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Abstract
The paper is an overview of the structural features of the phonology, morphology, syntax and vocabulary of Yokohama Pidgin Japanese, an under researched contact language. The data examined are from a corpus which includes records not analyzed in previous work on this 19th century variety of pidginized Japanese.
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1. Introduction


As is well known, pidgins can be classified according to social criteria. Sebba (1997, pp. 26-33) proposes the following classification according to the social context of the pidgin’s origins: (i) military and police pidgins; (ii) seafaring and trade pidgins;

---

1 And, most probably, in two other ports, Kobe and Nagasaki.
(iii) plantation pidgins; (iv) mine and construction pidgins; (v) immigrants’ pidgins; (vi) tourist pidgins); (vii) urban contact vernaculars. YPJ emerged as a trade pidgin, therefore, it is assigned to type (ii). In terms of the social situation in which pidgins are used (Bakker, 1995, pp. 27-28), pidgins can be classified as follows: (i) maritime pidgins; (ii) trade pidgins; (iii) interethnic contact languages; (iv) work force pidgins. YPJ is a trade pidgin, i.e. it is a representative of type (ii).

YPJ is rather poorly documented in the literature on pidgin and creole languages. Previous descriptions of YPJ have looked at the sources of its lexicon (Daniels 1948) and a limited number of mainly morpho-syntactic features (Inoue 2003, 2004, 2006). Moreover, the analysis of YPJ by Inoue (2003, 2004, 2006) is exclusively based on data from a single textual source, namely Atkinson (1879).

The present paper is an attempt at providing a more comprehensive overview of YPJ. The data analyzed are from a corpus consisting of the following textual sources: a phrasebook (Atkinson 1879), a glossary (Gills 1886), a dictionary (Lentzner 1892), travel accounts (Griffis 1883, Knollys 1887), and two magazine articles (Anon. 23 1879 and Diósy 1879). The findings are discussed with reference to other pidgins which exhibit similar characteristics.

All examples appear in the original orthography or system of transcription. The sources are mentioned between brackets. Unless otherwise specified, the translations are from the original sources. Abbreviations used: ACC = accusative; ADJ = adjective; ADV = adverb; D = Dutch; DEM = demonstrative; E = English; J = Japanese; N = noun; NEG = negator; O = object; P = Portuguese; QUANT = quantifier; S = subject; SG = singular; V = verb.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 I discuss the authenticity of the textual evidence. Section 3 is concerned with the phonology of YPJ. Sections 4 focuses on its morphology and syntax. In section 5 I examine the major characteristics of the vocabulary. The developmental stage attained by YPJ is discussed in section 6. The findings are summarized in section 7.

2. **Authenticity of textual evidence**

Given that the existence of YPJ is a matter of some debate in the literature, it is worth addressing the issue of the authenticity of the textual evidence examined.

Firstly, YPJ is mentioned by a number of contemporary authors. Diósy (1879, p. 500) refers to it as “Yokohama dialect”. The same designation is used by Griffis (1883, p. 493). Other authors offer additional details. Gills (1886: 185), for instance,

---

2 According to Daniels (1948, p. 806), the author is probably C. G. Leland.

3 Who erroneously believes it to be “Pigeon-English”, i.e. Pidgin English (Griffis, 1883, p. 352, n.).
describes it as “a species of hybrid, ungrammatical Japanese, spoken by foreigners who do not learn the language [= Japanese] accurately”. Lange (1903, p. XXVIII) draws the attention of his readers to the fact that “in the ports there is a good deal of pidgin-Japanese (Yokohama dialect), which is to be avoided”. Finally, Chamberlain (1904, p. 369) states that “in Japan […] we have “Pidgin Japanese” as the patois in which newcomers soon learn to make known their wants to coolies and tea-house girl, and which serves as the vehicle for grave commercial transactions at the open ports”. Notice that at least one author, Chamberlain (1904, p. 369), correctly recognizes the pidgin nature of YPJ.

Secondly, YPJ exhibits word-internal \( \eta \), a characteristic of earlier Tokyo Japanese:

1. \( \text{nang eye} ‘\text{long}’ \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18) / \( \text{nangeye} ‘\text{tall}’ \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) (< J nagai)

Thirdly, the transcription of YPJ forms reflects devoicing of /i/ and /ɯ/, as well as substitution of [ʃ] for Standard Japanese [ç], both phonological characteristics of the Tokyo dialectal area:

2. \( \text{shto} ‘\text{man}’ \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25), cf. Tokyo J hito [ʃito]

Fourthly, a number of lexical items recorded in YPJ, e.g. the forms chobber chobber ‘food, sustenance’ (Atkinson 1879: 21) and tempo ‘penny’ (Atkinson 1879: 18), are attested in 19\textsuperscript{th} century Japanese:

3. \( \text{Chabu chabu komarimasu tempō danna san dōzo} \) (Griffis, 1883, p. 358)

   grub be in trouble penny master please

   ‘Please master, a penny; we are in great trouble for our grub.’

Fifthly, formally identical or similar YPJ lexical items are listed by different contemporary authors:

4. a. \( \text{bōtō} \) (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) / \( \text{boto} \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 15) ‘boat’
   b. \( \text{bum-bum-funé} \) (Diósy, 1879, p. 501) / \( \text{boom-boom fune} \) (Griffis, 1883, p. 30) ‘man-of-war’
   c. \( \text{chobber chobber} ‘\text{food, sustenance}’ \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21) / \( \text{chabu-chabu} ‘\text{(vulgar) gruel}’ \) (Diósy, 1879, p. 501)
   d. \( \text{come here} \) (Atkinson 1879: 19), \( \text{come here} \) (Griffis, 1883, p. 451) / \( \text{komiya} \) (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) ‘dog’
   e. \( \text{dam your eye sto} \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25) / \( \text{damyuri sto} \) (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) / \( \text{damuraišu h’to} \) (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) / \( \text{damuraišu hito} \) (Griffis, 1883, p. 493) ‘sailor’
f. *hatoba* ‘solid granite pier’ (Griffis, 1883, p. 349) / ‘a pier, or landing-place’ (Gills, 1886, p. 97) / ‘jetty’ (Knollys, 1887, p. 312)

g. *matty* ‘wait’ (Atkinson 1879) / *mate-mate* ‘wait a little’ (Gills, 1883, p. 147)

Last but not least, lexical items attested in YPJ also occur – with an identical or similar form and meaning – in other Japanese-lexifier pidgins or in pidgins with Japanese as their substrate language. Consider the examples below, from Japanese Pidgin English (JPE), Thursday Island Aboriginal Japanese Pidgin (TIAJP), and Broome Pearling Lugger Pidgin (BPLP):

(5)  

a. YPJ  *ah me* ‘rain’ (Atkinson 1897, p. 23),  
TIAJP  *ami* ‘rain’ (Mühlhäusler and Trew, 1996, p. 392)

b. YPJ  *kooksan* ‘cook’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23),  
TIAJP  *kuk-san* ‘cook’ (Mühlhäusler and Trew, 1996, p. 392)

c. YPJ  *kurrumboh* ‘gentleman of color’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25),  
TIAJP  *churumpu* ‘black man’ (Mühlhäusler and Trew, 1996, p. 392)

d. YPJ  *piggy* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21) /  
*peke* (Diósy, p. 1879, p. 501) /  
*peggy* (Knollys, 1887, p. 312) ‘go’,  
BPLP  *peke* ‘go’ (Broome Pearling Lugger Pidgin n.d.)

e. YPJ  *sacky* ‘wine’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21),  
JPE  /sake/ or /sækiy/ ‘alcoholic drink’ (Goodman, 1967, pp. 51-52),  
BPLP  *saki* ‘grog (in general)’ (Hosokawa, 1987, p. 292),  
TIAJP  *sagi* ‘any drink’ (Mühlhäusler and Trew, 1996, p. 392)

Such lexical items appear, then, to have been part of the vocabulary of the pidgins in the formation of which Japanese has been involved, be it as a lexifier or as a substrate language.

3. **Phonology**

Given the inconsistency in the orthography or system of transcription used in the currently available sources, the phonological interpretation of the written records of YPJ can only be rather tentative in nature. Nonetheless, a number of remarks can be made with respect to the phonology of YPJ.

Consider first the deletion of the high vowels /i/ and /ɯ/ in items etymologically derived from Japanese, which reflects their devoicing in the Tokyo-Yokohama dialectal area. As is well known, when devoiced, /i/ and /ɯ/ are phonetically realized as [i] and [ɯ] respectively. Devoicing occurs in the following phonological environments: when the high vowel /i/ or /ɯ/ occurs between voiceless consonants, and in word-final position (see e.g. Author, 2005, pp. 28-33). These are also the
environments in which deletion of /i/ or /ɯ/ is attested in YPJ forms. In the examples below, deletion is indicated by the absence of the vowel letter <i> or <u> or by the use of the apostrophe:

(6)  a. arimas ‘to have’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 16) < J arimasu ‘to be’  
    b. h’to ‘person’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) < J hito ‘person’  
    c. moots ‘six’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18) < J mutsu ‘six’  
    d. tacksan ‘much’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18) < J takusan ‘much, many’  
    e. watarshee ‘I’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 15) < J watakushi ‘I’

As already mentioned, another phonological characteristic of the Tokyo-Yokohama dialectal area reflected by YPJ forms (see also Daniels, 1948, pp. 810 and 813; Inoue, 2006, p. 58) is the substitution of [ʃ] for Standard Japanese [ç]:

(7)  a. shto ‘man’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20) < J hito ‘person’  
    b. sheebatchey ‘stove’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24, f.n.) < J hibachi ‘stove’

As shown above, YPJ also has word-internal [ŋ], yet another phonological characteristic of earlier Tokyo Japanese⁴. Consider the following examples, in which [ŋ] is rendered by the digraph <ng>:

(8)  a. koongee ‘nail’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) < J kugi ‘nail’  
    b. tomango ‘egg’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24) < J tamago ‘egg’  
    c. usangi uma ‘donkey’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 501) < J usagi ‘hare’, uma ‘horse’

Inoue (2006, p. 58) claims that YPJ “generally retained the CV syllabic structure of Japanese”. A more accurate and complete description would be that, generally, the syllable structure of YPJ is that of Japanese, i.e. with simple syllable margins, and with /N/ as the only consonant allowed to occur in word-final codas. As in Japanese, a consequence of the rather simple nature of the syllable structure is the substantial phonological adjustment undergone by loanwords. YPJ resorts to two repair strategies for the resolution of illicit onset and codas: epenthesis and paragoge. The former is illustrated by the examples under (4), and the latter by those under (5) below:

(9)  a. bidoro ‘glass’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) < P vidro  
    b. buranket ‘blanket’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) < E blanket  
    c. sitésh’n ‘railway station’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) < E station

⁴ See e.g. Shibatani (1990, pp. 171-173), Author (2005, pp. 48-56).
The phonology of YPJ appears to have displayed considerable inter-speaker variation. This is sometimes explicitly mentioned, in the case of particular lexical items. For instance, Atkinson (1879, p. 24, f.n.) notes with respect to the word for ‘stove’ that “‘Sheebatchey” is used as well as “Heebatchey””, i.e. that the use of either [ʃ] or presumably [ç] is attested. Other instances of variation are attributed to the different first languages of YPJ users. In his comments on the differences between the pronunciation of Westerners and that of the Chinese users of YPJ in the phonetic realization of [ɾ], Atkinson (1879, p. 29) writes that “foreigners as a rule rattle their “Rs” roughly, readily […] or else ignore them altogether”, whereas a Chinese “lubricates the “R””, and provides the examples reproduced below:

(11) a. Westerner walk-karrymasing / walk-kawymasing vs.
Chinese walk-kallimasing ‘misunderstand’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)

b. Westerner am buy worry vs.
Chinese am buy wolly ‘not feeling well’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)

There is also variation in the form of the same YPJ lexical items recorded in different sources:

(12) a. piggy (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21) /
peke (Diósy, 1879, p. 501) /
peggy (Knollys, 1887, p. 312) ‘go’

b. pumgutz ‘punishment’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) /
bonkotz ‘thrashing’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 501)

Finally, different variants are sometimes listed by the same author:

(13) a. jiggy jiggy / jiki jiki ‘make haste’ Gills (1886, p. 113)

b. maro-maro / maru-maru ‘to be somewhere’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 501)

4. Morphology and syntax

As shown by Inoue (2006, p. 60), “YPJ data do not show evidence of bound morphology”. The negator nigh < J nai is referred as a “termination” by (Atkinson, 1879, p. 17), but it is, in fact, a free morpheme. The only apparent exception is the negator -en < J -en, recorded in two YPJ forms: arimasen ‘not to have’ and walk-arimasen ‘not to understand’. However, these instances both involve high-frequency verbs and should, therefore, be regarded as unanalyzed forms.
The derivational morphology of YPJ relies on the use of several word-formation means. The most frequently used one appears to have been compounding, illustrated in the following examples:

    b. *mar gin ricky-pshaw* ‘two-wheeled pony carriage’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)
    c. *nammai kammy* ‘card’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)
    d. *niwa-tori* ‘rooster’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 501)
    e. *yama-inu* ‘wolf’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 501)

In several compounds the second member is a reflex of Japanese *hito* ‘person’:

(15) a. *ah kye kimmono sto* ‘soldier’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25)
    c. *yakkamash’ shto* ‘ambassador’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24)

Such compounds, however, occur far less often than claimed by Inoue (2006: 60), who writes that “there is one frequently observed compounding strategy with sto/shto ‘person’”. In still other compounds the second member is *mono* (< Japanese *mono* ‘thing, object’):

    b. *caberra mono* ‘hat’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 15)
    c. *shiroy mono* ‘starch’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24)

Suffixation is limited to the use of -*san*:

    b. *doctorsan* ‘doctor’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24)
    c. *eejin san* ‘foreigner’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25)
    d. *kooksan* ‘cook’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)
    e. *Nankinsan* ‘Chinaman’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25)

Reduplication is also found, but it is neither productive nor frequent. The available corpus contains just two instances of reduplicated forms:

(18) a. *drunky drunky* ‘drunk’,
    cf. *drunky* ‘drunk’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)
    b. *mate-mate* ‘wait a little’ (Gills, 1883, p. 147),
    cf. *matty* ‘wait’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)
Furthermore, in (18a) there seems to be no demonstrable difference in meaning between the simplex and the reduplicated form. As for the other examples recorded, they are not cases of reduplication, contra Inoue (2006, p. 60), but rather “quasi-reduplicated” forms\(^5\), i.e. not derived from a base attested in YPJ.

\[(19)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{chobber chobber} & \text{‘food, sustenance’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{maro-maro / maru-maru} & \text{‘to be somewhere’ (Diósy, 1879, p. 501)} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{minner minner} & \text{‘all’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 22)} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{para para} & \text{‘to boil’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)} \\
\text{e.} & \quad \text{pom pom} & \text{‘hammer’ (Atkinson, 1979, p. 22)} \\
\text{f.} & \quad \text{sick-sick} & \text{‘crank’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)} \\
\text{g.} & \quad \text{so so} & \text{‘sew’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)}
\end{align*}
\]

The lack of bound morphology and the small size of the vocabulary\(^6\) account for the occurrence of categorial multifunctionality\(^7\). YPJ words can be assigned to more than one lexical category and can therefore be analyzed as lexically underspecified. Consider the examples below:

\[(20)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a.} & \quad \text{die job ADJ} & \text{‘strong, sound, good, able’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19),} \\
& & \text{and ADV ‘well’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{jiggy jig V} & \text{‘to hasten’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 17), ADV ‘quickly’} \\
& & \text{(Atkinson, 1879, p. 17), and ADJ ‘the nearest’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{pumgutz V} & \text{‘punish’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 22), and N ‘punishment’} \\
& & \text{(Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{sick-sick N} & \text{‘illness’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 17), and ADJ ‘sick, ill’} \\
& & \text{(Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)} \\
\text{e.} & \quad \text{tacksan QUANT} & \text{‘much’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18), and ADV ‘very’} \\
& & \text{(Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)}
\end{align*}
\]

The system of pronouns and pronominal adjectives is extremely poorly developed. While personal pronouns distinguish three persons, there is no distinction in number:

\[(21)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{watarkshee} & \quad 1\text{SG} \\
\text{anatta / anatter and oh my} & \quad 2\text{SG} \\
\text{acheera sto} & \quad 3\text{SG}
\end{align*}
\]

\(^5\) As defined by Bakker (2003, p. 40): “reduplicated forms for which single forms do not exist”.
\(^6\) The recorded vocabulary of YPJ (see Daniels 1948) amounts to approximately 250 words.
\(^7\) In the sense of Mühlhäusler (1997, p. 137).
Moreover, the only personal pronouns which are consistently used are *watarkshee* and *oh my*. The only demonstrative recorded (just once) is *kono*:

(22) \textit{kono house}  
Dem house  
‘this house’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 26)

Only cardinal numerals are attested.

Since there are no plural markers on nouns or pronouns plurality is inferred from the context or is expressed by e.g. numerals.

(23) \textit{Tempo meats high kin arimas}.  
penny three see be  
‘I see three pence.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18)

The Japanese case markers (particles and postpositions) do not occur. The only exception found in the corpus is case of interference with Standard Japanese:

(24) \textit{Mado oh shimerro}. (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24)  
window ACC shut  
‘Shut the window.’

Given the absence of case markers, possession is expressed by juxtaposition of the possessor and the possessee:

(25) \textit{oh my tempo}  
2sg penny  
‘your penny’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 15)

Adjectives are well represented in the corpus of YPJ. The only degree of comparison attested is the absolute superlative, formed with *num wun* preceding the adjective:

(26) \textit{num wun your a shee}  
very good  
‘exceptionally nice’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25)

In the absence of an adjective, *num wan* itself has the meaning ‘best’ and serves to form the relative superlative:

(27) \textit{num wun shto}  
best person  
‘the best of men’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)
An overt copula *arimasu* (< Japanese *arimasu*) occurs both in equative and predicative structures:

(28) a. *Tempo arimasu.*
    penny be
    ‘This is a penny.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 16)

   b. *Kooroy arimasu.*
    black be
    ‘It is black.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)

As also shown by Inoue (2006, p. 61), YPJ has no tense and aspect markers. This accounts for the fact that the temporal and aspectual interpretation relies on the context or on the use of time adverbials:

(29) a. *meonitchi [...] tacksan so so arimasu.*
    tomorrow a lot sew be
    ‘I will have plenty of work for him.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)

   b. *Sigh oh narrow dozo bynebai moh skosh cow*
    good bye please by and by more little buy
    ‘Good bye, please buy [in the future] some more.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 27)

There is one invariant negator, *nigh* (< J *nai*), which occurs in post-verbal position:

(30)  *Atsie sammy eel oh piggy nigh?*
    hot cold colour change NEG
    ‘Does his color change in the various seasons?’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)

Only a very small number of adverbs are recorded. These include:

(31) a. *bynebai* ‘by and bye’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 17)

   b. *coachy* ‘here’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)

   c. *meonitchi* ‘tomorrow’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)

The following quantifiers occur in YPJ:

(32) a. *skoshe* ‘a little’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18)

   b. *minner minner* ‘all’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 22)

   c. *tacksan* ‘much’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18)

Most question words are monomorphemic, with the exception of the alternative form for ‘who’ in (33e):
(33) a. *dalley* ‘who’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)
    b. *doko* ‘where’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)
    c. *ikoora* ‘how much’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18)
    d. *nanny* ‘what’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)
    e. *nanny sto* lit. ‘what person’, i.e. ‘who’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)

In WH-questions question words remain *in situ*:

(34) a. Aboorah doko?
    butter where
    ‘Where is the butter’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)

b. Mar ikoora?
    horse how much
    ‘How much is the horse?’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18) [my translation]

As noted by Inoue (2006, p. 61) the word order in YPJ is SOV, as in Japanese.
Generally, YPJ is typologically consistent. Consider the following parameters
correlated with the SOV word order:

(35) a. possessor – possessee
    *oh my oh char*
    2SG tea
    ‘your tea’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 15)

b. adjective – noun
    *die job sto* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)
    strong person
    ‘a strong man’

c. demonstrative – noun
    *kono house* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 26)
    DEM house
    ‘this house’

d. numeral – noun
    *Stoats sindoe skoshe matty.*
    one boatman a little wait
    ‘Let one boatman wait.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)

e. adverb – verb
    *coachy weedy*
    hither come
    ‘come here’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)
There are only a few exceptions:

(36) a. *Tempo meats high kin arimas.*
    penny three see be
    ‘I see three pence.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 18)

b. verb – adverb
    *Oh my piggy jiggy jig*
    2SG get out quickly
    ‘Get out quickly’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) [my translation]

c. *Watarkshee tempo high kin nigh nang eye tokey.*
    1SG penny see NEG long time
    ‘I have not seen a penny for a long time.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)

Sentence coordination is achieved via parataxis:

(37) *Watarkshe oki akindo, tacksan cow*
    1SG big merchant a lot buy
    ‘I am an important merchant and I buy a lot’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 26)
    [my translation]

YPJ has no overt complementizers. Whether YPJ has zero complementizers is difficult to ascertain, given the scarcity and quality of the available data. Consider the following examples:

(38) a. *Start here hanash meonitchi maro maro tacksan so so arimasu*
    tailor speak tomorrow pass a lot sew be
    ‘Tell the tailor to come tomorrow and I will have plenty of work for him.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)

b. *Sin turkey hanash kimmono a row.*
    laundryman speak clothes wash
    ‘Tell the laundryman to wash the clothes.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24)

In spite of the translation in the original, the syntax of the sentences under (38) is open to two interpretations. The clauses following the verb *hanash* ‘to tell’ can be analyzed either as being complement clauses or as instances of direct speech, i.e. ‘Tell the tailor: Come tomorrow and I will have plenty of work for you’ and ‘Tell the laundryman: Wash the clothes’ respectively. Compare (38) with (39):

(39) *Sendo hanash drunky itchibo sinjoe arimasen*
    captain speak drunk one *bu* give be
    ‘The captain says: I won’t give the drunkard one *bu*.’
    (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) [my translation]
Since the conjunctions and conjunctive particles of Japanese have not been preserved, YPJ also relies on mere juxtaposition in other types of subordinate clauses. Consider the examples of adverbial clauses of time (40), of reason (41), and of condition (42):

(40)  \textit{Nanny sto arimasu, watarkshee arimasen?}  
\hspace{1cm} who \hspace{0.5cm} be \hspace{0.5cm} 1SG \hspace{0.5cm} be-NEG  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Who called when I was out?’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)

(41)  a. \textit{Watarkshee am buy worry oh char parra parra.}  
\hspace{1cm} 1SG \hspace{0.5cm} ill \hspace{0.5cm} tea \hspace{0.5cm} boil  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Boil me some tea because I feel ill.’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 17)  
\hspace{1cm} [my translation]

b. \textit{Ginricky pshaw arimasen, mar motty koy!}  
\hspace{1cm} man-power carriage be-NEG horse bring  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Bring a horse because there is no man-power carriage!’  
\hspace{1cm} (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)

(42)  a. \textit{Nanny sto hanash, watarkshee boto piggy.}  
\hspace{1cm} anyone \hspace{0.5cm} speak \hspace{0.5cm} 1SG \hspace{0.5cm} boat \hspace{0.5cm} go  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Should anyone inquire say I’ve gone out in the boat.’  
\hspace{1cm} (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)

b. \textit{Oh my pompom bobbery wa tarkshee pumgutz.}  
\hspace{1cm} 2SG \hspace{0.5cm} hammer \hspace{0.5cm} noise \hspace{0.5cm} 1SG \hspace{0.5cm} punish  
\hspace{1cm} ‘If you make noise with the hammer, I’ll punish you.’  
\hspace{1cm} (Atkinson, 1879, p. 22)  
\hspace{1cm} [my translation]

c. \textit{Dye die job arimasen, itchiboo sinjoe nigh.}  
\hspace{1cm} table \hspace{0.5cm} good \hspace{0.5cm} be-NEG \hspace{0.5cm} one \hspace{0.5cm} bu \hspace{0.5cm} give \hspace{0.5cm} NEG  
\hspace{1cm} ‘If the table is not good, I won’t give you a \textit{bu}.’  
\hspace{1cm} (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28)  
\hspace{1cm} [my translation]

As can be seen, the sequencing of clauses is generally subordinate clause – main clause, as in Japanese. There is only one exception:

(43)  \textit{Nanny sto arimasu, watarkshee arimasen?}  
\hspace{1cm} who \hspace{0.5cm} be \hspace{0.5cm} 1SG \hspace{0.5cm} be-NEG  
\hspace{1cm} ‘Who called when I was out?’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)

However, what appears to be an exception may well be a pragmatically-motivated so-called “afterthought” construction, which is also attested in spoken Japanese.
5. Vocabulary

Since the etyma of the lexical items found in YPJ have been discussed in great detail by Daniels (1948) this section focuses on other characteristics of its vocabulary.

Several lexical items are the outcome of reanalysis of morphemic boundaries:

(44) a. *come here* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19) /
    *komiya* (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) /
    *kumheer* (Knollys, 1887, p. 311) ‘dog’
    \(< \text{E} \textit{come here}!\)

b. *dam your eye sto* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25) /
    *damyuri sto* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 28) /
    *damuraïsu h’to* (Diósy, 1879, p. 500) /
    *dammuraisu hito* (Griffis, 1883, p. 493) ‘sailor’
    \(< \text{E} \textit{damn your eye(s)}, \text{J} \textit{hito} ‘man’\)

Also attested are lexical hybrids⁸:

(45) a. *kireen* ‘clean’ (Atkinson, p. 1879, p. 25),
    cf. E \textit{clean} and J \textit{kirei}

b. *shiroy* ‘shirt’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 24),
    cf. E \textit{shirt} and J \textit{shiroy} ‘white’

Given the extremely reduced vocabulary of YPJ, synonyms would not be expected to occur. However, there are a few such instances. The synonyms are either from different source languages (43a) or from the same source language (43b):

    \(< \text{J} \textit{ambai} ‘condition’, \textit{warui} ‘bad’,
    \text{and} \textit{sick-sick} (Atkinson, p. 1879, p. 17) ‘ill’ \(< \text{E} \textit{sick}\)

b. *die job* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)
    \(< \text{J} \textit{daijobu} ‘fine’,
    \text{and} \textit{your a shee} ‘alright’ (Atkinson, p. 1879, p. 18) \(< \text{J} \textit{yoroshii} ‘good’\)

Two other characteristics of the YPJ vocabulary are direct consequences of the extremely small size of its vocabulary. One is the occurrence of lexical polysemy. As shown below, lexical items exhibit semantic extension, and cover a wide range of meanings:

---

⁸ Lexical items identified across languages, given their phonetic similarity (Mühlhäusler, 1997, p. 135)
(47) a. *aboorah* ‘butter, oil, kerosene, pomatum, grease’  
    (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)

b. *arimasu* ‘to have, to obtain, to be, to arrive, to want’  
    (Atkinson, 1879, p. 16)

c. *ohio* ‘good morning, good day, good evening’  
    (Atkinson, 1879, p. 17)

d. *piggy* ‘to remove, take away, carry off, clear [the table], get out,  
    remove’ (Atkinson 1879: 17), ‘change’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19),  
    ‘push off’ (Atkinson, p. 1879, p. 20) ‘go(ne) out’ (Atkinson, 1879, p. 21)

The extremely reduced vocabulary of YPJ also accounts for the use of lengthy and  
convoluted circumlocutions. Consider the following examples:

    consul noise person  
    ‘lawyer’

b. *coots pom pom otoko* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)  
    shoe hammer man  
    ‘bootmaker’

c. *fooney high-kin serampan nigh rosoko* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 19)  
    ship see break NEG candle  
    ‘lighthouse’

d. *okee abooneye pon pon* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 23)  
    big dangerous hammer  
    ‘earthquake’

e. *serampan funey high kin donnyson* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 25)  
    broken ship see master  
    ‘marine insurance surveyor’

f. *tacksan hanash bosan* (Atkinson, 1879, p. 20)  
    a lot speak priest  
    ‘officiating priest’

6. Developmental stage

Pidgin languages have been assigned to various developmental stages, on the basis  
of linguistic criteria. This well-known typology (Mühlhäusler, 1997, pp. 5-6; Siegel,  
2008, pp. 2-4) distinguishes accordingly three types of pidgin: (i) pre-pidgins; (ii)  
stable pidgins; (iii) expanded pidgins. Each of these types is characterized by a

---

9 Cf. also the comment in Anon. (1879, p. 501) on the YPJ form *ohayo*: “Foreigners use it at all  
hours”.

10 Also called “minimal pidgins” or “jargons”.

11 An alternative term is “extended pidgins”.

specific set of phonological, morphological, syntactic and lexical diagnostic features (see Mühlhäusler, 1997, pp. 128-138). To these I have added one more diagnostic feature, productive morphological reduplication, since its occurrence correlates with the developmental stage of the variety at issue\(^\text{12}\).

Consider the diagnostic features of pre-pidgins set out in Table 1 in light of the data from YPJ, discussed in sections 3, 4 and 5 (“+” = occurrence of a feature; “−” = absence of a feature):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>YPJ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>inter-speaker variation in phonology</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimal personal pronoun system</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no copula</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no tense and aspect markers</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no one adposition</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no complementizers</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-productive reduplication</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>categorial multifunctionality</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>small size of vocabulary</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reanalysis of morphemic boundaries</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical hybrids</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexical polysemy</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>circumlocutions</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen, with the exception of the copula, which, as shown in section 4, is found in both equative and predicative structures, YPJ exhibits features diagnostic of pre-pidgins\(^\text{13}\).

7. Conclusions

YPJ is one of the outcomes of the language contacts which took place at the very beginning of modernity in Japan. Like other short-lived varieties emerging in similar circumstance, YPJ exhibits features typical of pre-pidgins. These characteristics have obtained via processes such as reduction, simplification, and the adoption by the

\(^{12}\) As shown by Bakker (2003, p. 44), Bakker and Parkvall, 2005, p. 514), reduplication is not productive in pre-pidgins and stable pidgins.

\(^{13}\) See also Inoue (2006, pp. 64-65), who uses a different set of criteria and reaches the conclusion that YPJ is a “restructured pidgin”.
groups of users with different first languages of compromise solutions, with a view to attending to the immediate, bare necessities of communication.

This overview of YPJ is a contribution to a better knowledge of Japanese-lexifier pidgins, which are generally under researched. It is also hoped that the data from YPJ are relevant to the literature on pidgins and creoles, in which Japanese-lexifier varieties have figured less prominently.
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