

Studying unruly languages: Ohia, odea? Anokea

Michael L. Forman
University of Hawai‘i

This contribution consists of four parts. The first represents something that ethnographic linguists like to do: capturing strips of speech on the fly and reflecting on them. The second reports support received by the author from Howard P. McKaughan as boss, mentor, and co-author. The third concerns our shared interest in certain unruly languages. The fourth brings these disparate matters together to suggest to other linguists that there is something to be gained from attending not just to the form of a language but also to what it is to its users, a practice advocated by Charles Hockett, who taught us both.

1. Four strips of talk, caught on the fly

Linguists are, no doubt, always, so long as there are languages to be explored, going to arrive in the field with questions they brought from home. Bringing back answers to those questions and nothing more would leave much about language unknown. Those of us trained to be ethnographers strive to gather data on which we initially knew nothing and would never have learned about from our questions alone. We ethnographic linguists want to collect data on patterns of language use that would have been there anyway, without our investigating presences. As Labov put it: “the aim of linguistic research in the community must be to find out how people talk when they are not being systematically observed [...]” (1970:47). Four examples follow.

1.1 Local lady on national TV

It was the week before the beginning of a new semester, and I was weary from plugging away at my notes for two new preparations. Thinking to take a bit of a break, I turned on the television, knowing a University of Hawai‘i (UH) basketball game was supposed to be on. Our TV set was tuned, as usual, to KHET, the Public Broadcasting station. As the picture came on and before I could change the channel, something caught my attention. A program called *Antiques Roadshow* was on, the producers had come to Honolulu, and an appraiser was telling a LOCAL (a cultural category in Hawai‘i) that the piece she had brought in was appraised for between \$100,000 and \$150,000. The woman was obviously surprised and delighted. What caught my notice was that, as she heard the estimate, she looked down and touched her right hand to her left forearm then said:

(1) Wow! I have goose—skin.

Now if she had used *goose bumps* the moment might well have passed without notice; this is the idiom I grew up with in the Midwestern United States. But taking notice, I supposed, given that she looked local to me (and the piece was a painting of Hilo Harbor by Joseph Nāwahī), I would not have been very surprised had she said, in local fashion, that she had *chicken skin*. It was her pause, indicated in (1) by the dash, and the switch, mid-lexeme,

which drew my attention.¹ What I heard was that she was switching, or BLENDING, mid-lexeme, in effect cross-constructing (nonlocal) *goose bumps* with (local) *chicken skin*. I supposed that she had been holding to proper English (as people here say) for her conversation with the (obviously outsider) television program appraiser, but then she switched back to local talk on the very last syllable/morpheme/fragment of the lexeme. Was the switch because she was unsure of the *goose bumps* idiom? Did she think *chicken skin* too local for a national TV audience? I don't know. But what I observed was something like a neophyte skater slipping and falling when just one last step from getting off the ice: Whew!—Oops! (Alternatively, perhaps, a last-minute acknowledgement of a different audience too, that family and friends might be watching too? Perhaps the edit was to damp down the impact of selecting one or the other.) Duranti's question—"Why this form now?" (1994:170)—echoes through my head (also Forman 1999; Hill 2006).

1.2 Local ladies on campus

Thinking about this, I remembered a story Howard told of an encounter he had on campus one fine spring day some decades ago. Vice-chancellor or some such at the time (I've forgotten now when this was), he was out striding along McCarthy Mall, the main walkway through the Mānoa campus, when he encountered three elderly ladies walking together toward him. These women were dressed in expensive *mu'umu'u* and were all wearing fancy, straw, wide-brimmed hats decorated with beautiful (and expensive) feather *lei*. Howard reported one of them as saying to him:

(2) Excuse us, sir, can you kindly tell us where Crawford Hall stay?

Now I wish I could recall how this *stay* came out phonetically in Howard's retelling, but not being able to do so is part of the serious disadvantage of recall without benefit of audio recording: It is rarely possible to hold all the relevant lexical, syntactic, phonological, and other information accurately in mind for language caught on the fly. It is (much too) common for linguists who are not speakers of the language to hear and then represent the Hawai'i Creole form as if it were identical with English *stay* (e.g., Perlman 1973) when in fact native speakers pronounce it quite differently: with the [ɛ] of *met*, not the [eⁱ] of *mate* and use it in queries such as that above, or one I heard frequently when we lived in a plantation camp and neighborhood children inquired as to the whereabouts of my daughter: *Mr. Forman, Malaya [ste]? 'Mr. Forman, is Malaya at home (here)?' I'll come back to why I wonder which pronunciation Howard used. He may well not have noticed phonological detail, as he was concentrating on the lexical/syntactic and pragmatic dimensions of the utterance. But it was the form at the end of the reported utterance that was, to be sure, key to the point of Howard's story. These three women were code-switching, or style-shifting, UP, from what we supposed was their more everyday speech to the so-called proper English that the norms of Honolulu society called for in addressing a figure of Dr. McKaughan's stature in the community. They made it almost all the way through, but relaxed just a bit too soon, much like the lady on *Antiques Roadshow* had switched back to her comfort zone a split second too early. The blend of styles here was *where Crawford Hall is?* with a more local *where(re) Crawford Hall st[ɛ]?**

¹ Choices that linguists make, such as my use of the dash in (1), were introduced by Hockett 1960/1977a, 1967/1977c, 1977b) under OVERT EDITING, a new topic in the discipline. Easton (1982) takes a problem in university writing and in her analysis pushes linguistic examination of overt editing to the monograph level.

1.3 Local gal, PhD from UCLA, professor, creole scholar

There is a handwritten note (figure 1) that I have preserved from the late 1970s or early 1980s. The note's author, the late Professor Charlene "Charlie" Sato, was a native speaker of Hawai'i Creole English (HCE) and taught the English as Second Language course in Hawai'i Pidgin and Creole English (now in the Second Language Studies Department) after I turned it over to her when she returned to Honolulu with her doctorate in hand. Note especially her native speaker's *ste*, not *stei*, together with *pepaz* 'papers' and *stepo* 'staple(d)'. She does indicate glides, as in *ai* 'I', *dakain* (also spelled *dakine*, from *the kind*), and *aswai* '(th)a(t)'s why' and would, I think, have used *ei* if [ste], [pepaz], and [stepo] were not said with that particular vowel sound.

MLF,
Hea da pepaz. Sawri da staf no ste stepo bat ai no mo dakain big kain stepo aswai.
Tængks, æ.
CJS
(Odo otawgrafi)

Figure 1

Here is my translation.²

MLF [Michael Lawrence Forman],
Here are the papers. Sorry the stuff isn't stapled, but I don't have a big staple(r), that's why. Thanks.
CJS [Charlene Junko Sato]
(Odo orthography)

1.4 Local Guy, weatherman on radio and TV

Hunting through boxes for the 1970s clippings from Samuel Crowningburg-Amalu (discussed further below), I ran across another old note of talk caught on the fly which had this:

(3) [...] and this is how your Town and Country surf report looks like for today.

The speaker was Guy Hagi; the locus of hearing for my note was 93Q, an FM radio station in Honolulu. In those days, Hagi did a regular report on surf conditions and was very popular. Currently in Hawai'i one can see him in suit and tie, on television Channel Nine—known as "Hawaii's Severe Weather Station" (e.g., <<http://kgmb9.com/main/content/view/48/>>). He does three weather reports or forecasts per half-hour news program. A frequently recurring word of his on these weather reports is *today*. I believe that if one listens carefully, one can hear him pronounce this, consistently, as [tude], ending in a monophthong. There's lots of surfing photographs in the report, but no surfing on the vowels.

² Charlie was not accustomed to using her initials this way. She is teasing me, with imitation of my *MLF*. Here she refers to an orthography developed originally by Carol Odo and continually being modified since, to avoid some of the pressures of standard English in writing HCE. (See Odo 1975, 1977; Sakoda & Siegel 2003: esp. 21–30.)

2. Enter Howard McKaughan

Hired by Howard as a researcher at UH, I enjoyed his support through a number of assignments and through changes in turbulent times. This was the fieldwork career path I hoped for. Then when martial law in the Philippines closed that door for me and my family, Howard helped me shift my attention to fieldwork within the Filipino community in Hawai‘i.

2.1 My first links to the University of Hawai‘i

Though he may not have been my very first contact with UH, the first I remember is Howard McKaughan. At the time a graduate student at Cornell, I had been sent by the United States Peace Corps-Washington out to the Hilo-based training sites for Peace Corps volunteers (PCVs) some time in 1966 or 1967. Earlier, as one of the first PCVs in the Philippines (1961 to 1964), I had made a fuss about language training for the volunteers. Dr. Lawrence H. Fuchs, who was the first director of the Peace Corps in the Philippines, had responded to my wheedling by putting me in charge of an in-country training program. One result was that I had a very nice trip to SIL’s training center in Nasuli, in Bukidnon Province, and had received a kind welcome and assistance from Bus Dawson, among others. Finishing my stint in the Peace Corps, I had gone on to Cornell to study linguistics, anthropology, and Southeast Asian Studies. John Wolff, with whom I had run a Cebu City summer school in Cebuano for PCVs, was a new faculty member at Cornell and became a member of my doctoral committee. During that time, the Peace Corps sent me to Washington, DC, for training in language testing, and then sent me to Hawai‘i to test volunteers in training and to report on the program being run by UH. A year or two later, in 1968, as I was preparing to begin my dissertation, Howard called me in Ithaca and offered me a job as researcher for his Pacific and Asian Linguistics Institute project preparing dictionaries, reference grammars, and language lessons for various Philippine languages. My assignment was to have been Zamboanga Chabacano, and that was wonderful for me, as I had just received approval to write a dissertation on Zamboangueno, as it is also called. My committee, chaired by Charles F. Hockett, included Wolff and John M. Roberts. Alas, before I reached Honolulu, the Peace Corps had decided that Zamboanga was too dangerous for future posting of volunteers and cancelled that part of the contract with UH. What to do? With no more than one hundred dollars in my pocket, a wife, and three hungry children to be housed and fed, and now this employment development, there was real pressure on me. Howard knew of my commitment to Hockett to write on Zamboangueno. He kindly told me I could simply tear up my agreement with UH and him, no need to repay the advances, just go off to Zamboanga and do what I needed to do for Cornell. Or—Or what?! There was another language in his project yet un-spoken-for. I could have that, if I wanted. So began my adventures with Kapampangan; the dissertation (eventually Forman 1972) had to be relegated to nights and weekends, and to analysis of data gathered before any training in linguistics. Now this part of my tale is to be read as background for the subsequent invitation to co-author a piece with Howard, although there were yet to come some un-anticipated turns along the way.

2.2 Child bilingualism, bilingual education, and equal opportunity in Hawai‘i

Martial law descended on the Philippines in 1972. By then the Kapampangan books (Forman 1971a, 1971b; Mirikitani 1971) were just off the press—see Ramos (this volume) for more details—and I was rolling along on the UH tenure track as acting assistant professor, mostly instructing undergraduates in a linguistic approach to the study of language. As the grip of martial law grew tighter and tighter, and as my wife Sheila and I

became increasingly active in public in opposition to it, the likelihood of further fieldwork on languages in the Philippines began to appear more and more remote. The Peace Corps projects on the Big Island had led to funded work in public education there and in one school in particular. I was growing curious as to the small numbers of students of Philippine ancestry in my university classes, despite the size of the Filipino segment of the Hawai‘i population. My wife, with her graduate adviser and a colleague, had brought to UH a large grant from VISTA,³ involving university students in tutoring immigrant pupils in the lower schools (dubbed Operation Manong). She and I began working informally with then Congresswoman Patsy Takemoto Mink, who was distressed that her state—our state—was one of the last ones eligible for bilingual-education funding, something she had been instrumental in creating. Yet the State of Hawai‘i kept refusing the funds, one million a year over a stretch of eight years. Mrs. Mink also played a role (discussed below) in bringing federal education funds to Hilo (the Big Island’s main town) for that project, which proposed to adapt methods from the Peace Corps training to teaching standard English to children who entered school speaking HCE. We believed that equal opportunity in education would include beginning where the children were and building on what they brought to school. This would mean including knowledge of their linguistic repertoires. Howard invited me to work with him in writing proposals for funding of various research projects on children’s bilingualism in Hawai‘i. My wife and I thought that one of the clearest needs was to understand the situation of the children of plantation laborers recruited from the Philippines. In fairly short order, after some of the larger grant proposals had been rejected, I managed to land a smallish grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to study language acquisition in plantation homes at a Filipino camp.⁴

2.3 Moving beyond languages in the Philippines

In all this, Howard, now as dean of the Graduate Division, continued to support me. Prospects for further fieldwork in the Philippines appeared increasingly dimmer. My teaching, primarily of undergraduates, not to mention the growth and socialization of our now four children, were both drawing me more and more into the realization that so-called Pidgin (often not even capitalized) in Hawai‘i was very much in need of more scholarly attention. William Labov’s interest and involvement added to our determination to learn more about this language situation, not only in terms of Pidgin not only as an important so-called object of investigation in its own right,⁵ but also as a significant factor in the basic research required if children were to be provided equal opportunity in education.⁶

³ VISTA stands for ‘Volunteers in Service to America’, the domestic counterpart of the Peace Corps.

⁴ For details, see Forman et al. (1973), a review essay of a book attributing low school scores to cognitive deficit blamed—for children of Philippine, Portuguese, and Hawaiian ancestry—on their use of this speech variety: “pidgin [has] primitive grammar and word structure” (Werner et al. 1971:122). Preparation of the review led to the later work on Moloka‘i, which is reported in part in Forman & Forman (1991).

⁵ Labov writes about “the object of linguistic description” (1970:37). This appeared shortly after he taught a field-methods course at UH in the summer of 1969. The influence of George Grace on my thinking developed somewhat later. See his observation that “[i]t has often been said that sciences create their own objects of study” and that “the isolation of particular objects of investigation as objects and the characteristics which are attributed to them once they are isolated are aspects of this creating of objects [...]” (Grace 1987:3).

⁶ Among other things, “equal opportunity in education” is a desideratum encouraged by government funding requirements. Part of the challenge for linguistics is that, as Dell Hymes has said for decades: “To a great extent programs to change the language situation of children are an attempt to apply a basic science that does not yet exist” (Hymes 1972b/2001:53). See also Hymes (1972a, 1996) for further discussion of the ethnographic linguistics of the classroom.

2.4 Pidgin in the learner's repertoire: McKaughan & Forman (1982)

Howard's invitation to co-author our paper entitled "Pidgin in Hawaii" is something, looking back, I now see as a continuation of his mentoring and encouragement. Howard was assisting me to adapt to the changing circumstances of my research and teaching activities, and helping to link me to areas of research that had involved him in the past. But it will not surprise the reader to hear that there is yet more that at the time I had not understood.

Howard, having joined UH's Department of Linguistics as chair at its founding in 1963 (Grace, this volume), got involved in applied-linguistics activities in Hawai'i from the mid 1960s. As I have touched on above, the University had operated a training center for the Peace Corps since 1962. Deputy district superintendent of schools for the Big Island's district, Harry C. Chuck, had become aware of language-training activities as volunteer trainees at sites from Pepe'ekeo to Hāwī were learning to speak at first Philippine and then other Southeast Asian languages. The idea developed that methods being used there to teach languages might have value "for the problem of teaching standard classroom English to children who speak only the Hawaii Islands Dialect or, more commonly, 'Pidgin'" (Petersen 1967:753). A proposal was made and, in September 1965, funded, with support from Congresswoman Mink, by the federal Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The site selected was Keaukaha Elementary School in Hilo, and the project was known as the Keaukaha Project though more formally titled The Hilo Language Development Project (U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Program 5-0692). Howard was hired to supervise contrastive analysis and present it "to the staff in linguistically relevant statements which will reveal what must be taught to speakers of the Hawaii Islands Dialect before they can speak standard English" (Petersen 1967:754). One development out of this arrangement was the doctoral dissertation, supervised by Howard, by the late Gloria Glissmeyer (1970) and based in the Keaukaha Project.⁷

3. The unruly languages of Hawai'i and Zamboanga

Not every language fits so easily into the mold created by socialization to languages that have writing and schooling as important characteristics in their use. City-bred linguists, for example, may have had to adapt to and learn things about the sea, the plant world, and tropical insects. Others may have had to learn to work with speakers literate in a colonial language who rarely write in their first language. Such participant observation and interaction in language use differs considerably from the application of research protocols from the relative comfort of the veranda.

3.1 Getting from *no* to *yes*, getting negation right

McKaughan & Forman (1982) begins with a short section on forms of negation. For example, *no stay* is the response by others to roll call if the named student is absent. That was how we opened the piece (and *stay* is how we spelled that word). The next form we presented was *neva*:

- (4) I neva know.
'I didn't know' (≠ 'I never know').

⁷ I believe that it is inaccurate to identify Hawai'i Islands Dialect (also referred to as Hawai'i English) with Pidgin. The latter (more accurately Hawai'i Creole English and possibly also Hawai'i Pidgin English) is distinct from the Hawai'i dialect of (standard) English. Carr (1972) presented these as distinct, using a speech sample from Congresswoman Mink as her illustration of standard Hawai'i English.

Then our next paragraph introduces a non-negated example involving *get* in a context where the meaning is possession: ‘Do you have [...]?’ If we had continued with a listing of negative forms, this one’s reply would have been *no mo* or *nomoa*, which does not mean ‘no more’ (or ‘not any more’) but rather ‘does not have’ or ‘does not exist’.

At a quarter-century distance now from the writing of that paper, I wonder if I can get away with claiming that the selection of this list of negation forms in McKaughan & Forman (1982) involved some ulterior motive on my part. Why start such a paper with a list of negative forms? Forman et al. (1973) had used examples of negation as an expository device. But could it also have been because Howard and I shared another work experience—both of us having published on Zamboanga Chabacano (McKaughan 1954, 1958; Forman 1972, 1988, 1993, 2001)—and there was a lingering question about negation? McKaughan (1954) is the source of an unanswered query generated in reading Hall (1966). There is reprinted in Hall an excerpt from McKaughan, but with one difference not explained.⁸

- (5) para hende? no roba su sal el mana hente ya
 so not steal his salt the PLURAL people PAST
- pone ele el sal na rio i ya saka le un grande
 place he the salt in river and PAST take he a big
- pyedra ke ya pone ele ensima del sal para tapa.
 rock that PAST place he on.top of.the salt to cover

‘So that people would not steal his salt he placed the salt in the river and took a large stone with which to cover it.’

(Hall 1966:160, quoting McKaughan 1954:207)

The anomaly I’ve always wanted Howard’s comment on is why the Chabacano text in Hall reads “para hende? no roba [...]”; Howard’s original shows “para hende? roba [...]”, without *no*. It appears that Hall has added something to the original. Did Hall not understand that (Philippine) *hende?* is the negator, inserting Spanish *no* to cover the negation which he read in the translation? What happened here? As a graduate student I did try to raise this question once in Hall’s seminar on pidgins and creoles when he was reading us his manuscript but got nowhere.

3.2 Where speakers have been convinced they have no grammar

Another passage, this one from a report on the Hilo work, is now lost for context and proper citation, but still stuck in my head:

- (6) Us no moah get too.
 ‘We don’t have any either.’

This collocation of *no moah* and *get* was entirely unfamiliar to me, and it has puzzled native speakers I have asked about it. Of course, adding prosodic cues helps, and people do conjure up possible contexts for saying such a thing—e.g., talking metalinguistically about the form *get*: ‘We don’t have *get* either.’ But I am certainly in no position to say that it does not conform to patterns of some group’s ways of speaking. I can compare McKaughan (1954) to Hall (1966) and comfortably claim that it was Hall who got something wrong. In the case of

⁸ I am ignoring other differences of spelling in this example (e.g., Hall’s *i* for McKaughan’s *y* ‘and’). In (5) the data are as in Hall but the interlinear glossing follows McKaughan because Hall used no morpheme-by-morpheme glosses in his parallel-column rendition. The two authors’ free translations are the same.

the Hilo/Keaukaha materials, I can imagine it was a fieldworker's error, what Chomsky might deem a speaker's PERFORMANCE error, or even no mistake at all and just something I don't know about. Generally speakers do not worry about grammaticality. The common orientation is toward making sense, toward communication.

One is to understand that the list of negators in McKaughan & Forman (1982) is not to be taken as exhaustive. But then this is one of the problems with making notes on grammars where the speakers themselves have been dunned into thinking that their language—if they even consider it a language—is without grammar, that this is a case where anyone can say anything they like because there are no rules. Of course we are opening up a host of problems, from the issues with elicitation as a special kind of interviewing (Briggs 1986, 2007) to the questions of western ideology about language (Briggs 2002; Forman 2001; Hill 2006; Kroskrity 2005; for transcription as theory, Ochs 1979; Silverstein—many articles, but let's just mention his 2000 paper; and Woolard & Schieffelin 1994).

3.3 T-shirt celebrates co-ed residence

Fortunately sometimes, one is privileged to live among a community of speakers of what one is trying to study, and this provides opportunities for the observation of new things. Being vexed by a question about one's earlier observations can lead one to notice new data as they fly by, even in that blooming, buzzing confusion philosopher William James (e.g., 1890:462, 488) saw in everyday life. On the UH campus some time in the 1970s, one of the dormitories, until then a gender-segregated residence, changed policy and went co-ed. Students pleased with this development celebrated by printing a T-shirt. On the front of the shirt were depicted two children, one with braids clearly meant to be a girl child; the other, with what is called a *chawan* cut (a style of haircut, done with an upside-down bowl over the head) clearly the boy child. These two children were pulling at the fronts of each other's diapers and peering down, peeking inside. Around the drawing, above and below, were the words in figure 2.

JUNK
IF NO HAD DIFFERENCE
AT HALE LAULIMA.

Figure 2

(We're not ready for a translation just yet). At the point when I first saw this, *no had* was not yet in my grammar-slip files. My expectation was that if the existence of *difference* was being denied, negated, then shouldn't the shirt read *nomoa* (instead of *no had*)? Comparatively what I had in mind was *noay ~ nuay ~ nway* (probably from Spanish *no hay*) contrasted within Zamboangueño with *no* and with *hende?*. That's what I thought, for a while. I asked my usual informants (the relatively few people who would speak Pidgin with me). I asked anybody who would listen.

- (7) a. Junk if nomo difference.
b. Junk if no had difference.

And what I got back didn't help. Friends tried to assure me that everybody knows Pidgin doesn't have rules. You can say anything you like. Or—that there was no point in puzzling over the difference; both are OK and they really just mean the same thing. Of course what I was doing was eliciting judgments in social contexts different from the one in which the shirt

had been produced and engaging speakers in a practice unfamiliar to them. But when I tried to act on this information and say appropriate things, what happened was that all too often the response was laughter. I realized that such laughter was the best asterisk of all. And I know that even if linguists manage to persuade people that these languages really do have grammar, this is not going to stop their laughing.

Still my training tells me to suspect that, if there are different forms, then somewhere, at some level, there are different meanings. Hill (2006:115) continues to admonish us that we should “always assume that a difference is meaningful.” So I kept on worrying about this difference. Eventually I hit on a more complex way of asking my question, of teasing out something that I could get strong agreement on.

- (8) a. M.L.F.: *Junk if nomo difference*. Get difference?
 b. HCE speaker: Canna(t) tell, get?, o nomoa?

But then:

- (9) a. M.L.F.: *Junk if no had difference*. Get difference?
 b. HCE speaker: Get, but!

A clear implication was carried in the latter form, in (9b). Contrary to what others might think, there *is* a difference between boys and girls.⁹ Grammatically, we seem to be looking at a counterfactual form. Since then, I’ve been watching for clearer cases. I’m still listening. And there is more to the story.

3.4 The professor and the prince

Howard will remember two more people who fit into this tale. One is the late Yao Shen, professor in the UH Department of English. The other is the late Honolulu newspaper columnist Samuel Crowningburg-Amalu, who claimed to be descended from the “chiefly wombs” responsible for “the establishment of the Hawaiian Kingdom” (Amalu 1972), and who was widely referred to as quite a rascal: “‘I gained my repute through notoriety,’ said he about himself” (Shen 1975:34 fn. 4, quoting Amalu 1974a). An unlikely pair, I agree, and yet they did come together at least once, and they belong together in my tale. Here’s how.

Shen published a paper in the *Journal of English Linguistics* in 1975. In this paper she quotes Amalu (1974b) in support of her argument:

Columnist Samuel Crowningburg-Amalu, one of the best red leaves of the Hawaiian royal tree and truly a prodigal who has returned, wrote feelingly about his late mother on Mother’s Day. “But then one day she smiled at me, and it was if all the many intervening years had faded away and had never been.” (May 12, 197[4], p. A–22) Here verb be not followed by pred appears in a sentence the events of which existed and occurred, and then again as if they never did. (Shen 1975:29)

If ever he saw it, and I have no way of knowing whether he did, I imagine that Amalu would have been flattered to find his language being cited in a scholarly journal by a professor of English. He held some very strong opinions about language, but his were opinions not at all

⁹ According to Carr (1972:126), *but* is often shifted to utterance-final position and means ‘though’. Sakoda & Siegel add: “Pidgin is similar to some dialects of English (such as Australian English) in that *bat* (*but*) can occur either before the second clause [...] or at the end of the second clause [...]” (2003:98).

out of step with those of many in the community, particularly certain segments of the Hawai'i social order and even many on the UH faculty. In one column entitled "Language controls thought" (Amalu 1971a), he reports being invited to speak to the student body of Nānākuli High School. Amalu writes that he "accepted, primarily so because I expected the great majority of the students to be of Hawaiian extraction. I wanted to see how fared the youth of my own people, to see how the children on the homesteads were being educated [...]" He goes on to relate that he received a phone call from the school informing him that a vice-principal had "only been able to select a group of not more than 60 students." These students, the caller said, "were the only ones in school capable of following the English language sufficiently to follow [Amalu's] delivery." The caller, Amalu goes on, "then suggested that I refrain from using the English language as it is customarily spoken and instead speak in the pidgin vernacular. Or as he put it: Use the down-to-earth pidgin."

This column ends with Amalu on his high horse: "I instructed my office to inform that vice principal of that high school in Nanakuli that if I were ever to speak to any of his students, I would do so in pure English or pure Hawaiian. But under no circumstances would I ever talk down to his students and insult their intelligence with the use of pidgin." Nine days later, Amalu, in his regular column—this time entitled "More on English and pidgin" (1971b)—follows up, recognizing that Pidgin "has a place in our particular society and performs a function that is often enchanting and always quaint and even entertaining." He reports receiving a number of letters from staff and students of the school in question; "Every single one of them was written in perfect English. Every single one of them." Now comes the part I remembered long enough to set me to searching boxes of old clippings until I found this: "There was even one student who at least five times used the subjunctive mood in an 'if' clause, a usage, by the way, that is singular and meticulously correct."

Amalu concludes: "With those letters as proof undeniable, I concede that I may have been mistaken. And there is only one way to find out. Today, I am going to the Nanakuli High School to speak, and I may speak in pidgin." That is to say, he accepted Pidgin once he knew that the speaker was bilingual and could speak standard English. Would he concede the desirability, even the possibility, of a *perfect Pidgin* too? We will likely never find out. It is very unlikely that Amalu had seen the Hale Laulima T-shirt, with its counterfactual *if* clause, and McKaughan & Forman (1982) was not to appear for another decade, arguing against the notion expressed by Amalu that Pidgin was only for enchantment and entertainment. Neither did we raise in that short paper the matter of all the resources Pidgin has for expression.

In Sakoda & Siegel's recently published *Pidgin grammar: An introduction to the Creole language of Hawai'i*, a much fuller treatment of negation appears than had appeared in any previous grammatical sketch. I extract some of their statements (2003:84 [italics added]):

Two other expressions are also sometimes used for negative possessive: *no haev* (*no have*) and *no get*. [...] *Nomo* can be used to talk about things in the past [...]. But other expressions can also be used—i.e., *no haed* (*no had*), *neva haed* (*never had*), *neva haev* (*never have*), and *neva get* (*never get*).

But this does not tell a second-language learner enough to know when to use which. In contrast, Sakoda & Siegel do include functional hints in their treatment of *no* vs. *nat* (*not*): "*No* is used as in English for disagreement. [...] *Nat* is used for contradiction or denial" (2003:84). Alas, *no moah get* is not to be found in Sakoda & Siegel's sketch.

4. The moral to the story

So is there any moral to the story? I think so. Still wondering about *stay* and *ste* in (2), about *para hende? no roba su sal* in (5), about *Us no moah get too* in (6), not even to mention the practice of linguistics with or without social context, or what it is we teach our

students today, what I am mindful of is the position taken by the man who supervised both Howard's study and my own at Cornell: Chas Hockett. He insisted, contra Chomsky's dicta concerning "competence and performance" (e.g., 1965:3) that a "theoretical concern with language must try to deal not only with techniques of analysis, but also with what language is to its users, and with how it performs its role in human life" (Hockett 1968:35). This needs, I believe, to be applied to linguists as language users. Today there is more recognition of transcription as a theoretical problem than I recall from my younger days. After decades of Chomsky's insistence that linguistics was only to be concerned with linguistic knowledge (linguistic competence, I-language) and not with language use (Chomsky's "performance"—but not at all in the way this term is used in linguistic anthropology today), it is a relief to note the return, in language-documentation practice, or "documentary linguistics" (Hill 2006), of attention to language attitudes, language ideologies, collection of narrative, genre, styles, and the recognition that not all the ways of speaking in the repertoire of a person or of a community of practice will fit so easily into the ideas of language that our upbringing or professional training—our socialization into the discipline—have led us to presume.¹⁰

References

- Amalu, Samuel Crowningburg- [Sammy Amalu]. 1971a. Language controls thought. *The Honolulu Advertiser* (1 November). C5.
- Amalu, Samuel Crowningburg- [Sammy Amalu]. 1971b. More on English and pidgin. *The Honolulu Advertiser* (10 November). B3.
- Amalu, Samuel Crowningburg- [Sammy Amalu]. 1972. A toast to Francis Brown. *The Honolulu Advertiser* (2 May). B3.
- Amalu, Samuel Crowningburg- [Samy (sic) Amalu]. 1974a. [Untitled column.] *Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser* (24 March). A20.
- Amalu, Samuel Crowningburg- [Samy (sic) Amalu]. 1974b. [Untitled column.] *Sunday Star-Bulletin and Advertiser* (12 May). A22.
- Briggs, Charles L. 1986. *Learning how to ask: A sociolinguistic appraisal of the role of the interview in social science research* (Studies in the Social and Cultural Foundations of Language 1). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Briggs, Charles L. 2002. Linguistic magic bullets in the making of a modernist anthropology. *American Anthropologist* 104(2). 481–498.
- Briggs, Charles L. 2007. Anthropology, interviewing, and communicability in contemporary society. *Current Anthropology* 48(4). 551–580.
- Carr, Elizabeth Ball. 1972. *Da kine talk: From Pidgin to standard English in Hawaii*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

¹⁰ For more on competence (both linguistic, as presented by Chomsky, and communicative, as argued by Hymes) and "performance" Hymes (1972a:xxxvi) together with the historical retrospective provided in Duranti (1997:14–17, 2001:17–23) will explain a great deal for which space is lacking here. Duranti (1997:14) points out that performance is one of three major theoretical areas to have been developed in linguistic anthropology in the past two decades.

- Chomsky, Noam. 1965. *Aspects of the theory of syntax* (Massachusetts Institute of Technology. Research Laboratory of Electronics. Special Technical Report 11). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1994. *From grammar to politics: Linguistic anthropology in a Western Samoan village*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 1997. *Linguistic anthropology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Duranti, Alessandro. 2001. Linguistic anthropology: History, ideas, and issues. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 1). Malden, MA: Blackwell. 1–38.
- Easton, Barbara Jo. 1982. Blended beginnings: Connections and the effects of editing in a case of academic “Japanese English”. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i PhD dissertation.
- Forman, Michael L. 1971a. *Kapampangan dictionary*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Forman, Michael L. 1971b. *Kapampangan grammar notes*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Forman, Michael L. 1972. *Zamboangueño texts with grammatical analysis: A study of Philippine Creole Spanish*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University PhD dissertation.
- Forman, Michael L. 1988. Several prodigal sons: A closer look at the preposition *na* in Zamboangueño and Asian Creoles Portuguese. In Roger L. Hadlich & J. D. Ellsworth (eds.), *East meets west: Homage to Edgar C. Knowlton, Jr.* Honolulu: Department of European Languages and Literature, College of Languages, Linguistics, and Literature, University of Hawaii. 63–71.
- Forman, Michael L. 1993. Verb serialization, word order typology, and Zamboangueño: A comparative approach. *Oceanic Linguistics* 32(1). 163–182.
- Forman, Michael L. 1999. Review of *From grammar to politics: Linguistic anthropology in a Western Samoan village*, by Alessandro Duranti. *Oceanic Linguistics* 38(2). 440–445.
- Forman, Michael L. 2001. Confidence in Chabacano: Counterbalance to a western ideology of language. *Estudios de Sociolingüística* 2(2). 95–117.
- Forman, Michael L., & Sheila M. Forman. 1991. Maunaloa, Moloka‘i: An Ilokano community in Hawai‘i (1974–1976). In Jonathan Y. Okamura, Amefil R. Agbayani, & Melinda Tria Kerkvliet (eds.), *The Filipino American experience in Hawai‘i: In commemoration of the 85th anniversary of Filipino immigration to Hawai‘i* (Social Process in Hawaii 33). Honolulu: Department of Sociology, University of Hawaii at Manoa. 194–210.
- Forman, Michael L., Marsha H. Kakalia, Edgar Y. C. Lau, & Gail F. Tomita. 1973. Schoolchildren of Kauai: Failures or resisters? [Review of *The children of Kauai*, by Emmy E. Werner, Jessie M. Bierman, & Fern E. French.] *HCTE Leaflet* [Honolulu: Hawaii Council of Teachers of English] (April). 2–15.
- Glissmeyer, Gloria. 1970. A tagmemic analysis of Hawaii English clauses. Honolulu: University of Hawai‘i PhD dissertation.
- Grace, George W. 1987. *The linguistic construction of reality*. London: Croom Helm.
- Hall, Robert A., Jr. 1966. *Pidgin and creole languages*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

- Hill, Jane H. 2006. The ethnography of language and language documentation. In Jost Gippert, Nikolaus P. Himmelmann, & Ulrike Mosel (eds.), *Essentials of language documentation* (Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs 178). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 113–128.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1960/1977a. Ethnolinguistic implications of recent studies in linguistics and psychiatry. In Charles F. Hockett, *The view from language: Selected essays, 1949–1974*. Athens: University of Georgia Press. 107–123 (originally appeared as Ethnolinguistic implications of studies in linguistics and psychiatry, in W. M. Austin (ed.), *Report of the Ninth Annual [1958] Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Study* (Monographic Series on Languages and Linguistics 11), Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 175–193).
- Hockett, Charles F. 1967/1977c. Where the tongue slips, there slip I. In Charles F. Hockett, *The view from language: Selected essays, 1949–1974*. Athens: University of Georgia Press. 226–256 (originally appeared in *To honor Roman Jakobson: Essays on the occasion of his seventieth birthday, 11 October 1966*, vol. 2 (Janua Linguarum Series Maior 32), The Hague: Mouton, 910–936).
- Hockett, Charles F. 1968. *The state of the art* (Janua Linguarum Series Minor 73). The Hague: Mouton.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1977b. Notes on the creative process. In Charles F. Hockett, *The view from language: Selected essays, 1949–1974*. Athens: University of Georgia Press. 204–209.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972a. Introduction. In Courtney B. Cazden, Vera P. John, & Dell Hymes (eds.), *Functions of language in the classroom*. New York: Teachers College Press. xi–lvii.
- Hymes, Dell. 1972b/2001. On communicative competence. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *Linguistic anthropology: A reader* (Blackwell Anthologies in Social and Cultural Anthropology 1). Malden, MA: Blackwell. 53–73 (originally appeared in J. B. Pride & Janet Holmes (eds.), *Sociolinguistics: Selected readings*, Harmondsworth: Penguin. 269–293).
- Hymes, Dell H. 1996. *Ethnography, linguistics, narrative inequality: Toward an understanding of voice*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- James, William. 1890. *The principles of psychology*, 2 fascicles. New York: Holt.
- Kroskrity, Paul V. 2005. Language ideologies. In Alessandro Duranti (ed.), *A companion to linguistic anthropology* (Blackwell Companions to Anthropology 1). Malden, MA: Blackwell. 496–517.
- Labov, William. 1970. The study of language in its social context, *Studium Generale* 23(1). 30–87.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1954. Notes on Chabacano grammar. *Journal of East Asiatic Studies* 3(2). 205–226.
- McKaughan, Howard P. 1958. Review of *Spanish contact vernaculars in the Philippine Islands*, by Keith Whinnom. *Hispanic Review* 26(4). 355–357.
- McKaughan, Howard P., & Michael L. Forman. 1982. Pidgin in Hawaii: “Da Kine” talk serves useful purposes. *Ampersand* [Honolulu: Alexander & Baldwin] 14(4). 11–15.
- Mirikitani, Leatrice T. 1971. *Speaking Kapampangan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

- Ochs, Elinor. 1979. Transcription as theory. In Elinor Ochs & Bambi B. Schieffelin (eds.), *Developmental pragmatics*. New York: Academic Press. 43–72.
- Odo, Carol. 1975. Phonological processes in the English Dialect of Hawaii. Honolulu: University of Hawaii PhD dissertation.
- Odo, Carol. 1977. Phonological representation in Hawaiian English. *Working Papers in Linguistics* [Honolulu: Department of Linguistics, University of Hawai'i] 7(3). 77–85.
- Perlman, Alan M. 1973. Grammatical structure and style-shift in Hawaiian Pidgin and Creole. Chicago: University of Chicago PhD dissertation.
- Petersen, Robert O. H. 1967. The Hilo language development project. *Elementary English* 44(7). 753–755, 774.
- Sakoda, Kent, & Jeff Siegel. 2003. *Pidgin grammar: An introduction to the Creole language of Hawai'i*. Honolulu: Bess Press.
- Shen, Yao. 1975. Lexical constraint on grammatical distribution in English verb BE. *Journal of English Linguistics* 9(1). 26–35.
- Silverstein, Michael. 2000. Whorfianism and the linguistic imagination of nationality. In Paul V. Kroskrity (ed.), *Regimes of language: Ideologies, politics, and identities*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press; Oxford: J. Currey, 85–138.
- Werner, Emme E., Jessie M. Bierman, & Fern E. French. 1971. *The Children of Kauai: A longitudinal study from the prenatal period to age ten*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Woolard, Kathryn A., & Bambi B. Schieffelin. 1994. Language ideology. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 23. 55–82.