly about a shark that his
family kept. The second scene (L28-L50) tells what happened at their home when he and his wife were sleeping one night. He says that he perceived three visitors talking to his uncle. The third scene (L51-L86) follows up the preceding scene to describe what his uncle was explaining next morning about the three visitors. In the fourth scene (L87-L110), the narrator expresses his feeling and excitement about a supernatural belief in the traditional Hawaiian worship.

In ER's narrative, there are also four scenes recognized. The distinction between SN1 and SN2 is indicated by a change of main participants from weke to totems or generic belief in animals. SN2 is from ST4 to ST7 in which the narrator emphasizes the importance of having a belief of the single God. SN3, which is from ST8 to ST12, places a focus on people who tend to have their own gods once they believe in them, no matter what those gods really are, i.e., 'anykind.' SN4 goes on to talk about idols which are customarily kept in a house for generations. The discrepancies among different scenes, identified by such pragmatic junctures as changes of time, location, situations, and participants, are related to one of Hymes's criteria that 'scenes are discerned by a topic shift' as well. What have been described above may be summarized in Table 5-6 and 5-7.

The final maximum level in verse structure is ACT, which is defined as an UPPER JUNCTURE UNIT. Two narratives analyzed in HCE, WK's and ER's, consist of only one upper juncture. In WK's narrative entitled 'A Ghost Story,' the upper juncture or Act is a part, among other several talks in the interview, in which the narrator discusses the traditional Hawaiian religious style. In ER's narrative entitled 'A God Story,' the narrator talks about how he has received a lesson from his elder so that he has come to believe in only one god in Christianity. Both of the two acts in question can be regarded as units larger than scenes. At the same time, they can constitute an

---

5In the analysis of stanzas, the term participants include those which are generally called topics of a story.
autonomous structure by constructing coherency themselves. Both narratives are stories focused upon faith. However, in WK's, a spiritual aspect or invisible experience is emphasized whereas in ER's, it is idols or visible forms in religion that seem to be the focus of his talk.

### Table 5-6. Junctures for each of the scenes in WK's narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>JUNCTURES</th>
<th>KEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>shark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Time, Location</td>
<td>one night, Keawa Nui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>next morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>speaker</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5-7. Junctures for each of the scenes in ER's narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>JUNCTURES</th>
<th>KEYS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>weke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>totems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN3</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>any kind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN4</td>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>idol</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5.7. Poetic Attributes in HCE

Now is the time to examine whether WK's and ER's narratives demonstrate the four basic characteristics of poetic narratives in terms of patterning and numbering in verse structure. The fifth characteristic is also investigated. The first characteristic seems to have already been identified and confirmed since the two narratives in question have been properly analyzed in terms of the five levels of discourse units. That is to say, WK's and ER's narratives have been analyzable by means of five concepts of Verse structure: interpretation, coherency, episodes, lower juncture, and upper juncture. The second task is to see if lines are short (i.e., when compared to lines in prosaic narrative). Out of the total one hundred and ten lines in WK's narrative, there are ten lines which consist of more than eight words, and five lines that exceed ten words. In ER's narrative, on the other hand, there are only four lines that
are composed of more than eight words, and there are no lines which go beyond ten words, among the total one hundred and twelve lines.

There are one hundred and ten lines altogether in WK's. Twenty three of them go in pairs (53%), twelve in triads (28%), five quadruplets (12%), and two single lines. There are no quintuplets and only one sextuplets. From this numbering profile, it seems reasonable to state that 2 is the most frequent number with 3 as the next frequent number in lines: \{2-3-4\}. In ER's narrative, twenty lines are doublets (49%), twelve triplets (29%), nine quadruplets (22%), and there are neither singles, quintuplets, nor sextuplets. ER's appears to show a very similar number preference to WK's, and the numbering formula will be the same: \{2-3-4\}. It is worth noting, on the other hand, that the verse level demonstrates a very different numbering from the line level.

With respect to the third question, the verse level is perceived to be clearly consistent. Moreover, in WK's narrative which has a total of forty-three verses, twelve go in pairs (63%), three in triads (15%), two quadruplets (11%), and two single verses (11%). In ER's narrative, out of the total forty-one verses, there are twelve doublets (70%), three triplets (18%), two quadruplets (12%). These two narratives present number 2 as the single primary preference without a secondary number. Thus, the numbering formula in verses for both narratives is \{[2]-3\}. It can be tentatively hypothesized, from the discussion so far, that the line-level numbering does not necessarily follow \{2-4\} and \{3-5\}. The two narratives do not show such preference for a pairing of even or odd numbers in the primary-secondary relationship. Lines in WK's and ER's narratives tend to be formed in one single frequent number followed by other two numbers, the second and the third. On the other hand, the verse level tends to present a certain single number as its primary preference. The primary number in both WK's and ER's cases is 2.

With regard to the fourth characteristic, a question is raised whether the distinction between line and verse is obvious. As demonstrated in Chapter four, interpretation
units or lines in poetic narratives do not carry a coherent mental picture or message while those in prosaic narratives do. That is, a function of interpretation units does not overlap with that of coherency units or verses in GC whereas that in SE does. In WK's narrative, such lines as can be considered to be coherent messages themselves are only four: L14, L28, L51, and L76. In ER's, those three lines L47, L69, and L105 can possibly be regarded as coherent messages or mental images. In each of these cases, it is apparent that nearly all of the lines are clearly distinguished from verses in their functions (i.e., interpretation and coherency). Therefore, it is reasonable to say that in the two narratives analyzed, interpretation units and coherency units are explicitly distinguished in their structures and functions. In addition, it should be noted that the fifth characteristic of poetic narrative is applicable in HCE. A majority of verses, 79% in WK's and 92.5% in ER's, are signaled by a micro-pause or longer at the termination position. Moreover, 39.5% in WK's and 51.2% in ER's of all the verses take half second or more pauses.
"But the deeper question is why these structures of lines, stanzas and sections exist across so many diverse cultures and genres. It seems to me that the beginnings of an answer are to be found in the hypothesis that these structures reflect units of human narrative/discourse competence."

James Paul Gee (1990: 125)

6.1. COMPARISON OF POETIC NARRATIVES: GC AND HCE

The analyses and discussions presented in Chapter four and five have confirmed that the narratives in two creole languages demonstrate the four identified typical poetic characteristics. Additionally, the narratives in HCE also manifest correlation between semantic coherency and prosodic cues. It is of great interest now to make a comparison between GC and HCE in terms of their verse structures by carefully examining their poetic attributes. With the light found in the previous analyses, it is expected that the four narratives, DH's and BS's narratives in GC, and WK's and ER's narratives in HCE, demonstrate similarities. It is also assumed that general characteristics found in them can offer clues and insights for the discovery of potential universal principles in discourse.

First of all, the narrative texts in the two creole languages have been analyzed in terms of the five proposed concepts: interpretation, coherency, episodes, lower juncture, and upper juncture. As mentioned in Chapter five, the four narratives have
similar length and all of them consist of just a single act. However, this is not always the case in narrative because a single narrative discourse may contain several different upper junctures. If it is the case, it will be necessary to consider plural acts, instead of just one, in order to describe accurate structure of the narrative. Regarding the next lower level, all four narratives have four scenes. The number of stanzas in a scene varies from three as the minimum to five as the maximum.

Second, it has been noticed that lines are short in both creoles. In the two narrative texts in GC, there are only nine (4%) that are more than eight words out of a total two hundred sixteen lines. There are as few as two lines that exceed ten words. That is, 96% of all the lines in GC's texts consist of eight words or less. In the HCE narratives, there are fourteen lines (6%) that exceed eight words, out of a total two hundred twenty-two lines. In those fourteen lines, only five lines are composed of more than ten words. That is, 94% of all lines are made of eight or less words in the HCE narratives. As a whole, more than ninety percent of the lines in two creole languages consist of eight or less words and this turns out to be a very salient feature of poetic narrative.

Moreover, it has been found that the two narratives in HCE do not show either {2-4} or {3-5} pair preferences in the line level as Hymes claims is the case in Native American languages (Hymes 1990b: 72). This fact coincides with what was discovered in GC in Chapter four. Recall that DH's text appears to have 2, 3, and 4 equally as its frequent numbers in the line level. Furthermore, BS's text prefers 2 as its most frequent number with 3 as the next frequent number. As can been seen in those examples, neither of GC texts follow {2-4} nor {3-5} but manifest {2, 3, 4} and {2-3-4} respectively in the line level. The narratives in HCE also present preference for the numbers {2-3-4}, but not for {2-4}.

Nevertheless, a decisive conclusion should be kept until quantitative measurement is provided in the next section. Table 6-1 compares the line numbering in the four
narratives in question. Among the four, DH's narrative is the most flexible in terms of numbering selection whereas WK's narrative is the most restricted by showing 2 as the most frequent number. Thus, three out of four show 2 as the most frequent number, and WK only exceeds ER by 4%. Comparing the two creoles, it appears that GC is more variable than HCE in line numbering.

Table 6-1. Line numbering in the four narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line Numbering</th>
<th>DH (GC)</th>
<th>BS (GC)</th>
<th>WK (HCE)</th>
<th>ER (HCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>12 [32%]</td>
<td>15 [42%]</td>
<td>23 [53%]</td>
<td>20 [49%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>12 [32%]</td>
<td>13 [36%]</td>
<td>12 [28%]</td>
<td>12 [29%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>12 [32%]</td>
<td>6 [17%]</td>
<td>5 [12%]</td>
<td>9 [22%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>37 [100%]</td>
<td>36 [100%]</td>
<td>43 [100%]</td>
<td>41 [100%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2. Verse numbering in the four narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse Numbering</th>
<th>DH (GC)</th>
<th>BS (GC)</th>
<th>WK (HCE)</th>
<th>ER (HCE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>3 [17%]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 [11%]</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>11 [61%]</td>
<td>8 [57%]</td>
<td>12 [63%]</td>
<td>12 [70%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>4 [22%]</td>
<td>4 [29%]</td>
<td>3 [15%]</td>
<td>3 [18%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 [14%]</td>
<td>2 [11%]</td>
<td>2 [12%]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18 [100%]</td>
<td>14 [100%]</td>
<td>19 [100%]</td>
<td>17 [100%]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the third characteristic, it is also significant that the verse level manifests some generalities which are possibly considered to be shared features. Table 6-2 compares the numberings in the verse level in the four narratives. Contrary to a flexible or unrestrained nature of numbering in the line level, that in the verse level appears to be rather restricted. In WK's narrative, the numbering 2 accounts for 63% of all the verses, i.e., twelve doublets, which are followed by three triplets (15%), two singles (11%), and two quadruplets (11%). ER's narrative reveals a similar verse numbering to WK's. There are twelve doublets (70%), three triplets (18%), and two quadruplets.
(12%). In GC, DH's and BS's narratives also demonstrate that doublets are most common and account for more than half. In DH's, there are eleven doublets (61%), four triplets (22%), and three singles (17%). BS's narrative has eight doublets (57%), four triplets (29%), and two quadruplets (14%). It seems reasonable to conclude that these four narrative discourses in GC and HCE present 2 as their primary numbering in the verse level. Notice that in three of the four texts except BS's, the numbering 2 accounts for more than 60% of all the verses. Moreover, none of the four texts shows the secondary numbering. It should be realized that HCE shows a little higher ratio of the primary numbering 2 than GC does.

Fourth, a question arises about how the units of interpretation and coherency are correlated. In GC, eight lines (3.7%) seem to convey independent meaning by themselves and there are seven such semantically independent lines (3.2%) in HCE. These figures show that both creole languages do not have many of the combined interpretation-coherency units or the line-verse level, so to speak, but make clear distinction between these interpretation units and coherency units. This seems to be a very crucial indication if one compares a fragment of SE narrative that is cited from Gee in Chapter four to GC and HCE in the present chapter. We have seen that the SE narrative includes as many as five lines that are acting as verses, out of only thirteen lines. This discrepancy manifests a typical difference in discourse units between poetic and prosaic narratives.

Now is the time to ask whether it is possible to determine any general principles in discourse processes in creoles. Although languages cited in this dissertation, i.e., Guyanese Creole and Hawai'i Creole English, present some differences in their organization of narrative discourses, something which is shared by the two is an explicit VERSE STRUCTURE in patterning and numbering. More accurately, patterning here refers to the hierarchical organization of narrative discourse constructed by the five levels; lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, and acts. These five levels have been explained
in terms of the concepts of interpretation, coherency, episodes, lower juncture, and upper juncture, respectively. Numbering, on the other hand, refers to the four categories: the primary number, the secondary number, the most frequent number, and the next frequent number. These numbering categories apply to the levels of line and verse. In Section 6.3., it will be shown that some aspects of these patterning and the numbering have possibly originated from universal principles in discourse whereas others may be derived from culturally inherited and substratum properties. Moreover, there is a question that has to be answered regarding the inquiry of why such a metrical organization as verse structure exists in poetic-oriented languages. Before getting into a discussion of universality, it is useful to examine whether such shared characteristics as patterning and numbering can be supported quantitatively in several narratives in HCE.

6.2. QUANTITATIVE SUPPORT FOR VERSE STRUCTURE

This section attempts to strengthen the hypothesis made in the preceding chapter that lines tend to show the most frequent number but not the primary number whereas verses present the explicit primary number in poetic narrative. Thus, it is the principal concern to concentrate on carrying out the quantitative investigation and on showing how: 1) the numbering in the line level; and 2) the numbering in the verse level are quantitatively indicated. Nineteen narrative discourses have been investigated. These narrative discourse data have been produced by nine native speakers of HCE. There are six males (m) and three females (f). The narrative data which have already been utilized in the earlier analysis (in Chapter five) are excluded for the present discussion. The ethnic backgrounds of the narrators include Hawaiian (h), Part-Hawaiian (w),

1 "Poetic-oriented languages" is an informal naming for any languages that demonstrate poetic narrative discourse.

2 The length of each narrative varies from some three minutes to ten minutes (i.e. three to ten pages).
Chinese (c), Portuguese (p), and Puerto Rican (r) ancestries. Those of Japanese
descent, however, have not been used for the present purpose because they are related
to the main argument made in the next chapter. The narrators are described in the
following codes: The first and the second initials in lower cases stand for ethnicity and
gender, respectively, and those in upper cases are name initials, given and last: hmWK,
wmlKA, hmER, hfLK, hfRR, hfLJ, rmJV, cmYA, and pmAA. Table 6-3 is a
description of these subjects. The present study depends on the research materials,
especially the published and tape-recorded data which come from the projects listed
below. These projects have been completed by the Center for Oral History, Social
Science Research Institute, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa:

(1) COH. 1984. a, b, c. Kaliihi: Place of transition.
(3) COH. 1988. a, b, c. Kōloa: An oral history of a Kaua'i community.
(5) COH. 1989. a, b. Lana'i Ranch: The people of Ko'ele and Keomoku.
(6) COH. 1991. a, b. 'Ualapu'e, Moloka'i: Oral histories from the east end.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birthday</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hmWK</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4/9/1942</td>
<td>Manager of Fishermen's Association</td>
<td>Honolulu, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wmKA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4/22/1915</td>
<td>Construction worker</td>
<td>Waiakea, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hmER</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7/11/1910</td>
<td>Lana'i Ranch worker</td>
<td>Lahaina, Mau'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hfLK</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>6/10/1915</td>
<td>Housewife</td>
<td>Kipahulu, Mau'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hfRR</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>5/20/1914</td>
<td>Lana'i Ranch worker</td>
<td>Kahalepali, Lana'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hfLJ</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8/19/1928</td>
<td>Pineapple cannery worker, taxi driver</td>
<td>Honolulu, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rmJV</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>11/30/1912</td>
<td>Mill plantation laborer</td>
<td>North Kohala, Hawai'i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cmYA</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3/7/1894</td>
<td>Messenger, machinist</td>
<td>Waiahole, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pmAA</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5/21/1909</td>
<td>Shop worker, civilian defense worker</td>
<td>Nuuanu, Oahu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us first look at the result of the measurement of lines in Table 6-4. There are
altogether eight hundred and six verses in the nineteen narratives. Out of these verses,
three hundred and seventy one (46%) consist of two lines or doublets; a hundred and
seventy seven verses (22%) are three lines or triplets; and two hundred and thirty two
verses (29%) are four lines or quadruplets. This shows that 2 and 4 are two core numberings (i.e., with no primary and secondary numbers) that constitute the line-level organization with the former as the most frequent number and the latter as the next frequent number. The numbering formula for lines is thus described as {2-4} in these selected HCE narratives although the ratio of number 3 (22%) is close to that of number 4 (29%). This formula in a pair of even numbers is not exactly the same as the findings in the preceding section that the formula of lines in the four narratives include three core numbers in the order of {2-3-4}. And there are still five subjects in Table 6-4 who do not show {2-4} (i.e., hmER, htRR, rmJV, cmYA, and pmAA). Nonetheless, there are two things in common that should be noted: (1) all the narratives have 2 as the most frequent number; and (2) the next frequent number is either 3 or 4, without a crucial difference in percentages between them. At this stage, however, it seems reasonable to conclude that these selected HCE narratives as a whole reveal {2-4} numbering preference in lines, coinciding with Hymes's prediction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line No.ing</th>
<th>hmWK</th>
<th>wmKA</th>
<th>hmER</th>
<th>hFLK</th>
<th>hFRR</th>
<th>hFJ</th>
<th>mJLV</th>
<th>cmYA</th>
<th>pmAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>371 (46%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>177 (22%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>232 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16 (2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>806 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are three hundred and fifty one stanzas, in which two hundred and sixty four, 75%, are two verses or doublets (Table 6-5). The second and the third numberings are
three and four, and occurrence of both numbers are quite low, compared to number 2, 14% and 9%, respectively. Thus, 2 can be the primary number with no secondary number. The numbering formula for verses is thus described as \{[2]\}. It seems that the restricted numbering in the verse level is a device that can make it possible for a poetic narrative to form a structurally organized and rhetorically coherent structure beyond the sentence level. These results in the quantitative measurement of verses coincide with those of the qualitative analyses carried out in Chapters four and five, and a comparison of GC with HCE in the preceding section (6.1.). That is to say, the numbering in the verse level is rather restricted to 2 as the primary number. The next section presents a discussion on the nature of the universality. Which aspects of patterning and numbering are the manifestations of the universal principles and which are not? This is the main issue to be explored in the rest of this chapter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse No.ing</th>
<th>hmWK</th>
<th>wmKA</th>
<th>hmER</th>
<th>hfLR</th>
<th>hfLJ</th>
<th>mJV</th>
<th>cmYA</th>
<th>pmAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.3. UNIVERSALITY

In 6.1., it is mentioned that the aim of this chapter is to see if certain inherent properties can be discovered by means of examining the characteristics shared by the two creole languages in common. Certain hypotheses have been made with regard to
Verse Structure thus far. They are summarized here. First of all, poetic narratives consist of a verse structure which can be broken down into five hierarchical discourse units; lines, verses, stanzas, scenes, acts. These five units are represented by the concepts of interpretation, coherency, episodes, lower juncture, and upper juncture, respectively. Second, lines (i.e., interpretation units) are short, usually composed of not more than eight words. And although they show a flexible numbering, 2 and 4 tend to be the most frequent and the next frequent numbers respectively. Third, while lines (i.e., interpretation units) tend not to show the primary number (though it takes the most frequent number at least), verses (i.e., coherency units) take a certain single number as its primary numbering preference. In addition, there might be the next frequent number, however, it is sometimes much lower in frequency than the primary number. If that is the case, the next frequent number in question cannot be called the secondary number. The primary number has been identified as 2 in at least two GC and in at least nineteen HCE narratives introduced. Fourth, the distinction between lines or interpretation units and verses or coherency units is explicitly made by their fundamental features in poetic narrative discourse, whereas in prosaic narrative, the distinction is rather obscured. Fifth, verses are normally signaled by a micro or longer pause at their terminal positions. This suggests that, in poetic narrative, intonation units and coherency units coincide with each other, while in prosaic narrative, that is not the case as recognized in Chapter three.

Now an important question to be asked is whether it can be hypothesized that there are inherent characteristics in patterning and numbering. As far as the investigation completed so far is concerned, it seems that there are such essentials that derive possibly from certain universal principles in discourse processes that Hymes (1990b) and Gee (1990) have referred to. That is to say, Hymes and Gee claim independently that there must be operating principles established by inherent human ability in
discourse that are compared to other components of language such as morphology and syntax. A similar argument is also found in Chomsky (1980: 225):

Linguistic knowledge, of course, extends beyond the level of the sentence. We know how to construct discourses of various sorts, and there are no doubt principles governing discourse structure. (Noam Chomsky 1980: 225)

Moreover, it is also Hymes's and Gee's argument that the creation of lines and verses in poetic narrative can be one of those principles to construct a structure beyond the sentence level. Let us recapitulate their remarks below:

I have detected similar patterning of lines and groups of lines in two languages of the Pacific: Hawaiian Pidgin English (in a paragraph published by Bickerton 1981: 13), and Kriol, a language of Australia (see Hymes 1988c). Such a wide and independent distribution of a restricted set of alternatives suggests something inherent and universal. (Hymes 1990b: 101-2)

Because language is acquired early and rapidly, without training or instruction, linguists argue that human beings are biologically equipped to develop language, given the appropriate triggering experiences. I would suggest that the same model can be applied to the human ability to narrativize experience. Thus, no human, under normal conditions, fails to make sense when narrativizing his or her experience. (Gee 1985: 11)

My claim is that lines and stanzas are universal, the products of the mental mechanism by which humans produce speech. (Gee 1990: 117)

If what these leading scholars in the field of linguistics declare is true and worth exploring, the next task for discourse analysts is to step forward to discover such principles. The task that this dissertation has taken is to find the principles related to the study of pidgin/creole linguistics, especially those related to an inquiry of creole genesis. That is, this dissertation research aims at establishing the source of discourse structures in HCE. It is hypothesized here that the patterning in the hierarchical organization, or more specifically, the four characteristics of poetic narrative may be part of universal principles. It is because of the fact that many languages (e.g., NA

---

3 Prince (1988) argues that discourse competence is part of linguistic competence. And Forman (p.c. 1/19/95) claims: 'If it would be, would it be not? -- altogether astonishing if this were NOT the case.'
languages, Chinook Jargon, Guyanese Creole, and Hawai'i Creole English) reveal such a structure. On the other hand, numbering preference or favored numbers in verse structure is most likely to be one of the culturally inherited properties. This hypothesis will be presented in Chapter seven. It seems that some (but not all, of course) aspects of the cultural properties in HCE can be associated with substratal factors in creolization. In addition, the culturally inherited properties may well be, to some extent, influenced by external factors. The issue of cultural continuity and substratum transfer will be discussed in Chapter eight.

To begin with, in order for a speaker to construct a narrative discourse, there has to be an underlying discourse organization or 'the meaning being expressed in a verbal communication.' (Callow & Callow 1992: 6)⁴ Then, a universal principle operates when 'the meaning is encoded by a set of verbal forms' that Callow & Callow call 'discourse.' With regard to the process by which the message is converted into discourse, a question is raised about what kind of role or principle the human cognitive processes require for the minimum unit of discourse to take. It is reasonably speculated, as Chafe claims (1980, see also Chapter three, 3.2. of this dissertation), that the minimum verbal units have to be interpreted by the interlocutor. Otherwise, a discourse itself will be an unintelligible body of verbal forms, which does not make any sense. Thus, if the underlying representation is meaning, the first process that is required for verbal forms to fulfill, according to the hypothetical principle, is to be coded into interpretable forms. In other words, lines are expected to play that role as interpretation units in discourse. Yet, as will be fully illustrated in Chapter eight, this level, interpretation units or lines, should not be directly equated to clauses. In English as well as GC and HCE whose superstratum or lexifier language is English, the

---

⁴They call this underlying meaning the message and, 'any given set of verbal forms encoding it, the discourse;' and a message combined with one of realization such as in different languages or in paraphrases is called a text.
interpretation units happen to be clauses which contain a predication (i.e., *narrative clauses*, Linde 1993). However, the linguistic feature that interpretation units contain a predicate is not likely to be part of universals but to be a language specific feature (This issues is discussed in detail in Chapter eight).

With respect to the next level, it goes without saying that simply sequencing lines or interpretation units in sequence does not constitute a cohesive discourse. That is, a given sequence of interpretable verbal forms needs to be grouped together so that they *make sense* as meaningful body of information. In other words, the level of verses is the unit that plays a key communicative role of grouping such interpretable verbal forms to construct coherency as a piece of the entire discourse. Then, accumulation of these units of coherency eventually establishes another higher level of verse structure, that is, episode units or stanzas. After a sequence of verbal forms constructs a unit that can convey the smallest information, it seems to be an important and necessary process for that cohesive information to be extended to formulate a story. Moreover, making a story needs to include more elaborated information, answering such questions as who, what, when, and where. That is to say, a short story or an episode has to be established at this level, including such additional information.

The Stanza Features in the Verse Analytical Framework in 3.4 do not include any linguistic clues to identify the level of stanzas, which makes the level look less explicit than lines and verses. Nonetheless, stanzas occasionally (but not regularly) manifest certain linguistic clues to identify themselves as units though clues in stanzas cannot be found as often as those in the other two levels do. According to Hymes (1981: 165):

It remains that there is no overt mark that regularly initiates, or closes, a stanza (unlike the initial particles of verses), and some of the groupings of verses into stanzas could not but appear arbitrary, were it not for features of the stanzas themselves. Stanzas show verbal repetition and parallelism of content, internally and externally--that is among verses within stanzas, and among stanzas that go together within a scene.
Verbal repetition and parallelism discovered in the narrative discourse data in the present study is repetition of *verbs of reporting*. This type of utterance, if it is in English, includes such regular subject-verb combinations as 'She says,' 'I told him,' 'Bob answers...,' and so on, and these utterances occur at the beginning of several groups of verses. That is, these particular types of utterances may be indicating the beginning of a stanza. Moreover, the stanza level, as described in 3.4., shows rhetorical designs under a certain single scene. This feature of stanzas to manifest patterns of rhetorical organization is identified most of the cases.

It is mentioned that stanzas convey information of 'what it is about' or 'what happened, when and/or where, by who' and so forth. Episodes may change their organization when one (or possibly more) of those factors is (are) altered. That is when juncture occurs. When the first two, *who* or *what*, is altered, it signals a shift of situational juncture associated with participants. When the third and the fourth factors, *when* or *where*, are involved, it is a shift of temporal and locative junctures, respectively. This unitary level plays a role of transmitting content structure in the process of telling a story. As mentioned in Chapter three, Labov & Waletzky (1967) view the most explicit temporal sequence as the underlying semantic representation in narrative discourse. Put another way, if the structure of the lower (temporal) juncture units (i.e., scenes) 1-2-3 in a given narrative matches the explicit temporal sequence in real time, for example, A-B-C, then the narrative is viewed as representing the underlying semantic representation. However, if the juncture units do not correspond to the explicit sequence in the actual happening, the narrative is viewed as being altered in its organization of the lower juncture units in performance. The maximum level in verse structure, the upper juncture unit, is provided when another transition of junctures takes place beyond the lower juncture level. For instance, the narrator may simply change locations under the same temporal juncture in a single narrative. If that happens, the two locations are labeled as lower junctures or scenes and the higher
temporal juncture is labeled as an upper juncture or an act. If there is only one lower juncture, the label 'act' may be provided for a rank above the scene just for formality of description. Thus, the association between the lower junctures and the upper junctures is not established as an absolute hierarchy but rather as a relative interrelationship.

To summarize the five hierarchical levels, the underlying discourse organization starts to be broken down into units that can be interpretable first, then to those which can establish coherence, and finally to those which can compose a short episode including more elaborated information on who, what, when, and where. The other two higher levels, scenes and acts, play a role as transmitting content by changing one of the situational, temporal, and locative junctures. These hierarchical structures in patterned organization are hypothesized to derive from certain universal principles.

If these levels are looked at from the standpoint of explicitness of presentation, the verse level is the most fundamental unit and the line level the next fundamental unit of the discourse. Explicitness as structure appears to be presented with linguistic clues (and these devices are described as Features in Verse Analytical framework in 3.4.). It is notable that these two levels (lines and verses), among others, possess linguistic devices to signal themselves regularly as units (i.e., predication, line-initial particles, structural parallelism, prosodic rhyming, verse-initial particles, verse-final markers, and intonation contour), while the other three levels (stanzas, scenes, and acts) do not have such devices (Stanzas, however, sporadically but not regularly show some linguistic clues). Moreover, only those two levels appear to present numbering preference, and verses indicate more distinct numbering preference than lines (i.e., the most frequent number in lines vs the primary number in verses). These facts suggest, therefore, that lines and verses constitute the core part of verse structure. More specifically, it is assumed that the ability to organize a structure of lines and verses in hierarchical fashion and make them cohesive might be the core and the inherent part of human language faculty though functional motivation cannot be completely excluded as
discussed later. In addition, this argument above bears an assumption that not only lines or interpretation units but also verses or coherency units play an important role in processing information. In this sense, it should be noted that poetic narrative differs from prosaic narrative in which coherency units (extended sentences in Chafe's term) are not units of information processing but rather units of variable intellectual judgments (See Chapter three for a fuller discussion).

Now universality can be interpreted as either innate or functionally-motivated. However, to present a full case for supporting only one of these two explanations does not look like an easy task at this stage. There seem to be several reasons for the difficulty. To begin with, it can be the case that the patterning or the hierarchical organization of narrative discourse is innate on the ground that the existence of patterning itself is autonomous and is not necessary to be supported by non-linguistic or external factors. Put another way, the underlying discourse organization, in other words, meaning itself, is not something that is influenced or altered depending on people, context, situation, and other variables in a given speech event. Rather, it is the way in which the meaning is conveyed that is subject to be affected by external or contextual factors (i.e., discourse competence as part of linguistic competence, Prince 1988). Despite such an innate nature of underlying meaning construction, however, the existence of verse structure still seems not to be able to exclude totally the possibility of functional motivation.

For one thing, there is a fact that it is almost impossible to obtain an underlying discourse organization on hand as a concrete or physical entity. Any verbal forms in constructed narrative discourse are entities already produced in a particular context and situation, and addressed to particular audience including the speaker him/herself. Although this is not to deny the existence of innately determined principles in discourse at all, it seems to be very difficult to reinforce such a line of argument supporting only the innate theory without providing any concrete evidence. For another thing, as it is
clear by now, each of the units in verse structure is explained in terms of meaning. That is, it is not possible to determine each level of unit only by means of clues in linguistic forms. This feature makes it rather intricate to maintain the nature of narrative discourse exclusively in innate attributes, unlike some principles of Universal Grammar in syntax that are claimed exclusively to be innate (But, see Newmeyer 1991, a discussion on functional explanation for universal principles in syntactic theories).

Because of the reasons stated thus far, it appears to be hard to draw a clear line between the innate and the functionally-motivated distinctions in discourse processes and it is also far beyond the scope of the present investigation. Thus, it is not a task of the present study to search further for finding a single answer but is a attempt, therefore, to provide generally a possible meaning-based explanation for the existence of patterning or the hierarchical organization of narrative discourse in seeking universals in it.

There is a question left to be answered. It has been argued that the hierarchical organization of narratives in *patterning* found in the present study can be part of the universal principles in discourse. Yet, these characteristics possibly occur in either of the three types of languages: the universal in 1) any natural languages; 2) a certain type of poetic-oriented languages including NA & creole languages; and 3) languages in oral culture. A question is which one of these is the most compatible source of universality. The first possibility is implied by Hymes and he has demonstrated that many Native American languages as well as Chinook Jargon have revealed the characteristic. He comments (Hymes & Zenk 1987: 446):

The principles of patterning and repetition involved appear not to be limited to American Indian languages, but to be present in English narratives from Ireland, Appalachia, Philadelphia, and elsewhere (cf. V. Hymes 1982; D. Hymes 1982b, 1982d). The full extent of the occurrence of such patterning is not yet known.
Nonetheless, Gee argues, as mentioned in Chapter three, that there is a clear structural difference between poetic and prosaic narrative structures. He demonstrated such a difference in narrative discourse organization in SE and BVE. Sato (1989), moreover, stands in a similar position to Gee, stating that there exists 'systematic differences at the discourse level between BEV and SE and between HCE and SE.' (ibid.: 274, see 3.1. in the present dissertation)

Although further investigation of Verse Analysis in SE is necessary in order to present more explicit conclusion, it seems that Gee's claim as well as Sato's are right as far as the research outcomes in the present study are concerned. This is not to deny what Hymes has claimed above, but it is a purpose of this discussion to emphasize that there are still many things left to be studied and explained. It is highly probable that some aspects of patterning in narrative structure be universal in all natural languages. However, as the five poetic characteristics identified here are concerned, they seem to be unique to a specific type of poetic-oriented languages including the two creoles. The third possibility does not seem to be plausible because of the reason touched upon in 3.3. that languages in oral culture are not necessarily poetic and languages in literary culture are not always prosaic. This fact will be illustrated in detail in Chapter eight in which the Japanese substratal influence is discussed. Thus, it seems that the second possibility is promising at this stage. Yet at the same time, it is desirable to look for differences in poetic narrative between NA languages and creole languages and to explain where such differences derive from. Unlike the rather vague conclusion not to be able to find a single source in pursuit of the universal principles, the next chapter introduces the opening part of an extremely interesting discovery on the nature of discourse processes in Hawai'i Creole English.
CHAPTER 7

THE SUBSTRATUM:

HAWAII CREOLE ENGLISH AND JAPANESE

"While the pidgin input they received from their parents was probably scanty, it is also likely that they relied heavily on their ancestral languages in developing the creole."

Suzanne Romaine (1988: 293)

7.1. JAPANESE HCE AND OTHER HCES

Hymes and Gee have independently remarked on the nature of discourse organization. As quoted earlier, Hymes states 'such a wide and independent distribution of a restricted set of alternatives suggests something inherent and universal (emphasis added).'. Nonetheless, in the final paragraph of the same article, he points out (1990b: 103):

The evidence of Saanich Salish itself suggests that the presence of such patterning in pidgin and creole languages need not be evidence for a biological basis of such languages, but may be evidence for historical continuity of cultural traditions.

Moreover, Gee also mentions as follows (1990: 117):

My claim is that lines and stanzas are universal, the products of the mental mechanism by which humans produce speech. At the same time, how different people organize language within these lines and stanzas is socially and culturally variable.¹

Accordingly, the data of HCE narrative discourse will be re-examined to determine whether, in addition to universal tendencies, cultural influences play a role in discourse patterns. From Gee's remark above, it seems appropriate to hypothesize that a specific numbering preference derives from the culturally inherited aspect of discourse structure

¹Gee's stanzas are equated to Hymes's verses.
althoughexistence of verse structure itself is most likely part of the universal principles
in discourse.

Furthermore, Hymes's statement implies that such numbering

preferences can possibly be transmitted from background ancestral languages as
substrata! influence if those numberings are subjectto beingculturallydetermined.
For instance, it is observed that the average occurrence of numberings in HCE
narratives, both lines and verses, shows a slightly larger proportion of the number 2
than that in GC. The average percentage that Line numbering 2 has in GC (i.e., DH &
BS) accounts for 37%, whereas that in HCE (i.e., WK & ER) is 51 %. That is, more
than half of all the lines in HCE go in pairs, i.e., number 2. With respect to verses, the
distribution of number 2 is 59% in GC and 66.5% in HCE. These minor differences
between the two creole languagesmay have derived from certain cultural traditions that
each of them has inherited. This evidence that HCE manifests a higher ratio of 2numbering than GC does may induce us to speculate that there is a substratal influence
from the Hawaiian language. That is, Hawaiian might have affected the formation of
HCE when creolizationstarted around 1890 on the islands of Hawai'i. Up to 1878,the
speakers of the Hawaiian language were the majority group (Reinecke 1969). Thus,
sociohistorically speaking, as well as from a viewpoint of the founder principle
(Mufwene 1991, 1994a),2 Hawaiian could have very likely been a substratum language
for HCE (assuming that his term grammar applies also to discourse processes.)
Nevertheless, it is difficult now to search for linguistic features that could have
existed in the language during that time. Neither enough numbers of native speakers
nor reliable linguistic data are currently available to carry out discourseanalysis at this
stage of investigation. Albert 1. Schutz (personal communication 4/94) states that
contemporary Hawaiian grammars do not adequately describe the language. It is also
2According to Mufwene (l994a: 30), this principle is explained as follows: 'The general idea.
suggested from population genetics is that in the formation of new language varieties, grammatical
features, like genes in species, are in competition with one another. Some make it into the new
system and some simply do not. Those thatare more numerous stand a betterchance of being selected,
though otherfactors bearon the selection (Mufwene 1991a).'
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the case that there are very few native speakers alive now. Although documents such as newspapers published in the Hawaiian language in the nineteenth century are accessible, the study of those materials is just beginning. Therefore, these situations make it rather difficult to find authentic characteristics of the language, especially those in discourse processes. If, however, one can find a good amount of discourse data and form a research team consisting of native speakers of the language and creolists, it may become possible to provide further evidence to support Hawaiian influence on HCE. In any case, it is necessary to wait until such a research project, if any, is realized in the future.

However, there is another case in which very interesting evidence has been discovered. In Chapter six, HCE data from speakers of Japanese ancestry were excluded in that chapter for the reason given below. It is because, as you will see in detail later in this chapter, HCE as spoken by such speakers (JHCE, henceforth) shows crucial differences from HCE spoken by other ethnic groups (OHCEs, hereafter). Such differences are manifested in three linguistic aspects of verse structure. The first aspect is that JHCE appears to have more explicit line-level patterning than OHCEs, showing preference to a single numbering 3. Recall that lines tend to go in pairs or triplets in OHCEs, although the pairs, i.e., 2-numbering, appear most of the time in their total measurement. Nonetheless, the verse structure in every JHCE narrative investigated indicates a more explicit consistency in its line-level and the most frequent number is 3, not 2. Second, JHCE also shows 3 as a clear primary number in verses unlike OHCEs showing 2 as a primary number. Third, JHCE makes more use of V[erse]-F[inal] M[arkers] (e.g., yæ, æ, sii, y’no, y’sii, no, yo, rait, laDæ) than OHCEs, which will be described later. These VFMs usually occur with an intonation contour to indicate termination of the unit (see also 3.4. Verse Feature 3).

The following section presents an analysis of verse structure in two JHCE narratives. The result of the analyses of fourteen narratives from six speakers is also
presented. The section consists of the same organization as in the earlier chapters in describing the verse structure: a description of the narrators, narrative discourse data (by MY and MM) and notes, translation, patterning & numbering profile, and a discussion on findings. One thing has to be noted here. The purpose of the present chapter is not to give a detailed verse analysis of the two narrative discourses MY and MM, but to illustrate what kind of differences the six subjects as well as those two selected in the text data demonstrate in terms of their characteristics of verse structure, as compared to those in OHCEs narratives described in Chapter five and six. Accordingly, three features will be dealt with: (1) The most frequent number in the line level, (2) the primary number in the verse level, and (3) VFM. Before looking at the narrative data, however, it is helpful to be familiar with background information about the JHCE speakers studied in the present chapter.

7.2. DESCRIPTION OF THE NARRATORS

Tables 7-1 and 7-2 describe the JHCE speakers being studied in the present section. The ages given in Table 7-1 are at the time of recording, and the recording dates vary depending on every subject. The projects that have been referred to in the present discussion include COH 1985a and 1988a, b, c. Table 7-2, moreover, provides information about the places where the subjects' parents had immigrated from. Since the subjects are all of Japanese descent, *ken* or 'a prefecture' is indicated for each of them. Please note that Hiroshima-ken and Yamaguchi-ken are the top two prefectures from which most of the Japanese immigrants had arrived between 1885 and 1920. A discussion of sociohistorical evidence is presented in detail in Chapter eight.
TABLE 7-1. Background of JHCE subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Birthday</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Birthplace</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jmMM</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>2/15/1905</td>
<td>Plantation laborer</td>
<td>Koloa, Kaua’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmMY</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1/1/1916</td>
<td>Sales attendant, company worker</td>
<td>Honolulu, Oahu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmMN</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9/13/1906</td>
<td>Plantation laborer</td>
<td>Koloa, Kaua’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmTK</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>4/2/1911</td>
<td>Barber</td>
<td>Koloa, Kaua’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmRK</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>2/14/1915</td>
<td>Mill employee</td>
<td>Koloa, Kaua’i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jHG</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7/27/1908</td>
<td>Nurse’s aide, laundry owner</td>
<td>Honohina, Hawai’i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 7-2. Parents’ home places

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>PARENTS’ HOME-PLACE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jmMM</td>
<td>Kumamoto-ken, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmMY</td>
<td>Yamaguchi-ken, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmMN</td>
<td>Hiroshima-ken, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmTK</td>
<td>Yamaguchi-ken, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jmRK</td>
<td>Yamaguchi-ken, Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jHG</td>
<td>Hiroshima-ken, Japan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.3. VERSE STRUCTURE IN JAPANESE HCE

It is not the purpose of the present section to explore the data from two JHCE in detail. Rather, it is the immediate aim of presenting those narratives here to show how verse structure in JHCE discourse differs from that in OHCEs. Section 7.4. offers a comparison of the two narrative discourse organizations. Notes are provided at the end of the texts.

7.3.1. Narrative discourse and notes

MY’s Narrative: Male, 70, Japanese ancestry. Transcribed in Odo orthography Center for Oral History 1985a: 1475 (re-examined along with the recorded tape)

WAN SMAWL-KII-TAIM STORI

ACT JAPAN
SN1 YOKOHAMA [Location]
ST1 Ex: Prolog--Mr. Mashimo
V1 L1 So efla ai grajweit,
     L2 Ai went japan. (.5)
V2 L3 Wen ai wentu japen, yokohama,
     156
Ai met mai makiki Japaniz skul prinsapo, Mista mashimo waz insai da hotel.

XX Hotel, ryokan, dei kawl it, Nat dis kain big hotel, Ryokan.

XX Hii waz rait insai da lobii, Siting daun, SII.

Wen hii saw mii, Frst ting hii kawl mii, Yoshimura-san, kam.

XX Ai went, Tu sii him.

XX Hii sed, Yu gud boi, no? Benkyo site.

No, Asobi ni kita.

Ah, luz hiz fait.

XX Dei waz awl in dakain tap klas in Japan skul, Hosoi, kansai, an eniwei.

Bat dei neva kam beq,

Dei wen get jrafitid in Japan ami.

So wen naitijn trDi faiv,

Wen ai went daa,

Wen ai wentu da kanchri,

Yamaguchi-ken,

Ai stei daa wan wiik.

XX Mai anko tod mii,

Yu beDa get aut fram hia.

Bikawz hii wrk fo da gavament, ə?

Reirod steishen, hii wrk fo da gavament,

So reirod steishen, dei get nyuz, ə?

XX Dei get nyuz,

Yu stei daun hia,

Yu gon get jrafitid.
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Bikawz wii wr duo sitizn den,
Wii wr duo sitizn.
Japaniiz an Japan, duo sitizn.

So hii tod mii,
No stei longa dan wan wiik awrede,
Yuv siin yo grænfaDa awrede,
So go.

Fishing
So mii an mai grænfaDa,
Wii hæd a gud taim,
Fishing everi dei.

XX Wii hæd, wii, mai grænfaDa hæd lænd rait araun' da oshan,
Oh, byuDifo lænd rait an da oshan,
Wai sænd, byuDifo.

XX Wii go fishing everi nait,
Wii go nait,
Wii go kæch 'opae, naitaim.

Deitaim, wii go fishing,
Wii kæch awi da fish,
Wii puDom insai wan biig dakain fish chrap, Y'NO.

Den, dis gai fram yanai, da pedla,
Hii kam bai da fish, Â?

Ænd ai tel mai grænfaDa,
Bikawz da pedla kruking yu.

XX Japan, wen dei kam,
Dei nomo skeil, y'no,
Dei get dakain weit, Â?

XX Dei belans da ting,
Da ting hia iz long,
So dei belans it wida...

XX Ai tink,
Da ting no gud,
Ai tel him, YÆ.

So wen ai waz in Japan,
Eveni dei ai go da baisiko,
Ai go yanai iz da niarest taun, sii,
It teiks yu abaut, oh, abaut foDi-faiv minits,
Tu raid tu yanai.

XX Ai go in taun,
Ai bai breik--
Y'no, dakain pan, NE?

V29

XX Bai pan.

L82

Ai hai wain fo mai grænfaDa,

L83

Bai fud.

L84

Kam hom.

L85

(.5)

V30

Ænd mai grænfaDa sei,

L86

Hii don jrink dakain wain,

L87

Hii laik dakain chip, swiit wain.

L88

(.)

V31

Ai bai dakain sawa, ikspensiv wain,

L89

Hii sei,

L90

No, dakain no gud.

L91

(.)

V32

So wii hæd wan leide fram hawai,

L92

Living dea,

L93

Hawai no leide, æ?

L94

So hii giv'om awl tu hr,

L95

Oh, shii jrink ap.

L96

(1)

V33

Epilog--Piipo

XX Dei awl laik kam mai haus naitaim,

L97

Wen ai waz dea,

L98

Dei awl laik kam mai haus.

L99

(0)

V34

Bikawz ai bring awl da gudizi fo mai grænfaDa, yæ?

L100

Oh, mai grænfaDa, giv'om awl kain,

L101

Bring kraeka, kafii, chakaleit, eniting, fo him.

L102

(.5)

V35

So everi nait, awl diiz piipo laik, he sed mago,

L103

Dei laik kam sii mii,

L104

Nat mii, dei laik kam iit,

L105

Dei laik kam iit.

L106

Kawz hii gaDa meik kafii æn awl, æ?

L107

{ PAU

PAU

MM's Narrative: Male, 82, Japanese ancestry. Transcribed in Odo orthography
Center for Oral History 1988a: 372 (re-examined along with the recorded tape)

WAN PLÆNTEISHEN STORI

ACT

SHUGA PLÆNTEISHEN

[Participant]

ST1

Kein KaDa

Prolog--Kein KaDa

V1

L1

Yæ, æs wat dei du,

L2

Bat awldo sam plænteishen, dei get kei kaDa.

L3

Ai hia,

L4

Dei get kein kaDa,

L5

Bat, yee, bat most av dem iz push reik, YÆ. (5)

V2

L6

XX Kein KaDa.

L7

Bat kein kaDa, no.

L8

In a wei dei kat da kei kainda shawt, YO. (2)
V3  L9  Æn’ da kein, evri pleis yu kat,  (2)
L10  Yu goin tu lus sam amaunt av jus, Y’NO.

ST2  Cm:  Jus Lost
V4  L11  Y’no wen yu kat da kein, æ,
L12  Meibii tu trii jrap fawl dan, æ,
L13  Æs dët mach,
L14  Yu luzing.

V5  L15  Bat nau wen da mashi--,
L16  Wen da kaDa go,
L17  Its nat,
L18  Wii nat tawking abaut wan kein o tu kein o wat,
L19  Tauzenz ân tauzenz av kein, Æ.

V6  L20  Ænd, evri evri wan get dëmij, æ,
L21  Yu going tu luz dët mach jus, æ,
L22  Æs qwait a bit, Y’NO.

ST3  Cl:  Rikaveri
V7  L23  XX Æswai in da mil, æ,
L24  Wel I donnor mach abaut mil,
L25  Bat in da mil, dei sei da rikaveri, YO.

V8  L26  XX Da rikaveri iz, y’no,
L27  In di end wea dei meik da shuga laDët.

ST4  Dn:  Prsent
V9  L28  If dei get trDi so meni prsent nainDi sik prsent o nainDi sevn prsent,
L29  Dei laik tu sii,
L30  Dët ting go mo, æ, nainDi eit prsent.

V10  L31  If dei go nainDi eit prsent,
L32  Dët miinz,
L33  Yu oni luzing tu prsent, y’no, Æ.

V11  L34  So da kein reik, æ, sam jab do.

SN2  PUSH REIK  [Participant]
ST5  Ex & Cm:  Tu Saiz
V12  L35  Den wii gaDa get æfta da kein reik a lat av taim yo,
L36  Wai, bikawz sam gaiz dei apereit,
L37  Dei smat, SII.

V13  L38  Wen yu apereit,
L39  Wen yu go.
L40  Yujaali fram tu said yu gaDa push, Æ.

V14  L41  XX Yu gaDa push fram tu said, æ,
L42  Nat fram wan said,
L43  Afkaws sam pleis, meibii fram wan said, yu keen push,
L44  Meibii yu get wan nero fiild laidis.

ST6  Cl & Dn:  Wan Said
V15  L45  XX In a nero fiild laidis, yu nat going tu tu said,
L46  Ænd push da kein,
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SN3  FILZ  [Location]  
ST7 Ex:  Kapulu  
V18  
L54  Awrai nau den yu du Dat,  
L55  Sam fellaz dei meik kapulu, YO.  
V19  
L56  XX Wat ai miin bai kapulu iz,  
L57  Dei push fram wan said,  
L58  Dei go so meni fiit, Æ.  
V20  
L59  Æn'den dei kam bæk,  
L60  Æ'n dei push fram da aDa said.  

ST8  Cm:  Push  
V21  
L61  XX Wat wii tel dem,  
L62  Chrai end push rait klin andaniit,  
L63  Yu nat going tu push laidis.  
V22  
L64  Æn'den fram dis wei yu kam,  
L65  Ænd insaid bia, nat push, Æ.  
V23  
L66  Ænd if insaid bia nat push,  
L67  Da lodaz, dei grambo, YO.  

ST9  Cm:  Neva Push  
V24  
L68  Eh, dët gaiz, dei kapulu,  
L69  Yu sii da kein, Æ,  
L70  Insaid bia insaid bia no ste push.  
V25  
L71  Ænd hau yu kein tel,  
L72  Æs wen,.  
L73  Da loda, dei greb,  
L74  Ænd lod,  
L75  Dis sentr pat da kein ste awl stiking aut laidis, SII.  
V26  
L76  Bikawz yu kein tel awredii  
L77  Dei neva push,  
L78  Aniivn, YÆ.  

ST10   Cm:  Aniivn  
V27  
L79  So wii tel'om,  
L80  Yu fellaz, chra push gud,  
L81  Chra push all.  
V28  
L82  Æn'den wen yu kam disaid,  
L83  Yu meik shua,  
L84  Dæt yu ste, yu ste pats fram,  
L85  Wat yu min,
7.3.2. Translation

Translation of MY's Narrative: Transcribed in standard (English) orthography

A SMALL-KID-TIME STORY

**ACT JAPAN**

**SN1 YOKOHAMA**

**ST1 Prologue--Mr. Mashimo**

V1  L1  So after I graduated,
    L2  I went to Japan.

V2  L3  When I went to Japan, Yokohama,
    L4  I met my Makiki Japanese School principal,
    L5  Mr. Mashimo was inside the hotel.

V3  L6  Hotel, they call it ryokan,
    L7  Not this kind of a big hotel,
    L8  It is a ryokan.

**ST2 Lobby**

V4  L9  He was right inside the lobby,
    L10 And sitting down, see.

V5  L11 When he saw me,
    L12 First thing was that he called me,
    L13 Mr. Yoshimura, come.

V6  L14 I went,
    L15 To see him.

**ST3 A Good Boy**

V7  L16 He said,
    L17 You are good boy, aren't you?

Notes: *yokohama* < Japanese = a name of a city located down south of Tokyo; *ryokan* < Japanese = an inn; *mashimo, yoshimura, hosoi, kansai,* < Japanese = family names; *yamaguchi-ken* < Japanese = a name of prefecture located in the mid-west of Japan mainland; *'opae* < Hawaiian = a name of fish; *yanai* < Japanese = a name of city in Yamaguchi-ken; *pan* < Japanese = Portuguese 'bread'; *mago* < Japanese = 'grandchildren'; *kapulu* < Hawaiian = 'careless, slipshod'.
ST4  Top
L18 Study hard.
V8 L19 No, I came to play.
L20 Ah, lose his fight.

V9 L25 Because that time when I went to Japan,
L22 There were four of my classmates from my class,
L23 Who were going to Japan,
L24 Who was going to school there.
V10 L25 They were all in the top class in Japanese schools,
L26 Hosoi, Kansai, and so forth.
V11 L27 But they have never come back,
L28 They were drafted in the Japanese army.

SN2  YAMAGUCHI PREFECTURE
ST5  News
V12 L29 So, in nineteen thirty-five,
L30 When I went there,
L31 When I went to the country,
L32 Yamaguchi Prefecture,
L33 I stayed there for a week.
V13 L34 My uncle told me,
L35 You'd better get out from here.
V14 L36 Because he was working for the government, you know.
L37 Railroad station, he was working for the government,
L38 So, they got news at the railroad station, you know.

ST6  Dual Citizen
V15 L39 They got news,
L40 If you stay down there,
L41 You are going to get drafted.
V16 L42 Because we were dual citizen then,
L43 We were dual citizen,
L44 Japanese and Japan (American?), dual citizen yet.
V17 L45 So he told me,
L46 Do not stay longer, one week already,
L47 You've already seen your grandfather,
L48 So, go.

ST7  Fishing
V18 L49 So my grandfather and I,
L50 We had a good time,
L51 We were fishing every day.
V19 L52 We, my grandfather had land right around the ocean.
L53 Oh, it was beautiful land right on the ocean,
L54 it has white sand and is beautiful.
V20 L55 We go fishing every night,
L56 We go night,
We go catch 'opae, night time.

Daytime, we go fishing,
We catch all the fish,
We put them inside a big fish trap, you know.

Then, this guy from Yanai was the peddler,
He came to buy the fish, you know.
And I told my grandfather,
Because the peddler was crooking you.

When Japanese guys came,
They did not scale, you know,
They got a weight measure, you know.
They balance the thing,
The thing here is long,
So they balance it with a...
I think,
The thing was not good,
I told him, you know.

So when I was in Japan,
Every day I rode a bicycle,
I went to Yanai which was the nearest town, you see,
It took you about forty-five minutes,
To ride to Yanai.
I went in town,
I bought bread--
You know that kind of bread, don't you?
Bought bread,
I bought wine for my grandfather,
Bought food,
Came home.

And my grandfather said,
He doesn't drink such wine,
He liked cheap and sweet wine.
I bought a kind of sour, expensive wine,
He said
No, that kind of wine is no good.
So there was a lady from Hawai'i,
Living there,
A lady from Hawai'i, right?
So he gave them all to her,
Oh, she drank up.
They all liked to come to my house during night time, when I was there. They all liked to come to my house.

Because I used to bring all the goodies for my grandfather, you know. Oh, I gave my grandfather all kind of things, I brought cracker, coffee, chocolate, and anything for him.

So every night, all these people like, he said, grandchildren, they liked to come to see me. Not me, they liked to come to eat. Because he got to make coffee and all, you see.

Translation of MM's Narrative. Transcribed in standard (English) orthography.

A PLANTATION STORY

ACT Sugar Plantations

SN1 Cane Cutter

ST1 Prologue--Cane Cutter

V1 Yeah, that's what they do.
L1 Some plantations get cane cutters,
L2 I hear,
L3 They get cane cutters,
L4 But most of them are push rake, you know.

V2 Cane cutters,
L6 But cane cutters, you know,
L7 In a way, they cut the cane rather short, you see.

V3 And every place of cane you cut,
L9 You are going to lose some amount of juice, you know.
L10

ST2 Juice Lost

V4 You know when you cut the cane, see,
L11 Maybe two or three drops of juice fall down, you see,
L12 That's that much,
L13 You are losing.

V5 But now when the machi--,
L15 When the cutter works,
L16 It's not,
L17 We are not talking about one cane or two canes or what,
L18 Thousands and thousands of canes, you know.

V6 And every one gets damage, you know,
L20 You are going to lose that much juice, you see,
L21 That's quite a bit, you know.

ST3 Recovery

V7 That's why in the mill, you see,
L23 Well, I don't know much about the mill,
But in the mill they say 'the recovery', don't they?
The recovery is, you know, In the end where they make the sugar like that.

If they get so many percent such as ninety-six percent or ninety-seven percent, They like to see, That thing goes more to like ninety-eight percent.

If they go ninety-eight percent, That means, You are only losing two percent, you know.

So the cane rake requires some jobs though.

Then we need to have lot of time after the cane rake, you see, Why, because some guys they operate too good, They are smart, see.

When you operate, When you go, You usually need to push from two sides, you know.

You have to push from two sides, you see, Not from one side, Of course at some places, you can probably push from one side, Maybe when you get a narrow field like this.

In a narrow field like this, you are not going to push from two sides, And push the cane, Instead, you are going to push from only one side, either this way or that way.

Now you imagine, This is a narrow field, You are going to push only one way.

But when you come to an ordinary wide field, You are going to push from two sides, So that you can make a good pile, you see.

All right now then you do that, Some guys do a slipshod job, you know.

What I mean by slipshod is, They push from one side, The canes stick out so many feet, right?
And then they come back, and they push from the other side.

What we tell them, they try and push right clean underneath, you are not going to push like this.

And then you come from this way, and inside here, they don't push, right?

And if they don't push inside here, the loaders grumble, you see.

Ey, those guys cheat, you see the cane, you know, they are not pushing inside here.

And how you can tell it, that is when, the loaders grab, and load, the cane are all sticking out at the center part like this, see.

Because you can already tell, they haven't pushed, the canes are uneven, right?

So we tell them, you fellows should try to push well, try to push all of them.

And then when you come this side, you make sure, that you stay parts from, what you mean, push from this side, yeah.

But when you tell them, they do it in that way for a little while.

And then they go back again, so you are burned up with that one. }

(Arrangement by the present author)

7.3.3. Profile: patterning & numbering
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST1</th>
<th>Ex:</th>
<th>V1</th>
<th>L1-L2</th>
<th>So</th>
<th>(.5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V2</td>
<td>L3-L4-L5</td>
<td>Wen</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3</td>
<td>L6-L7-L8</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Labii</td>
<td>V4</td>
<td>L9-L10</td>
<td>Xx</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5</td>
<td>L11-L12-L13</td>
<td>Wen</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6</td>
<td>L14-L15</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V7</td>
<td>L16-L17-L18</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Wan God Boi</td>
<td>V8</td>
<td>L19-L20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4</td>
<td>L9-L10</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V7</td>
<td>L16-L17-L18</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&amp; Da:</td>
<td>Tap</td>
<td>V8</td>
<td>L19-L20</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V9</td>
<td>L21-L22-L23-L24</td>
<td>Bikawz</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V10</td>
<td>L25-L26</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V11</td>
<td>L27-L28</td>
<td>Bat</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SN2</td>
<td>YAMAGUCHI-KEN [Location]</td>
<td>V12</td>
<td>L29-L30-L31-L32-L33</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST5</td>
<td>Ex:</td>
<td>V13</td>
<td>L34-L35</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V14</td>
<td>L36-L37-L38</td>
<td>Bikawz</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V15</td>
<td>L39-L40-L41</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Duo Sitzm</td>
<td>V16</td>
<td>L42-L43-L44</td>
<td>Bikawz</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V17</td>
<td>L45-L46-L47-L48</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST7</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V18</td>
<td>L49-L50-L51</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>V19</td>
<td>L52-L53-L54</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V20</td>
<td>L55-L56-L57</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V21</td>
<td>L58-L59-L60</td>
<td>Deitaim</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST8</td>
<td>Cm2:</td>
<td>V22</td>
<td>L61-L62</td>
<td>Den</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Pedla</td>
<td>V23</td>
<td>L63-L64</td>
<td>&amp;End</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST9</td>
<td>Cm2:</td>
<td>V24</td>
<td>L65-L66-L67</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Skeil</td>
<td>V25</td>
<td>L68-L69-L70</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V26</td>
<td>L71-L72-L73</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST10</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V27</td>
<td>L74-L75-L76-L77-L78</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Yanai</td>
<td>V28</td>
<td>L79-L80-L81</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V29</td>
<td>L82-L83-L84-L85</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST11</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V30</td>
<td>L86-L87-L88</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Wain</td>
<td>V31</td>
<td>L89-L90-L91</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V32</td>
<td>L92-L93-L94-L95-L96</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ST12</td>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>V33</td>
<td>L97-L98-L99</td>
<td>XX</td>
<td>(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cm:</td>
<td>Epilog--Piipo</td>
<td>V34</td>
<td>L100-L101-L102</td>
<td>Bikawz</td>
<td>(.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V35</td>
<td>L103-L104-L105-L106-L107</td>
<td>So</td>
<td>PAU</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MM's WAN PLÄENTEISHEN STORI

ACT SHUGA PLÄENTEISHEN

SN1 KEIN KADA [Participant]

ST1 Ex Prolog--Kein KaDa

V1 L1-L2-L3-L4-L5 Y're (5)
V2 L6-L7-L8 XX (2)
V3 L9-L10 Y'no (2)

ST2 Cm: Juice Lost

V4 L11-L12-L13-L14 Y'no (1)
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TABLE 7-3. The numbering of MY’s narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS</th>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>STANZAS</th>
<th>VERSES</th>
<th>LINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>V1-V3</td>
<td>[3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>V7-V8</td>
<td>[2]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      |        | ST7     | V18-V21| [4]   | L49-L60 [3-3-3] |
|      |        | ST9     | V24-V26| [3]   | L65-L73 [3-3-3] |
The JHCE narrative discourses described above demonstrate three characteristics that differ from OHCEs: (a) The most frequent number 3 in the line level; (b) the primary number 3 in the verse level; and (c) occurrence of VFM. Interestingly, it is the case that these three are very common features among other JHCE narrative discourses studied in the present research. The discussion in the following section has its basis on the analysis of fourteen narratives. Six JHCE subjects described in 7.2. are investigated, including the two narrators introduced above.

### 7.4. FINDINGS

#### 7.4.1. The most frequent number in the line level

The first aspect that JHCE demonstrates is the line-level numbering. For the purpose of comparison, it is helpful to recapitulate the result of the numbering of lines in OHCEs from Chapter six as Table 7-5, followed by that numbering in JHCE as in Table 7-6. Note, first of all, that the most frequent number as a whole in OHCEs is 2 (46%) while that in JHCE is 3 (55%). Among the nine subjects, WK and KA take 4 instead of 2 as the most frequent number while all others take 2. The next frequent number is 4 (29%) followed by 3 (22%). Neither a primary nor a secondary number is found, the numbering formula for the total of these selected OHCEs narratives will be
This formula is read as follows: 'The most frequent number is 2 followed by 4 as the next frequent number. There are no primary and secondary numbers.'

Contrary to OHCEs, all of the six JHCE subjects take 3 (55%) as the most frequent number. The next frequent number is 2 (24%) followed by 5 (12%). Although the distribution of numbering 3 in JHCE is slightly higher than that of 2 in OHCEs, neither of them are not many enough to be regarded as the primary number. The secondary number is not present, either. Thus, the numbering formula for these JHCE narratives will be \{3-2\}. This formula reads as follows: 'The most frequent number is 3 (55%) followed by 2 (24%). There are no primary and secondary numbers.'
This mixture of odd and even numbers (i.e., 3-2 not 3-5), against Hymes's prediction, has already been touched upon in Chapter 4 in which GC reveals three mixed numbers 2, 3, and 4 in lines. Even though OHCEs have presented {2-4} numbering, the percentage of number 3 is not clearly distinguished from that of number 4. This suggests that the numberings in GC and HCE as a whole do not manifest themselves as explicit in either odd or even numbers, as Hymes has found in NA languages. Rather, the numbering in these two creoles appears to take all three, i.e., 2, 3, and 4, as potential core numbers.

### TABLE 7-7. A chi-square calculation for the relationship between JHCE/OHCEs and the numberings 2/3 in the line level (adopted from Table 7-5 and 7-6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JHCE</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHCEs</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>832</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 (df=1) = 101.953, p = < 0.001. \]
7.4.2. The primary number in the verse level

Unlike the numbering in the line level in which neither primary nor secondary numbers have been found, the numbering in the verse level shows a clear primary preference in both OHCEs and JHCE narratives though neither of the narratives present the secondary number. In OHCEs (Table 7-8), first of all, numbering 2 indicates an explicit characteristic of primary preference, seventy-five percent of all. This figure accounts enough for '60% or more' of all. Thus, the numbering formula for the verse level in OHCEs is \{[2]\}. This reads: 'The primary number is 2. There is no secondary number.'

JHCE narratives (Table 7-9) indicate that the numbering 3 is not only the most frequent number but acts also as the primary number accounting for seventy-six percent of all. The next frequent number is 2, however, it is not frequent enough to be regarded as the secondary number (at least 30% of all). The other three numbers, 1, 4, and 5, are very low in frequency and it is reasonable to state that number 2 and 3 play major role in numbering preference in the verse level. The numbering formula appears to be \{[3]\} meaning 'the primary number is 3. There is no secondary number.'

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse No.</th>
<th>hmWK</th>
<th>wmKA</th>
<th>hmER</th>
<th>hflK</th>
<th>hflR</th>
<th>hflJ</th>
<th>mJV</th>
<th>cmYA</th>
<th>pmAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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7.4.3. Verse-final markers

Hymes has discovered that most of the verses in Native American narrative discourse are marked by a particle at the verse-initial position. In Chapter five, it is stated that HCE also has such particles as End, So, Den, Wel, etc., to indicate the beginning of verses. Tables 7-1- and 7-11 proffer VIP scores in both OHCEs and JHCE narratives. Thus, it is the case that both OHCEs and JHCE possess VIP and the fact that all the narratives contain VIP in at least half (and as much as eighty-three

3Incidentally, at this stage of investiation, it is not quite certain why JHCE indicates more occurrence of VIP than OHCEs does.
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percent at most) of their verses indicates that the particles are surely identifying the beginning of coherency units (i.e., verses).

### TABLE 7.10. The verse-initial particles in OHCEs narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bmWK</th>
<th>wmKA</th>
<th>hmER</th>
<th>hflK</th>
<th>hflR</th>
<th>hflJ</th>
<th>mrV</th>
<th>cmYA</th>
<th>pmAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIP</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/verses</td>
<td>/162</td>
<td>/47</td>
<td>/124</td>
<td>/100</td>
<td>/110</td>
<td>/83</td>
<td>/105</td>
<td>/97</td>
<td>/62</td>
<td>/890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 7.11. The verse-initial particles in JHCE narratives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>jmMM</th>
<th>jmNY</th>
<th>jmMN</th>
<th>jmMK</th>
<th>jmRK</th>
<th>jHG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIP</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>267</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/verses</td>
<td>/73</td>
<td>/125</td>
<td>/37</td>
<td>/44</td>
<td>/42</td>
<td>/38</td>
<td>/359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This subsection illustrates another interesting fact which has been found in HCE narratives. It shows how OHCEs and JHCE differ in their use of verse-final markers (i.e. VFM), in comparison to the use of verse-initial particles (i.e. VIP) touched on Chapter four and five. Besides VIP, some HCE narratives demonstrate VFM such as \(\&\), ye, \(\&\)ii, no, yo, etc., and these markers occasionally appear at the end of a verse or a minimum unit of coherency. VFM is defined as 'a single word carrying no significant meaning and placed at the end of minimum unit of coherency to make its closure.'

Although occurrence of these markers in the real discourse data is less than expected in fact, it is worth being noted that JHCE makes more use of those markers than OHCEs do, as can been seen in Tables 7-12 and 7-13.

It is notable that the overall observation of the two types of HCEs, that is, OHCEs and JHCE, can identify an obvious difference in the use of their VFM. In OHCEs, only

---

4. Linde (1993: 94) remarks: 'For meaning to be scientifically valid, it must be communicated by a fixed set of markers in the text that invariably correspond to a portion of the meaning. The analyst's task, then, is simply to discover these markers and to make explicit their correspondences.'

5. However, these two utterances, y'no and y'sii, are considered to be VFM. Although they are derived from two-word counterparts, you know and you see in SE, respectively, they do not usually mean what they literally express but function as merely interjections or fillers.
sixteen percent of all the verses are terminated by VFM, while in JHCE, thirty-five percent, or more than twice as much as the former's, are signaled by VFM as a whole. Moreover, two subjects mark fifty percent or more, and four subjects mark more than thirty percent. This fact appears to be a significant finding, as can be seen in the next subsection, that the difference derives from a substratum influence.

**TABLE 7-12. The verse-final markers in OHCEs narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFM</th>
<th>hmWK</th>
<th>wmKA</th>
<th>hmER</th>
<th>hfL.K</th>
<th>hfRR</th>
<th>hfL.J</th>
<th>rmJV</th>
<th>cmYA</th>
<th>pmAA</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/verses</td>
<td>/162</td>
<td>/47</td>
<td>/124</td>
<td>/100</td>
<td>/110</td>
<td>/83</td>
<td>/105</td>
<td>/97</td>
<td>/62</td>
<td>/890</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 7-13. The verse-final markers in JHCE narratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VFM</th>
<th>jmMM</th>
<th>jmMY</th>
<th>jmMN</th>
<th>jmTK</th>
<th>jmRK</th>
<th>jfHG</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/verses</td>
<td>/73</td>
<td>/125</td>
<td>/37</td>
<td>/44</td>
<td>/42</td>
<td>/38</td>
<td>/359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One thing which needs attention, however, is the occurrence of VFM in the usage of subject YA in OHCEs. He is the second in rank (48%) among all of the HCE subjects studied here including JHCE (First in rank is MM = 52%). It is difficult to give an explicit explanation for this high percentage of his use of VFM. Nevertheless, one possibility can be pursued. It may be the case that YA's frequent use of VFM has been influenced by sentence-final particles in Cantonese. This speculation finds a supportive fact in that YA’s parents are immigrants from Canton, China (COH 1984c: 1044-5). Luke (1990), for instance, is an extensive discussion on the use of utterance particles -la and -le, claiming that these markers signal conversational units in Cantonese. Moreover, Roberts (personal communication 9/7/94) has recognized frequent use of such utterance particles in the text data of pidgin Hawaiian spoken by Chinese in the
early stage of pidginization in Hawai‘i. Although YA’s VFM are not Chinese equivalents (i.e., la and le) but HCE counterparts (i.e., a, yae, y'na, and so on), his discourse strategy to construct cohesive units might have been affected by his ancestral language. Further research is needed to reinforce this speculation.

7.5. JAPANESE SUBSTRATAL INFLUENCE

In the preceding sections, these three components, line numbering, verse numbering, and verse-Final Markers, have been claimed to be the particular features discovered in JHCE. JHCE narrative takes 3 as the most frequent number in lines and as the primary number in verses. JHCE also indicates more use of VFM than OHCEs. If those three features are described here and compared closely as in Table 7-14, it is obvious that the discrepancy between JHCE and OHCEs is crucial and cannot be ignored.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>JHCE</th>
<th>OHCEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Line-Numbering 3</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse-Numbering 3</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verse-Final Markers</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now a question arises where those particular characteristics in JHCE have derived from. It is the aim of the next chapter to introduce the JAPANESE SUBSTRATAL HYPOTHESIS and provide a detailed argument to support the hypothesis. It is claimed that all of the three features in question have been transferred from the Japanese language in creolization.

6Strangely enough, those sentence particles, according to Roberts, had ceased to be used at the later stage of pidginization when lexicon of English began to take over that of Hawaiian (see Chapter two for a discussion of HPE).
Especially, the fact that only those who have Japanese ancestry show such differences suggests that those features are not necessarily pan-ethnic among HCE speakers of different ethnic backgrounds. Rather, the numbering 3 and VFM are culturally determined, idiosyncratic characteristics. This appears to imply two aspects of substratum transfer. For one thing, pidgin languages spoken in Hawai'i were not a single homogeneous linguistic code but rather a mixture of several different varieties of rudimentary pidgin languages. Each of these varieties may have been heavily influenced by the speakers' own ancestral language. The other aspect involves the necessity to make distinction between feature transfer directly from an ancestral language to a creole, and the influence from the ancestral language handed down to a pidgin first and then to the creole language (Masuda, 1991, in press-a). This issue will be taken up again in Chapter nine when the Complementary Hypothesis is discussed.

However, it should be remembered here that linguistic characteristics in HCE, at least those in discourse processes, do not seem to be homogeneous but heterogeneous depending on the ethnic background of speakers. This fact may lead to a conclusion that creole languages are likely to demonstrate some unique attributes as one of the languages born in contact situation. Those attributes are not shared with other natural languages in which speakers' ancestral backgrounds do not usually reflect differences in discourse structures or other aspects of language.
"The Japanese language naturally retained its vitality in such a supportive environment. No doubt this mother tongue retention had the effect of increasing the amount of Japanese features that became conventionalized in HPE because there were so many of these speakers around."
Charlene J. Sato (1985: 250)

8.1. SOCIOHISTORICAL ARGUMENT

In the preceding chapter, it was claimed that the three characteristics that are uniquely demonstrated by JHCE have been derived from the Japanese language. In order to confirm that a particular single language is a donor for another as a matter of substratal influence, this supposed substratum language has to be dominant in terms of the number of speakers over other ancestral languages. It is also indispensable to show that the dominance in population occurs at the very site where pidginization and creolization take place (Bickerton 1994). It seems necessary, therefore, to look at how the demographic figures describe the sociohistorical context for each of the ethnic languages spoken around the time of pidginization and creolization in Hawai‘i, i.e., between 1890 and 1920. It is appropriate to look first at the overall picture of the other ethnic groups besides Hawaiian, which has already been illustrated in Chapter seven. A historical fact tells that the Chinese was isolated from the other immigrant groups. Most Chinese immigrants left the plantations very early to enter into other occupations, such as shop-keeping and farming. Later, they came into closer contact with Hawaiians. Reinecke describes this phenomenon in the following words (1969: 90):
Even after the Chinese immigrated in large numbers, their influence upon the creole dialect continued, apparently, to be slight. The large numbers of single males, keeping pretty much to themselves, probably had little opportunity to imprint their linguistic peculiarities upon the rest of the population.¹

In regards to the Portuguese, while 'the Portuguese appear to have been the most influential nationality in spreading its (HPE's) use,' (Reinecke ibid.: 109, italics and parenthesis added) they do not seem to have been influential in the formation of its structure. He states that 'the Portuguese influence is less than that of Hawaiian.' (91)

As far as the demographic figures are concerned, the Portuguese population was also less than that of the Chinese, let alone the Japanese, as will be further illustrated in the following discussion.

**TABLE 8-1. Kaua‘i demographic profile (source: Anderson et al. 1975: 12)**

[Others-1 contains Part-Hawaiians and Puerto Ricans. Others-2 includes Caucasian-Hawaiians, Asiatic-Hawaiians, Puerto Ricans, Spanish. Total number in the brackets are the figures given on the original document.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1890</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1920</th>
<th>1930</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>3,313 (27.9)</td>
<td>2,864 (13.9)</td>
<td>2,208 (9.2)</td>
<td>1,728 (6.0)</td>
<td>1,363 (3.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2,015 (17.0)</td>
<td>3,265 (15.9)</td>
<td>2,312 (9.7)</td>
<td>1,433 (4.9)</td>
<td>1,201 (3.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1,369 (11.6)</td>
<td>803 (4.0)</td>
<td>2,643 (11.0)</td>
<td>3,190 (11.0)</td>
<td>2,554 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2,626 (22.1)</td>
<td>9,735 (47.3)</td>
<td>12,541 (52.4)</td>
<td>14,582 (50.2)</td>
<td>13,905 (38.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>969 (4.0)</td>
<td>642 (2.2)</td>
<td>362 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td>372 (1.6)</td>
<td>1,104 (4.1)</td>
<td>12,562 (35.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>794 (6.7)</td>
<td>587 (2.8)</td>
<td>938 (3.9)</td>
<td>961 (3.3)</td>
<td>1,171 (3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others-1</td>
<td>1,741 (14.7)</td>
<td>3,304 (16.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others-2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,969 (8.2)</td>
<td>2,421 (8.3)</td>
<td>2,824 (7.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>20,558</td>
<td>23,952</td>
<td>29,061</td>
<td>35,942</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us start with the figures of the island of Kaua‘i. The island of Kaua‘i is where Grove Farm established the first plantation in 1835 (Center for Oral History 1988a, b, c). These demographic figures have been quoted from Kaua‘i socio-economic profile.

¹It is assumed that Reinecke’s term creole dialect is not equated to HCE but is closer to HPE. Moreover, it is the colonial dialect in his term that refers to HCE, as recognized in his comment below (ibid.: 163): 'Roughly speaking, the creole dialect was the product of adults, chiefly of adult males, while the colonial dialect is largely the product of little children and adolescents.'
As one can see in Table 8-1, in 1890, eighteen years after the first Portuguese immigration, the Japanese ranked second in population.\(^2\) In 1900, the Japanese population reached 9,735, which was 3.4 times more than that of the Hawaiian population, 2.9 times that of the Chinese, and 12 times that of the Portuguese. Furthermore, in 1910, the figures show that the Japanese population reached 12,541, which was more than half (52.4%) of the total population (23,952). This fact tells us that one out of every two people was in all likelihood speaking Japanese at that time, which suggests that the core part of the linguistic environment in the contact situation is formed mainly by speakers of Japanese.

While the figures in Table 8-1 portray the population on the Island of Kaua‘i only, additional evidence is taken from the data for the whole kingdom/state of Hawai‘i as described in Table 8-2.\(^3\) The first plantation was established on Koloa, Kaua‘i, in 1835 as noted earlier, and in Chapter two, it was argued that HPE had not been linguistically stable when Japanese first arrived in the islands in 1885 (In fact, HPE has never been stabilized, as far as evidence available at this stage of investigation is concerned). It was also postulated by Roberts (in press) that the first stage of creolization in Hawai‘i took place as early as in 1890.

Now the demographic data for 1890 show that there were 34,436 Hawaiians (38%), 16,752 Chinese (19%), 12,719 Portuguese (14%), and 12,610 Japanese (14%) in the islands of Hawai‘i. However, six years later in 1896, the ratios of the population for the four ethnic groups were altered: Hawaiians, 31,019 (28%); Chinese, 21,616 (20%); Portuguese, 15,191 (14%); and Japanese, 24,407 (22%). In 1900 when the creolization was at its peak, the Japanese population reached as high as

---

\(^2\)The first group of Portuguese immigrants came in 1872. The arrival of the Chinese had started earlier in 1853.

\(^3\)The Hawaiian Kingdom (The Kalakaua Dynasty) was overthrown by the middle class Anglo-Americans in 1893. Hawai‘i was annexed to the U.S. in 1898.
61,111 (40%), as compared to the Hawaiians who totaled 29,799 (19%), Chinese, 25,767 (17%); and Portuguese, 18,272 (12%).

Furthermore, in 1910, Hawaiians numbered 26,041 (14%), Chinese 21,674 (11%), Portuguese 22,301 (12%), and Japanese reached as many as 79,675. This figure for the Japanese accounted for 42% of the total population, that is, almost half of the total population were speakers of the Japanese language. After that year, the Hawaiian population kept decreasing, Chinese and Portuguese plateaued, and only
Japanese continued to increase as is illustrated. This evidence reveals that whereas all other ethnic groups showed a decline, the Japanese had a dramatic increase in population.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8-3. Ethnic composition of the plantation workforce 1888-1900</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(sources: Roberts 1993: 9, Hawaiian Gazette Company 1888, 1892, 1898, 1900, Robert Grieve Printer, 1890, 1891, 1894, Hawaiian Star Press, 1897)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(13.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(38.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(20.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(22.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Finally, it is appropriate to look at the demographic data of the plantation workforce. While both Tables 8-1 and 8-2 describe the total population made up of Kaua'i and the whole kingdom/state of Hawai'i, respectively, Table 8-3 describes only the people working on the plantations of the islands. In addition to the high ratio of the Japanese population in general, figures for Japanese laborers on plantations in particular also indicate a demographic dominance. In fact, the ratio of the Japanese over the others in the workforce is much higher than that found in the general population. In the year 1890, Japanese laborers already accounted for almost half (42.8%) of the total workforce. From 1892 onward until 1898, this ethnic group was more than half of the plantation population. There was a slight decrease in 1898 at 49.2%; however, it rose again in 1900 to as much as 72%. Around 1900 is the peak of creolization in the islands, according to Roberts (in press). What these numerical data...
examined thus far indicate is that the Japanese were so large a group compared to the other ethnic groups.

It is then necessary to ask what kind of linguistic situation can be determined from these demographic figures of the plantation scenes. What languages were the laborers speaking there? Recent research by Bickerton & Wilson (1987) and Roberts (1992, 1993, in press) shows that Pidgin Hawaiian and rudimentary HPE were languages spoken among the various ethnic groups. This, of course, applies to the linguistic situation on the plantation sites as well. In addition to these two major tools of communication, however, the demographic figures illustrated so far strongly suggest that Japanese must also have been one of the languages spoken on the working sites by Japanese laborers. This assumption is supported by the fact that the language spoken by half or more of the speakers in the contact situation was Japanese. Furthermore, on the grounds that the speakers of that language had been constantly increasing from the beginning of the first stages of creolization, it is most likely that the language must have influenced the use of HPE by Japanese immigrants as well as contributed to the formation of JHCE to a great extent in terms of discourse organization and communicative strategies. In other words, the size of the Japanese community made it more likely that Japanese speakers would be influenced by their native language than that other ethnic groups would be influenced by their native language.

Incidentally, it was mentioned in Chapter two that some creolists such as Holm (1988), Goodman (1985), and McWhorter (1994), believe that the Japanese came to Hawai‘i too late to affect the formation of HPE and HCE. They seem to rely on Reinecke’s (1969: 93) remark that some people believe that there had developed a certain type of pidgin spoken by Hawaiians, Chinese, and Portuguese on the plantations before the arrival of the Japanese. Nevertheless, as Reinecke’s refutation below illustrates, that speculation does not seem plausible (Reinecke ibid.: 93).
Yet one may be allowed to doubt this general impression [that the Japanese had only to learn the creole dialect and that they added little to it (93)], in view of the forty-seven Japanese words found in "Terms Used on Hawaiian Plantations", compiled in 1930 by U.K. Das for the Hawaiian Sugar Planters' Association (though it is true that few of these terms have carried over into the later colloquial dialect, as so many of the Hawaiian words have done). It is probable, however, that the Japanese influence has been more noticeable upon the later stages of the creole dialect [i.e., HPE] and upon the colonial dialect [i.e., HCE] which grew out of it.

Above all, since there is no evidence that there had been a stabilized pidgin when Japanese arrived in Hawai'i, and since there is obvious evidence that Japanese was overwhelmingly dominant in population at the time of pidginization/creolization, the claim that Japanese had contributed nothing influential can no longer be maintained for the case of JHCE. There is no doubt that the Japanese influence is highly predictable if the above sociohistorical evidence is seriously taken into consideration. It goes without saying, however, that it is another interesting research question whether it is possible for substratal transmission in discourse processes to take place even after the development has crystallized. Yet, the answer to that question has to be kept for the future until such time when research will provide some insights on the issue.\(^4\)

Based on these demographic figures and the sociohistorical facts illustrated thus far are concerned, the most promising substratal language for JHCE seems to have been Japanese, then Hawaiian as the second possible donor. Chinese and Portuguese do not seem to have been potential donors. In the next section, an extensive argument will be made to explore the possibility of the JAPANESE SUBSTRATUM HYPOTHESIS from the linguistic point of view.

---
\(^4\)Incidentally, Huttar (1993: 52) mentions as follows:
'In general, I believe the structure of discourse, as opposed to that of words, phrases, and clauses, is an area for which it is hard for native speakers to be made aware of their unconscious knowledge. *I further assume that such areas are likely to be particularly resistant to change.*' (emphasis added)
In the preceding section, it is claimed that Japanese was overwhelmingly dominant in population size over the other three ethnic groups (i.e., Hawaiian, Chinese, and Portuguese) when pidginization and creolization were taking place. In addition to the demographic figures and sociohistorical arguments, another thing that has to be presented to support the substratal hypothesis is linguistic evidence. In Chapter seven, three characteristics are discovered in JHCE that are claimed to have been transferred from the Japanese language. They are: (1) 3 as the most frequent number in lines; (2) 3 as the primary number in verses; and (3) verse-final markers (VFM). It is necessary, therefore, to show that the substratum language in question, i.e., Japanese itself, has such characteristics. Based on the findings in Japanese linguistics accomplished up to the present time, it seems appropriate to state that Japanese discourse, particularly the casual-style narrative discourse, often has the characteristics that have been called "poetic." In fact, it is recognized that the three characteristics in question are related to important aspects of discourse being studied in the language.

The first and the second characteristics, that is, the occurrence of 3 in the numbering of lines and verses, have been remarked by Minami & McCabe (1991). Using Gee's Stanza Analysis (1985), M & M studied conversational narratives of Japanese children ranging in age from five to nine years old. After examining seventeen children's narrative structures, they found that one hundred and seven (59%) out of a total one hundred eighty-one stanzas were composed of three verses. Their criteria for identifying verses, however, are a little different from that of the present study. Basically, they use only two of the Verse Features that have been introduced in 3.4. in this research: Feature 2 (V[erse] I[nitial] P[articles]) and Feature 4 (V[erse] F[inal] M[arkers]). These two features are proposed as Rule 2 and Rule 1 respectively, and described as follows by them (Minami & McCabe ibid.: 581):
Rule 1. When Japanese ne 'you know' appears, it always signals the break between two lines. When ne comes at the end of one semantically complete statement, it also tends to signal the break between two verses.

Rule 2. Irrespective of conjunction type, a clause that follows a conjunction forms one verse.

(underlined emphasis added)

As the part emphasized with an underline in Rule 1 shows, M & M adopt semantic factors, as well as other clues, to identify verses. What differs from the framework in the present study is that the two factors described in Rule 1, i.e., semantic component and VFM, are treated as a unified single feature as a mandatory combination to identify verses. On the contrary, the framework used in this study allows those features to be separated to signal a verse individually. It seems that their criteria are more 'form-oriented' than the present study's (which is 'meaning-oriented').

The third linguistic variable discovered in mCE, i.e., VFM, is also mentioned in M & M's Rule 1 above. Moreover, Clancy (1982, 1986) discusses three sentence-final particles in Japanese, ne, sa, and yo, in her analysis of Japanese children's narratives. She explains those three particles in the following statement (1982: 61):

In Japanese, speakers frequently indicate their concern for the listener by using the particle ne, which is similar to a tag question or 'you know?' with rising intonation in English. The particle ne is essentially a request for confirmation, either that the listener agrees with the speaker's statement, has understood it, or merely is continuing to listen attentively to what is being said.

This particle (i.e., sa), which is common in Tokyo dialect, is used in the same syntactic environments as ne, but conveys a somewhat different feeling, sometimes compared with English 'of course'. It is extremely casual, and was used by only three speakers in these narratives, who also never used polite verb endings. (parentheses added)

Use of this particle (i.e., yo) tends to be emphatic and/or to imply that the speaker is presupposing that the listener does not already know the information being communicated. Yo was used most frequently in imparting new information in these narratives when something was being asserted somewhat more strongly than usual, either because it was unexpected or because it had been elicited by the listener. (parentheses added)

Regarding the pragmatic function of ne, Cook (1992) argues that maintaining conversation without using the particle is difficult and uncomfortable in Japanese
because 'the particle *ne* creates affective common ground, or emotional ties between the interlocutors.' (534) On the other hand, Rudolph (1994) describes some inadequacy of the previous research on the particle *yo*, and has started an investigation to provide a new explanation of its function from the viewpoint of the speaker's internal process and subjectivity. One will find many of the three particles in discussion, *ne*, *sa*, and *yo*, when the narrative discourse data in Japanese are examined below. These particles function as markers for terminating verses. In addition, before exploring the data, more discussion is necessary to illustrate the nature of Japanese discourse structure. It seems that some modifications are required in the Verse Analytical framework proposed in 3.4. to add analytical devices for particular grammatical characteristics in Japanese.

First of all, it is mentioned in Minami & McCabe's Rule 1 above that 'when Japanese *ne* "you know" appears, it always signals the break between two lines.' This criterion, however, does not coincide with Line Feature 1 proposed in the present Verse Analytical framework since the latter requires *predication* to form a line. Japanese *ne* does not necessarily come only at the end of a clause but also at word/phrasal endings as well as does English *you know*. Thus, there seems to be a good reason to modify Line Feature 1 to cover this particular character. Nonetheless, it also seems necessary to distinguish these two markers, *ne* and *you know*, in terms of their roles in verse structure. Apparently, unlike English *you know*, Japanese *ne* is not merely a hesitation noise or a filler but a marker to indicate a unit in narrative discourse. Clancy (1982: 72-3) points out as follows:

In spoken Japanese, a syntactic clause is frequently broken down into a number of smaller units, each of which is preceded by an audible pause and/or other hesitations, has a distinct intonation contour, and often ends with heavy stress and higher pitch on the final syllable of the last word or with a particle such as *ne* or *sa*........In this sample of oral narratives, 67.4 percent of all intonation groups were shorter than a syntactically complete clause; that is, they did not include the predicate of the case frame being verbalized. Temporal, locative, and adverbial phrases, arguments of the predicate, modifiers, verbal complements, conjunctions,

---

5 She calls this concept 'the Japanese cultural value of shared feeling among interlocutors.' (ibid.: 534)

6 The concept of subjectivity is first introduced in the study of Japanese discourse by Iwasaki (1993).
and even hesitations such as the common...*ano ne* 'well uh', were frequently produced as separate units having their own intonation contour.

This claim for the characteristic of Japanese narrative discourse that she calls 'the highly fragmental quality'\(^7\) is also supported by Iwasaki (in press). He argues that Japanese speakers make frequent use of *partial propositional strategy* to carry out *the multi-faced task*\(^8\) in a single intonation unit. On the other hand, 'English speakers may attend to similar needs in conversation, they do not necessarily do it in one intonation unit.' (ibid.: 3) Moreover, Jordan & Noda (1987: 262) touch upon this phenomenon by saying that 'in spoken Japanese, a sentence is frequently broken up into shorter spans, with *ne*.' They go on to say that 'Japanese conversation places heavy emphasis on the participation of the addressee(s) as well as the speaker, and the use of *ne* is one way to involve the hearer(s).’ What is obvious from the discussion so far is that in Japanese narrative discourse, interpretation units are not always predicate clauses but frequently fragmental words/phrases, typically signaled by one of those particles. This fact leads to a concern that an important linguistic characteristic might be omitted if this particular phenomenon is ignored in Verse Analysis. It, therefore, seems more appropriate to take into consideration the feature in question and modify Line Features in Verse analysis. (i.e., Line Feature 1d, *ne*-post-tailed phrases, will be added.)

Moreover, it is well-known in Japanese syntax that to draw a clear line between so-called *relative clauses* and *adjective clauses* is rather difficult. This is because Japanese adjectives carry declension and behave like verbs. If a given Japanese adjectival phrase in the attributive usage is in the imperfective aspect, it may be possible to equate it to the English adjectival equivalent, which is non-finite (i.e., without a predicative form) as in *Utsukushi-i niwa (beautiful garden)* 'a beautiful garden.' However, if the adjectival

---

\(^7\)She defines the quality as: 'A single clause is communicated in several distinct intonation groups.' (ibid.: 73) Please recall that intonation units in English usually contain a clause-predicate verb (Chafe 1980), as discussed in Chapter 3 of this dissertation.

\(^8\)He shows four tasks: ideational content, cohesion marking, subjective expression, and interaction management.
phrase is in the perfective aspect, it is no longer possible to find an English counterpart of a perfective adjectival phrase which is finite. It is necessary instead to give a relative clause counterpart: e.g., *Utsukushi-katta niwa (beautiful-Perfective garden)* 'a garden which was beautiful.' Thus, when Verse Analysis is carried out, it seems necessary for this morphosyntactic difference between the two languages to be paid attention to and necessary that Line Features be modified to accommodate this characteristic.

That is to say, the imperfective-aspect forms of adjectives in Japanese (e.g., *okii* 'large,' *kawaii* 'pretty,' etc.) as well as those of adjectival nominals+na (e.g., *kirei na* 'clean,' *shizuka na* 'quiet,' etc.) may not be regarded as lines in their attributive usage as in Adj+N: *okii tatemono (large building)* or 'a large building' and Adj.Nom + na + N: *benri na computer (convenient copula computer)* or 'a convenient computer.' (It can be regarded as a line if they are in the declarative usage as in Adj+Copula: *Yasui desu* [cheap copula-Imperfective] or 'It is cheap' and Adj.Nom + Copula: *Shizuka desu* [quiet copula-Imperfective] or 'It is quiet') Nevertheless, the perfective counterparts for the adjectives in the attributive usage should be considered to be lines on the grounds that they behave like verbal predicates manifesting an aspect declension. Examples: Adj [PERFECTIVE ASPECT] + N: *Takakatta jisho (expensive-Perfective dictionary)* 'A dictionary which was expensive'; Adj.Nom [PERFECTIVE ASPECT] + na + N: *Kirei datta kouen (clean copula-Perfective garden)* 'A garden which was clean.' (i.e., 'Predicate verb' in Line Feature 1a does not exclude the Japanese adjectival and adjectival-nominal phrases if they are in the perfective aspect form: *Adj.STEM-katta* or *Adj.Nom.-datta*)

Furthermore, it is also well-known that Japanese is a typical topic-comment language and this fact reflects upon Japanese speakers' strategy of narrative construction in discourse. In fact, it has been recognized in the analyses of the present study that the Japanese narrators make frequent use of such a topic-prominent utterance structure as *X wa ne, Y ne, Z yo* or 'As for X (you know), it is Y (you know), and it is
Z (I assure you), with some variation in the usage of particles. As can be seen here, X-wa frame is playing a significant role in constructing an organized narrative structure by introducing a topic at the beginning of an utterance. Although X in the topic frame is sometimes not a predicate clause, an important characteristic would be lost if that phenomenon was overlooked in Verse analysis. Thus, as far as the Japanese language is concerned, any phrase or clause that ends in the topic particle -wa or -wa ne is regarded as a line, indifferent to the number of words (i.e., Line Feature 3a will be modified).

It has to be noted that the above modifications are not attempting to make ad hoc changes but facilitating devices to cover peculiarities of the Japanese language which cannot be dealt with by the original framework. It is not possible that the features proposed for given languages (i.e., GC, HCE, and Japanese in the present study) are applicable for any other languages. That is, in order for Verse Analytical framework to be utilized for more than one languages, it is inevitable to modify minimally its features depending on what particular characteristics a certain language has. Nevertheless, an important thing is that the definitions for each level will not be altered. These definitions as fully discussed in Chapters three and six (i.e. interpretation, coherency, episodes, the lower juncture, and the upper juncture) describe core concepts and should be applied to any language when the present VA is practiced. The following section summarizes what have been explored in this section into the format utilized in 3.4.

---

9 This type of narrative topic does not include an explicit single sentential-topic phrase functioning as an agent or a doer of the predicate. These two types are compared as follows: Narrative type -- Sono mondai wa, Taro ni makasete, amari shinpaisuru no wa yosou. "As for that problem, let's leave it to Taro, and let's not be worried about it." Sentential type -- Sono mondai wa totemo muzukashii desu. "That problem (at least) is very difficult." In the Narrative type of topic construction, the scope of the topic is extended to go beyond the relationship of the agent (doer) and the predicate.
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8.3. MODIFICATIONS TO THE ANALYTICAL FEATURES

As discussed in 8.2. above, the Verse Analytical framework needs to be modified to facilitate devices to deal with particular characteristics of the Japanese language. There are three features to be changed and they are described as in the following modified forms. Please refer to Chapter three, section 3.4., for the original description. (Underlying indicates additions or modifications.)

**Line**  
A minimal level in VERSE STRUCTURE

A Line is defined as an INTERPRETATION UNIT which represents a block of ideas constituting the minimum amount of information.

**Feature 1: PREDICATION**  
(No notation in the texts)  
[Predication here refers to both coordination and subordination and covers the following operational linguistic structures:]

(a) Predicate verb with or without adverbials (In Japanese, adjectives and adjectival nominals are regarded as predicate verbs in the attributive usage if they are in the perfective aspect -kata and -datta, respectively.)

  e.g.,  
  Ano sugoku taka-kata konpyuuta,  
  'Uh, that computer which was awfully expensive,
  'That one, the price has gone down, (I inform you).'

(b) and (c) are omitted here.

(d) Words/phrases that are terminated with a sentence-final particle such as ne, sa, yo, are considered to be lines regardless of the presence or absence of a predicate verb.

  e.g.,  
  De, sono toki ne,  
  Ano Ginza no uchi no toki ne,  
  Hajimete atta no yo.  
  'And at that time, (you know),
  'When (we were living) in that house in Ginza, (you know),
  '(I) met (him/her) for the first time, (I inform you).

{Feature 1a modified and Feature 1d added}

**Feature 3: INDEPENDENCE**  
(Italized in the text)
A sequence of words is counted as a line if there is a clear boundary in meaning which separates it from the preceding and the following groups of words.

(a) A long topic (More than five words). In Japanese: A narrative topic phrase/clause with the particle wa

e.g.,   L De sono hito-tachi wa,
        L Kekkyoku sonna sugu shoku wa naishi,
        L Seikatsu ni komaru janai.

'Then, speaking of those people,'
'Hard to find a job right away,'
'And (they) get trouble in living, right?'

{Feature 3a modified}

Section 8.4. below introduces a description of narrative discourse in Japanese. The section has an organization similar to the previous ones, that is, it includes narrative discourse data, translations and notes, profiles in patterning and numbering, and discussion (brief comments, in this section).

8.4. LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE

8.4.1. Verse structure in Japanese

In 8.3., Line Features in Verse Analysis were slightly modified in order to include an investigation of the Japanese language, in addition to Native American and creole languages. It is desirable, incidentally, that the present framework should be examined and revised if necessary to apply to other languages as well, in future research. The present chapter attempts to analyze narrative discourse in Japanese in order to provide linguistic evidence for the substratum hypothesis. Japanese demonstrates an explicit verse structure with clear patterning and numbering. The fact suggests that the language is more likely to be poetic-oriented rather than prosaic-oriented in oral
narrative discourse. This finding that Japanese, which has hundreds of years of literary artistic history, presents poetic features does not support the absolute dichotomy between oral and literary languages.

To illustrate the poetic nature of Japanese, the following narrative discourse data has been elicited from a native speaker of (the standard variety of) Japanese, SY. She was born and raised in Tokyo, Japan, but at the age of fifty, had moved to Hawai'i. She was sixty years old at the time of the recording. A translation is given right after the texts.

8.4.2. Narrative discourse, translation, and profile

SY's Narrative: Female, 60, Japanese. Transcribed in romanization
Recorded by the author on September 22, 1990, at SY's residence in Mililani, Hawai'i.

IMIN NO HANASHI

ACT | HAWAI | NIHON-JIN
---|---|---
SN1 | [Participant] | Issei no Hito
ST1 | Ex: | Dakedo, imano nihon no sa,
V1 | L1 | Nan, nihon kara kiteiru issei, issei.
L2 | Nan, nihon kara kiteiru issei, issei.
L3 | Nikkei no issei ne,
L4 | Minna kuroshita mitai NE.
L5 | .

V2 | L6 | So yo, so ne,
L7 | Atashi ga ima issho ni shigoto shiteiru hito mo,
L8 | Mo nanaju go YO.

V3 | L9 | A, nisei ka, nisei ka,
L10 | Oksasan ga nihon kara kita kara,
L11 | Nisei yo NE.

ST2 | Cm: | Hidoi Seikatsu
V4 | L12 | Ano ne, tatami,
L13 | Ano mukashi ne,

10Bickerton (p.c. 5/94) points out that poetic and prosaic narratives are possibly 'not two discrete categories but rather points on a narrative continuum.' The present writer agrees with him to the extent that poetic characteristics may be obscured in HCE and Japanese in a formal context. Especially in the Japanese language, it is most likely that a shift from the informal or casual style to the formal or careful style will require changes of both grammatical forms and speech styles. This suggests that a style shift will also influence the verse structure. With regards to HCE, a speaker might code-switch from HCE to SE if it is in a formal situation or if he wants to make use of the signalling of formality. Nonetheless, only a few studies have been accomplished so far in Verse analytical framework for languages other than NA languages and further investigation is desirable.
Allante yu NO.

XX Painappuru hatake de hataraiteta desho, Minna ayu nihon kara imin, Satokibi toka painappuru.

XX So sutto ne, Hottategoya mitai na koya nan datte NE.

Soide koyu toko ne, Minna ita no ue shinbun shiite, Nea n desutte YO.

XX Soyu seikatsu shiteta no yo, Mukashi wa, Issei no hito wa NE.

Demo kou shiite, Soide kodomo kyoiku sashita kara, Erai wa NE.

Dakara, ima nisei no shito ga ne, Minna ne, ue ni tatteru hito, Ooi janai.

XX Are wa issei no hito ga kekkyoku, jibun wa gakumon ga naikara, Kodomo-tachi ni ne, Gakumon minitsukete SA.

Soshite, shusse sashita kara, Erai to, Omou.

Datte atashi-tachi ga omou toki ni, so no jidai ni, Yoso no kuni ni imin surtte koto wa, Nihon de seikatsu dekinakatta hito desho, kekkyoku.

XX Seikatsu dekinakute, Iminshita, Sonokoro no imin no hitotte sou na no yo ne, Ima wa chigau kedo SA.

Dakara sore koso donzoko no seikatsu nihon de shiite, Imin sun dakara, NE.

Dakara kocchi kite, Yoku hataraita wake yo ne, Satokibi toka minna ayu sa, Roudou no shigoto bakkashi yo NE.

Dakedo kodomo ni wa sa,
LS2 Gakumon minitsuketa kara ne,
LS3 Ima minna rippa na hito takusan iru janai,
LS4 *Nisei demo NE.*

V18 L55 *Dakara atashi,*
L56 Issei no hitotte erai natte,
L57 Omou YO.

SN2 ANO JIDAI
[Time]

ST7 Ex: Mazushii
V19 L58 *Datte ano jidai ni yo,*
L59 Gaikoku ni iku nante kimochi ni,
L60 Narenai janai,
L61 Futsu dattara,
L62 *Heiwa na jidai ni, NE.*

V20 L63 *Dakara nihon demo sa,*
L64 Naniken naniken te ko katamatte,
L65 Kiteru wake yo,
L66 *Imin ni.*

V21 L67 *Dakara sono chibo wa mazushikatta wake yo,*
L68 *Mukashi NE.*

ST8 Cm: Chiho no Hito
V22 L69 *Soide, nante yu no,*
L70 Shudan de hawai ni imin ni kitan desho.

V23 L71 *Da, sono jidai no,*
L72 Uchi no otosan ya okasan Tokyo ita toki wa,
L73 Sonna imin nante tondemo, NE.

V24 L74 *XX Zenzen mo sorekoso shiranai janai,*
L75 *Soyu kotette shiranai de,*
L76 *Sunda janai.*

ST9 Dn: Hitohata
V25 L77 *Dakara, chibo no hito yo ne,*
L78 Un ayu hito wa gamanzuyoi n janai,
L79 *Yappari.*

V26 L80 *De, minna hito hata agete,*
L81 *Okane tamete,*
L82 Nihon ni kaeru,
L83 Tsumori datta no ga,
L84 *Minna itsuichatta wake yo NE.*

V27 L85 *Ma, kaetta hito mo,*
L86 *Iru desho kedo ne,*
L87 *Hotondo itsuichatta no yo NE.*

Translation for SY's Narrative: Transcribed in English orthography
Recorded on September 22, 1990.

AN IMMIGRANTS STORY
ACT HAWAII
The First Generation

ST1

V1  L1  But, Japanese immigrants, (you see),
L2  What you call, people from Japan, the first generation, the
first generation,
L3  the first generation from Japan,
L4  the first generation of the Japanese descent, (you know),
L5  All seem to have gone through hardships, (you know).

V2  L6  That's right, that's right,
L7  A woman that I am working with now, too,
L8  (She is) Already seventy-five, (I inform you).

V3  L9  Oh, (she is) the second generation, I guess,
L10 Her mother was from Japan,
L11 So, (she is) the second generation, (you know).

An Awful Life

ST2

V4  L12 You know, what, (it's) straw mats,
L13 You know, old times,
L14 You know, what you call.

V5  L15 (They were) working at pineapple fields, right?,
L16 All of them are those immigrants from Japan,
L17 (They worked with) Sugar cane and pineapples.

V6  L18 Then what happened, (you know),
L19 (It's) a shack or a pen, (you know).

Hardships

ST3

V7  L20 Then a floor like this, (you know),
L21 Everyone put a paper on it,
L22 And slept (there), (I tell you).

V8  L23 (They were) living such a cruel life, (I assure you),
L24 (That's) Old days,
L25 (That's) People of the first generation, (you know).

V9  L26 But (they) worked hard,
L27 And gave education to their children,
L28 So (they were) nice, (you know).

The Second Generation

ST4

V10 L29 That's why people of the second generation now, (you
know),
L30 Many of them made success,
L31 Many of them (did), didn't they?

V11 L32 That's because the first generation people have not
received education,
L33 So to their children, (you know),
L34 (They) gave them education, (you see.)

V12 L35 And then (they) made them succeed in their life ,
L36 So (they're) nice,
L37 (I) think.
Because we assume, those days, Immigrating to a foreign country means, (They) could not make their livings in their country, right?

(They were) not able to make their livings, That’s why (they) immigrated, Immigrants those days were like that, (you know), It may be different now, but, (you see).

So (they were) living at extreme poverty in Japan,, Then (they) had to leave Japan, (you know).

So (they) came here, And worked so hard, (you know), At the sugar plantations or whatever, (you see), All those labor works, (you know),

But to their children, (you know), (They) gave them education, (you know), There are many successful people now, The second generation, (you know).

So, I, The people of the first generation are respectable, I think so, (I tell you).

Because those days, (I assure you) (No one) cared for going to a foreign country, Never, (you know), That’s natural, During such a peaceful time, (you know).

So, in Japan, (you see), (Those people) assembled according to their prefectures, And came here, (I tell you), As immigrants.

Because the people in those areas were poor, (I tell you), In old times, (you know).

And then what you call, They immigrated to Hawai‘i in large groups, didn't they?

And then, those days, When my father and mother were living in Tokyo, They've never thought of immigrating, (you know),

We'd never been aware of such a thing, (you know) We've never known such a thing, (you know) That's how it was there.
So, (those were) people in rural areas, (I inform you),
Those people were very patient and strong, weren't they?
As we believe.

And (they) wished to make a success,
To save money, and,
To go back to Japan,
That's what they'd planned.
But they remained here at last, (I inform you, you know).

Well, some of them returned (to Japan),
(I guess) there would be some, (you know)
But most (of them) remained here, (I inform you, you know.)
TABLE 8-4. The numbering of SY's narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTS</th>
<th>SCENES</th>
<th>STANZAS</th>
<th>VERSES</th>
<th>LINES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>SN1</td>
<td>ST1</td>
<td>V1-V3</td>
<td>[3] L1-L11 [5-3-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST2</td>
<td>V4-V6</td>
<td>[3] L12-L19 [3-3-2]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST3</td>
<td>V7-V9</td>
<td>[3] L20-L28 [3-3-3]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST4</td>
<td>V10-V12 [3] L29-L37 [3-3-3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ST6</td>
<td>V16-V18 [3] L47-L57 [4-4-3]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.4.3. Comments on SY's narrative

In 8.2., it is predicted that narrative discourse in Japanese demonstrates three distinctive characteristics: 3 as the most frequent number in the line level; 3 as the primary number in the verse level;\(^ {11}\) and verse-final markers (VFM). These three characteristics are claimed to have been transferred to HCE as substratal influence. It seems necessary, therefore, to see first whether SY's narrative reflects these three characteristics together with the five fundamental poetic attributes. First of all, this narrative expresses a clear verse structure consisting of five hierarchical levels: line=interpretation, verse=coherency, stanza=episode, scene=lower juncture, and act=upper juncture (i.e., the first attribute of poetic narrative). The whole story is about Japanese immigrants to Hawai‘i, and there are two scenes. In the first scene, the narrator talks about what Japanese immigrants were like in Hawai‘i, and in the second scene, she focuses on what those people used to do back home in Japan in those days. The first scene consists of a regular single linear structure of stanzas, i.e., Ex-Cm-Cl-

\(^{11}\)That is, triplets of lines in verses and triplets of verses in stanzas, respectively.
Dn, while the second scene does not have Cl. It seems that her story describes well the lives of the first generation of Japanese immigrants in Hawai'i.\footnote{One of her comments, however, may not necessarily be accurate. Although she excludes Tokyo from the regional sources or prefectures from which those immigrants came, there were in fact four hundred sixty-one people from Tokyo in 1924 (United Japanese Society of Hawai'i 1964: 314).}

Out of a total of eighty-seven lines, only six lines are composed of more than eight words of which only two exceed ten words. This coincides with the second attribute of poetic narrative, that lines tend to be short. Sixteen verses out of twenty-seven consist of three lines, which account for 59.2 percent. This ratio is quite high, making it close to that of the primary number (i.e., 60%). All of the twenty-seven verses are in triplets. Thus, SY's narrative manifests very clear 3-numbering in both lines and verses (the third attribute of poetic narrative). Regarding the fourth attribute of poetic narrative, it is very interesting to find that none of the lines or interpretation units in this narrative seem to form a verse or a coherency unit in itself. Each line is very fragmented in both form and meaning, truly manifesting its poetic attributes. As discussed in 8.2, Iwasaki (in press: 12) points out this feature of Japanese narrative discourse. He states that 'frequent uses of partial propositional strategy is a consequence of the multi-faced task which the speaker must carry out in one I[ntonation]U[nit].' The fifth attribute can also be recognized in SY's narrative. All of the verses except for one are terminated by a micropause or a longer pause. Eleven verses are followed by a half-second pause and four are followed by a full second or more, showing that coherency units undoubtedly correspond to prosody units most of the time.

With respect to VFMs, nineteen out of twenty-seven verses (70%) are terminated by one of the VFMs. Thus, from the discussion so far, it seems reasonable to conclude that this narrative of SY's, in terms of the five poetic attributes, is quite poetic. At the same time, SY's narrative explicitly presents the three characteristics that are also
claimed to be the substratum influence from Japanese to HCE. Here is a recapping of the three substratum characteristics identified: a) 3 as the most frequent number in the line level; b) 3 as the primary number in the verse level; and c) the verse-final markers.

8.4.4. Evidence for substratum

As can be seen in the descriptions in 8.4.2 and 8.4.3., SY's narrative discourse demonstrates the three substratum characteristics as well as the five fundamental poetic attributes. The following analysis attempts to provide more support for the existence of those characteristics in Japanese narrative in general. The data have been obtained from seven narrative discourses made by three native speakers of the language, including the narrator introduced in 8.4.2. All three were born and raised in Tokyo, Japan, female, and in their 50s and 60s. They are native speakers of standard Japanese. Two of them have been living in Hawai'i since adulthood. All three were interviewed by the present writer. One was recorded in 1990 at her residence in Mililani, Hawai'i, and the other two were recorded in 1994 in offices at the University of Hawai'i. Nobody else was present at the time of recording besides the interviewer and the interviewee. The subjects were asked to talk stories about several different topics such as trips, holidays, recent experiences, and so on. It is expected that their narrative discourse in Japanese will present the three characteristics as poetic structure-constructing devices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Line</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Total/196</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>----</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8-1.** The total line-numbering in Japanese narrative texts
First of all, let us take a look at the line-level numbering in Figure 8-1. There are one hundred and ninety six verses altogether. Among them, one hundred and eighteen of them consist of three lines or triplets (60.2%), thirty four doublets (17.3%), and twenty one quadruplets (10.7%). This distribution of the line numberings in verses shows that the number 3 plays a role as the primary number since it accounts for more than sixty percent of all. The next frequent number, 2, is too low in frequency to be considered the secondary number (which requires at least thirty percent). Thus, the numbering formula for the line level is described as \{[3]-2\}. The fact that the even line level takes the primary number should be paid attention to because none of the HCE narrative texts have presented the primary number in the line level as analyzed earlier.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>20</th>
<th>30</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>50</th>
<th>60</th>
<th>70</th>
<th>80</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>Total/68</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>-2.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5)</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 8-2. The total verse-numbering in Japanese narrative texts**

There are sixty eight stanzas altogether from which fifty three are composed of three verses or triplets (Figure 8-2). This accounts for as much as 77.9 percent of all the verses, and is significant to be regarded as the primary number in the verse level. In fact, this figure is the higher than any other numbering preference in all of the analyzed narrative texts in the present study, including CJ, GC, OHCEs, JHCE, Japanese, and a few others which appear later. The next frequent number is 2, however, its ratio is much too low to be called the secondary number. Therefore, the verse level obtains \{[3]\} as the numbering formula.
TABLE 8-5. The verse-initial particles & the verse-final markers in Japanese narrative texts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>KY</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>KS</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VIP</td>
<td>38/58 (65.5%)</td>
<td>46/73 (63%)</td>
<td>48/65 (73.8%)</td>
<td>132/196 (67.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VFM</td>
<td>29/58 (50%)</td>
<td>53/73 (67.9%)</td>
<td>38/65 (58.4%)</td>
<td>120/196 (61.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is observed in Chapter seven that JHCE or HCE spoken by people of Japanese descent demonstrates more V[erse]-I[nitial] P[articles] in their narrative discourse than OHCEs or other HCEs of non-Japanese ancestry (74% vs 65%). This fact might be extended to a claim that VIP is also associated with the substratal influence from the Japanese language. As far as the figures in Table 8-5 are concerned, it is apparent that in Japanese there is a very frequent use of VIP. Nevertheless, its frequency (67.3%) is not really large when compared to other narrative texts investigated in this study: GC=61%; OHCEs=65%; and JHCE=74%. This suggests that the existence of VIPs is neither a result of substratum transfer nor a culturally or externally determined linguistic feature, but is rather an inherent linguistic indicator in narrative discourse. The indicators, VIPs, may be used in narrative discourse to signal the beginning of coherency units or verses that are argued in Chapter six to be part of the universal principles of discourse.

In relation to VIP, V[erse]-F[inal] M[arkers] make a sharp contrast among different narratives. The ratios of the use of VFM in four different types of narratives are: GC=None (Section 4.5); OHCEs=16% (Table 7-12); JHCE=35% (Table 7-13); and Japanese=61.2% (Table 8-5). VFM in Japanese includes *ne* 'you know,' *sa* 'you see,' *yo* 'I tell you,' *no* 'that's why,' *nee* 'right?,' *ee* 'yeah,' *-kedo* 'but,' and so forth. Although GC does not provide any VFM in the two narrative texts analyzed, there may be some to be found if more data are examined. On the other hand, OHCEs manifest a VFM in 16% of the verses, JHCE at twice this figure and Japanese twice as much as even that found in JHCE. These outcomes of contrast are presenting an interesting fact that should not be overlooked. Unlike the pervasive use of VIP, the data show that...
VFM is language specific, and there seems to be an externally determined factor for its existence. More accurately, in the case of JHCE, VFM is most likely to have been transferred from the Japanese language as another substratum influence.

To sum up what has been discussed in this section, the Japanese language possesses the three substratum characteristics discovered in JHCE: 3 as the most frequent number in lines; 3 as the primary number in verses; and the frequent use of VFM. Moreover, Japanese presents all of these three characteristics in more extensive manner than JHCE. This linguistic evidence, together with the sociohistorical argument made in 8.1., greatly reinforces the hypothesis of the Japanese substratum influence in JHCE. The following section further attempts to present a possible scenario on how these three characteristics have been transferred cross-linguistically from Japanese to HPE and HCE.

8.5. A SCENARIO FOR THE SUBSTRATUM TRANSFER

8.5.1. The Matrix Language Frame model

In Chapter two, it is mentioned that a pidgin English in Hawai‘i, that is, HPE (of Japanese descent), was heavily influenced by the sentence structure of Japanese. Although raw linguistic data of the pidgin is limited, it is not impossible to see if any such influence from Japanese discourse structure is recognized. It is highly plausible that discourse processes as well as communicative strategies in HPE were also influenced greatly by the Japanese language as pointed out by Sato (1985: 250, see the first page of this chapter). Particularly, it is interesting to know that many of the first-generation creole speakers in Hawai‘i were bilingual or even trilingual (Bickerton 1981, Romaine 1988). It seems quite plausible, therefore, to suppose that pidginization and creolization can be viewed from a broader perspective of language contact phenomena not only at the societal level but at the individual level as well. This implies the
necessity that researchers in pidgin/creole linguistics in particular pay attention to studies in bilingualism and/or language contact in general.

The present study finds a stimulating insight in recent research in CODE-SWITCHING, which seems to shed light on the study of creole genesis. Myers-Scotton (1993a: 1) applies her theory in contact linguistics as well as that in code-switching to the study of pidgins and creoles, by claiming that 'P[idgin]/C[reole] formation is related to other language contact phenomena.' She presents her M[atrix] L[anguage] F[rame] model (1993b) as a theoretical basis of her argument and explains the mechanism of code-switching as follows:

Only one language, called the Matrix Language, supplies syntactically relevant system morphemes in such constituents, while content morphemes may come from either the Matrix or the other participating language, called the Embedded Language.

She goes on to state that 'when two or more languages are "on" at the same time, one language--labeled the Matrix Language here--sets the morphosyntactic frame of bilingual constituents.' Based on the discussion in Chapter two in which Japanese grammatical influence in HPE is emphasized and illustrated, it is reasonable to hypothesize that Japanese must have played a crucial role as the Matrix Language (ML, henceforth) in pidginization. According to her theory above, other ethnic languages could have acted as the Embedded Languages (EL). Furthermore, relating the above-mentioned characteristics in code-switching to pidginization, Myers-Scotton has proposed a hypothesis for pidginization, which seems applicable to the case in Hawai'i. She states (ibid.: 9):

Speakers will communicate using C[ode]S[witching] as their unmarked mode, with Alpha Substrate as the Matrix Language and the other substrate languages as Embedded Languages, but with Superstrate Alpha as the main Embedded Language. The result will be a pidgin, which, to the extent it has a morphosyntactic package at all, show system morphemes and
morpheme order from Alpha Substrate. It shows many content morphemes from the Superstrate.¹³ (brackets added)

In the case of Hawai‘i, Alpha Substrate as ML is most likely to have been Japanese. Other substrate languages as EL, on the other hand, may have included Hawaiian, Chinese, and Portuguese. Then, Superstrate Alpha as the main EL was English. The discussion thus far suggests, by analogy to the morphosyntactic frame as the fundamental grammatical device, that the discourse frame in a pidgin language is also likely to be determined by the MLF model. Put another way, it can be argued that discourse structure and strategy in the variety of HPE spoken by people of Japanese descent is essentially Japanese. Furthermore, in light of the fact that most of the first generation speakers of HCE are bilingual or trilingual, it follows that those creole speakers also code-switch between HCE and their ancestral languages including Japanese in their communication. When it comes to a language contact situation, it goes without saying that Japanese is the most promising candidate for the ML because of the sociohistorical situations and linguistic evidence discussed in the earlier sections.

TABLE 8-6. Ethnic composition of locally-born and foreign-born populations, 1896
(sources: Roberts 1993: 10, Hawaiian Gazette Company 1898, 1900, Hawaiian Star Press, 1897)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicities - 1896</th>
<th>Locally-Born</th>
<th>Foreign-Born</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>2,234 (16.3)</td>
<td>19,382 (34.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>6,959 (51.0)</td>
<td>8,232 (14.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>2,078 (15.1)</td>
<td>22,329 (40.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micronesians</td>
<td>46 (0.3)</td>
<td>409 (0.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Americans</td>
<td>1,532 (11.2)</td>
<td>3,804 (6.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>884 (6.4)</td>
<td>1,627 (2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13,733 (100.0)</td>
<td>55,783 (100.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹³According to her (ibid.: 9), Alpha Substrate is a language which is spoken by plantation workers as their first language and is 'clearly dominating in terms of both numbers of speakers and group prestige.' Although Japanese does not appear to have been dominating in terms of group prestige, its overwhelming dominance in terms of population seems strong enough to call the language Alpha Substrate. This scenario, however, does not apply to the formation of creole languages. She supports Bickerton’s bioprogram theory, rather than the substratum theory, to explain the mechanism of creolization in syntax.
The following discussion focuses upon advancing the hypothesis presented thus far. Particularly, it discusses the mechanism of how the three substratum characteristics (the line numbering, the verse numbering, and VFM) have been transmitted from Japanese through HPE to HCE. This process of argument acknowledges the fact that the linguistic inputs from HPE as well as Japanese to the children acquiring HCE were overwhelming, far beyond the contributions from other possible groups at the time of creolization. Table 8-6 (Roberts 1993) shows how a large part of the demographic figures in 1896 is accounted for by foreign-born populations. Moreover, the largest group of all is 'foreign-born' Japanese. It has to be recalled here that in 1900 the Japanese population on plantations reached 72% of all the ethnic groups as was shown in Table 8-3. In addition, Sato (1985: 261) says that 'it was not until the mid 1930s or so, when HCE usage was at its peak -- judging from the greater portion of local-born to immigrants in the population -- that significantly more of the second and third generation offspring approached monolingualism in the creole.' This fact, together with the argument made in 8.1., leads to a conclusion that the most influential languages for the formation of HCE are Japanese and Japanese-framed HPE.

Now in order to provide a more accurate scenario for the Japanese-HPE/HCE substratum transfer, it may be helpful and interesting to see what dialects of Japanese were spoken by the immigrants from Japan. According to A History of Japanese Immigrants in Hawaii, published by U[nnited] J[apanese] S[society] of H[awaii] in 1964 (313), the first immigrant ship that arrived in Hawai‘i in 1885 carried 953 immigrants: 428 people (44.9%) from Yamaguchi prefecture, 222 (23.2%) from Hiroshima prefecture, 214 (22.4%) from Kanagawa prefecture, and 89 (0.9%) from other prefectures. The second ship in 1886 carried 390 immigrants from Hiroshima (41%) and none from Yamaguchi. Some statistics in 1924 (cited in UJSH ibid.: 314), moreover, tell that the population who came from Hiroshima prefecture ranked first
totalling 30,534 (26.5%) and those from Yamaguchi prefecture was second with 25,878 (22.4%) people.

Furthermore, the census carried out by the consulate of Japan (cited in Hilo Times, *The history of Japanese immigrants in island of Hawaii*, 1971: 667) indicates that the total population from Hiroshima prefecture is 4,715 (24.1%), that of Yamaguchi prefecture is 3,918 (20%), and Okinawa prefecture 2,873 (14.6%), in 1960. Most of the people surveyed in this census are the first generation immigrants who were already over sixty-five years old at the time of the census (Kobayashi 1989: 153). It seems that the immigrants from these three prefectures (i.e., Hiroshima, Yamaguchi, and Okinawa) are the largest groups, ranking one, two, and three, in that order. The above-presented sociohistorical evidence leads to a hypothesis that the core language serving as a donor for the formation of HPE and JHCE must have been a sort of hybrid of the two major dialects of Japanese, i.e., Hiroshima and Yamaguchi. Regarding the language situation around that time, UJSH (ibid.: 315) concludes:

"Japanese in Hawaii, as discussed so far, are mixture of people from varieties of prefectures. Each of them has his/her own personality, customs, vocabulary, and speech accent, which vary to some extent one another. Those different features have been mixed up in a long time, and produced something unique to Hawaii. Languages have also been mixed, with Hiroshima and Yamaguchi dialects as their bases, since the speakers of those dialects were the largest in population. As a result, a particular type of speech, 'Hawaiian Japanese', so to speak, has been invented."

(translated and emphasis added by the present writer.)

Hiroshima and Yamaguchi are neighboring prefectures, located next to each other in the south-western part of mainland Japan. The dialects spoken in the two regions are very close. They are occasionally classified as a single super-categorial group called 'Chugoku dialects family' in Japanese dialectology (Fujiwara 1965, Shibata 1967, Shigemoto, 1976, Hiroto 1982, Kagami 1982, Higa 1985). Thus, if the two are regarded as sharing common features as a single dialect, i.e., Hiroshima-Yamaguchi Dialect (HYD, henceforth) so to speak, nearly half of the entire Japanese population in
Hawai'i turned out to be the speakers of HYD (68% in 1885, 41% in 1886, 48.9% in 1924, and 44% in 1960). With support from these figures, it could be supposed that the linguistic situation where substratum transfer was taking place in pidginization/creolization may be seen as contributions overwhelmingly by speakers of HYD, together with other dialects of Japanese, and additionally, HPE.

8.5.2. The verse-projection strategy

It seems high time now to attempt to unravel the complex fabric of the linguistic mechanism. It is the mechanism that makes it possible to transfer discourse features from HYD as well as other Japanese dialects through HPE or directly to JHCE. The present study, as noted above, follows the MLF model originated by Myers-Scotton (1993a, b). The Japanese-Substratum Hypothesis is proposed here as follows:

-- By analogy to the morphosyntactic frame in the MLF model, the ML is considered to provide the discourse frame. In pidginization, HYD as well as other Japanese dialects played an important role as Alpha Substrate toward the construction of HPE. As a result, Japanese-framed HPE was formed. In creolization, it is likely that the Japanese language via HYD was acting as a more powerful donor than the Japanese-framed HPE. These two varieties of linguistic codes, i.e., Japanese with HYD and Japanese-framed HPE, must have been the major inputs that the first generation JHCE speakers were attaining to establish their discourse grammar in HCE. As a natural process of language contact phenomenon at the individual level, many of the local-born Japanese became bilingual speakers of HCE and Japanese. Thus, it is also supposed that the cross-linguistic influence might have occurred between these two languages. Additionally, the universal principles of discourse processes are also likely to operate.

The sociohistorical evidence presented earlier shows that HYD as well as Japanese in general must have acted as the ML with respect to discourse strategies in pidginization and creolization in Hawai'i. Thus, it is necessary to look at how HYD presents itself as ML in discourse structure. Following is a HYD narrative text excerpted from Shibata (1967: 232-37). The narrator is Japanese, female, born 1894 in Yamaguchi prefecture. The date of recording is September 4th, 1955. It is described
that the recording site is some twenty kilometers away to the west from the center of
Yamaguchi city, Yamaguchi prefecture.

"A FOX STORY"

"I went to pick persimmons, (I) picked some from the tree in front. It's still bright, you know."

"So, as there is another tree at Sanjo over there, (I) went as far as that Sanjo tree to pick persimmons, you know."

"Well, speaking of picking persimmons, (I) picked some, you know."

"Well, my bag was getting heavy, (I) got to go home, I felt."

"As (I) go forward a little bit, (I) usually come out to a path, From where that Sanjo tree is located."

"But, however much did I walk, And walk, There was no such a path!"

"Then, (it's) getting dark, you see, By that time, (I've) got some mushrooms, too, (I was) grabbing them in my hand, you know."

"But, (it's) getting darker and darker, However far away (I) went, However much (I) walked, However much (I) walked, (I) couldn't come to the path at all."

"So (it) was bad, And (I) threw away all the mushrooms. (I) was scared, that's why."

"Then (I) kept walking and walking, But the more (I) walked,
As can be clearly seen, the three characteristics that have been claimed as substratal influence from Japanese in general to HPE and JHCE are also existent in the above HYD text. It shows a very patterned verse structure with principally 3-numbering in both lines and verses. Moreover, many of the verses (12/18, 66.6 %) are terminated...
with VFM. The only unique feature that the above HYD narrative text demonstrates.
compared to the standard variety of Japanese analyzed in 8.3., is the forms of VFM.
Particularly, the text shows many uses of a confirmation seeker no as VFM.¹⁴ The
standard counterpart to this VFM is ne as fully discussed in 8.2. This bunmatsushi or
'phrase/sentence-final particle' no as labeled as such in Japanese linguistics is a very
common feature in both the Hiroshima and Yamaguchi dialects of Japanese, i.e., HYD.
Nakagawa (1982), for example, says that the use of the sentence-final particles no/noo
is pervasive throughout Yamaguchi prefecture, which is adjoined on the west side to
Hiroshima prefecture. Moreover, Kandori (1982: 126) states that the particle no is
used dominantly in Aki or the western part of Hiroshima prefecture while another
particle na might replace no in the more eastern side of the prefecture (Notice that L48
includes this particle). He (ibid.) provides the following example elicited in Hiroshima
city. It is interesting to observe that this utterance can be arranged in three lines as one
can see below.

Kinyo, no,
Washi ga, no,
Itte kara ni, no.
"Yesterday, you know,
It was me, you know,
Who went, that's why, you see."
(arrangement by the present writer)

Now it is very interesting to see if such characteristics as these can be discovered in
HPE narrative discourse. The following is excerpted from Bickerton (1981: 13).
Although he argues that HPE is deficient in its syntactic structure, he remarks and
acknowledges the philosophical and rhetorical elaboration in the HPE discourse text
described below.

Samtaim gud rod get,
Samtaim osem ben get,
Enguru get no?
"Sometimes there's a good road,
Sometimes there's like, bends,
Corners, right?"

¹⁴Needless to say, there are quite a few lexical differences between the two varieties of Japanese (i.e.,
HYD and the standard Japanese). However, the difference in vocabulary is not a crucial point for the
present discussion. Moreover, although the standard Japanese also has a particle no, its function is not
the same as that in HYD (i.e., a confirmation seeker) but a marker of interpersonal harmony and
affective dependence (Cook 1990).
| Olsem human laif,  | "Everything's like that, Human life's,  |
| Olsem.            | Just like that."                  |
| Gud rod get,      | "There's good roads,              |
| Enguru get,       | There's sharp corners,            |
| Mauntin get, no.  | There's mountains, right?."       |
| Awl,              | "All sorts                       |
| Enikain.          | of things."                      |
| Stawmu get,       | "There's storms,                  |
| Nais dei get,     | Nice days,                       |
| Olsem.            | It's like that."                 |
| Enibadi,          | "For everybody,                   |
| Mi, olsem,        | It was for me, too                |
| Smawl taim.       | When I was young."               |

Please recall that it was Hymes who found the poetic characteristics existing in the text above. He mentions (1990b: 101, see page two of Chapter three in this dissertation): ‘I have detected similar patterning of lines and groups of lines in two languages of the Pacific: Hawaiian Pidgin English (in a paragraph published in Bickerton 1981: 13)...’ Here is another narrative text quoted from Nagara (1972: 294, re-written in Odo orthography and translated by the present writer with help from Kent Sakoda):

| Hii kuk,          | "He cooked,                          |
| A-, biho, hanahana pres, | Ah, before, the working place,     |
| Happai kaukau, yo. | Carried lunch, you know."            |
| Hii pake: kuk,    | "He was a Chinese cook,             |
| Wan men happai,   | Only one man carried,               |
| Ha: lontaim dis wan. | It's like that for a long time."   |
| Nau no,           | "Now it's not like that.            |
| It, wan men, wan men, | Each person eats by himself     |
| Wa: kaukau ten happai. | Ten lunches are carried by ten people." |
| Biho: no:         | "Before, it's not like that,        |
| Iibn twenti men, pake: kuk haus, | Even twenty men were at the Chinese cook house, |
| Bat awl happai.   | But he carried all lunches."        |
| Nabe: eni kain happai, | "He carried pots and anything,     |
| Kaukau, wan pres. | They ate at the same place.         |
| A gud fan awl se:m piknik | It's fun like a picnic." |

With respect to the mechanism of discourse substratum transfer, it is reasonably assumed from the research results obtained thus far that the units of *verses* play a
crucial role in establishing the discourse frame. Verses are considered to provide the core part of a structure to construct a coherent frame of discourse. A comparison between these HPE texts and the HYD text show that the two share at least something common in terms of their verse construction. As you can see, it is recognized that grouping of lines or formation of a verse is a basic strategy to convey coherent meaning in HPE, and it also reveals the use of VFM in the first and the third verses in Bickerton's data and the first verse in Nagara's data. Thus, the characteristics salient in HYD appear to be retained here in HPE narrative texts to some extent. Although the entire discourse organization as well as its syntactic structure are not as elaborated as those in HCE, this linear structuring of verses (cf., linear vs hierarchical sequences, Sprott 1992) and the use of VFM seem to be a basic strategy of constructing structured discourse in HPE. This also explains why the three characteristics, that is, line numbering, verse numbering, and VFM, have been transferred. Such a tactic in HPE in which verses play a major role to construct coherency and organize a piece of discourse structure is tentatively named VERSE-PROJECTION STRATEGY (VPS) in the present study. Put another way, VPS is a tactic process by which measured verses act as core structural components carrying cohesive meaning.

Now, in the end, it may be of interest to look at a result of all those processes of pidginization and creolization, i.e., a narrative discourse in HCE spoken by a bilingual speaker. She switches back and forth frequently between HCE and HYD, and this datum presents a fragment of evidence of how JHCE speakers used HYD and other Japanese dialects to establish the structural frame in their discourse organization. The following narrative has been excerpted from COH (1988c: 1394). The narrator was born in Honohina, Hawai'i, on July 27th, 1908, and was seventy-nine years old at the

---

15 Please recall that the level of verse is claimed, in Chapter six, to be the most explicit unit in verse structure, because of the two features it presents: possession of linguistic clues and existence of the primary numbering.
time of recording. Her parents were immigrants from Hiroshima prefecture, Japan.

The story is about a Japanese language school that she attended.

ÆEn' fanii, y'no, everi Fraide,
Ai yustu,
Ai donno wai, Y'NO.

Ai yustu vanit suru no (to do, you see),
Gakko itte (In school),
Dakara gakko kara kaeshita shichotta kedo NE (So sometimes I came back from school, you know).

Bat Misiz bleik ga honto oya no yo ni kawaigatte kurerareta (really cared for me as if she was my real parent),

Ai stil rimemba, y'no,
Ai sei dettu Mis Wong, tu.

Y'no, if shii iiits lanchi,
ÆEn' shii kiip fo mii da tu pænkeik, Y'NO.

ÆEn' telz mii, no (you know),
Teik dis hom, Y'NO.

ÆEn', da. Mis Wong waz mai kæsmei', tu,
Hr daDa, BAT.

ÆEn' ano (that) that no (you see), an da wei going hom,
Ai hav tu pænkeiks fo yu,
So iit yitte KARA (She said, that's why).

Honto ano (Truly), aiv neva teistid sach a gud pænkeik in mai laif,
'Kawz pænkeik hom de yaku (to bake) kain dat, y'no,
Katai yo NO (It's hard, you know).

Panko to tada sato mazete (Just mix flour and sugar),
Tamago ga me hairu ka (You may put eggs or),
Hairan gui no naka ni NO (You may not put them, you see).

Shii waz so nais,
Ano (That) shiz (her) sista teiking kea da haus, no (right)?
Totemo kawaigatte kureta YO (I was really cared for, I tell you).

Watashi hontoni shiawase itatta (I was really happy),
Gakko itte (To attend school).

First grade wa (As for ...),
Miss X no? (Miss X, right?).
Mainland kara korareta sensei datta (She was a teacher from the mainland).

216
Despite the fact that this fragment of narrative discourse includes a great deal of code-switching and even code-mixing within a single utterance, the three substratum features are maintained. That is to say, it can be noticed that lines and verses are grouped and both of them tend to go in triplets. Most of the verses are terminated with VFM, in HCE (i.e., y'no), HYD (i.e., no), and general Japanese (i.e., yo). The last two particles in HYD and in general Japanese have not been found in DHCEs data, which suggests that they have been transferred merely to JHCE by means of VPS.

In section 8.4., it is explicitly illustrated that the Japanese language expresses itself as a donor in substratal transfer by presenting the three characteristics as well as other poetic attributes. In this section, it is claimed that HYD in particular also demonstrates the three substratum characteristics in its verse structure. This fact reinforces the hypothesis (made at the beginning of the present section) that the immigrants from Hiroshima and Yamaguchi prefectures in Japan compose the core substrate group among other prefectural groups of Japanese. It appears to be plausible that the speakers of HYD and other Japanese dialects linguistically overwhelmed the workforce on plantations in the late nineteenth and the early twentieth century in Hawai'i.

Even though early HPE must have been deficient in syntactic structure and in overall discourse organization, the speakers of HPE could have utilized the VPS to retain the capability of constructing at least coherent pieces of discourse. This strategy is maintained and transferred to JHCE, leaving the three characteristics as the substratal influence. Furthermore, it has to be remembered that JHCE must also have been influenced directly (not through HPE) from HYD and other Japanese as well. Receiving these substrate features in the discourse frame, together with operating the universal principles identified in Chapter six, JHCE speakers must have established

16According to Heller (1988: 1), code-switching is defined as 'the use of more than one language (code) in the course of a single communicative episode.' On the other hand, if this switch of codes happens intimately in a single utterance or inter-sententially, it is distinguishably called code-mixing (Appel & Muysken 1987: 117). On the other hand, Myers-Scotton argues that the distinction is not really necessary.
their discourse grammar as a newly invented or restructured linguistic system. The discussions made so far have reinforced the Japanese Substratum Hypothesis by indicating what kind of features have been found and how those features have been transferred from Japanese mainly via HYD through HPE or directly to JHCE.

8.5.3. On numbering

We have spent a great deal of time thus far on analyzing the patterning and numbering of verse structure. One might wonder where such a numbering preference of 3 in HYD or Japanese in general possibly comes from. As mentioned in 8.2., Minami & McCabe (1991) have proposed a very interesting theory in their study of Japanese children's narrative discourse, applying Gee's Stanza Analysis (1985). Examining the conversational narratives made by seventeen Japanese children, they found that '59% (107) of the total 181 stanzas produced by the children were three verses, with little variability beyond this.' (ibid.: 587, emphasis added) They argue that the narrative structure is patterned with number 3 in the metrical organization as seen in the following example (583).

Stanza A: First shot
(a) Sai-sho wa ne,
(b) Ehime no toki ni ya-(t)te ne,
(c) itaka-(t)ta sugoku.

Stanza B: Second shot
(d) Ni-kai-me wa ne,
(e) itai-omoi ne,
(waka-(t)te-ta kara ne.
(f) Maa ne,
   ma ma itaku-naka-(t)ta kedo ne.

Stanza C: The other shots
(g) Sono tsugi mo mata onnaji.
(h) Ichiban-sai-go wa ne,
(i) zenzen itaku-naka-(t)ta.

"As for the first (shot), you know,
(f) got (the shot) at Ehime, you know,
(It) hurt a lot."

"As for the second (shot), you know
(I) knew, you know,
(It would) hurt, you know
Well, you know,
(It) didn't hurt so much, you know."

"The next (shot) was the same again.
As for the very last (shot), you know,
It didn't hurt at all."

17Please recall that verses and stanzas in Gee's Stanza Analysis are closer components to lines and verses respectively in Hymes's Verse Analysis.
Regarding this preference of numbering 3, they go on to claim that it was derived from a form of traditional Japanese poetry called *Haiku*, as well as "its developmental precursor, *Karuta." as the underlying narrative organization. *M & M* explain as follows (588):

In that they tend to consist of three verses, that they are collections of experiences, and that they are in many respects quite compressed, the form of Japanese children's narratives reflects the essential features of haiku, a three-line form of poetry that often gives location, event (or implied event), and time in such a way that it also functions as a compact one-event narrative that is never supposed to exceed 17 syllables.

Following is an example of haiku that they proffer (590). It is noted that the haiku is composed of three basic functions; *orientation, act, and outcome*, the concepts of which are likely to be adopted from *Hymes's illustration of patterning of three semantic logic* (1981).\(^{18}\)

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Haru-no-yo-no} & \text{A spring night;} & \text{(Orientation)} \\
\text{Shibin oto-o-tatsu} & \text{A bedpan makes sound,} & \text{(Act)} \\
\text{Wabissha yo} & \text{Loneliness I feel.} & \text{(Outcome)} \\
\end{array}
\]

by Tamura, Sanpei

Although it is apparent that there is a structural similarity between two types of linguistic forms, i.e., narrative and haiku, the above statement appears to sound a bit too strong a claim in that *M & M* attempt to connect a linguistic phenomenon in oral conversation narrative by children directly to a traditional form of artistic poetry. Their conclusion, however, does not necessarily associate children's narrative style immediately to *haiku* composition. *M & M* point out (ibid.: 595):

We do not believe that *haiku* has directly "caused" the development of the Japanese children's oral narrative styles. In Japan children are not necessarily formally instructed in such rules as are observed in *haiku*.

\(^{18}\)Hymes uses the terms *onset or condition, ongoing, and outcome* for the three-part pattern (Hymes 1981, Hymes & Zenk 1987).
Not abiding by such a strong claim as implied previously, they come up with a more plausible conclusion, which the present author also agrees with. M & M state in the following passage:

Instead, because haiku reflects some underlying cultural values (such as omoiyari 'empathy' described earlier), it has long been very popular among Japanese people. The haiku (or quasi-haiku) style is so culturally embedded and children are so abundantly exposed to this style in ordinary discourse situations that their oral narratives unconsciously echo the three-line pattern observed in haiku.

With regard to the cultural explanation for numbering preference, Hockett, a leading scholar in anthropological linguistics, mentions favored numbers in a certain culture. He states that 'no culture ever acquired its favored number as a big sudden gift from some erratic genius.' (1973: 139) According to M & M, 'haiku became established as written literature in the 14th or 15th century' and it is a succeeded version of 'a primitive form of linked verse in the Heian period of the 9th to the 12th century.' (591) Based on this fact that the poetry has a long history as a form of literature, it is not outrageous to claim that verbal forms in the Japanese language have been greatly influenced by it. Hymes (1982: 140) summarizes the relationship between favored numbers and their cultural layers as follows:

The relationships between verses (and often but not always between lines) are grounded in an implicit cultural patterning of the form of action, a logic or rhetoric of experience, if you will, such that the form of language and the form of culture are one and the same at this point.

Although the source from which the number 3 has derived may have been identified, it is not yet clear why the number 3 has been adopted in Japanese tradition. One possibility can be found in a custom and formalism practiced in Buddhism, another aspect of underlying Japanese cultural layer. One of those customs can be seen in rather fixed and ritualized occasions, for instance, such as when Buddhist practitioners offer something to the altar. They tend to, or are obliged to, avoid even numbers of items they are offering because the even numbers are thoroughly divided or parted. Particularly, number four is a taboo because of its exact phonological parallelism to the
word meaning 'death.' Now it is obvious that number 3 is the minimum plural number which is next to the singular. The implicit consciousness that even numbers are disfavored is pervasively held not merely by Buddhists but also by many Japanese nationals, and odd numbers are often times preferred even in daily life.

For example, in Japanese society, when people wish to take a bouquet of flowers to someone who is hospitalized or sick in bed, they are not supposed to take two or four strands but three, five, or more strands of odd numbers. It is also the case when you pack individual items such as cakes, canned confectionaries, fruits, and so on, into a set or a box to give someone as a gift. You will find, if you go to the gift merchandise section of Japanese department stores, many boxed gifts containing three or five sets of items. It becomes all the more restricted in that manner when an occasion is formal, such as a wedding and a funeral. This underlying pattern of thoughts and behaviors is most likely to be extended to other situations whenever a negative impression or an inimical parallelism should be avoided. Furthermore, it seems that such a cultural habit involves, in addition to various types of daily occasions, another implication. That is, it sounds reasonable to include a possibility that such a profound cultural heritage in the community may also have affected the structure of language, that is, linguistic forms, discourse organization, and communication strategies, in verbal communication. This may be a reason why number 3 is preferred in verse structures of the Japanese language.
"I personally do not think that the universalist and substrate hypotheses are mutually exclusive; it is high time we started figuring out how they complement one another in accounting for the genesis of different pidgins and creoles around the world."

Salikoko S. Mufwene (1986: 144)

9.1. THE COMPLEMENTARY HYPOTHESIS AND DISCOURSE

In Chapter one, it is mentioned that recent study in pidgin/creole linguistics includes an attempt to integrate different theories of creole genesis. Muysken & Smith (1986) and Mufwene (1986, 1993a) contain several works in accordance with that stream of the discipline. Especially, Mufwene points out that no single theory 'can account fully for the systems of individual creoles (1993b: 23)' and suggests an approach in which the three possible sources, universalist, superstrate/adstrate, and substrate theories should be taken into consideration to identify various linguistic aspects of a given creole. When it comes to the issue of creole genesis, it is commonly the field of syntax that draws attention and discussion. Mufwene's C[OMPLEMENTARY] H[YPOTHESIS] also seems to refer to and deal with the morpho-syntactic structure and processes. Nonetheless, those three theories appear to apply to another important linguistic structure focused in the present research, i.e., discourse structure. The present study, moreover, has discovered further complicated matters regarding the mechanisms of universal principles and substratal influences in the structure beyond the sentence level.

For one thing, discussion in Chapter six pointed out that there are two possible facets to explain universality in verse structure: innate and functionally-motivated properties. However, it appears to be difficult at this stage of investigation to specify
whether patterning in verse structure derives from the former or the latter source. On the other hand, the Japanese Substratum Hypothesis has presented evidence in terms of three indispensable arguments in the substratum theory: sociohistorical facts, linguistic evidence, and a scenario for substratal transfer. At the same time, this study has also revealed a complex aspect of discourse processes in creolization in that one of the linguistic attributes, i.e., numbering, in HCE discourse is not necessarily pan-ethnic but rather differentiated at least in two ethnically heterogeneous groups, i.e., Japanese and Non-Japanese. Furthermore, the substratal influence can take place in two different ways of transmission. One is an indirect process by which substratum features are handed down from ancestral languages (HYD and other Japanese), to a pidgin (HPE), and then to a creole variety (HCE). The other is a direct process from the ancestral languages to the creole. Whether substratal transfer can take place even after crystallization is another question, and the answer relies totally on future investigation.

In addition to the universalist and the substratum theories, it is most likely the case that the superstratum language or SE provides some inputs to HCE, as CH assumes. Although this aspect of inquiry has not been dealt with in this dissertation, it is possible to find superstratum influence as well in HCE discourse. Let us look at the line level in verse structure, for example. It has been shown that the interpretation units or lines tend to be rather fragmental units such as words and phrases (but not clauses) in Japanese discourse, whereas in SE, lines consist of more predicate-verb clauses. Although the Japanese influence is a point of focus, lines in HCE are not exactly the same as those in Japanese but rather they are in-between Japanese and SE.

First, most of the lines in HCE are identified by a predicate verb, which is a feature shared with lines in SE. Yet, the lines in HCE are explicitly numbered, which does not seem to apply to SE but to be a characteristic of Japanese. This shows that HCE demonstrates all the three possible sources of creole features in lines. One is related to
the universal principle in poetic narrative in which lines are short and patterned. Another source is the superstratum influence from SE that lines tend to be clauses with a predicate verb, which is not the case in Japanese. The other source includes substratal features transferred from Japanese, indicating a particular numbering. The discussion made so far can be illustrated in Table 9-1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCES</th>
<th>PROCESSES</th>
<th>EXAMPLES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIVERSAL PRINCIPLES</td>
<td>Innate-Based</td>
<td>Patterning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Functionally-Motivated</td>
<td>Patterning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPERSTRATUM</td>
<td>SE to HCE</td>
<td>Predication in lines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBSTRATUM</td>
<td>Japanese to HPE, then to HCE</td>
<td>Numbering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese directly to HCE</td>
<td>Numbering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from what is discussed thus far, CH is a promising framework which will be able to explain the complex fabric of discourse processes in pidginization and creolization. With recent development in discourse analysis and pragmatics in general linguistics as well as in other related fields such as linguistic anthropology and sociolinguistics, now is the time for pidgin/creole linguistics to pay more attention to the structure of language beyond the sentence and to its use in cultural context. It is expected that the study of discourse will help investigate various aspects of creole languages in the world. Hence, researchers in the field will be able to understand all the more the nature of the linguistic systems and use of pidgin and creole languages.

9.2. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

This dissertation opened in Chapter one by discussing fundamental theoretical concepts such as universality & substratum in pidginization/creolization, discourse grammar, and linguistic/communicative competence. It was mentioned that the present study was going to explore the two main theories of creole genesis, that is, the
universalist and the substratum theories. This study was also claimed to be based on the theory of communicative competence in which sociocultural attributes are taken into consideration to explain the human language faculty to construct grammar and to use it appropriately in a given context. In other words, discourse grammar is not merely established by an innate internal ability of human beings but is influenced by external factors as well.

Chapter two provided background information for pidgin and creole languages in Hawai‘i as well as several arguments over the origins and developments of HPE and HCE. It was confirmed from recent research outcome that a Hawaiian-lexified contact language, or Pidgin Hawaiian most likely, was spoken by people in different ethnic groups. Roberts argues that Pidgin Hawaiian was stabilized by the middle of the nineteenth century and came to be relexified into English-based pidgin, i.e., HPE, at a later stage. HPE does not seem to have been stabilized as far as linguistic evidence available at present is concerned. The Hawai‘i case presented evidence to support both the universalist and the substratum theories. For the former, an abrupt creolization and deficiency of inputs can reinforce the innate-based hypothesis in explaining the syntactic grammar in HCE. For the latter, Hawai‘i is a very special case in which a single ethnic group, Japanese, constituted the majority of speakers (more than half) when creolization was at its peak between 1890 and 1920.

Chapter three introduced the framework utilized in the present research, that is, Verse Analysis. The chapter started with a discussion of terminology invented or adopted by several researchers in discourse analysis. Nevertheless, there were similarities among those technical terms in their basic concepts. Moreover, the terms interpretation units and coherency units were coined in order to cover groups of discourse units in general which are smaller and larger than the sentence level, respectively. The discussion went on to make distinction between poetic and prosaic narrative organization. It was argued that there are explicit characteristic differences
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between these two structures although it was not sustained that the former type of narrative is only found in languages in oral culture. At the end of the chapter, a modified version of Verse Analytical framework was presented to facilitate analytical devices for GC, HCE, and Japanese.

Chapter four proceeded into an analysis of two narrative texts in Guyanese Creole. It was discovered that GC narrative showed an explicit verse structure and revealed four basic poetic features. They were also organized in *patterning* or the hierarchical structure, comprised of the units of *interpretation, coherency, episodes, the lower juncture, and the upper juncture*. The two narrative texts also proffered a *numbering* preference. GC texts showed the most frequent number but did not have the primary number in lines. On the contrary, verses had the primary number 2. The distinction between poetic and prosaic narratives was emphasized again in this chapter and its validity was supported with evidence in GC.

In Chapter five, verse structure in HCE was investigated. Narrative discourse in HCE demonstrated poetic characteristics similar to what has been discovered in GC. That is, the two analyzed narratives presented their patterning in the hierarchical organization showing four basic characteristics in poetic narrative: (1) The hierarchical organization in five discourse units; (2) short lines showing the most frequent number; (3) measured verse showing the primary number; and (4) a clear division between lines and verses. In addition, HCE narrative also manifested a correspondence between coherency and prosodic units. This was considered to be the fifth feature of poetic narrative. Moreover, the numbering formula in lines showed the most frequent number 2 and that in verses, the primary number 2.

Chapter six started with a comparison between GC and HCE narratives. Based on the findings in Chapter four and five as well as some other works completed by Hymes and Gee, this chapter argued that the *patterning* or the hierarchical organization of discourse units might be part of universal principles in discourse. The fact that
underlying meaning itself is autonomous from external factors suggested that the patterning can be created by an innate-based property. Nevertheless, a functional motivation cannot be excluded because of the nature of a discourse that is subject to being in a particular context whenever it is constructed. It is very hard to imagine any sense in which discourse could be seen as context-free. This chapter also included quantitative support to illustrate nine speakers' narrative discourse in HCE. The result showed that the numbering in lines tends to be 2 followed by 4. 2 is the most frequent but not primary number. The verse-level numbering indicated 2 as the clear primary number.

Chapter seven explored a possibility of cultural specifics or a substratal influence in numbering. This chapter described three variables in HCE discourse. These variables were line numbering, verse numbering, and V[erse]-F[inal] M[arkers]. Unlike HCE narratives constructed by speakers of non-Japanese ancestry (i.e., OHCEs.), those of Japanese descent (i.e., JHCE) revealed the numbering 3 in both lines and verses. Moreover, the use of VFM was more frequent in JHCE than that in OHCEs. It was concluded that these three particular variables in JHCE, that is, 3 as the most frequent number in lines, 3 as the primary number in verses, and a frequent use of VFM, have most likely come from the Japanese language.

Chapter eight constituted the climax in the dissertation. There were three main arguments given in this chapter. First, a sociohistorical argument was provided to illustrate that the Japanese immigrants had overwhelmed other ethnic groups in population when creolization was taking place between 1890 and 1920 on the Islands of Hawai'i. Second, linguistic evidence was presented to show that the numbering 3 and VFM are very explicit features in Japanese discourse, and several scholars in Japanese linguistics had previously pointed out such characteristics in discourse of the language. Third, a scenario for the substratum transfer was proffered. It was claimed that the donors creating a discourse frame in creolization were Hiroshima and
Yamaguchi dialects of Japanese (i.e., HYD) as well as other Japanese dialects and Japanese-framed HPE. The mechanism of the substratal transfer was explained by MLF model and the Verse-Projection Strategy. Furthermore, the existence of number 3 in Japanese can be explained in terms of their cultural tradition and custom in which the number has been taken favorably as a pattern of people's behavior, grouping of items, and the composition of certain linguistic structures in their community.

In conclusion, the analyses of narrative discourse in GC and HCE revealed that there are possibly universal principles existing in poetic narrative of creole languages. Although it is difficult to determine which factor, an innate principle or a functionally-motivated property, is responsible, there is no doubt that creole languages operate certain inherent rules to construct discourse which is semantically coherent and structurally organized. Furthermore, besides the universal aspect of discourse construction, clear evidence has been offered that HCE manifests linguistic variables which have been transferred from the Japanese language as substratal influence. It should be noted, however, that this Japanese influence was salient in HCE spoken by the speakers of Japanese ancestry or JHCE. This fact suggested that characteristics in creole discourse processes vary depending on what kind of ethnic background or linguistic environment the speakers of a given creole are exposed to when creolization is taking place.

Lastly, this dissertation presents three aspects of inquiries contributing to pidgin/creole linguistics. It has argued: 1) discourse processes in creole languages involve two or possibly three theories of creole genesis (universality, superstratum or adstratum, and substratum), 2) some linguistic variables in discourse can be heterogeneous among different ethnic groups, and finally, 3) as opposed to the previous assumption, Japanese was the major contributor for substratal influence on HCE spoken by people of Japanese ancestry. This fact reinforces a hypothesis that the demographic factor is highly influential for a selection of a substratum language as a
contributor for a creole language. All of the three discoveries suggest that discourse structure in creole languages is most likely to be determined by not only the innate linguistic principles but by external and culturally-inherited factors as well.

9.3. A PERSPECTIVE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

The present dissertation has also presented several issues which can be investigated in future research in the fields of pidgin/creole and general linguistics. First of all, it seems reasonable to say that this study opened a path of discourse analysis in the inquiries of creole genesis. This new way of investigating will extend the discipline, i.e., pidgin/creole linguistics, from morpho-syntax to the structure beyond the sentence, in other words, to include the discourse/pragmatic components of language.

Second, Verse Analysis has great potentialities for the comparative analysis of other languages. As mentioned in Chapters one and three, numerous scholars have been exploring the underlying aspects of discourse units and narrative discourse structure. Nonetheless, even though there are several frameworks for narrative analysis, few works have compared and analyzed several different languages within a single theoretical framework. It seems to be of great interest to find out what similarities and differences certain languages show in their features of discourse units.

Finally, it is necessary not to limit discourse studies to the creole in Hawai‘i but to extend it to other creoles as well. Especially, pidgins and creoles in Asian regions are of great interest. It seems that a comparative and descriptive work on Asia is much less in amount and depth than the work on the Atlantic and Pacific (Forman 1991, 1993). It is known, moreover, that there are several pidgins and creoles lexified by not European but Asian languages such as Bazaar Malay in Malacca, Malaysia, and Pidgin Japanese in Yokohama, Japan. The study of these and other pidgins/creoles is also of great interests. Although Pidgin Japanese is said to have been extinct and is not used any
more as a communication tool, it seems worth investigating its structure and usage from the ethnolinguistic point of view, since a description of the pidgin has been very scanty.

And furthermore, the ultimate goal of my linguistic research is to be acquainted as fully as possible with the nature of languages as systems of representation and tools of communication endowed to human beings. The results deduced from those studies in pidgins and creoles are expected to be reserved and applied to other possible contact phenomena in the future, for instance, language contact outside the earth. It is the present author's prediction that linguists will need to prepare for a time when such necessity could come along. That is to say, it does not seem to be just a scene of science fiction when human beings would encounter extra-terrestrials or space people speaking an unintelligible language (Language may not be an appropriate word to refer to their representation and communication system.). It may look unrealistic now, however, it will not be very long before such a language-contact situation could occur. Therefore, in the near future, linguistics might have to cooperate with the researchers in Space Science, or, it may be necessary for the discipline to add another prospective subfield christened, say, Astro-linguistics, to deal with such an unencountered language contact situation.
APPENDIX A

THE ODO ORTHOGRAPHY
(Adopted from Sato 1993)

A spelling system for Hawai'i Creole English (HCE) devised by Carol Odo in the early 1970s for the Nonstandard Hawaiian English Project, directed by Derek Bickerton (Dept. of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa). Slight modification have been made by Charlene Sato (Dept. of ESL, UHM) and Kent Sakoda (Dept. of Linguistics, UHM).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vowel Symbols</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>English Equivalents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>hit, liv</td>
<td>hit, live</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ii</td>
<td>hiit, liiv</td>
<td>heat, leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ei</td>
<td>beit, leit</td>
<td>bait, late</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>bet, let</td>
<td>bet, let</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>æ</td>
<td>hæt, bæt</td>
<td>hat, bat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>bat, hat, leita</td>
<td>but, heart, later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>but, gud</td>
<td>boot, good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>bot, ho</td>
<td>boat, hoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aw</td>
<td>bawt, awn</td>
<td>bought, on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ai</td>
<td>bai, ai</td>
<td>buy, I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>au</td>
<td>laud, hau</td>
<td>loud, how</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oi</td>
<td>boi, toilet</td>
<td>boy, toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>drt, wrd, leitr</td>
<td>dirt, word, later</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Consonant Symbols</strong></th>
<th><strong>Examples</strong></th>
<th><strong>English Equivalents</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>pin, map</td>
<td>pin, mop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>tin, mæta, melt</td>
<td>tin, matter, melt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>th</td>
<td>thin, pæth</td>
<td>thin, path</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>kin, joka</td>
<td>kin, joker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>bin, rab</td>
<td>been, rub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>dawg, da, kad</td>
<td>dog, the, card</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dh</td>
<td>dha, briidh</td>
<td>the, breathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>go, jæg</td>
<td>go, drag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>hani</td>
<td>honey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>fin, inaf</td>
<td>fin, enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>v</td>
<td>veri, hæv</td>
<td>very, have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>sin, schrit, mas</td>
<td>sin, street, must</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>z</td>
<td>zu, uz</td>
<td>zoo, ooze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch</td>
<td>chap, chrail, kæch</td>
<td>chop, try, catch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sh</td>
<td>shu, schrit, presha</td>
<td>shoe, street, pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zh</td>
<td>mezha, yuzhol</td>
<td>measure, usual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>jiip, jrai, baj</td>
<td>jeep, dry, barge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>mad, hæm</td>
<td>mud, ham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>nais, enjoi</td>
<td>nice, enjoy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ng</td>
<td>sing, tingk</td>
<td>sing, think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>rip, ker</td>
<td>rip, care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>pul, lip</td>
<td>pull, lip</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>y</td>
<td>yæ, kyut</td>
<td>yeah, cute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>w</td>
<td>wiid, kwik</td>
<td>weed, quick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. The symbols " " or "D" can be used to represent a "flapped" intervocalic "t", "d", or "dh". Examples: waDa, fraiDe, maDa (water, Friday, mother)

2. The initial sound in words such as "tsunami" is written "ts": tsunami
APPENDIX B

A SAMPLE TEXT FROM COH
(Adopted from COH 1989a)

MM: She stayed by herself?

RR: She stayed by herself but most times she stay with Tūtū them. Maybe after a year--maybe almost two year, I think, or going three year, somebody came along and then she had companion. So she stayed with that person until she died.

MM: About when did she die?

RR: Chee, I don't know what year she died.

MM: In the '50s?

RR: Yeah. In the '50s. No, I think just about the 60s, I think.

MM: So she was the last one to live down there?

RR: Yeah.

MM: And then, what year did Tūtū Mama and Tūtū Papa move up to the city?

RR: Hmm, '51. When the ranch close, then by the time everything settled, I think he [Daniel Kaopuiki, Sr.] came up... Before--I wonder if was in '49. I don't know if was '49. But he got to come back and go continue work with the company. So no more da kine supervisor job, so they wen take him go pineapple. He wen go pick pineapple maybe, I don't know, for two week. I thought, "Ey, my father no can, he's old already." Then they go da kine [pick] slips, bolohed kind. Maybe he never work for about a month, I think, then they put him go in the camp with the other guys work take care at the park, Dole Park, used to. And then he used to go with them...

END OF SIDE ONE

SIDE TWO

MM: Okay, he had to work for little while before he could retire?

RR: Yeah, retire.

MM: So he just did any kind of work that was available?
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