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Since the early twentieth century, creole studies have been concerned with the question of how these new languages came into being, whether they form a separate class, and whether the study of these languages enhances our understanding of language change and its relation to human knowledge of language. The present study contributes to the discussion on the issue of creole genesis by investigating the development of the nominal domain in a variety of creole languages. It offers a thorough examination of the etymology, morpho-syntactic and discourse-semantic properties of creole nominal markers. Special emphasis is put on the distribution and interpretation of bare (unmarked) nominal expressions – a feature that is considered distinctive of creoles.

The properties of creole nominal expressions are considered from a comparative-typological perspective: the study is carried out on fifteen creoles contrasted to their European superstrates and their non-European substrates. In addition to superstrate and substrate influence, the study investigates the role of the universals of second language acquisition, grammaticalization, as well as the universal principles of reference marking and discourse organization in the development of the creole nominal domain. The findings of the study pose challenges for a number of contemporarily prominent views on creole genesis as well as for general theories of the structural organization and interpretation of nominal expressions such as the DP hypothesis.

This study is particularly relevant to linguists interested in language contact, creole studies, language change, language acquisition, and syntax, semantics, and typology of nominal expressions.
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<td>INCL</td>
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<tr>
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<td>interjection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPFV</td>
<td>imperfective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
xii

IRR     irrealis
InfP    inflectional phrase
LF      logical form
LOC     locative
M       masculine
N       non-
NEG     negation, negative
NE      nominal expression
NOM     nominative
NP      noun phrase
NumP    number phrase
SM      simultaneous
OBJ     object
OBL     oblique
NUM     numeral
NS      nominal stem
PF      phonetic form
PFV     perfective
PL      plural
PM      predicate marker
PN      proper name
POSS    possessive
PREP    preposition
PROG    progressive
PRS     present
PST     past
PURP    purposive
Q       question particle/marker
QP      quantity phrase
REINF   reinforcer
REFL    reflexive
REL     relative
SG      singular
Spec    specifier
TOP     topic
TopP    topic phrase
Chapter 1

Introduction

As the title of the book suggests, the present study examines the properties of creole nominal expressions (NEs) with the intention of obtaining findings relevant to the issue of creole genesis. So, what is the issue of creole genesis and how can the study of the creole NEs shed light on it? In this opening chapter, a brief answer to these questions (sections 1.1 and 1.2) will be provided. Further, a formulation of the main aims and research questions (section 1.3) will be introduced, followed by a discussion of the methodology (1.4), the theoretical background (1.5) and, finally, the organization of the study (1.6).

1.1 The issue of creole genesis

The issue of creole genesis has been the driving force underlying creole studies from the establishment of this research area. While language contact is likely to have played a role in the development of all the languages of the world, creoles are considered special in the sense that their creation as such is a product of a special case of language contact. Most creoles as we know them today developed in the context of European colonial expansion as a result of contact between typologically distinct languages (e.g., Niger-Congo vs. Romance or Germanic in the case of Atlantic creoles). While majority of the morphosyntactic, lexical and phonological make-up of creoles manifests creoles’ resemblance to their European superstrates or to one or several of their non-European substrates, creoles also show properties which cannot be traced in a straightforward manner to any of their source languages. Another puzzling fact about creoles is that they exhibit similarity amongst each other with regard to their structural organization, such as the fact that they are almost exclusively isolating, and with regard to the interpretational properties of certain morphemes (e.g., tense-mood-aspect (TMA) markers or copulas).

The unusual synchronic and diachronic properties of creoles have triggered much interest in the process of creole genesis. The available literature on creoles

---

1 The term “nominal expression” is used here as a theory-neutral term to refer to the nominal constituent regardless of its possible structural analysis as an NP or a DP.
presents us with a vast range of conflicting ideas concerning creole genesis. While some scholars (e.g., Lefebvre 1998) claim that creoles are hybrids with the structure of a non-European substrate and the lexicon from a European superstrate, others (e.g., Mufwene 2001, and other work; Chaudenson 1977, 2003) maintain the idea that creoles represent a result of the gradual development of their European superstrates. Next to the substrate- and superstrate-oriented approaches to the process of creolization, there is a claim that the creole structure manifests universal constrains which apply in special cases of first language acquisition (Bickerton 1981 and other work). The universals of (unguided) second language acquisition have also been invoked to account for the structural properties of creoles (e.g., Plag 2008a,b, 2009a,b). The issue of creole genesis has always been the subject of a hot debate, and, up to now, scholars are far from reaching a consensus.

Prior to the present study, I carried out a study in which I investigated the development of nominal markers in Sranan, Jamaican and Haitian Creole (Bobyleva 2006). The findings of that study provided me with evidence that none of the factors mentioned above, taken in isolation, could account for the properties of creole NEs. This conclusion consides with what had been earlier observed by Aboh (2004c, 2006). The present study sets out to substantiate this conclusion based on a larger sample of creole languages.

1.2 Creole nominal expressions

As mentioned above, the present study addresses the issue of creole genesis through the analysis of creole NEs. The primary focus of the study is on (in)definite determiners and plural markers. The study analyses the etymology, morphosyntax and semantico-pragmatic properties of these markers and tries to establish their sources.

The choice to focus on NEs is not an arbitrary one. Until recently, NEs were in the periphery of creole studies. After Bickerton (1981), much of the research focused on those aspects of creole grammar, which highlight the structural uniformity of creoles as a class. The area of TMA marking is perhaps best known for showing cross-creole uniformity. In many known creoles, tense, mood, and aspect are expressed by means of three separate preverbal particles that always appear in the same order in front of the verb. This is illustrated below in the examples from Sranan and Haitian Creole:

Sranan (Adamson and Smith 1995: 229)

(1) A ben sa e ferfi a oso
   3SG PST IRR IPFV paint DEF.SG house
   ‘He would be painting the house.’
Haitian Creole (Lefebvre 1996: 252)

(2) Mari t’ av ap prepare pat.
    Mary PST IRR IPFV prepare dough
    ‘Mary might eventually be preparing dough.’

    The cross-creole parallelism observed in the clausal and verbal domains does not, however, extend to the nominal domain, which demonstrates considerable diversity across creoles. Creoles vary with regard to the pre- or postnominal placement of determiners and plural markers as well as with regard to their relative ordering. For instance, in Chabacano both the definite determiner and the plural marker are prenominal and occur in the DEF-PL order (3). In Haitian Creole, the order of the definite determiner and the plural marker are the same but, in contrast to their Chabacano counterparts, in Haitian Creole these elements are postnominal (4). In Jamaican Creole, the definite determiner is prenominal, while the plural marker is placed after the noun (5). In Mauritian Creole, we find a mirror image of what we observe in Jamaican (6).

Chabacano (Whinom 1956: 51)

(3) el manga pariente
    DEF PL relative
    ‘the relatives’

Haitian Creole (Lefebvre 1998: 85)

(4) krab la yo
    crab DEF PL
    ‘the crabs’

Jamaican Creole (my data)

(5) di bwai dem
    DEF boy PL
    ‘the boys’

Mauritian Creole (Alleesaib 2005: 2)

(6) bann butej la
    PL bottle DEF
    ‘the bottles’
Furthermore, plurality can be expressed by means of a separate morpheme, which typically occurs in combination with an (in)definite determiner, as illustrated in examples (3-6), or by means of a portmanteau element which serves to express both number and definiteness/specificity. This latter option is illustrated in examples (7a-b) from Sranan. Unlike the creoles cited above, Sranan has two forms of the definite determiner: the singular form *a* and the plural form *den*.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 58, 62)

(7) a. *a* man
   DEF.SG man
   ‘the man’

b. *den* apresina
   DEF.PL orange
   ‘the oranges’

While a few studies have attempted to carry out a systematic comparison of the structural organization of the creole NE (e.g., Déprez 2003; Aboh 2006; Bobyleva 2006; Baptista and Guéron 2007), most studies on this issue represent individual case studies. The present study, which covers a sample of fifteen creoles (see section 1.4), attempts to increase our knowledge of the structural variation in the creole NE. This study describes the variants of the structural organization of creole NEs and establishes the limits of variation. In so doing, I expect to bring to light new evidence for the discussion of the role of superstrate languages, substrate languages, and universals, as well as the language internal and language-external factors that may affect their importance.

In contrast to their morphosyntax, the interpretational properties of creole determiners and plural markers have been claimed to show significant similarities. For instance, Bickerton (1981) lists specificity-based determiner use as a universal property of creoles. Some other studies characterize the restriction of plural marking to definite NEs as a feature common to creoles. More nuanced studies on the distribution of determiners and plural markers in one or several individual creoles (Dijkhoff 1983; Singler 1989, 1994; Sankoff and Mazzie 1991; Lucchesi 1993; Bruyn 1995; Poplack, Tagliamonte and Eze 1997; Baptista 2003; Aboh 2006; Bobyleva 2006; Stewart 2006; Baptista and Guéron 2007) have, however, shown that these generalizations oversimplify the picture and do not work equally well for all creoles.

One feature creole languages certainly have in common is the use of bare NEs (i.e. NEs that contain no overt determiners or number markers). This feature, which distinguishes creoles from their European superstrates on many counts, has received quite some attention in the literature. In 2007, Baptista and Guéron edited a volume that embraces fifteen studies of creoles with different lexifiers and focuses on the
interpretational properties of overt determiners, plural markers, and, crucially, bare NEs. Although the volume represents an extremely valuable contribution to the study of the interpretational properties of creole NEs, it surely leaves room for further research. Even though the volume has a well-defined theme, the contributions seem rather diverse and do not cover the same range of issues. They employ different definitions of the term “bare NE” as well as such terms as “specificity” (see chapter 4 for discussion). Furthermore, most of the studies included in the volume do not offer a comparative perspective. In fact, out of the fifteen studies, only three contain a systematic comparison between two or more creoles. Only four studies offer a comparison between a creole and its superstrate, while only three mention substrate influence as a possible explanation for the interpretational properties of creole NEs. Out of these three studies, only one contains a systematic comparison between a creole and its superstrate. The present study aims at complementing the volume edited by Baptista and Guéron by offering a systematic comparison of the interpretational properties of overtly determined and bare NEs in fifteen creoles contrasted to their superstrate and substrate languages.

1.3 Research questions

As I mention in section 1.1, the findings from previous research (Aboh 2004c, 2006; Bobyleva 2006) strongly suggest that neither the substratist, nor the superstratist, nor the universalist approach to creole genesis, taken in isolation, could account for the properties of creole NEs. In order to substantiate this conclusion, the present study addresses the following research questions:

(i) How is the structural organization and interpretation of NEs in creole languages different from/similar to the structural organization and interpretation of NEs in their superstrate and substrate languages?

(ii) How is the substrate and superstrate input transferred into the developing creole? Does it remain unchanged or does it undergo restructuring as a result of interaction with other contributing linguistic systems, adaptation to the new creole system, or any other factors?

In relation to these two questions, there is another research question of:

(iii) Whether all properties of creole NEs can be accounted for in terms of substrate or superstrate influence or a combination thereof? Are innovative properties of creole NEs, unattested in their source languages, suggestive of the role of universal principles in creole genesis?
If it appears that creoles are shaped by influences of the languages present in a contact setting alongside universal principles, then, paraphrasing Mufwene (1996), the main objective of the research into creole genesis is to identify the factors that would justify the particular selections made from the competing alternatives. This gives us the following research question:

(iv) Which factors, linguistic or non-linguistic, control the competing influences of substrate and superstrate languages and universal principles?

This study will attempt to provide answers to these research questions by performing a systematic comparative analysis of NEs in fifteen creoles contrasted to their superstrate and substrate languages.

1.4 Methodology

1.4.1 Sampling

As mentioned above, this study is based on a sample of fifteen creoles. The idea is to amass the relevant data from a collection of creole languages as diverse as possible. Therefore, the sampling is based on three principles: (i) the diversity of contributing superstrate languages, (ii) the diversity of contributing substrate languages, and (iii) geographical diversity. Each superstrate-based grouping is represented by three creoles (i.e. three English-based creoles; three Dutch-based creoles; three French-based creoles; three Spanish-based creoles; and three Portuguese-based creoles). Out of each group of three creoles, two belong to the creoles spoken on the island and coastal territories of the Atlantic area and one represents a different geographical area. The Atlantic bias is inevitable as the majority of the creoles known and studied nowadays are spoken in the Atlantic zone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Atlantic Ocean</th>
<th>Pacific Ocean</th>
<th>South Africa</th>
<th>Indian Ocean</th>
<th>Philippines</th>
<th>India</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Jamaican</td>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>Chabacano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Berbice</td>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td>Diu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>Antillean</td>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Cape Verdean</td>
<td>Santome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1. The creoles under study classified with regard to their superstrate and geographic distribution.
The geographic bias leads to a bias in the type of substrate. Most slaves sold to the colonies in the Atlantic were from Niger-Congo speaking areas. Therefore, most of the creoles in the sample have a Niger-Congo substrate. In order to maintain the idea of the diversity of the substrate, I included Atlantic creoles with different Niger-Congo substrates (Kwa, Bantu, Benue-Congo, Atlantic, Mande, and Ijoid). The sample also includes creoles with non-Niger-Congo substrates, namely, Austronesian, Khoisan, and Indo-European. The substrates of individual creole languages are given in table 1.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creole</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Further classification</th>
<th>Individual representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Kwa</td>
<td>Gbe</td>
<td>Akan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bantu</td>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollads</td>
<td></td>
<td>Benue-Congo</td>
<td>Edo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Bantu</td>
<td>Kikongo</td>
<td>Kimbundu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Ijoid</td>
<td>Eastern Ijo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape-Verdean Creole</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Mande</td>
<td>Bambara</td>
<td>Mandinka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antlantic</td>
<td>Fulfulde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian Creole</td>
<td>Niger-Congo</td>
<td>Kwa</td>
<td>Gbe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Bantu</td>
<td>Bemba</td>
<td>Kongo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Makua</td>
<td>Swahili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>Khoisan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Eastern Oceanic</td>
<td>Raga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arosi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Western Oceanic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td>Austronesian</td>
<td>Philippine</td>
<td>Tagalog</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diu</td>
<td>Indo-European</td>
<td>Indo-Aryan</td>
<td>Gujarati</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2. The creoles under study and their major substrates.

### 1.4.2 Data collection

Given the scarcity of the literature on creole languages and their substrates, the data for this study were obtained from diverse sources, including theoretical, descriptive, and learner’s grammars, studies dealing with the nominal domain, existing corpora (texts published by other researchers and/or available on the Internet), and spontaneous and
elicited data from native speakers.

Although the study is concerned with the development of creole NEs, due to its broad scope it will be largely based on the examination of the contemporary data. I only make a reference to the diachronic data when the relevant information is available from prior research (e.g., Bruyn 1995; Sankoff and Mazzi 1991; Guillemin 2009). A systematic diachronic investigation of creole NEs is a concept for future research.

As the data was collected from diverse sources, the orthographic representations were not uniform. I chose to preserve the orthography of the original sources. The same holds for the morphological analysis (if it was performed by the author of the data source), unless it did not conform to the Leipzig Glossing Rules.

1.5 Theoretical background

1.5.1 Syntactic framework

The structural analysis of NEs in the present study was performed within the generative approach. Apart from the fact that the generative framework provides one with ready-to-use descriptive and analytical tools, it contains a number of assumptions on human linguistic knowledge which are concerned with issues highly relevant in the study of creole languages and their genesis. The central issue underlying generative grammar is the question of language acquisition, that is, how the knowledge of language arises in the mind of a speaker. With regard to this, generative grammar assumes that humans are endowed with a Universal Grammar (UG), which determines the basic principles of language structure and delimits the ultimate range of possible variants of linguistic structural organization. Under this perspective, language acquisition can be conceptualized as a choice of one variant out of the total number of available variants. This choice is defined as parameter setting. While all languages are the same, in the sense that they comply with the basic principles of the UG, the variation between languages is a matter of parametric variation.

One can identify two views on the role of UG in creole genesis. Some researchers, such as Bickerton (1981), assume that because of the restricted input from the existing languages (see chapter 3) UG played a special role in the process of creole genesis, providing the default options of structural organization in order to reconstitute the grammatical distinctions essential for any natural language. Others, for instance DeGraff (1999) and Aboh (2004c, 2006), do not share this view and argue that, while creoles, like any other natural languages, comply with the basic principles of the UG, they do not show any creole-specific parameter settings that set them apart from other languages.

Another important assumption underlying generative grammar, specifically, the Minimalist Program (Chomsky 1995b), is that every grammar is subject to specific output conditions at the interface level where grammatical form interacts with meaning.
This implies that there is a certain set of concepts that will, in one or another way, be expressed in all languages of the world. With regard to the nominal domain, Baptista and Guéron (2007: 477) assume that “individuation and identifiability are grammatical interface concepts associated with NPs which must be expressed in a language”. If this is the case, then creoles are expected to have developed (or at least be developing) the means to express these concepts.

Thus, in addition to the description and analysis of the structure of creole NEs in accordance with the phrase structure rules proposed in the generative framework, this study aims to verify these claims with regard to the role of the UG in creole genesis and about the universality of the notions of identifiability and individuation.

1.5.2 Semantic analysis: definitions

In addition to serving a function in the syntax of NEs, determiners and number markers assign NEs a number of semantic features. As mentioned above, identifiability and individuation are the major semantic concepts associated with the nominal domain. The languages of the world differ with regard to the ways in which they specify these concepts. For instance, the concept of identifiability may be realized cross-linguistically as definiteness or specificity marking. In addition, elements which are used to express these features are often also specified for such features as deixis, number, gender and animacy. Elements which realize individuation also specify NEs for number. On the other hand, some languages employ number markers which do not imply the individuated interpretation (cf. Rijkhoff 2002).

Another aspect that deserves attention in the discussion of the semantics of NEs is the lexical semantics of nouns. In the literature, there are different views on this issue. While some researchers (e.g., Borer 2005) believe that the lexical semantics of nouns is cross-linguistically uniform and grammatically inert and that the exact interpretation of a noun with regard to such features as specificity, definiteness, number, and individuation is assigned in a corresponding grammatical structure, others (e.g., Rijkhoff 2002) maintain that the cross-linguistic differences in the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs suggest that the lexical semantics of nouns varies across languages with regard to the specification for such features as number and individuation.

In the definitions and the description of the cross-linguistic realization of the features of specificity, definiteness, number and individuation, I will rely on the current linguistic theories, as well as on existing typological studies and descriptions of individual languages.

1.6 Organization of the book

The book is divided into three major parts. The first part, Setting the Stage lays the foundation for the rest of the study providing the necessary background in order to
contextualize the analysis and the claims presented here. This part of the book includes three chapters. Chapter 2 gives an overview of linguistic and non-linguistic (historical and socio-demographic) factors underlying creolization and contact language formation, focusing on the languages under study. Chapter 3 shows how these factors have been interpreted in the contemporary literature on creole genesis and discusses the main trends in the creole genesis debate. Chapter 4 provides the theoretical background relevant for the analysis of NEs presenting the current linguistic theories with regard to the interpretation and structural organization of NEs.

The data analysis is presented in the second part of the book, *Analysis*. This part is subdivided into 5 chapters. Chapter 5 deals with the formal properties of nominal functional elements focusing on their etymology. Chapter 6 discusses the surface structure of creole NEs paying special attention to such aspects of the structural organization as agreement, word order and interdependency of nominal markers. The next three chapters discuss the interpretation of determiners, number markers and bare NEs in the creoles under study. Chapter 7 focuses on the marking of individuation and number based on the discussion of the distributional properties of singular indefinite determiners and plural markers as opposed to bare NEs. Chapter 8 considers the behavior of indefinite determiners and bare indefinites with regard to the marking of specificity. Chapter 9 performs the same type of analysis in the domain of definite NEs.

The third part of the book, *Synthesis*, is represented by Chapter 10. In this chapter, I recapitulate the major findings of the study, focus on their implications for the creole genesis debate and sketch out directions for further research.
Part I

Setting the stage
Chapter 2

Contact language formation and creolization

The majority of the creoles known nowadays share a similar social and linguistic history. The creoles discussed in this book are all products of European colonial expansion. European trading posts, settlements and plantation colonies that emerged in coastal areas of West Africa, South America, India, South and Southeast Asia, the Philippines and the islands of the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific oceans became meeting grounds for genetically distant and typologically diverse languages. Germanic and Romance languages spoken by the European colonizers were brought into contact with multiple non-European languages, such as Niger-Congo, Khoisan, Austronesian or Indo-Aryan. This contact gave rise to the development of new languages identified as creoles.

While being the product of language contact is an essential characteristic of all creole languages, not all languages that emerge out of language contact situations (including some of the languages in my sample) are classified by scholars as creoles. For instance, hardly anyone would apply the term creole to the varieties spoken by contemporary immigrant worker communities in Europe. Such communities usually develop an L2 variety, which, despite some idiosyncrasies, can be clearly aligned with the local European language. Similarly, not all contact varieties that developed during the European colonial expansion are always referred to as creoles. In addition to creoles, scholars distinguish pidgins, semi-creoles, and colonial dialects. Semi-creoles, together with mesolectal, allegedly decreolized creoles, are opposed to so-called radical or prototypical creoles. While this subcategorization of contact languages relies on a mixture of linguistic and non-linguistic criteria and is often criticized for being intuitive and arbitrary, the fact remains that language contact which took place during European colonial expansion produced structurally diverse varieties with different degrees of grammatical stability and varying proportions of European and non-European content. While all these varieties developed out of comparable linguistic material (contact between two or more typologically different languages), the diversity of demographic and socioeconomic contexts determined the diversity of ways in which this material was selected, transferred and re-combined.

In what follows, I will provide a closer examination of the linguistic and non-linguistic factors underlying the processes of contact language formation and
creolization. In section 2.1, I will identify the linguistic environment out of which the languages under study emerged and discuss some of the problems regarding the establishment of their linguistic sources. In section 2.2, I will turn to non-linguistic, historical, socio-economic, and demographic factors, which lead to the emergence of different types of contact languages.

2.1 Linguistic aspects of contact language formation and creolization

This section is devoted to the discussion of languages that came into contact in the European colonies of West Africa, South America, India, the Philippines and on the islands of the Atlantic, Indian and Pacific Oceans giving rise to the emergence of the creoles under study. Although the issue of the linguistic origins of creoles is the subject of hot debate (see Chapter 3), most creolists recognize the importance of both the languages of the colonizers and the languages of the colonized populations or of the slaves for creole formation. In creolistics, these two major linguistic sources of creoles are referred to as superstrate languages and substrate languages, respectively.

2.1.1 Superstrate languages

The creole languages discussed in this book have a Germanic (English or Dutch) or a Romance (French, Spanish or Portuguese) superstrate. As already stated in 1.4.1, the sample of fifteen creoles considered here includes three English, three Dutch, three French, three Spanish, and three Portuguese-based creoles.

The establishment of a creole’s superstrate usually does not represent a complex task, as the relationship between the two languages, literally speaking, lies on the surface. Superstrate languages provide the largest proportion of the creoles’ basic vocabulary. Therefore, alongside the term “superstrate” creolists often use the term “lexifier”. Consider the following example from Jamaican Creole:

Jamaican Creole (my data)

(8) Im no nuo weh di gyal dem a taak bout.
    3SG NEG know what DEF girl PL PROG talk about

‘He does not know what the girls are talking about.’

Although a layman might not be able to identify the superstrate cognates of all the creole lexical items, for a trained creolist, who is aware of possible phonological changes and creole orthographical conventions, this usually does not pose a problem. In 19th century linguistics, the high superficial similarity between creoles and their respective superstrates even gave rise to the popular assumption that creoles are corrupted, imperfect, or simplified varieties of the European languages (e.g., Vinson 1889)
Although in postcolonial creolistics this linguistically ungrounded characterization of creoles has been refuted, some researchers, especially in the French tradition (e.g., Chaudenson 1977, 1992, 2003; Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001) view creoles as varieties, or dialects, of the metropolitan European languages. Superstratist researchers such as Chaudenson argue that, in addition to providing the bulk of a creole’s vocabulary, the superstrate also determines the structural properties (feature specifications and syntactic distribution) of these items. In this book, we shall see that this claim holds for many creole nominal elements.

Despite the fact that identifying the creoles’ superstrates and establishing lexical as well as structural parallels between them appears to be a rather easy task, a word of caution is due here. In the literature, creoles are often compared with the contemporary standard varieties of their superstrates. Neglecting the discrepancy between contemporary and older states of the superstrate as well as the dialectal variation abundant in Germanic and Romance languages renders such comparisons oversimplified and sometimes even inaccurate (cf. Chaudenson 2003). Historical demographic studies inform us that the European colonial population was linguistically very heterogeneous: Europeans who ended up in a colony came from different geographical areas of the colonizing countries and were thus speakers of various regional dialects. Given that many Europeans in the colonies were poorly educated and of low socio-economic rank, it is very likely that dialects (rather than standard varieties) of the European languages were spoken. The presence of pirates, buccaneers, soldiers and indentured servants (who were usually debtors and convicted felons forcibly shipped to a plantation) contributed to this variation (e.g., Le Page 1960; Alleyne 1980; Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Chaudenson 2003).

In some cases of contact language formation, there is strong evidence that the restructuring of the superstrate language might have begun before it came in contact with the languages identified as the substrate. One such case is that of Pacific Pidgin English. Most Englishmen, Irishmen and Americans on board whaling and trading ships in the Pacific Ocean spoke working class and regional dialects of British and American English. The crewmen equally included Indians, Peruvians, Europeans of various nationalities and Malays. This linguistic heterogeneity is likely to have given rise to (presumably, pidginized) L2 varieties of English before Pacific Islanders, whose languages are identified as the substrates of Pacific Pidgin English, came into the picture. Similarly, the development of Diu Portuguese out of contact between Portuguese and Gujarati is likely to have been preceded by the reconstruction of the superstrate. In the initial years of the Portuguese presence in Diu, the Portuguese were confined to the fort. As observed by Cardoso (2009: 70), “[c]onsidering that the majority of the population [of the fort] was not Portuguese-speaking communication must have proceeded through a reconstructed Portuguese register, whether locally formed or the general Asian Portuguese Pidgin identified by Clements (2000)”.

Also, the superstrate of Afrikaans was not restricted to L1 Dutch. The European population of the Cape colony included not only Dutchmen, but also Germans from Low and Middle
German dialect areas, as well as a small group of French Huguenots. Due to a policy of cultural and linguistic assimilation pursued by the Dutch colonial government, they were strongly encouraged to acquire and speak Dutch. Thus, in addition to native Dutch dialects, non-native Dutch varieties were also present.

Given that the type of superstrate which participated in the formation of creoles was not the standard variety of a European language but rather a combination of regional and social dialects and (pidginized) L2 varieties, one needs to keep in mind that certain creole constructions, which at first sight might appear non-European, could find parallels in non-standard varieties of European languages.

Although standard varieties of European languages are far more extensively described than their numerous dialects (especially as far as their state at the time of colonization is concerned), I will attempt to include the available dialectal data into the comparison undertaken in the present study.

2.1.2 Substrate languages

Throughout the history of European colonial expansion, colonies emerged in previously populated as well as in uninhabited territories. While, in the former case, the servile population consisted of both locals and imported workers, in the latter case, all of the labor force was imported through slave trade or, later, indentured labor recruitment. In creole studies, both the local languages spoken by the native population of a colonized area before the arrival of Europeans and the languages of the immigrant servile populations are referred to as substrates. The distinction can be captured in more specific terms such as *endogenous* and *exogenous* substrates (cf. Chaudenson 1977).

The linguistic composition of endogenous and exogenous substrates is usually rather different. When the substrate language(s) of a creole is/are spoken by the native population of a colony, it is usually composed of a single language or a number of genetically related and typologically similar languages. Exogenous substrates are often composed of a number of different languages, as the slaves were typically acquired from more than one area. This will be illustrated in the subsequent sections.

2.1.2.1 Atlantic and Indian Ocean Creoles

The majority of the creoles spoken in the Atlantic and Indian Ocean areas have an exogenous substrate. Languages that constituted the substrates of Atlantic and Indian Ocean creoles were brought to the colonies of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans as a result of the introduction of slavery. When British, Dutch, French, Spanish and Portuguese colonizers settled on the West African coast, in South America and on the islands of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, they soon realized that the exploration of these areas would require mass employment of labor force (see section 2.2.1.2). The intensity of exploration, the severity of labor conditions together with the hostility of the tropical climate and the danger of new, unknown disease environments dictated the necessity to
employ forced labor, slaves, who would be available in large numbers, cheap and prone to the severe environmental conditions. After some unsuccessful experiments with the local Amerindian population, the choice of the colonizers turned to Africa, which became virtually the sole provider of enslaved laborers for the whole period of European colonialism.

In order to establish which African languages were involved in the creation of the Atlantic and Indian Ocean creoles under study, one needs to establish the ethnolinguistic background of the enslaved populations of the colonies where these creoles came into existence. In this section, I will consider the ethnolinguistic composition of the slave exportation areas for the Atlantic and Indian Oceans and discuss ways of assessing substrate contribution to a creole.

In the colonies of the Atlantic, the overwhelming majority of slaves came from Niger-Congo-speaking Africa. The Afro-European slave trade involved the whole West African coast and parts of Central Africa. European slave traders, with the exception of the Portuguese who cooperated with rulers in the interior of Angola, did not venture inland. Therefore, almost all slaves came from places that were situated not more than 200-300 kilometers from the coastal line ([Curtin 1969: 102; Manning 1982: 32; Postma 2005: 119]). The area involved in the slave trade was divided by the Europeans into a number of exportation zones, which were often identified by their most important export. Table 2.1 gives an overview of these zones and a corresponding overview of their linguistic composition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slave exportation zones</th>
<th>Their modern correspondences</th>
<th>Language groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UPPER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegambia</td>
<td>Senegal-Gambia-Guinea</td>
<td>West Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bissau</td>
<td>Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Sierra Leone-Liberia</td>
<td>West Atlantic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(up to Monrovia)</td>
<td>Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windward Coast</td>
<td>Liberia-Ivory Coast</td>
<td>Kru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>up to Assini River</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gold Coast</td>
<td>Ivory Coast-Ghana</td>
<td>Kwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Benin</td>
<td>Togo, Benin, Nigeria</td>
<td>Kwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Slave Coast)</td>
<td>(up to Niger Delta)</td>
<td>Delto-Benuic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Biafra</td>
<td>Nigeria-Cameroon</td>
<td>Delto-Benuic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equatorial Guinea</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>north of Gabon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bantu (Congo-Angola area)</td>
<td>South of Gabon, Congo, Angola</td>
<td>Bantu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1. Slave exportation zones in the Atlantic and their linguistic compositions, based on [Curtin 1969], [Parkvall 2000], and [Postma 2005].

For logistical reasons, slave trade in the Indian Ocean involved areas different from the Atlantic slave trade. Although some slaves were imported from West Africa,
namely, Senegambia and Bight of Benin, many were drawn from Mozambique, Madagascar and even from India. The areas involved in the Indian Ocean slave trade together with the languages that are spoken there are listed in table 2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slave exportation areas</th>
<th>Language groups and their most important representatives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegambia</td>
<td>West Atlantic, Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bight of Benin (Slave Coast)</td>
<td>Kwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Malayo-Polynesian (Malagasy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>Indo-Aryan, Dravidian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The overview of the slave-trading areas in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans suggests that the colonial slave populations were made up of speakers of a large number of (sometimes typologically distant) languages. In view of the linguistic diversity of the slaves, creolists inevitably face the issue of how to establish the substrate contribution in each particular case of creole formation.

Until the end of the 20th century, many scholars neglected this issue. In substrate-oriented research on the Atlantic Creoles, there was an assumption that Niger-Congo languages were typologically similar. Therefore, in order to establish structural parallels between creoles and Niger-Congo, any representative of the family could be used for comparison. In practice, this led to studies which would deliberately pick a Niger-Congo language showing similar structural properties to the ones found in a creole in order to make a case for substrate influence. Given the large number and diversity of languages in the Niger-Congo family, the chance to find such correspondences just by accident was quite high. This methodological flaw is referred to as the Cafeteria Principle.

Nowadays, the methods of substratist research have significantly improved. For instance, Kouwenberg (2007, 2009), in her work on the substrate sources of Jamaican Creole, emphasizes that, despite a certain typological affinity which surely exists between the branches of the Niger-Congo family, they still show a great amount of diversity, and that this needs to be taken into account. Needless to say, this statement also holds for the substrate languages of the rest of the Atlantic creoles as well as Indian Ocean creoles, which include representatives from different language families.

Therefore, contemporary substratist research focuses on the attempts to put together historical-demographic and linguistic evidence in order to identify the relevant substrate(s) for each individual creole. Historical-demographic evidence concerns all the information (e.g., slave shipment records, colonial population censuses, etc.) about which ethnonlinguistic groups were well-represented among the slave population at any given moment. Linguistic evidence concerns observed structural (grammatical, lexical and phonetic) similarities between a creole and its potential substrate. Both types of
evidence should be carefully valued against what we know about creole genesis and language change in general.

As for linguistic evidence, particularly significant are those similarities that do not correspond to universally pervasive, unmarked features, which could arise in a creole independently from substrate influence. Therefore, not every feature that a creole and its potential substrate have in common may be interpreted as an indication of substrate influence.

Historical-demographic evidence is equally important in substratist research, as it helps to include only possible candidates for the establishment of linguistic parallels between a creole and an alleged substrate. However, only the correct interpretation of this evidence can give one a hint as to the most likely substrates. While almost all the available exportation areas were represented in the slave population of many colonies, the proportion of different linguistic groups was unequal. Although it has been often suggested that slave owners strove to put together slaves with different ethnolinguistic backgrounds to make it harder for them to conspire and to escape, in practice the policy of ethnolinguistic separation was quite difficult to implement and it remained a nicety rather than an operating principle (cf. Singler 1988). European slave owners were dependent on their relationship with the local slave traders and on what was available on the market. Therefore, at different periods in the history of a colony, slave importations from certain regions would usually prevail.

It has been argued that creolization happened rapidly, within the first few decades after the formation of the plantation slave community. A large number of studies demonstrate that the languages of the ethnic groups which dominated among the colonial slave population at this linguistically critical time exerted the most profound influence on the structure of an emerging creole. Mufwene identified this tendency as the Founder Principle (Mufwene 2001, and other work).

Although historical-demographic evidence for the linguistically crucial early stages of creolization is not equally available for all creoles and is usually quite scarce, when combined with the comparative linguistic data compiled in such large-scale studies as Parkvall (2000) as well as in studies of the linguistic history of individual creoles (e.g., Baker 1972, 1982, 1984; Ferraz 1979; Den Besten 1986; Smith 1987; Smith et al. 1987; Arends 1989; Kouwenberg 1994, 2007; Lefebvre 1998; Lorenzino 1998; Hagemeijer 2005; Schwegler 2006; Cardoso 2009; Grant 2011; Hagemeijer and Ota 2011), it provides a rather accurate indication as to which substrate languages were involved in the creation of each of the Atlantic and Indian Creoles under study. In table 2.3, I have summarized the information on the substrate languages of the Atlantic creoles considered. As the table shows, with the sole exception of Berbice Dutch, for which only one substrate language has been identified (Smith et al. 1987), most Atlantic creoles in our sample are said to have more than one important substrate. Cape Verdean, which has been developed and is spoken in the Upper Guinea area, is the only creole whose substrate languages belong to the languages of Upper Guinea: Atlantic and
Mande. The rest of the creoles have Lower Guinean (Kwa, Delto-Benuic) and Bantu substrates.

As for Mauritian Creole, the only Indian Ocean creole in the sample, its major substrates include Kwa, Bantu and Malagasy. While Kwa (Gbe) prevailed in the early stages of creolization, the influence of Bantu and Malagasy is likely to have been more significant in the later stages (cf. Baker 1984).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creole</th>
<th>Major substrate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>Bantu (Kikongo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe, Akan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bantu (Kikongo), Benue-Congo (Edo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eastern Ijo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe, Akan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean</td>
<td>Bantu (Kikongo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Santome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bantu (Kikongo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benue-Congo (Edo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean</td>
<td>Atlantic (Bambara, Temne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mande (Mandinka)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bantu (Kikongo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>Bantu (Kikongo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3. The major substrate languages of the Atlantic creoles studied here.

2.1.2.2 Afrikaans

Some of the creole languages studied here have a mixture of exogenous and endogenous substrates. One of them is Afrikaans. In addition to the dialects of early Modern Dutch (particularly, South-Hollandic) and L2 varieties spoken by non-Dutch European colonial population, the linguistic feature pool that led to the formation of Afrikaans consisted of the languages of the native population of the Cape colony, the Khoekhoens, and of the slaves of African and Asian provenance (cf. Den Besten 1986; Van der Wouden 2012).

The native inhabitants of the Cape colony, the Khoekhoens, all spoke one language with a number of mutually intelligible dialects. This language, known as Khoikhoi, is a Khoisan language. The Khoikhoi dialects, once spoken by the Cape Khoekhoen, (West) Cape Hottentot and East Cape Hottentot, are now extinct, and not much is known about their syntax. However, other dialects of the language, Korana and Nama, which appear to display structural similarity to the dialects of Cape Hottentot, are relatively well described. According to Den Besten (1986), one may consult their descriptions in order to get an idea of what the structure of Cape Hottentot would have looked like.

As for the immigrant slave population of the Cape, it was ethnolinguistically extremely diverse. Two languages were particularly important among the slaves, as they
were used as lingua francas by the multilingual slave population. These languages were Pasar Malay (“market” Malay) and Indo-Portuguese creole, both originally Asian contact languages.

2.1.2.3 Tok Pisin

Tok Pisin developed in the Pacific area as a result of contact between English and the local Oceanic (Austronesian) substrate. The history of Pacific Pidgin English includes a number of different stages from a socio-economic point of view. It started with whaling, which was followed by sandalwood and bêche-de-mer\(^2\) trade, which was then followed by external and, later on, internal labor recruitment for plantations. These successive contexts brought English, spoken at first by the crewmembers of the whaling ships, then by sandalwood and bêche-de-mer and, later, labor traders, in contact with Central Eastern Oceanic languages spoken by the populations of New Caledonia, the Loyalty Islands, the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands. (Keesing 1988; Goulden 1990; Baker 1993). Later on, when Pacific Pidgin was transferred to Papua New Guinea, it came in contact with the Western Oceanic language Tolai (Mosel 1980).

Due to the enormous linguistic diversity of the Pacific area and inter-island mobility of the population, it is practically impossible to establish which individual languages provided substrate material for Pacific Pidgin. This concerns in particular the early substrate strata composed of Central-Eastern Oceanic languages.

This problem appears less significant if we take into account Keesing’s (1988) point that “the substrate languages that could have provided models for an emerging Pacific pidgin at successive stages in the 19th century, while spoken over a vast area, are genetically and typologically rather homogenous. The majority of languages spoken in Melanesia fall in the Oceanic subgroup of Austronesian, and most of them fall in a subgroup of Oceanic identified as ‘Central/Eastern Oceanic” (cf. Lynch et al. 2002).

According to Keesing (1988), Eastern Oceanic languages share a lot of core structural properties. If we assume that the structural stabilization and homogenization (leveling out) of the pidgin, which most likely took place during the periods of extractive trades and plantations, involved elimination of individually occurring idiosyncratic L1-based patterns\(^3\) we can hypothesize that in the later Pacific Pidgin, as well as in its modern varieties, we are most likely to find features shared by Eastern Oceanic languages.

---

\(^2\) bêche-de-mer (lit. ‘sea-spade’) is a marine animal that belongs to the class of sea cucumbers; rumored to be an aphrodisiac.

\(^3\) The relevance of typological congruence has been repeatedly pointed out in language contact as well as second language acquisition studies. It has been shown that typologically congruent features from different languages in contact tend to reinforce each other and have therefore better chances to be preserved in the emerging contact variety than idiosyncratic features present in one language, with no parallels in the remainder of the contact environment (cf. Aboh and Ansaldo 2007).
Another problem related to the establishment of the sources of non-European features concerns Tok Pisin specifically. Unlike other modern varieties of Pacific Pidgin, after the abolition of external labor recruitment, Tok Pisin continued its development in an area linguistically different from the area where the development of the earlier Pacific Pidgin took place. The Western Oceanic languages of Bismarck Archipelago, spoken in the part of Papua New Guinea whose population was involved in indentured labor recruitment, show fewer structural resemblances to Eastern Oceanic languages than the latter do amongst each other. In Keesing’s words, “many patterns pervasive in Eastern Oceanic languages [and found in Pacific Pidgin – E.B.] are either absent or attenuated in the Oceanic languages of Bismarck Archipelago” (Keesing 1988: 116). According to Keesing, by the time Tok Pisin was transplanted to an alien linguistic environment, it represented a stabilized and elaborated pidgin, thus many of its well-established Melanesian features survived. However, over time the pidgin underwent some new developments and therefore “bent in the direction of the dominant local substrate” (172) Kanua (Tolai). In other words, some of its Eastern Oceanic structural patterns either disappeared or were modified under the influence of the new substrate.

In view of these multiple layers of temporally stratified substrate influence, one inevitably faces the question of how to establish at which stage of pidgin development one must search for the origin of non-European features attested in modern Tok Pisin. Fortunately, the existence of other modern varieties of Pacific Pidgin that have continued to develop in the Eastern Oceanic linguistic environment offers a solution to this problem. Given the considerable period of shared history, it is reasonable to assume the structural features that are attested both in the earlier pidgin and in all its modern varieties are likely to have been incorporated from the earlier Eastern Oceanic substrate. The structural features specific to Tok Pisin, with no resemblance in other modern varieties or in the earlier pidgin, are likely to be due to the later Tolai influence. Therefore, although the focus of the present work is on Tok Pisin, other modern varieties of Pacific Pidgin as well as data available from earlier stages of its existence have also been considered.

2.1.2.4 Chabacano

Chabacano, or Philippine Creole Spanish, is spoken in several regions of the Philippines. The six regional varieties of the language were subject to influence from different, albeit genetically related and typologically close, Philippine languages. The three earliest varieties of Chabacano, Ternateño (spoken in Ternate), Caviteño (spoken in Cavite City) and Ermiteño (once spoken in the old district of Ermita in Manila), dating back to the 16th and 17th century, are assumed to have Tagalog as their substrate. Zamboangueño (spoken in Zamboanga city and neighboring areas) and its two offshoots Davauéño and Cotabateño are assumed to have been influenced by Cebuano (cf. Grant 2011).
2.1.2.5 Diu Portuguese

Despite the presence of African slaves, emphasized by Cardoso (2009), Diu Portuguese has a predominantly endogenous substrate, the Indo-Aryan language Gujarati.

2.2 Socio-historical aspects

In section 2.1, we established that all the languages under study emerged out of a contact between typologically distinct (groups of) languages, usually a European superstrate and a non-European (Niger-Congo, Khoisan, Austronesian or Indo-Aryan) substrate. However, none of the languages considered here (and none of the known contact languages) represents an even 50/50 mixture of European and non-European features. Most creoles have a predominantly European lexicon, while their structure typically displays both European and non-European features. The extent to which creoles depart from their superstrate language and absorb substrate features in their structure differs from one individual case to another. Based on the relative distance from the superstrate, some researchers distinguish radical creoles, semi-creoles, mesolectal creoles, and colonial dialects. Also, contact languages differ with regard to their structural complexity (i.e. elaboration of morphological means) and stability. These are assumed to be the properties that distinguish creoles from (prototypical) pidgins. The aforementioned differences can be related to the differences in the socio-historical context in which different contact varieties emerge and develop. The impact of the socio-historical settings on the process of creole (and contact language) formation will be the matter of the subsequent sections.

2.2.1 The amount of contact between groups of colonial population

In this section, we shall compare the types of socio-historical settings that give rise to contact varieties sometimes identified in the literature as radical creoles, semi-creoles, mesolectal creoles and colonial dialects. As mentioned above, the main criterion used in this classification is the relative distance between a contact language and its superstrate, or the amount of superstrate-derived as opposed to substrate-derived features and features that may have emerged in a creole as a result of UG-based independent developments. Radical creoles such as Saramaccan, Sranan or Haitian are those with the greatest amount of non-European features, which, depending on the framework, are accounted for either in terms of substrate influence (e.g., Lefebvre 1998) or language universals (e.g., Bickerton 1981). Languages that are classified as semi-creoles (Afrikaans, Brazilian Vernacular Portuguese, African American Vernacular English) contain a much greater amount of superstrate-like properties than radical creoles, allegedly, due to incomplete creolization. The same characterization applies to
mesolectal creoles with the only difference that they are assumed to have departed from the erstwhile basilect as a result of decreolization, a process whereby “original” creole features are replaced with features from the superstrate. Colonial dialects are the least restructured contact varieties and bear close resemblance to the superstrate. Unlike creoles, they are often conceived of as offshoots of the European (Germanic or Romance) genealogical lineage.

Typically, the relative amount of superstrate-derived features in a contact variety correlates positively with the amount of contact between the non-European population of the colony and speakers of the superstrate. In what follows, we shall thus focus on how different socio-historical settings regulate (i.e. promote or restrict) language contact between colonizers and colonized populations.

As many creolization scenarios consider the break or impairment in the transmission of the superstrate a crucial condition for creolization (see Chapter 3), this topic has received much attention in the literature. Some studies demonstrate the impact of the socio-economic and political context on the outcome of language contact by opposing different types of colonial settings. Such studies typically emphasize the difference between the two types of colonial settings: the homestead society (la société d’habitation) and the plantation society (la société de plantation) (Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Chaudenson 2003). Faraclas et al. (2007) and Faraclas (2011) perform a detailed comparison of the political, cultural and socio-economic profile of these two types based on the discussion of the Hispanic as opposed to the British, French and Dutch colonization systems.

2.2.1.1 Homestead societies

It has repeatedly been pointed out in the literature that the population of many Hispanic colonies in South America, Cuba or Brazil did not develop a creole (e.g., McWhorter 2000). Instead, both the slaves and their masters ended up speaking a (perhaps, slightly “africanized”) dialect of the metropolitan European language. As argued in Faraclas et al. (2007), this is related to the fact that many colonies of the Hispanic nations were of a homestead type.

In a typical homestead society, economic activities were diversified: they included smallholdings, mines and ranching. Plantation agriculture, including sugar planting, was limited and often not very successful. Most of the laborers were Europeans, and when African slaves were involved, their proportion never significantly exceeded the 1:1 ratio. There was no strict labor division between slaves and freemen: African slaves often worked side by side with European peasants (cf. Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Chaudenson 2003). Faraclas et al. (2007) point out a few other factors that promoted the spread of the Spanish language and culture by the colonized populations in Hispanic colonies.

As far as social ideology is concerned, in Hispanic colonies, there was also no strict dichotomization between the Blacks and the Whites. Although considerations of
race played a role in the organization of social relations in the colonial communities and in the conceptualization of slavery, the boundaries between races, as well as between slaves and freemen were not impenetrable. A phenomenon that contributed significantly to the relaxation of racial distinctions was that of frequent intermarriage between European males and African females. These unions were of high linguistic significance. Firstly, they enhanced the spread of the European language among the African population. Secondly, the children born of such marriages were recognized by their fathers and raised in European culture and religion. These children created an intermediate Spanish-speaking group that consolidated the cultural and linguistic space of the colonial community.

For the Spanish, colonization of other peoples was not only part of the economic enterprise. They also considered it culturally and religiously significant and aimed to integrate the colonized peoples into their civilization. Therefore, they were interested in the spread of the Spanish language and culture and encouraged the participation of slaves in practices and institutions mediated by the Spanish language. On the other hand, despite their civilizing mission, the Spanish did not place a ban on African socioeconomic and cultural traditions, which, channeled through the Spanish cultural forms and structures, became an integral part of Spanish Caribbean life. This latter facilitated the integration of the slave population into the Spanish-dominated colonial community.

The socio-economic, political and cultural settings in the Hispanic colonies facilitated and encouraged the acquisition and use of the colonial language by the slave population. Firstly, the interaction between the masters and their slaves was intimate and systematic enough for the latter to gain sufficient access to the native speaker models of the European language. Secondly, the high level of socio-economic and cultural co-integration between the two groups of colonial population made the European language not only an available, but also a useful communication tool in an emerging multiethnic community dominated by the Europeans.

Another example of a homestead colonial community not considered in Faraclas et al. (2007) is the Cape Colony. The topography of the Cape was unsuitable for plantation agriculture (Roberge 1993). Therefore, no large-scale plantations were developed at the Cape. The demographic evolution of the Cape society also corresponded to the homestead type of economic structure (cf. Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001). In the initial stages, the number of Europeans exceeded the number of slaves. Numerical parity was only reached around 1730 (almost eighty years after the establishment of the settlement) and, in 1798, the number of slaves exceeded the number of Europeans only by 29% (Roberge 1993). Thus, the slave population of the Cape never became significantly larger than the European settler population. Also, homestead economy did not create conditions for the concentration of large groups of slaves in one household. Since the farms at the Cape were generally small, the number of slaves working together on a farm was also small. Households existed in relative isolation from one another. This deprived the slaves of an opportunity to interact among each other
regularly on the community level and prevented the formation and consolidation of a distinct slave cultural and linguistic tradition (unlike in plantation colonies).

The interaction between slaves and their masters within the small households was, on the other hand, frequent and intimate. The slaves as well as the Khoekhoen serfs formed part of the immediate household and were considered “an integral part of the family” (Deumert 2004: 28). Sexual encounters and ethnically mixed marriages between European males and Khoekhoen or slave females were also quite frequent, especially in the first decades of the settlement, when the scarcity of European women in the colony led to mixed unions (Shell 1994).

Dutch was very important in the interaction between slaves, serfs and their masters within one household. And, since this interaction was regular and intimate, it provided the grounds for the consolidation of native and non-native varieties of Dutch, giving both native and non-native speakers motivation and opportunity to closely approximate each other’s linguistic codes. As a result of the process of mutual approximation, European settlers, slaves and Khoekhoen serfs came to share a common language, Afrikaans, which, based on its close affinity with the superstrate, is often classified not as a creole but as a semi-creole or creoloid.

2.2.1.2  Plantation societies

Plantation communities predominantly flourished in the colonies of England, France, and the Netherlands in the 18th century. Having started their colonial expansion with the establishment of smallholder-based homestead settlements with a predominance of European indentured servants and a low proportion of African slaves, the Dutch and, following them, the English and the French, soon reoriented to large-scale sugar production.

The introduction of large-scale sugar plantations in the colonies totally reshaped the demographic composition of the colonial communities. It brought about a dramatic increase in the size of the slave population, changing the ratio of Europeans to Africans from 1:1 or even less to ratios as high as 1:10 or even 1:20, in some colonies, in few decades. For example, the shift from tobacco to sugar in Haiti, which occurred in the early 1690s (just over thirty years after the establishment of the colony), triggered a rapid increase in the proportion of the slave population. From the 34.8% documented for 1681 it rose to 87.8% by 1721 (Singler 1995: 210). In pre-plantation Jamaica, the proportion of slaves to the European population was of about 1:7. Once the plantation system had been established, around 1670-75, the proportion of slaves quickly rose to 10:1 (Dunn 2000: 155; Mufwene 1996: 92). The social structure of colonial communities, the relationships and patterns of interaction between the two groups of the colonial population were also strongly affected by the introduction of plantation economies. Sugar crops resulted not only in the increase of the number of African slaves, but also in the removal of European laborers from the plantations (Singler 1995). Given the intensity of labor, the severe conditions and the danger of tropical diseases,
those who had a choice chose not to work on sugar plantations. As a result, the workforce on sugar plantations soon consisted only of African slaves. The harsh exploitation and mistreatment of the slave population required justification. The “justification” was provided by the ideology of racial segregation based on the assumption of the inferiority of black people. The associated concepts of race and slavery came to underlie the life of colonial communities. In the era of sugar production, colonial societies acquired a rigid dichotomous structure: large masses of politically and economically powerless slaves were totally dominated by small groups of European masters. There were very few social links between the two groups of colonial population. Slaves were excluded from most social and cultural practices mediated by the European language (see, for example, *Le Code Noir* ‘The Black Code’ from 1685, which regulated the rights of the slaves and their masters in all French colonies). The northern European nations were not interested in spreading their language and culture among the colonized populations and did not encourage learning among the slaves. In some colonies, such as Surinam, slaves were even explicitly forbidden to speak the language of their masters (Smith 2006: 53).

Under these conditions, interaction between the two groups of the colonial population became both quantitatively and qualitatively restricted. This had two related consequences. Firstly, the exposure of the slaves to native speaker models of the European language was much lower than their exposure to L2 models, spoken by other slaves (although in the beginning of the plantation phase there were “old” slaves with a good command of the colonial language, their proportion quickly decreased in course of the rapid importation of newcomers). Secondly, native speaker models lost their pragmatic value. With the segregation of the slave population, slave-to-slave (as opposed to slave-to-master) interaction began to prevail. The motivation to approximate the European language the way it was spoken by the masters (which was supposedly present in the earliest days, when contact between the masters and the slaves was more frequent and intimate) disappeared. The relaxation of the European norm gave way to the process of restructuring and the massive penetration of features from the native languages of the slaves, which resulted in the emergence of an autonomous language, a creole. Some researchers claim that it was not mere lack of motivation, but that plantation slaves deliberately refused to speak the language of their oppressors and created their own language in opposition to the language of the Whites. This new language, with its pervasive non-European element, became the signifier of their distinctive identity, intra-group solidarity, and resistance to oppression (e.g., Baker 1990).

### 2.2.1.3 Maroon communities

Sugar plantations did not represent the only setting for creole formation. Another phenomenon in the history of colonization that resulted in creole genesis was marronage,
“the mass escape of slaves from the forced labor in the colonies and the subsequent establishment of their own communities” (Arends 1994: 16).

Maroon communities settled in remote, not easily reachable areas, isolating themselves from the European colonial regime. Plantation creoles, already mastered by those runaway slaves who had spent a considerable amount of time working on the plantation, continued to serve as the medium of interethnic communication. However, due to a decrease in the amount of contact with Europeans as well as with plantation slaves, and because of the fact that the maroons were sometimes joined by slaves who fled from plantations shortly after their arrival to the colony and who therefore had a poor knowledge of the plantation creole, maroon communities developed their own language varieties, nowadays referred to as *maroon creoles*. Despite showing much affinity with the plantation creoles they are historically related to, maroon creoles can be clearly distinguished from their ancestors in terms of grammatical, lexical and phonological properties.

Among the languages that will be discussed in the present work there is one maroon creole, Palenquero. It developed within the Spanish Empire, in the territory of Colombia. It was created in the 17th century by the runaway slaves employed in building the fortifications of Cartagena, the most important entrepôt of Spanish slave trade in the 16th and 17th centuries (Bickerton & Escalante 1970: 255; Curtin 1969: 45). These runaway slaves settled in areas of dense swamps and jungles, where they established a village known as Palenque de San Basilio (hence, the name of the creole).

### 2.2.1.4 Post-colonial creole society and decreolization

While homestead communities are considered to have led to a less radical restructuring of the superstrate, or unfinished creolization, post-colonial creole societies are considered to have provided conditions for decreolization, or reunification of the creole with its superstrate. While the term “decreolization” (as well as “creolization”) is criticized by some scholars (e.g., DeGraff 2005) as it conveys the idea of a departure from the creole state thus presupposing that a creole is a linguistic entity qualitatively distinct from a non-creole, it has been empirically demonstrated that prolonged contact between a creole and its superstrate, usually combined with pressure from the superstrate as the model of correctness and the language of bigger opportunities, results in the development of more superstrate-like varieties of a creole identified together as the mesolect. The mesolect is considered to form a continuum between the basilect (i.e. the form of a creole maximally different from the superstrate, which often represents a theoretical abstraction in the sense that it is not spoken in real life in its pure form) and the acrolect (i.e. the local standard of the superstrate). This continuum is referred to as the post-creole speech continuum. The term “post-creole” implies that the mesolect is assumed to have developed later than the basilect. The process of decreolization is commonly attributed to the socio-economic restructuring of colonial communities in the post-Emancipation era, which brought about greater social mobility and broader access
to education for the descendants of slaves (cf. Rickford 1987). Some researchers (e.g., Alleyne 1980), however, believe that basilectal and mesolectal varieties develop simultaneously. Under this perspective, the decretolization scenario does not apply and there is no difference between mesolectal creoles and semi-creoles.

### 2.2.2 Creoles and pidgins

While pidgins are usually opposed to creoles on linguistic grounds as being less stable and less elaborated, structurally and lexically, these differences can be shown to be the product of the socio-economic settings in which these two types of contact languages usually emerge (cf. Mufwene 2001). Pidgins often develop in trade colonies, when groups of speakers of different languages need to communicate and have no existing common means of communication. A pidgin does not become anybody’s native language and does not replace the native languages of the groups in contact. Its existence is context-dependent and its use, typically, remains restricted to certain thematic areas (e.g. trade). Given their limited application, typical pidgins remain lexically and structurally limited.

Although the once popular assumption that every creole is preceded by a pidgin, the so-called pidgin-to-creole life cycle (cf. Hall 1966), is not empirically supported and has severe opponents (e.g. Mufwene 2001; Chaudenson 2003), the history of some contact varieties demonstrates that, provided the right circumstances, a pidgin may develop into a stable contact variety indistinguishable from those that are commonly identified as creoles. One such example is Tok Pisin.

Regular contact between Europeans and Pacific islanders began at the end of the 18th century. European commercial activities in the Pacific began with whaling operations in the South Pacific. Whaling ships usually undertook voyages that lasted for two or three years. Voyages of this length required the renewal of both supplies and lost crewmen. The ships’ crews would come ashore in search of food, water and firewood. Some crewmen deserted the ships and settled among the natives. On the other hand, when crewmembers were lost as a result of such desertions or accidents, Pacific islanders often took their places among the already multilingual crewmen community, whose working language was (restructured) English (cf. Clark 1979-80, 1983) (see section 2.1.1).

The contact of native Pacific Islanders with the crewmen and traders of frequently passing ships, and even more so the participation of the islanders as crew members on these ships, preconditioned the emergence and spread of an early English-based contact variety in the Pacific area. This variety is referred to as South Pacific Jargon (Clark 1983: 13) or South Seas Jargon (Clark 1979-80: 14).

With the decline of whaling activities in the 1860s, the focus of language contact shifted from Polynesia and Micronesia to Melanesia, specifically the Loyalty Islands, Isle des Pins, New Caledonia and the southern New Hebrides, where sandalwood and bêche-de-mer trade took place. The processing of sandalwood and the
extraction of bêche-de-mer were both time-consuming and required the establishment of shore stations and long-term employment of the natives. Europeans involved in sandalwood and bêche-de-mer trade also had to spend a longer time ashore waiting for the cargo to be ready than whalers did. Thus, sandalwood and bêche-de-mer trade provided more continuous and stable contact settings.

Unlike on board whaling ships, in the extractive trade settings, Europeans constituted a minority among the native Melanesians. Among the linguistic diversity of Melanesia, there was no single vernacular they could acquire that would suffice to interact with all the native laborers. Furthermore, the laborers themselves often had no common native language or lingua franca. It is suggested in the literature (Clark 1979, 1983) that, for safety reasons, European traders in the Pacific attempted to implement a strategy already known from the history of the West African slave trade, namely, bringing together the laborers from different areas so that they could not combine against the employer. In the context of the Pacific, it implied employing laborers from different islands, who spoke languages different from the one spoken by the natives of the island that hosted the stations. Thus, the working conditions on sandalwood and bêche-de-mer stations created a need for a lingua franca to be used not only in European-to-non-European contact but also as a means of communication among the Pacific Islanders themselves. The South Seas Jargon spoken by some crewmembers (among which there were many Polynesians) of the trading vessels began to spread among Melanesians and came to fulfill this function.

The use of South Seas Jargon in non-native-to-non-native interaction enhanced the incorporation of non-European grammatical features, leading to further autonomization of the contact variety from English. And the more stable and continuous contact settings provided conditions for the stabilization of its distinct structure.

The exhaustion of sandalwood in Melanesia took place at the same time as sugar and coconut plantations started to develop in Queensland (Australia) and Samoa. As already observed in section 2.2.1.2, the introduction of sugar agriculture always produced a large demand of cheap labor force. As neither the natives of the areas where the plantations were established nor the Europeans were willing to work on plantations, plantation owners turned to the nearest and already familiar source, Melanesia. By that time, slavery had been abolished and plantation owners made use of another way of labor force recruitment, namely indenturing. The first laborers for the plantations of Queensland were recruited from the same islands that were involved in sandalwood and bêche-de-mer trade (the Loyalty Islands, New Caledonia and the New Hebrides). Only later did the recruitment spread northwards to the Solomon Islands and, eventually, New Guinea. Thus, many of those who went to Queensland were by then already speakers of Sandalwood English (the variety of Pidgin English developed at the time of sandalwood and bêche-de-mer trade). In addition, some of the former sandalwood traders engaged in labor recruitment (Clark 1983; Keesing 1988). Such interchange of people involved in the sandalwood and labor trades provided a condition for the continuity of the linguistic tradition. The plantations played a crucial role in the development of the trade pidgin
towards a more stable and extended variety. In plantation settings, linguistically heterogeneous laborers lived together for a period of several years. This intensified the need for a common language and provided a community with greater continuity, in which it could develop (Clark 1983). During the plantation period, the English-based pidgin developed on the islands of southern Melanesia underwent leveling of variation, the establishment of community-wide norms, and further elaboration and extension of functions. Thus, a more stable and complex variety emerged. By the end of the 1870s, a rather homogenous language was in use in Queensland, and it spread to southern Melanesia as laborers returned home from the plantations. This language is referred to as Melanesian Pidgin (Clark 1983: 22). Despite its name, Melanesian Pidgin is a full-fledged language that neither structurally, nor functionally conforms to the pidgin prototype (which is based on such languages as Russennorsk, a trade pidgin created by Russian traders and Norwegian fishermen from northern Norway and the Russian Kola peninsula). Therefore, in the literature it is often characterized as an extended pidgin.

Up till the end of the 1870s, New Guinea, which was then controlled by Germany, did not form part of the pidgin English linguistic space. New Guineans only went to Queensland in 1883-1884, but many more went to Samoa starting in 1879, when the Germans established copra plantations there. By that time, the natives of the New Hebrides or the Solomon Islands were already present in Samoan plantations and they remained numerically dominant up to 1885. Many of them had already worked on Queensland plantations (which were established earlier) and were thus speakers of Melanesian Pidgin. The contact variety spoken by the founder labor community was adopted in Samoa by the new arrivals from New Guinea. After 1885, no more laborers from the New Hebrides and the Solomon Islands went to Samoa. This broke the continuity of the linguistic tradition originating in Queensland, and Melanesian Pidgin began to diverge into two different varieties.

When, at the turn of the century, external recruitment was abolished and the laborers returned to their home islands, the extended pidgin they brought with them began to spread among the locals. The linguistic heterogeneity of Melanesia and the lack of a common language created facilitating conditions for the spread of the extended pidgin, which had already proved suitable to function as a lingua franca. In particular, it was adopted as a means of communication by the internal labor force employed at the plantations established on the New Hebrides, the Solomon Islands, and in New Guinea, which continued to exist after external labor recruitment was abolished. In each country, Melanesian Pidgin continued to undergo independent developments. This led to the emergence of the three different forms related to Melanesian Pidgin: Bislama (from bêche-de-mer) in the New Hebrides (nowadays Vanuatu), Pijin in the Solomon Islands, and Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea. Although their names preserve the history of their origins in a pidgin (Pijin and Tok Pisin), they neither structurally nor functionally conform to the pidgin prototype. Similarly to the creole languages spoken in the Atlantic and Indian Oceans, they are full-fledged languages, with both L1 and L2 speakers. In the literature on Tok Pisin, L1 and L2 varieties of the language are referred to as creole and
extended pidgin, respectively. However, the two terms are sometimes also used interchangeably to characterize Tok Pisin in its contemporary state.

2.3 Summary and discussion

In this chapter, I considered the linguistic and socio-historical settings of contact language formation. I established that, from the linguistic perspective, all the languages considered here are the same in the sense that they represent the outcome of contact between typologically different languages. In each contact situation, one can identify superstrate and substrate languages. While the languages of the European colonizers (English, Dutch, French, Spanish and Portuguese) are identified as superstrate languages, the languages spoken by the native colonized populations of the immigrant slaves are identified as substrate languages. While the superstrate languages were always imported to a colony from Europe, the substrate could be either imported (i.e. the languages of the immigrant slaves) or local (i.e. the languages of the native population of the colony). While local (or endogenous) substrates are typically composed of one language or several genetically and typologically closely related languages, imported (or endogenous) substrates are typically composed of multiple diverse languages.

Despite the fact that the languages under study all have developed due to language contact, some researchers differentiate between the various outcomes of language contact, distinguishing prototypical creoles from semi-creoles, mesolectal creoles, and colonial dialects, and creoles from pidgins. Some creolists (e.g. Bickerton 1981; McWhorter 2005; Bakker et al. 2011) claim that creoles represent a typologically distinct class, qualitatively distinct from “normal” languages as well as from pidgins. Some advocates of this view assume that there is a specific process of creolization that leads to the formation of prototypical creoles and that this process can be incomplete or reversed. The former has as a consequence the formation of semi-creoles and colonial dialects. The latter is described in the literature as decreolization, the departure from the creole prototype in the direction of the superstrate, instantiated by the formation of decreolized, or mesolectal creole varieties.

As the starting point for this study, I will adhere to the null-hypothesis that there are no absolute linguistic criteria distinguishing creoles from non-creoles, as well as from other contact languages classified as pidgins, semi-creoles or colonial dialects. From a linguistic point of view, the classification of contact languages into creoles, semi-creoles, dialects and pidgins is arbitrary as it relies on relative measures such as the proportion of superstrate-derived as opposed to substrate-derived or universally unmarked features or the degree of structural complexity and stability. In section 2.2, I demonstrate that these linguistic differences are the product of the socio-economic settings in which contact varieties emerge and develop. The relative proportion of superstrate features, which distinguishes prototypical creoles from semi-creoles, mesolectal creoles and colonial dialects, depends on the amount and intensity of contact
and the degree of socio-economic integration between the colonizers (who are also the native speakers of the superstrate) and the colonized population groups. These factors regulate the accessibility of L1 models of the superstrate language and determine its functional and symbolic role in the creole community. The degree of structural complexity and stability, which distinguishes creoles from pidgins, is related to the stability and continuity of the language contact situation.

Whether one wants to maintain the terminological distinction within contact languages is a matter of preference and of the purposes of the research one is conducting. The purpose of the present research is to investigate the interaction of language systems in contact, regardless of whether the outcomes of this contact are classified as (extended) pidgins, creoles or semi-creoles. Therefore, in addition to languages unanimously classified in the literature as creoles, the sample includes a semi-creole (Afrikaans), and an extended pidgin (Tok Pisin). In what follows, I will use “creole” as a cover term to refer to all the languages studied here. The terms “semi-creole” or “pidgin” will be invoked when certain socio-historical and linguistic differences between the languages under study need to be emphasized.
Chapter 3

The issue of creole genesis

In the previous chapter, we saw that the contact between typologically different languages in the specific context of the European colonial expansion gave birth to new language varieties identified as creoles. One issue that now remains open is the issue of how exactly creoles came about: which linguistic processes have led to creole formation and what are the sources of creole structures? This issue is known in creolistics as the issue of creole genesis.

The issue of creole genesis constitutes without a doubt the most intriguing and challenging aspect of creole studies. For decades, it has puzzled creolists and attracted the attention of researchers working in other fields of linguistics. Creole genesis has always been the subject of hot debate and scholars remain far from reaching a consensus. In fact, it would be difficult to find any other issue in linguistics that has given rise to so many conflicting theories which, in their radicalism, deny each other completely.

In this chapter, I discuss various proposals concerning the origins of creoles and the processes that led to creole development. In chapter 2, I already mentioned that creoles often developed in settings where slaves did not have sufficient access to the European language. This observation has given rise to the idea that creolization represents the result of a break in normal language transmission. This idea underlies a number of famous scenarios of creoles genesis such as Lefebvre’s (1998) substrate relexification hypothesis and Bickerton’s (1981) universalist Language Bioprogram hypothesis. Break-in-transmission scenarios of creole genesis are discussed in section 3.1. Section 3.2 discusses the opponents of the view of creole formation as a result of the break in language transmission, Chaudenson (2003), Mufwene (2001, and other work), Aboh (2006, 2009), and Ansaldo (2009). Section 3.3 shifts the focus of the discussion from the sources of creoles to the processes underlying creole development. Section 3.4 concludes the chapter.
3.1 Creolization as a result of a break in language transmission

The idea that creoles resulted from a break in normal language transmission has been around for a long time, providing the basis for many prominent theories of creole genesis. The idea goes back to the 19th century, when it was argued that the break in language transmission from masters to slaves resulted from the biologically conditioned inability of the latter to learn a European language (cf. DeGraff 2003, 2005). In post-colonial creole studies, the idea that slaves were unable to learn a European language has remained, having acquired a different explanatory basis. The modern advocates of the break in transmission idea suggest that normal language transmission was barred due to the peculiar linguistic, socio-economic and demographic environment of colonial communities.

In the modern break in transmission scenario, the following factors are considered to be particularly important for understanding the reasons for creolization:

- The ethnolinguistic heterogeneity of the colonial communities, and slave communities in particular.
- An uneven growth of the population groups in plantation communities, which resulted in an extremely high ratio of non-European slaves to European colonizers (see section 2.2.1.2).
- Strict racial segregation, which created a vast socioeconomic distance between the slaves and the European colonizers.

These factors are incorporated into the break-in-transmission creolization scenario in the following way: It is assumed that the colonial order characterized by political, socioeconomic and cultural dominance of the European colonizers put pressure on the slaves to shift to the dominant European language. At the same time, the multilingual settings of slave communities diminished the functionality of the native languages of the slaves. According to Thomason and Kaufman (1988), in normal two-language shift situations the shifting group shares the same native language. This language can continue to be used by this group until all its members become fluent and eventually nativize the target language. Plantation slaves were not granted this prolonged transition phase. While the socio-economic context and the multilingual environment put pressure on the slaves to acquire the European language, access to this language was restricted due to racial segregation and to uneven growth of the European and the slave populations, which made it increasingly difficult for slaves to gain access to L1 models of the European language. Thus, a break in language transmission was determined by the need for rapid language shift in a situation in which the shifting group was deprived of sufficient access to the target language.

Advocates of the idea that creolization resulted from a break in language transmission from the Europeans to the slaves further hypothesized that, in order to reconstitute the language structure lost as a result of this break in transmission, creole
creators had to fall back on sources other than the target language. Regarding the nature of these sources, there are two competing proposals. While some creolists ascribe the primary role in creole formation to innate universal principles of language, others adhere to the idea that creoles acquired their structure as a result of a significant contribution of substrate languages. These two approaches to creole genesis will be considered in detail in the two following sections.

3.1.1 Universalist accounts of creolization and Bickerton’s Language Bioprogram

Before we proceed to the discussion of Bickerton’s Language Bioprogram, it needs to be said the idea that the process of creole genesis was governed by principles or tendencies of the universal nature as such does not necessarily imply the idea that this process is different from the processes of normal language acquisition and development. For instance, some scholars argue for the role of what Muysken and Veenstra (1994) identify as procedural universals in the development of creoles. The term “procedural universals” refers to universal properties of the processes involved in language change such as grammaticalization or second language acquisition. Needless to say, such procedural universals are also assumed to be involved in normal language acquisition and change. This type of universals will be discussed in section 3.3, which deals with the processes underlying creole genesis. In this section, we focus on the ideas of those researchers who believe that language universals and, specifically, Universal Grammar (UG) had a special function in the process of creole genesis, different from the function it has in normal language development.

The idea that language universals might have somehow been involved in the process of creole creation often rests on the assumption that creoles display broad structural similarities which go beyond the similarities that can be accounted for by reference to similarities among the contributing languages. Several scholars have claimed that these cross-creole similarities manifest universally unmarked principles of structural organization. The universally unmarked grammatical properties are often characterized as non-complex and semantically transparent. The semantic transparency theory put forward by Seuren and Wekker (1986) claims that the structure of creole languages manifests universal semantic structures. According to Seuren and Wekker, this is reflected in the fact that creoles often manifest one-to-one correspondence between meaning (a semantic feature) and form (a morpheme). Examples of semantically transparent structures they provide include, for instance, TMA markers and bi-morphemic question words.

The most prominent advocate of the idea that creoles manifest unmarked settings of grammatical organization is Derek Bickerton, who proposed the Language Bioprogram Hypothesis (LBH) of creolization (1981, 1984, 1988). The LBH is based on the observation that creole languages display remarkable structural uniformity. Bickerton (1981) lists 12 structural features diagnostic of prototypical creoles. The list
includes such well-known manifestations of cross-creole uniformity as the expression of
tense, modality and aspect by means of preverbal particles, the use of different forms for
each semantically distinct copula function, and the bimorphemic structure of question
words. One of the typical creole features pointed out by Bickerton, namely the
restriction in use of overt (in)definite determiners to specific nominal expressions, is
very relevant for our discussion of the distribution of (in)definite determiners in creoles
(chapters 8 and 9).

To account for the broad similarity, which he observes even among unrelated
creoles (i.e. creoles that emerged in different geographic areas and had different source
languages), Bickerton proposes that creole structure universally derives from the
Language Bioprogram (LB), a species-specific program for language, which is
“genetically coded <…> in the structures and modes of operation of the human brain”

The idea of the LB explicitly relates to the Chomskyan theory of linguistic
innateness. The latter suggests that a child’s capacity to process a language is provided
by a genetically transmitted human-specific Language Acquisition Device (LAD). The
LAD contains a set of linguistic universals that comprise UG. UG determines the basic
principles of language structure and delimits the range of possible variability. The latter
is determined by a set of parameters, hence the theory of Principles and Parameters.
Operating on the basis of UG principles and parameters, the LAD converts the input a
child receives from the environment into systematic linguistic knowledge. It is important
to realize that, in terms of the Principles and Parameters framework, UG embeds no
preset or unmarked parameter in the absence of linguistic input.

Bickerton’s view differs on this point. As Bickerton (1981: 297) claims, his
work “complements and amplifies” the theory of Chomsky. Contrary to the LAD, which
contains all potential language grammars, Bickerton’s LB specifies a “core structure for
human language” (1981: 297), a set of default, or unmarked grammatical options. As a
child develops, the LB unfolds, providing specific structures that express grammatical
distinctions essential to human language. However, usually, children who are born in the
environment where a full-fledged language is spoken receive a ready input in the form of
this language. This input interferes with the unfolding of the LB. The result of language-
building in accordance with the grammatical settings provided by the LB can only be
observed when the process of language acquisition takes place without adequate input.
And this only obtains when normal language transmission from generation to generation
breaks down, which is what, according to Bickerton, happened in plantation colonies.

In his break-in-transmission scenario, Bickerton employs the famous pidgin-to-
creole life cycle idea (Hall 1966 and much related work), assuming that the emergence
of creoles is always preceded by pidginization, a drastic simplification of the target
language resulting from imperfect L2 acquisition. According to Bickerton, a pidgin
developed by the first generations of adult slaves represented a “highly variable,
extremely rudimentary language state” (1981: 5), a language without grammatical
structure. Children born to the pidgin-speaking adult generation of plantation slaves
found themselves in a “linguistic vacuum” as the pidgin spoken by their parents was not suitable to be acquired and to function as anybody’s first language. Note that Bickerton emphasizes that the transition from a pidgin to a creole happened abruptly, within the lifetime of one generation, and that within such a short time span no structurally stable and referentially adequate pidgin could have developed. With no adequate language they could acquire, these children had to create a new language out of an extremely restricted and structureless input. And, because they were equipped with the innate LB, they were able to fulfill this task. In the absence of evidence for language-specific grammatical settings, which had been stripped away in a pidgin, the LB served as the sole source of linguistic structure. It provided default grammatical settings, reconstructing the essential grammatical distinctions which were lost in a pidgin. According to Bickerton’s scenario, creoles, which were recreated out of pidgins through a process of nativization, universally manifest the same default grammatical settings in their structure.

Bickerton’s scenario of creole genesis represents a radical interpretation of the break in language transmission idea. According to this scenario, no pre-existing language was transmitted and a new language was produced ab ovo. Bickerton argues that only those creoles that emerged as a result of such complete break in language transmission represent pure manifestations of the LB. Other contact languages which are considered to be creoles but which do not fully conform to the LB are, according to Bickerton, results of partial break in transmission, cases in which the transmitted structural properties of the preexisting languages interfere with the LB. In Bickerton’s framework, these latter cases are not considered to be true creoles.

Bickerton posits categorical restrictions on a type of situation which could produce a purely LB-based creole. He argues that a LB-based creole could only be a language that (a) arose out of a prior pidgin which had not existed for more than a generation and (b) developed in a community where no more that 20 percent were native speakers of the dominant language and where the remaining 80 percent (i.e. the slaves) were composed of diverse language groups (1981: 4). Condition (a) rules out the possibility that an incipient pidgin would undergo expansion and acquire a stable grammatical structure prior to the moment of nativization. Condition (b), controls the input from the pre-existing languages, superstrates and substrates. On the one hand, the low proportion of native speakers of the dominant language restricts the access of the slaves to this language, thus excluding the possibility of transmission of its structural properties into the pidgin and, consequently, into the creole. On the other hand, the linguistic heterogeneity of the remaining population, the slaves, largely restricted the functionality of their native languages, making it impossible for these languages to be sustained for more than one generation. As Bickerton (1981: 4) puts it, “[b]y limiting our research area in this way, it becomes possible to concentrate on those situations, in which the human linguistic capacity is stretched to the uttermost”. Thus, Bickerton’s understanding of the term “creole” is a newborn language, with no relation to any preexisting language.
In his later work (1984, 1988), Bickerton rethinks some of his 1981 claims. Most importantly, instead of strictly limiting himself to the cases of complete break in language transmission, he tries to accommodate his model to the deviating cases, in which the transmission was bent but not completely broken. He suggests that there is a continuum between purely LB-based and other creoles, which absorbed elements from the superstrate languages to varying degrees. Instead of the simplistic conditions (a) and (b), he suggests a more flexible model of creole genesis. This new model incorporates a number of variables, which determine the “richness” (=the amount of retained superstrate features) of the pidgin and, hence, the amount of deficit to be reconstructed during creolization. Thus, the model suggests that “the effectiveness of transmission of preexisting languages will vary inversely with the degree to which bioprogram features are able to emerge.” (1984: 176)

Although, in this later model, Bickerton accommodates the possibility of the transmission of superstrate features into the emerging creole, he remains reluctant to the idea that substrate languages could have also played a role in creole formation. He strongly adheres to the assumption that, because of the diversity of languages spoken by the slaves (see condition (b) of Bickerton’s (1981) creolization scenario), none of them could have affected the structure of the emerging creole.

3.1.2 Creole exceptionalism

The idea that creoles develop as the result of a break in normal language transmission and are thus not phylogenetically related to any pre-existing languages has led to a widespread belief which DeGraff (2003, 2005) identified as creole exceptionalism. This is the belief that creoles form a special typological class, somehow different from the rest of the world’s languages. While the idea that creoles can be synchronically defined is highly disputable, it has a number of strong advocates. Although no feature has been found that would be diagnostic of “creoleness”, the advocates of creole exceptionalism commonly argue that creoles are, on the average, morphologically and phonologically less complex than the rest of the world’s languages (although the criteria on which the opposition simple/complex relies are not always clearly formulated). While Bickerton (1981) argued that the prototypical creole features represent manifestations of the unmarked settings of UG, modern advocates of the break-in-transmission scenario relate the lack of complex features in creoles to the fact that creoles are much younger than the rest of the world’s languages.

At present, the most prominent advocate of the break-in-transmission scenario of creole genesis is McWhorter (2001, 2005), who proposes three features to characterize what he identifies as the creole prototype. While many old languages may have one of these prototypically creole features, the combination of the three can, according to McWhorter, only be found in prototypical creoles.
• lack or very restricted range of inflectional morphology (not more than two or three morphemes);
• lack of tone on monosyllabic words and tone-based lexical distinctions;
• lack of semantically opaque derivation.

McWhorter argues that inflectional morphology, tone-based lexical distinctions and semantically opaque word formation are “ornamental” features that typically emerge in languages over time. Creoles, of which the oldest we know of have only existed for five centuries, have not had time to develop these features yet. Interpreting these features as diagnostic of structural simplicity, he concludes that “the world's simplest grammars are Creole grammars”.

McWhorter’s claims are both theoretically and empirically problematic. For instance, Gil (2001) demonstrates that Riau Indonesian structurally conforms to McWhorter’s characteristics of a prototypical creole, although, from a sociohistorical perspective, it cannot be characterized as a creole. Also, there are creole languages that do not conform to the creole prototype. For instance, Berbice Dutch displays multiple instances of inflectional morphology, while Papiamentu and Saramaccan have tonal distinctions. With regard to creoles that deviate from the prototype, similarly to Bickerton (1984), McWhorter observes that creoleness is a matter of degree, which implies that some languages that are identified as creoles on socio-historical grounds would have less affinity with the creole prototype than others.

Parkvall (2008) also argues that creoles, as a group, are less complex than any other typological, geographical, or genealogical groupings of languages. In Bakker et al. (2011), Bakker, Daval-Markussen, Parkvall, and Plag dissociate the issue of creoleness from the simplicity vs. complexity debate. Using computational tools of quantitative typology (i.e. phylogenetic trees and networks) to measure the typological distance between creoles and other world languages, based both on features that are considered typically creole and on an arbitrary set of features, they argue that creoles are extremely similar to each other, which, as they claim, provides empirical evidence that creoles form a structurally distinguishable subgroup of the world’s languages.

These modern advocates of the assumption that creoles are different from other world languages limit their claims to the synchronic definition of creoles. They explicitly state that they “consider creoles in a comparative and synchronic perspective, and […] do not make any claims as to whether the diachronic developments in creolization differ from those in language change in non-creoles” (Bakker et al. 2011: 7). In other words, their claims about the synchronic properties of creoles are not intended to make inferences with regard to the issue of creole genesis.
3.1.3 Substratist accounts of creolization and Lefebvre’s Relexification Hypothesis

While Bickerton (1981) considers creolization to be the result of a complete break in language transmission and remains particularly reluctant to the idea of substrate influence, some creolists believe that substrate influence played a decisive role in the formation of creole languages. According to such advocates of the substratist approach to creolization as Lefebvre (1998), there was only a break in transmission of a superstrate language from masters to their slaves, while the grammatical and semantic properties of substrate languages are argued to be transferred to an emerging creole without any break in transmission.

The idea that creoles diverged from the European languages as a result of massive influence from the native languages of the slaves is not new. It has repeatedly been demonstrated in creole literature that creoles possess many structural properties which show close resemblance to their suggested substrate sources and have no parallels in their European superstrate languages. Extensive substrate-oriented research has been conducted over the past decades (e.g., Alleyne 1971, 1980, 1986; Boretzky 1983; Holm 1988-89; Smith 1987; Kouwenberg 2007 for Atlantic creoles; Keesing 1988 for Melanesian Pidgin).

Lefebvre’s (1998) Relexification Hypothesis is the most radical line of thinking in the history of the substratist tradition. She proposes that not just some structural properties, but creole structure as a whole replicates the structure of the substrate, while the European contribution to creoles can only be observed in the phonetic shapes of vocabulary items and some word order principles.

Lefebvre assumes that creoles emerged in a multilingual context, where there was an immediate need for a lingua franca and where the speakers of substrate languages, the slaves, had very limited access to the superstrate language spoken by their European masters. Based on these assumptions, she puts forward a more specific claim that the slaves’ exposure to the European language was not sufficient to make any inferences about the semantic and syntactic properties of the words and word combinations they heard. She argues that what they could perceive were just “phonetic strings used in specific semantic and pragmatic contexts” (1998: 16).

The Relexification Hypothesis offers an explanation of how, in the absence of sufficient input, creoles acquired their structure. The general idea of the Relexification Hypothesis is that creoles were created through a process of relexification, which is defined as “a mental process that builds new lexical entries by copying the lexical entries of an already established lexicon and replacing their phonological representations with representations derived from another language” (see figure 3.1 below).
The process of relexification takes place during L2 acquisition. A learner uses the properties of his native lexicon to interpret the input in the target language and, as a result, creates associations of the forms of lexical items (or their combinations) in the target language with the semantic and syntactic properties of semantically/functionally similar lexical items in his native language. To put it in more technical terms, one could say that a learner copies a lexical entry of his native language into his/her interlanguage, replacing its original phonetic representation with that of the target language. Thus, the lexical entry in the interlanguage retains the semantic and syntactic properties of the corresponding lexical entry in the learner’s native language, and the only thing acquired from the target language is the phonetic representation, which is itself parsed through the learner’s native phonological system.

Lefebvre considers creolization to be a particular case of L2 acquisition, in a context where learners have very limited access to the target language. She claims that it is this limited access to the target language that makes relexification so overwhelmingly important in the formation of creoles. While in cases of “normal” L2 acquisition the result of relexification is open to further revision as a learner progresses towards a closer approximation of the target, in case of creolization, where the social context makes closer approximation impossible, the result of relexification stabilizes in a creole.

---

4 Lefebvre emphasizes that the phonological representations of the relexified lexical entries do not always replicate phonological representations of the lexical entries of the target language. She gives examples of cases in which phonetic strings used to relexify copied lexical entries do not correspond to words in the target language (1998: 17).

5 \(j'\) reflects the fact that second language learners only approximate the phonological representations of the target language vocabulary items, and do not replicate them perfectly.

6 \([\emptyset]\) suggests that lexical entries of the original language which do not have a semantically/functionally corresponding lexical item in the target language can be assigned a zero phonological representation.
Emphasizing the role of relexification, Lefebvre argues that, in cases of creolization, it operates not only on lexical items (as in the case of mixed languages analyzed in terms of relexification by Muysken (1981)), but also on functional items. Based on the idea that creole creators “typically fail to identify the functional categories of the superstratum language” (36), she assumes that the functional categories of the substrate language are relexified on the basis of lexical items of the superstrate language which possess similar semantic and distributional properties.

Finally, Lefebvre suggests that creole creators use not only the properties of their native lexicons, but also L1 settings of parametric values, semantic interpretation rules and principles of morpheme and word concatenation in order to establish those of the creole. Thus, according to Lefebvre, all grammatical and semantic properties of an emerging creole derive from the native language of its creators, i.e. the substrate. As for superstrate “contribution”, she proposes that, apart from the approximations of phonetic representations of lexical items, the only thing acquired from the superstrate is the directionality (word order) properties of the lexical items.

3.2 Against the break-in-transmission idea

The break in transmission idea has long been prominent in creole studies. For a long time, it largely defined the mainstream views on the development and structural properties of creoles. However, it has also always had its opponents, who argue that creolization should be treated as a case of normal language change, without any significant break in transmission. The earliest prominent representative of this tradition, Chaudenson (1977, 1992, 2003), argues that creoles result from a gradual, non-disruptive development of their superstrate languages in the context of intensive language contact. While Chaudenson plays down the role of substrate languages in creole genesis, the advocates of the feature competition-and-selection model of creole genesis (Mufwene 2001; Aboh 2006; Aboh and Ansaldo 2007; Ansaldo 2009) assume that both superstrate and substrate languages contributed to the formation of creoles.

3.2.1 Creolization as gradual restructuring of the superstrate

The superstratist hypothesis crucially relies on a different interpretation of the social history of creoles, which highlights the existence of two socio-economically and demographically distinct phases in the history of creole communities. These phases are identified as the homestead society (la société d’habitation) and the plantation society (la société de plantation). In chapter 2, I already invoked this distinction in the discussion of the socio-economic and demographic conditions of creole formation.

Chaudenson (1977, 1992, 2003) and Chaudenson and Mufwene (2001) justly state that break-in-transmission models of creolization ignore the existence of the homestead phase, emphasizing the socioeconomic and demographic characteristics of
the later plantation phase in defining the major preconditions of creolization. According to Chaudenson, this leads to wrong conclusions concerning the initial stages of creolization, which can and should be eliminated once the significance of the homestead phase is considered. He argues that linguistic developments which took place during the homestead phase served as a basis for the subsequent process of creolization, which occurred during the plantation phase. Therefore, in his framework, the homestead phase is considered crucial to understanding the nature of the process of creolization as a whole.

The homestead phase characterized the first decades of existence of many colonial communities, between early settlement and the time when colonial agricultural industry began to develop. The homestead economy was based on small farms, where African slaves were often outnumbered by indentured European workers. As small-scale farming did not require many laborers, slaves were never imported in large numbers. Throughout the homestead phase, they formed a minority of the colonial population, and the number of locally born slaves exceeded the number of newcomers.

An important socioeconomic characteristic of this period is the proximity between the Europeans colonizers and the slaves. The two groups led identical daily lives, worked alongside each other and shared the same living conditions. Slaves working in small homestead colonies were integrated into the master’s family. Due to the lack of European women in the early colonial community, racially mixed unions between European men and their female slaves became a widespread practice. Ties between slaves from different homesteads were, on the other hand, rather weak. The autonomy of homesteads did not allow the slaves to move around and to interact with each other freely. This description corresponds to the socioeconomic profiles of the Hispanic colonies and the Dutch Cape Colony in South Africa discussed in chapter 2. Chaudenson emphasizes that plantation colonies must have also gone through the homestead stage.

As demonstrated in chapter 2, homestead settings typically gave rise to contact varieties that are closer to their superstrates than prototypical creoles (such as Sranan or Haitian Creole) and that are therefore identified as semi-creoles or as colonial dialects. According to Chaudenson, in the demographic and socioeconomic settings of the homestead community, the slaves were sufficiently exposed to the target language and were motivated to learn the European language due to their proximity with their masters. In his own words, in the conditions of a homestead “…communication was oriented in a highly centripetal fashion” towards the language spoken by the European colonizers, which “served not only as the language of the colony, but also as the language of communication at the heart of the basic social unit formed by the homestead” (Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001: 108). Therefore, Chaudenson argues that, instead of creating a new autonomous language, the homestead slaves simply appropriated an approximative L2 variety of the European language. In support of this interpretation, he presents details of travelers’ reports of various slaves across settlement colonies who could speak the European language well. Based on this evidence, he emphasizes that
these approximative varieties could not be classified as pidgins either on the basis of their structural properties or on the basis of their function (primary language of communication for many speakers).

Substrate languages, according to Chaudenson, did not influence these early slaves’ varieties of the European language. The linguistic heterogeneity of the slaves, the low proportion of newcomers from the substrate-speaking areas, combined with the relative isolation of the homesteads and the weak ties between the slaves of different homesteads, are put forward as factors that downplayed the role of substrate languages in the slave communities.

Creolization, which Chaudenson defines as the *autonomization* of the approximative varieties spoken by the slaves in relation to the language spoken by Europeans, took place during the plantation phase. The substitution of homesteads by plantations had as a consequence the rapid growth of the slave population, produced by the importation of large numbers of new slaves. Unlike homestead slaves, the newcomers had no significant contact with Europeans, who were removed from work on the agricultural units and occupied ruling positions in the colonial society. Their only exposure to the colonial language was through the approximative varieties spoken by locally born and already “acclimatized” slaves. Having developed their own approximative varieties, they, in turn, provided linguistic models for the next generations of arrivals. The continuous series of new arrivals created a continuum of “approximations of approximations”, in which each new approximation was more distantly removed from the European languages than the previous one. This continuum of approximations eventually led to the emergence of a new, autonomous linguistic system, a creole. Thus, in contrast to the break in transmission scenario, the superstratist scenario suggests that creolization was not an abrupt process, but a gradual transition from a superstrate to a creole, through a continuum of intermediate stages.

From a linguistic perspective, Chaudenson describes the evolution from a European language to a creole as the result of cumulative restructuring. This process of restructuring is viewed as an instance of normal language change, accelerated and radicalized by two factors: the absence of normative pressure and the presence of a large proportion of non-native speakers. As is known, low exposure and sensitivity to norm represent a very favorable factor to variation and the restructuring of a linguistic system. Chaudenson emphasizes that, in colonial societies, ‘there was no explicit norm, in that the dominant social group, comprised of Whites, was itself relatively heterogeneous and made up essentially of illiterate individuals of humble origin and modest social condition’ (Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001: 164). Thus, even during the homestead phase, the slaves did not have a stable linguistic target. The European language spoken by the colonizers already contained variation and deviations from the metropolitan standard.

Restructuring that had already taken place in the homestead phase was radically enhanced as a result of the mass influx of non-native speakers which happened during the plantation phase. Similarly to Lefebvre (and to other advocates of the substratist
idea), Chaudenson assumes that unguided second language acquisition played the crucial role in the process of creolization. However, he is strongly opposed to the idea that this process of second language acquisition involved either mixing of superstrate and substrate linguistic systems, or relexification. His position is that “…the elaboration of approximative systems does not proceed by simply transferring syntactic structures of the first/source language to the target language <…>, but by elaborating hypotheses on the structure of the target language” (2001: 158). In other words, Chaudenson argues that the process of restructuring which takes place during unguided second language learning always depends on the variants and developmental directions available in the target language.

Based on this position, Chaudenson develops his hypothesis about the dynamics and structural properties of the outcome of the process of creolization. He argues that earlier and closer approximations of a European language offered variants and provided directions for the subsequent approximative varieties. Although he does not exclude that the direction of the restructuring process could be partly determined by convergence with the learners’ native language(s), in his view, native language influence does not go beyond the reinforcement of converging features. His claim is that “in creole languages there are almost no positive transfers of obviously non-European linguistic features” (2001: 148). The superstratist hypothesis posits that most creole structural features could be in a more or less direct way related to similar or congruent features of their European superstrates. In accordance with this position, creoles are considered to be varieties of the European languages.

3.2.2 Mufwene’s competition-and-selection scenario of creole genesis

In the literature, Mufwene is often treated as a representative of the superstratist “camp” on a par with Chaudenson (see for example McWhorter 1998, Siegel 2007). In the present section I would like to emphasize that, despite the considerable compatibility of Mufwene’s and Chaudenson’s views on the socioeconomic and sociolinguistic developments which took place in colonial communities, Mufwene proposes a rather different view of the issue of creole genesis.

What often leads scholars to characterize Mufwene as a superstratist is his view of creoles as the result of gradual development of their superstrate languages. Similarly to Chaudenson, Mufwene (2001) highlights the role of the initial, pre-plantation phase of the existence of colonial communities as a crucial phase in creole linguistic history and treats it as an important argument against the idea that creoles developed as the result of a break in transmission of the lexifiers. He fully concurs with Chaudenson in the assumptions that, in the integrated settings of a homestead, the slaves must have developed close approximations of the European language, and that only the later socioeconomic and demographic developments during the plantation phase (i.e. institutionalized segregation, which minimized the contact between the slaves and the European colonizers, and rapid slave population growth and replacement due to high
mortality rates and massive importation) promoted continual restructuring, leading to the divorce of the varieties spoken by the slaves from the language spoken by the Europeans. Mufwene defines this divorce of the slaves’ varieties from the local acrolect as *basilectalization*.

Also similarly to Chaudenson, Mufwene assumes that, in the socioeconomic conditions of colonial communities, European languages represented the linguistic target for the slaves. Assuming that the slaves always strove to approximate the local dominant language, he emphasizes the role of locally born and acclimatized (“seasoned”) slaves as intermediaries who provided linguistic models for the newcomers.

Based on this assumption, Mufwene (1996, 2001) formulates the Founder Principle in creole genesis. The Founder Principle proposes the following: because the varieties spoken by the founder populations were always the ones being targeted and because the features of these varieties acquired more and more carriers and became more and more entrenched through their repeated adoptions by newcomers, these features had a better chance to be preserved in an emerging creole than the newer alternatives brought in by subsequent generations of arrivals. In other words, the Founder Principle suggests that “the structural features of creoles have been predetermined to a large extent <…> by characteristics of the vernaculars spoken by the populations that founded the colonies in which they developed” (2001: 29). In the case of creoles, these populations were the European colonists.

The Founder Principle should not, however, be misinterpreted as a purely superstratist claim. Mufwene explicitly states that “as a concept, the Founder Principle is adopted here [Mufwene 2001] rather loosely, to underscore the influence of earlier populations in every colony, not always those who founded the colony” (2001: 60). He further emphasizes that “the Founder Principle does not preclude later influence as the ethnographic conditions of the contact setting changed during the gradual and protracted development of the new vernacular, especially during its basilectalization phase” (2001: 76). When applied to the basilectalization phase, the Founder Principle suggests that the features introduced by the first generations of slaves were more likely to be preserved in the emerging slaves’ vernacular than the innovations introduced by the subsequent arrivals. Positing the Founder Principle in creole genesis this way does not imply that all creole structural properties derive from the superstrate languages. There is nothing in Mufwene’s formulation of the Founder Principle that argues against the possibility of substrate influence.

In his work, Mufwene explicitly argues against the exclusively superstratist approach to creole genesis, which is based on the assumption that creole languages owe very little or nothing to the native languages of their creators. Discussing Chaudenson’s proposal, he states: “Convergence is <…> not mutually exclusive with substrate influence <…> and one should be cautious about refuting the latter by fiat” (Mufwene 1996a: 166). In Mufwene (2001), he states: “There is no a priori reason why some features could not have been selected from substrate languages, except possibly that targeting the lexifiers disfavored the substrate languages” (56). Mufwene treats substrate
influence as an important factor, which determined the direction of restructuring of the European superstrate, especially during the process of basilectalization.

The Founder Principle should not be taken as a hypothesis of creole genesis in the same way as the universalist, substratist or superstratist hypotheses are claimed to be. It does not stipulate any particular source for creole structure, but offers a historically grounded perspective of the dynamics of creole development out of contact between European and non-European languages in the context of colonization. Combined with information about the demographic and socioeconomic histories of individual colonies, it can help establish which linguistic varieties are likely to have served as sources of a creole’s structure and when.

Based on the assumption that superstrate and substrate influence are not mutually incompatible and that they complemented each other during the gradual development of creoles, Mufwene formulates his complementary hypothesis of creole genesis, which represents a compromise between the superstratist and the substratist proposals. It proposes that creoles emerge out of competition and selection of the structural features provided by superstrate and substrate languages in contact. Given this, the main objective of a creolist is to identify the principles that would justify particular selections made from among the competing alternatives.

Mufwene’s competition-and-selection model is intended to account not only for the development of creoles but also for normal language change. In both cases, contact between speakers is considered to play a crucial role, regardless of whether they speak varieties of the same language or typologically different languages. Creole development is regarded as a case of accelerated language change, typical of what Mufwene identifies as high contact settings.

Mufwene’s interpretation of “language” is crucial to the understanding of his contact-based model of language evolution. Mufwene adopts Chomsky’s (1986: 19-24) distinction between internalized language (I-language) and externalized language (E-language). E-language is considered to be an abstract term, an extrapolation. In reality, it only exists as an ensemble of similar I-languages, linguistic systems of individuals who are said to be speakers of this language. Based on this reasoning, Mufwene suggests the metaphor of language as species based on an analogy with biological species, which only exist as an extrapolation from similar individual organisms.

Language evolution is seen as a result of interaction between speakers, in the same way as the biological evolution of species is a result of interbreeding between their individual representatives. While interacting with each other, speakers exchange linguistic features (=linguistic units and principles of their use) of their individual linguistic systems or I-languages. The set of linguistic features produced by the I-languages of all individuals in a certain contact environment is referred to as the feature pool. The feature pool represents an arena of competition between linguistic features associated with the same or similar grammatical functions. In the course of language acquisition and daily linguistic interactions, individuals replicate the features of ideolects they are exposed to, thus making particular selections out of the competing alternatives
present in the feature pool. Every I-language recombines the features present in the
feature pool on the model of blending inheritance in biology. As a result, while sharing
features with I-languages of individuals who contributed to the feature pool, it is not
identical to any of them.

Thus, linguistic interaction sets in motion constant feature competition-and-
selection processes, which bring about changes in the linguistic systems of interacting
individuals. The changes in individual linguistic systems, which result from individual
selections, can amount to changes in communal systems, E-languages, affecting the
trajectory of language evolution.

Crucial in Mufwene’s biological metaphor is the rejection of the common idea
that language represents a well-defined entity which can be transmitted from one speaker
to another as a whole. The units of language transmission are linguistic features, and the
process of language transmission, which is always selective, involves restructuring of
features of the existing linguistic systems into new ones. Thus, according to Mufwene,
restructuring of the existing linguistic systems takes place not only during the formation
of creoles (and other contact languages), but also in course of “normal” language
development.

Although restructuring of linguistic features is modeled on genetic
recombination in biology, Mufwene emphasizes that the two processes are not identical.
In biology, innovations in new genotypes arise only from the way the parental genes are
recombined, while genes themselves are replicated perfectly. Linguistic restructuring,
apart from recombination, involves imperfect replication, modification of “original”
features. This modification results from the co-influence of competing features or from
the dynamics of the emerging linguistic system itself.

The degree and rate of language restructuring depend on the conditions in
which a language is being transmitted and acquired. These conditions are referred to as
the ecology of language. The notion of ecology of language is crucial to Mufwene’s
account of language evolution. It determines the evolutionary trajectory of language
(language birth, language change and language death) in the same way as biological
ecology determines the evolution of species. Ecology of language is a complex notion. It
subsumes all the linguistic and extralinguistic factors which affect the processes of
feature competition, selection, and modification.

An important ecological factor, which distinguishes cases of creolization from
cases of “normal” language evolution, is the degree of heterogeneity of the feature pool.
The degree of heterogeneity of the feature pool depends on whether a language exists in
the relative isolation of a monolingual community, or whether it coexists with other
language varieties being spoken by bilinguals or appropriated by non-native speakers in
a community where other languages are spoken. In the latter case, the typological
distance between the language in question and the coexisting languages also plays an
important role. When the linguistic systems in contact are largely identical (as is the case
in monolingual communities), their similar or congruent features do not compete, but
reinforce each other, leaving little room for recombination and modification. When the
contributing linguistic systems are diverse, they offer alternative strategies for the same grammatical functions. The presence of competing alternatives gives a broader range of recombination options and provides the grounds for greater feature modification, which leads to more extensive restructuring. While the first scenario describes the evolution of “normal” (presumably, unmixed) languages, the second refers to cases of the development of mixed varieties, such as creoles.

Thus, according to Mufwene, creoles represent the result of the evolution of European languages in the specific ecological conditions of colonial communities, which were distinct from “normal” linguistic communities because of high multilingualism. The massive appropriation of the European languages by the slaves brought them in competition with the slaves’ native languages. On a par with the European languages, the native languages of the slaves contributed features to the feature pool, out of which selections for the emerging creole systems were made.

Although, according to Mufwene, the socioeconomic conditions of the colonial communities “encouraged” slaves to target European linguistic features, thus giving them selective advantage in the competition with the features of their native languages, other factors could allow substrate influence to prevail and to affect the way superstrate features were selected and modified in creoles.

One of the most important factors to determine the outcome of feature competition is congruence. Mufwene explains the role of congruence in creole genesis from a pragmatic perspective: “In learning an umpteenth language speakers typically apply the principle of least effort, trying to identify things that are the same in the lexifiers and the languages they already speak…” (2001: 36). In the context of substrate/superstrate feature competition, congruent features reinforced each other, which gave them dominance over non-congruent competitors and favored their selection in the emerging creoles. In this way, some of the features which were infrequent or limited in use in the European language could have been selected into a creole as a result of their congruence with the features of substrate languages.

On the other hand, congruence could also hinder the selection of superstrate features into an emerging creole: “when structures of most of the substrate languages were very similar typologically, their common features often prevailed over alternatives provided by lexifier” (2001: 52).

Mufwene stresses that, in order for two features to interact, congruence need not be absolute. Partially congruent (similar, but not identical) features from two different sources can converge, producing modified variants of the originals. The results of such modifications can often be observed in creoles, where superstrate-derived forms and constructions acquire new usages based on the way similar items are used in substrate languages. The abundance of such modifications in creoles shows that “grammatical substrate influence is not incompatible with items from the lexifiers which have only partially congruent patterns” (Mufwene 2001: 56) and that the source of the building blocks of a language (matériaux de construction, in Chaudenson’s terms) need not be the same as the principles for using them.
When there is no congruence, feature competition is resolved by other factors. Factors that give selective advantage to competing features can be of a structural as well as of a non-structural nature. Mufwene points out that structural and extralinguistic factors differ crucially with regard to the level of feature competition-and-selection in which they apply. Extralinguistic factors such as the relative frequencies of competing features (which depend on the ratios of the bearers of these features in a community) or the socioeconomic, cultural or ethnic undertones associated with the different features in competition apply at the communal level, the level of E-language. According to Mufwene, these factors, accommodated under the Founder Principle, explain why European languages were chosen as the target in creole communities and why most of the lexical material for emerging creoles was selected from the European languages.

Structural factors operate at the level of an individual speaker, the level of I-language, regulating the way features from different linguistic systems interact in this individual speaker’s mind. In the discussion of structural factors underlying the process of creole genesis, the notion of markedness has often been invoked. Recall Bickerton’s LBH, which suggests that creoles developed in accordance with the unmarked settings of UG. Mufwene (1991, 2001) discusses an alternative interpretation of the notion of markedness, which argues against Bickerton’s assumption that in UG certain parametric settings are more or less marked than others. Mufwene’s ecology-sensitive model of markedness treats markedness in grammar not as an absolute, but as a context-relative value. It proposes that the markedness value of each linguistic structure can only be determined relative to other alternatives it is competing with in a given context, and that the factors which determine markedness may vary from one type of context to another.

According to Mufwene, in the context of creole genesis, which was characterized by high multilingualism and large proportions of second language learners, next to congruence, such factors as “regularity or invariance of form, frequency, generality, semantic transparency, and perceptual salience” (2001: 36) determined the relative markedness values of the competing features.

### 3.2.3 Mentalist approach to feature competition-and-selection

During the past few years, Mufwene’s ideas have inspired a considerable amount of discussion and research in creole and contact language studies. Abah’s (2004c, 2006, 2009) work stands out as an attempt to integrate the idea of feature competition-and-selection into the mentalist perspective on languages as it is envisaged in the generative framework.

Mufwene identifies two levels of feature competition-and-selection, the level of the population (or the level of E-language) vs. the level of the individual speaker (or the level of I-language). The two levels differ crucially with regard to the type of factors determining the outcome of the feature competition-and-selection process. At the population level, the chances of competing features of I-languages in contact to be selected into an E-language are determined by extralinguistic factors such as the number
of carriers of a certain feature and their socio-economic status and cultural identity. The principles of feature selection that apply at the level of I-language appear to be much more obscure. Mufwene distinguishes markedness and perceptual salience among potentially relevant factors, but remarks that there is probably a host of other factors at work.

Mufwene’s evolutionary model of language change mainly deals with the level of the population, as only at this level can language evolution be identified. Although the idea of individual speakers as agents of language evolution is the cornerstone of Mufwene’s proposal, feature competition-and-selection at the level of I-languages is mainly regarded as a contribution to variation and change in the communal language. The focus on the population level explains why Mufwene puts emphasis on sociohistorical factors in his discussion of the ecology of language evolution (2000a,b, 2001, 2002, 2008).

Studying the process of feature competition-and-selection at the level of the individual speaker gives one a different perspective. Generative grammar offers a useful tool in addressing this matter. According to the generativist view of language competence, extralinguistic factors are not directly relevant to the way the speaker’s linguistic knowledge is organized. In this respect, language competence is crucially distinguished from individual language performance, which certainly does get affected by external factors such as the ones Mufwene encompasses under the notion of linguistic ecology. Following Chomsky’s opposition between I-language and E-language, DeGraff (1999: 9) introduces the distinction between E-creole, a socio-historically identified linguistic state, and I-creole, “a mental grammar that shows a certain typological distance from the grammars of the languages in contact”. Importantly, DeGraff argues that, when it comes to the level of I-language, creolization is only quantitatively different from the processes of “normal” language acquisition and language change. Following the same line of thinking, Aboh (2006, 2009) argues that the competition-and-selection of features at the level of language competence is blind to ecological factors, which can assign certain non-linguistic values (e.g., prestigious, cool, rural, literary, etc.) to the features of competing systems. Regardless of the way certain features are valued at the community level, in the mind of an individual speaker all features are equal. In terms of creole genesis, this implies that, in the mind of an individual creole creator, superstrate-derived features had no selective advantage over the competing features from substrate languages. The mentalist approach to language proposed within the generative framework allows one to abstract from the external environment of language contact and attempt to envisage the structural factors that determine the way competing linguistic systems interacted in the minds of creole creators.

Regarding the factors that underlie the process of feature competition-and-selection at this level, Aboh emphasizes the role of the syntax-semantics interface. He argues that areas of grammar which are interpretable at the discourse-semantic interface are visible in the situation of language contact and are more likely to be selected in the emerging contact variety than other areas of grammar that may involve purely formal
features only. According to Aboh (2006, 2009), this explains why elements and structures with discourse-semantic content survive in emerging contact varieties, and those that are semantically vacuous (e.g., agreement) get lost.

Unlike Bickerton, whose LBH is also rooted in the generativist notion of language faculty, Aboh does not assume that UG has any special role in creole creation different from the role it plays in normal language change. He defines the role of UG in language contact as “an ultimate filter for the relevant combinatory possibilities” (Aboh 2006: 233).

3.3 Processes underlying creole development

In the previous sections, I identified several approaches to creole genesis and discussed the claims of their most prominent representatives. Although most of the approaches to creole genesis discussed above only make sense when they are contextualized within the assumption that creolization represents a (special) case of first or second language acquisition, the discussion in the previous section mainly revolved around the sources of creole structures. In this section, I will discuss claims made with regard to the role of (imperfect) second language acquisition and grammaticalization in creole formation.

3.3.1 Second language acquisition

The idea that tendencies observed in (imperfect) L2 acquisition play an important role in creolization is accepted by many researchers. The claims regarding the role of imperfect L2 in creolization do not boil down to the claims concerning the role of L1 transfer discussed in the previous sections. Some scholars believe that pidgins and creoles are the result of unfinished, or imperfect second language acquisition of the dominant lexifier language and characterize them as fossilized interlanguages (Mather 2006; Plag 2008a,b, 2009a,b). Although the equation between creolization and fossilization of an interlanguage undoubtedly gives an oversimplified picture of the process, it has been repeatedly demonstrated that pidgins and creoles do share some properties with interlanguages. Just like in interlanguages, elements which are necessary for successful communication and/or which are perceptually salient are easily acquired by creole creators, while “ornamental” features marginal to the immediate requirements of a successful communication are often omitted. As a result, just like interlanguages, creoles possess a grammar which is characterized by a minimum of (inflectional) morphology, lack of agreement and other instances of redundancy and the use of lexical items to express notions that are grammaticalized in the target languages, such as definiteness or tense.
3.3.2 Grammaticalization

The massive loss of superstrate morphology which takes place in the initial stages of creole formation is assumed to result from accumulated effects of imperfect second languages acquisition or, as argued by some scholars (e.g., Bickerton 1981), pidginization. In the rudimentary language state characterized by Givón (1979) as the “pragmatic mode”, the absence of morphosyntactic marking leads to the dependence of communication on context, shared knowledge, intonation, and non-verbal means of communication. The subsequent functional expansion of creoles, which begin to gain the role of primary languages in the creole community and to acquire native speakers, is accompanied by their structural and lexical expansion. During this expansion phase, the process of grammaticalization is argued to have played a crucial role in the development of creoles (Bruyn 1995, 2007, 2008).

Grammaticalization, “the change whereby lexical items and constructions come in particular linguistic contexts to serve grammatical functions, and, once grammaticalized, continue to develop new grammatical functions” (Hopper and Traugott 2003: xv), is a universal process which takes place in all languages of the world. Grammaticalization involves morphosyntactic change (change of grammatical category and corresponding change in distribution), which is usually accompanied by phonological reduction and semantic shifts which can be described in terms of weakening or bleaching of the original meaning, the development from a more concrete to a more abstract meaning.

While many functional elements in creoles have lexical origins, and their development can therefore be claimed to instantiate the process of grammaticalization, it is debatable whether the notion of grammaticalization is fully appropriate when applied to creole structural elaboration. The main objection to the assumption that functional items with lexical etymons in creoles develop through grammaticalization is that, while grammaticalization in “normal” languages is a gradual process that involves multiple changes and may expand over several centuries, in creoles grammaticalization is exceptionally rapid or even abrupt. Some superstrate-derived lexical items are only attested in creoles with a grammatical function. In such cases, no language-internal process of grammaticalization appears to have taken place and one can more appropriately speak of reanalysis during the process of acquisition.

While grammaticalization is usually assumed to be brought about by a complex interplay between the need for expressiveness and creativity on the one hand, and for regularization and routinization on the other, the accounts of the unusually high rate of grammaticalization in creoles appeal to the notion of communicative need. As observed by Bruyn (2007: 389), “[i]t is problematic to regard communicative need as a factor that induces grammaticalization. To assume that grammaticalization occurs in order to fill functional gaps in the grammar leads to the normally unwarranted implication that a language is in some respect inadequate before the grammaticalization took place”. Creoles are, however, often considered different in this respect, as they are assumed to
lack grammatical material that was not transmitted from the lexifier. Based on this, Bruyn (2007: 389) hypothesizes that “[i]t may […] be the case that grammaticalization in the early stages of P[idgin]/C[reeol] development sometimes involves the creation of new categories or constructions in order to fill functional gaps”. On the other hand, she justly remarks that “[t]o the extent that languages vary widely in what is coded by grammatical means, it is difficult to establish on independent grounds what would count as a functional inadequacy” (2007: 389).

In addition to functional pressure, the fact that grammaticalization in creoles often takes shortcuts can be accounted for by appealing to external influence. While grammaticalization is normally conceived of as a language-internal process, in creoles language contact can often be claimed to have influenced the direction of reinterpretation of the items undergoing grammaticalization. For instance, while in many Atlantic creoles the superstrate-derived form of the 3Pl pronoun grammaticalized into a plural marker, this development is often assumed to have resulted from substrate influence (but see the discussion in chapter 5). Some instances of grammaticalization found in creoles can be claimed to represent the continuation of a process already started in the superstrate. As observed by Arends and Bruyn (1994), the development of the marker of immediate future from the verb *go* may be affected by the fact that English *be going to* is also used to express future.

Thus, while the grammatical functions assumed by superstrate-derived lexical elements in creoles often correspond to the outcomes of universal or frequently observed grammaticalization paths (e.g., development of indefinite determiners from the numeral ‘one’, or definite determiners from a deictic element), the motivation as well as the internal mechanisms of the reanalysis of superstrate-derived lexical items might be different from the motivation and internal mechanisms of grammaticalization. In what follows, I will therefore use the term grammaticalization in a loose sense, to refer to the traceable linguistic change as defined by Hopper and Traugott (2003) cited above, without making any claims with regard to its motivations and underlying mechanisms.

### 3.4 Summary and discussion

In the previous sections, we considered various approaches to the issue of creole genesis. We observed that, while some scholars focus on establishing the major source(s) of creole languages (UG, substrates or superstrates), others attempt to identify the processes (second language acquisition, grammaticalization) underlying creole formation. While the role of second language acquisition and grammaticalization in creoles (as well as in normal language change) is rather widely acknowledged, the debate on the major sources of creolization encompasses extremely radical claims, which are completely at odds with one another. One cannot but be puzzled by the fact that the same phenomenon has given rise to mutually incompatible ideas.
The UG-oriented, substratist and superstratist accounts of creolization can be better understood once they are contextualized in the different interpretations of the socioeconomic conditions of creolization. The advocates of each of the three hypotheses of creole genesis highlight those factors that lend support to their analysis of the linguistic data. For instance, both Bickerton (1981) and Lefebvre (1998) strongly adhere to the assumption that the socioeconomic conditions in the colonies significantly restricted the slaves’ access to the superstrate language. From this assumption, they derive the idea that creole creators had to resort to other sources of linguistic structure to compensate for the break in transmission of the superstrate. Chaudenson (2003, and other work), on the other hand, emphasizes the functional and symbolic significance of the European language and highlights the role of locally born and previously assimilated slaves as linguistic mediators between the European masters and the newcomers. This supports the idea that superstrate structural properties were passed down to the emerging creoles without any break in transmission.

Another aspect of the history of creoles subject to conflicting interpretations is the degree of homogeneity of substrate languages. As convincingly demonstrated by Singler, “degree of homogeneity in substratal input bears crucially on the extent of substratal influence in a pidgin or creole” (1988: 27). Bickerton and Chaudenson, who deny the role of substrate influence in creole formation, emphasize the linguistic diversity of the slave population as an important factor accounting for the rapid disappearance of the slaves’ native languages and for their weak contribution to the structure of the emerging creoles. Lefebvre’s analysis, on the other hand, presupposes the existence of a rather homogenous substrate.

The analysis of the demographic, socioeconomic and ideological settings of the European colonies shows that the degree of access the slaves had to the superstrate, functionality and symbolic status of the dominant colonial language, as well as the degree of heterogeneity of the substrate are all variables whose actual values differ from colony to colony, as well as within the same colony over time (see chapter 2). In other words, the historical truth appears to be more complex and diverse than some approaches to creole genesis assume. In the empirical chapters of this book, engaged with an analysis of the origins of the structural properties of creole NEs, I will attempt to demonstrate that the same conclusion holds for the linguistic facts.
Chapter 4

Nominal expressions: functions, semantics, and structure

As stated in the Introduction, this research investigates the factors underlying creole structural formation by looking at the development of NEs. This chapter provides a general overview of the function, semantic properties, and the structure of NEs. Section 4.1 deals with the function and semantics. It starts with the discussion of the two major functions of NEs, denotation and reference (section 4.1.1), and introduces the ways in which nouns, which are stored in the lexicon as Kind or property-denoting terms, are converted in speech into referring NEs (sections 4.1.2-4.1.9).

While at the level of denotation such grammatical features as quantity, identifiability and, according to some theories (e.g., Borer 2005), even individuation are irrelevant, referring NEs are interpreted for these features. The ways in which these features are realized appear to depend on the lexico-semantic type of the noun (e.g. count vs. mass) and vary significantly across languages. For instance, in languages like English nouns that refer to bounded entities and are traditionally classified as count (e.g., ‘table’) are always overtly marked for individuation and quantity by means of the plural marker -(e)s or the indefinite determiner a(n). This is in contrast to mass nouns, which are never directly individuated or quantified. In many world languages, apparent semantic equivalents of English count nouns (i.e. nouns that are used to denote bounded entities) behave differently with regard to the expression of individuation and quantity. In some languages, including many creoles, the expression of these features is not categorical. There are also languages in which nouns may never be directly individuated or quantified. Based on these cross-linguistic differences in the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs Rijkhoff (2002) proposes a typological classification of lexical noun types. The discussion of different lexical noun types and the licensing properties of NEs headed by different lexical noun types is in section 4.1.2. Section 4.1.3 is devoted to Borer (2005), who denies the existence of lexical subcategories within the category of nouns. Sections 4.1.4 and 4.1.5 focus on markers of individuation and quantification, respectively.
The notion of identifiability is introduced in section 4.1.6. In languages like English all (referring) NEs are obligatorily marked for identifiability (definiteness). In English, this function is most commonly performed by means of the definite determiner *the*, which functions in opposition to the indefinite determiner *a(n)* and zero. Many world languages, including most known creoles, do not express identifiability categorically. In such languages, the distribution of determiners is based on other criteria instead of or in addition to definiteness. In sections 4.1.7-4.1.9, I consider semantic and pragmatic factors that may underlie the distribution of elements commonly identified in the literature as (in)definite determiners or articles and discuss the notions of definiteness, referentiality, and specificity.

Section 4.2 deals with the structural representation of NEs proposed within the generative framework. It discusses the DP-hypothesis and the related claims that the specifications of NEs with regard to individuation, quantity, and identifiability are encoded in the structure of NE. Since Abney (1987), it is commonly assumed within the generative framework that the lexical NP layer is dominated by a functional projection, identified as DP. Some researchers (Szabolcsi 1987; Ritter 1991; Aboh 2004a; Borer 2005, and others) have argued that the nominal functional domain has a layered structure, in which such features as individuation, quantity and identifiability head their own functional projections. Needless to say, not all layers of the nominal functional domain are always overtly expressed. The existence of non-overt functional categories, particularly the null D, represents the most serious challenge for the DP hypothesis. This issue is extremely relevant for the discussion of the structural representation of NEs in creoles, as these languages typically allow for bare NEs (i.e. NEs which occur without number markers or determiners and are, therefore, not overtly specified for either individuation or identifiability) in a large array of contexts.

4.1 Functions and semantics

4.1.1 Denotation and reference

Nouns are assumed to be stored in the lexicon as Kind or property-denoting terms. Kinds are classes of objects or individuals whose occurrence is regular enough to class them together based on a certain property. For instance, the Kind TABLE is the class of objects that have a property associated with being a table. Since objects are classed together based on a certain defining property, nouns are also assumed to denote the defining properties of classes (i.e. the property which all members of the class share and by virtue of which they are members of the class in question). Some researchers argue that the lexical semantics of nouns vary across languages. According to Chierchia (1998), there are languages with Kind-denoting nouns, languages with property-denoting nouns and languages with nouns that may denote both Kinds and properties (see section 4.1.1)
In speech, NEs are used not only to denote Kinds or their properties, but also to refer to their individual representatives. For instance, ‘a table’, ‘the table’, ‘this table’, ‘tables’, ‘the tables’ and ‘these tables’ all refer to one or multiple individual representatives of the Kind or property denoted by the noun ‘table’. As these examples show, the reference of an NE is specified by means of determiners, demonstratives and number markers. Together with the situational and discourse context, these elements make it possible to individuate and identify the referent(s) of the noun.

4.1.2 Lexical noun types

The lexical class of nouns is subdivided into count nouns and mass nouns. While count nouns denote bounded entities like ‘dog’, ‘table’ or ‘apple’, mass nouns denote unbounded stuff such as ‘water’, ‘butter’ or ‘furniture’. Many languages treat count and mass nouns differently in their grammar. For instance, in English, count nouns are overtly individuated either by means of the indefinite determiner \textit{a(n)} or by means of the plural marker -(e)s. Mass nouns cannot be individuated and they therefore cannot occur with either of these markers. Also, unlike count nouns, mass nouns in English do not occur in a direct construction with numerals.

Rijkhoff (2002) elaborates the traditional lexical classification of nouns. Based on the analysis of the semantics and morphosyntactic behavior of NEs in a sample of typologically diverse languages, Rijkhoff (2002) distinguishes six noun types: mass nouns, collective nouns, singular object nouns, set nouns, sort nouns, and general nouns. In contrast to mass nouns, which are used to refer to unbounded, non-discrete spatial entities, and collective nouns, which are used to refer to several discrete entities that are conceived as a unit, singular object nouns, set nouns, sort nouns and general nouns are all used to refer to singular discrete spatial entities. In terms of the traditional lexical semantics, such nouns typically pertain to the class of count nouns. The term ‘count noun’ is only accurate in application to nouns in languages like English, which are identified by Rijkhoff as singular object noun languages. While sort nouns and general nouns are used to refer to the same kind of entities as a typical count noun, they show considerably different morphosyntactic properties. Rijkhoff focuses on the following aspects of the morphosyntactic behavior of nouns: (i) whether or not nouns appear in the plural form when modified by a numeral higher than one, and (ii) whether or not nouns are in direct construction with a numeral or whether the numeral must first combine with a classifier. He gives four logical possibilities:

1. \textit{numeral + noun + plural} (no classifier)
2. \textit{numeral + noun} (no plural, no classifier)
3. \textit{numeral + classifier + noun} (no plural)
4. \textit{numeral + classifier + noun + plural}
While the first three types are all represented among the languages of the world, with regard to the fourth type Rijkhoff reports that ‘previous research has indicated that there are very few (possibly no) languages’ of this type (2002: 29). Type 1 is represented by languages like English and Dutch. In these languages, nouns that are used to refer to singular discrete entities are always marked for plural when modified by a plural numeral or when reference is made to more than one individual object. In the absence of plural marking, only the singular interpretation is possible. That is why languages like English and Dutch are referred to as singular object noun languages. Like singular object nouns, nouns of type 2 languages may also be in a direct construction with a numeral. However, plural marking is variable in these languages. It is not consistently seen in semantically plural nouns without a numeral and is normally absent when the noun is modified by a numeral. Rijkhoff identifies nouns in type 2 languages as set nouns. Set nouns are nouns which are not associated with either singularity or plurality. In their unmarked form, they may be used to refer to a set which may consist of singular or plural individuals, a singleton set or a collective set, respectively. Because of the transnumeral semantics of set nouns number marking in set noun languages is optional. As will be discussed in section 4.1.5, the nature of number marking in these languages is also different from the nature of number marking in languages like English. Type 3 is represented by sort noun languages and general noun languages. Like set nouns, sort nouns and general nouns are transnumeral. However, unlike set nouns, they cannot be directly quantified by means of a numeral. In order to be quantified, they first need to be overtly individuated by means of a classifier. Rijkhoff observes that two types of classifiers are used cross-linguistically: mensural classifiers, which indicate measures such as size, volume, or weight and typically occur in combination with nouns denoting non-discrete spatial entities (masses), and sortal classifiers, which are used in combination with nouns that denote discrete objects and whose semantics may involve various notions, often related to shape (e.g., a long, pointed object). Nouns that combine with mensural classifiers are referred to by Rijkhoff with the traditional term ‘mass nouns’. Nouns that are used with sort classifiers are identified by Rijkhoff as sort nouns. Based on the morphosyntactic behavior of sort nouns he argues that these nouns have the semantics of a conceptual label. Further, Rijkhoff observes that in some languages the distinction between mensural classifiers and sort classifiers is blurry. He concludes that these languages make no distinction between sort nouns and mass nouns and calls nouns in such languages general nouns.

With regard to the semantic properties of the noun types, which he alternatively defines as nominal subcategories, Rijkhoff (2002: 28) argues that “each nominal subcategory defines a different Seinsart of a spatial property, i.e. an alternative way in which a nominal property is specified for the features Shape and Homogeneity”. According to Rijkhoff, the feature Shape, which stands for spatial boundedness, distinguishes singular object nouns and set nouns from sort nouns and general nouns. The morphosyntactic behavior of the former two noun types, namely, the fact that they can be directly quantified, suggests that they designate properties that are characterized
as having a definite outline (Shape) in the spatial dimension. In contrast, the fact that sort nouns and general nouns require a classifier in order to be quantified suggests that they designate properties that are not characterized as having Shape. The feature Homogeneity, which stands for “likepartedness” and “dissectiveness”, distinguishes singular object nouns and sort nouns from set nouns and general nouns. Rijkhoff argues that, in contrast to mass nouns that represent a classic example of [+homogenous] nouns, singular object nouns and sort nouns are [-homogenous] as they designate properties that are not dissective. General nouns and set nouns are considered by Rijkhoff to be neutral with regard to Homogeneity. In general noun languages, there is no distinction between sort nouns and mass nouns. As for set nouns, they are considered [±homogenous] as “a set entity may be homogenous, when it is a collective set which can be divided into as many singleton sets as there are individuals” (Rijkhoff 2002: 52) or non-homogenous if it is a singleton set which cannot be further divided. According to Rijkhoff, unless they are coded by overt morphology, the features Shape and Homogeneity are part of the lexical semantics of the noun. This suggests that nouns across languages possess different lexico-semantic properties.

Rijkhoff’s classification has been applied in the study of creole nouns. For instance, Stewart (2006) characterizes nouns in Jamaican Creole as set nouns. As I will show in chapter 7 of this book, Stewart’s claim may be in principle extended to the majority of the creoles under study as well as to some of their important substrates. However, as I argue in Bobyleva (2011b) and in chapter 7 of this book, the superstrate-like behavior of plural markers found in some creoles, including Jamaican, does not fit the pattern observed in set noun languages. Phenomena observed in these creoles not only pose problems for Stewart’s claim but also question the universality of Rijkhoff’s lexical noun type classification.

4.1.3 Borer’s universalist approach to the nominal lexical semantics

An alternative to the traditional lexical semantics and to Rijkhoff’s classification would be to assume that the lexical semantics of nouns are universal, and that languages differ in the ways they map these universal lexical semantics onto different types of referents. This possibility is pursued by Borer (2005). According to Borer, “word knowledge is grammatically inert” (107); that is, nouns are stored in the lexicon without any grammatical specifications and the exact interpretation of a noun as a mass or as a singular or plural individual is assigned in a corresponding grammatical structure. Borer defines the lexical semantics of a noun as unstructured stuff, which is akin to a mass denotation. A similar definition of the lexical semantics of nouns is proposed by Bouchard (2002:41): “The property of a common noun is not atomized < . . . > and is thus seen as a mass; it applies in an undifferentiated way to all individuals of the set, to the set itself and to all its subsets < . . . > So a signifiant for TOMATO at this level of grammaticalization does not distinguish between a tomato, the tomato, some tomatoes, the tomatoes or tomato as a mass”. This proposal eliminates the classic opposition
between count nouns and mass nouns, as well as the opposition between singular object nouns, set nouns, sort nouns and general nouns.

Some specific claims in Borer’s study are in direct contradiction to the analysis proposed by Rijkhoff. Recall, for instance, Rijkhoff’s claim that singular object nouns and set nouns designate properties that are characterized as [+Shape] as these noun types may be used in a direct construction with quantifying elements (numerals) as opposed to sort nouns and general nouns, which designate properties that are [-Shape] as these noun types require a classifier in order to be quantified. According to Rijkhoff, classifiers in sort noun and general noun languages function “as a kind of individualizer” (50). According to Borer, nouns in singular object noun languages like English are also [-Shape]. She argues that the English plural marker -(e)s, which is required when nouns in this language combine with numerals, instantiates the same function as classifiers in languages identified by Rijkhoff as sort noun and general noun languages, namely partitioning out or dividing stuff into atomic, countable parts.

Borer’s analysis proposes an alternative way of looking at the lexical semantics of nouns and at the processes of individuation and quantification. While Borer’s analysis is not unquestionable, as I will argue in chapter 7, it provides an interesting insight into the analysis of creole nouns. Interestingly, long before the appearance of Borer’s work, similar views were expressed by Allan (1980), who observed that while nouns do seem to have “countability preferences”, they receive count (individuated) or mass (non-individuated) interpretation in the actual use (which in Borer’s analysis translates as syntax). Mufwene (1981) further develops this idea based on the analysis of NEs in Jamaican Creole, English, French and Lingala. Like Borer, Mufwene concludes that the ability to be counted is a characteristic of NEs and not of lexical semantics of nouns. Mufwene perceives individuation as a scalar category. He proposes that while bare nouns convey the non-individuated, mass-like interpretation, the use of determiners and plural marking in various degrees contributes to the individuation of reference. In chapter 7, I will further discuss Borer’s and Mufwene’s claims in application to the data considered here.

4.1.4 Individuation

Individuation has already received considerable attention in sections 4.1.2 and 4.1.3. As observed in these sections, while the issue of whether or not individuation (i.e. “boundedness”) represents part of the lexical semantics of the noun is subject to debate, it is obvious that NEs may be treated differently in syntax depending on whether they are used to refer to an individuated, bounded entity or to a non-individuated, unbounded mass. Languages employ different means to distinguish individuated and non-individuated NEs. While English and other Germanic and Romance languages use plural marking and indefinite determiners, languages like Chinese employ classifiers for this function, and in creole languages specification with regard to individuation may not be expressed overtly.
4.1.5 Quantification and other ways to express number

In addition to individuation, plural markers and indefinite determiners also encode the quantity feature. For instance, while -(e)s marks a noun as plural, a(n) also gives a singular reading. The quantity feature may be also realized lexically, by means of numerals and quantifiers.

Not all languages express number by means of quantification. For instance, Rijkhoff (2002) observes that in set noun languages, number is conveyed by means of nominal aspect markers. According to Rijkhoff, the semantic function of plural marking in singular object noun languages can be identified as multiplication of the referent of the singular unmarked form. When a plural marker attaches to the unmarked form of a singular object noun, it indicates that the number of individual referents is more than one. As for nominal aspect markers, they specify not a quantitative but a qualitative property of the referent, namely, the kind of set the speaker is referring to. Two kinds of nominal aspect markers are found in set noun languages: singulative aspect markers and collective aspect markers. These grammatical elements indicate that the noun designates a property of a set which consists of one individual (singleton set) or multiple individual entities which together form a collective (collective set). From this description, it appears that conceptually number marking in set noun languages is fundamentally different from number marking in singular object noun languages like English. Whereas in singular object noun languages number marking is based on the opposition between singular and plural individuals, in set noun languages, it is based on the opposition between singleton and collective sets. In addition to the way they conceptualize number, nominal aspect markers differ from number markers in singular object noun languages with regard to their distribution. For instance, while plural markers should always be used to convey plural meaning, collective aspect markers are optional as “the property designated by a set nouns also applies to multiple objects without this marker” (Rijkhoff 2002: 105).

As we shall see in chapter 7, in some of the creoles under study, elements which seem to perform the plural marking function fit Rijkhoff’s definition of collective aspect markers with regard to their semantic properties and distribution.

4.1.6 Identifiability

In addition to individuation, nouns are also cross-linguistically marked for identifiability. In the literature on the semantics of definiteness (e.g. Lyons 1999), identifiability is conceived of as the speaker’s assumption about whether or not the referent of a noun is identifiable to the hearer. Here I adopt a broader definition of identifiability as the status of a referent in the universe of discourse. This definition embraces the identifiability of the referent to the hearer and the speaker or only to the speaker. The semantic feature of
identifiability can be grammaticalized in languages as definiteness, referentiality, specificity and topicality. The following three sections discuss these notions.

4.1.7 Definiteness

Definitions of the semantic category of definiteness are typically based on the function of definite articles in languages like English. The function of English the is identified based on the analysis of the distribution of NEs marked by the as opposed to NEs marked by a(n) and the zero article. While a(n) and the zero article occur with NEs that introduce new referents into discourse which are not yet familiar to the speaker, the use of the signals that the referent of the NE is already familiar or in any case identifiable to both the speaker and the hearer.

The idea that the use of the definite determiner presupposes shared familiarity on the part of the speaker and the hearer has given rise to the view on definiteness known as familiarity theory (Christophersen 1939). Familiarity theory is the most prominent theory of definiteness, and it has been expanded and elaborated over time. An important point in the development of the theory is the identification of ‘Stages of Familiarity’. The notion of ‘Stages of Familiarity’ was first introduced by Jespersen (1933), who identified several ‘Stages of Familiarity’ ranging from complete unfamiliarity, which corresponds to indefiniteness, to complete familiarity, manifested by proper names. Building up on Jespersen (1933), Hawkins (1978) identifies 7 usage types of the definite article:

(i) direct anaphora
(ii) associative anaphora
(iii) visible situation use
(iv) immediate situation use
(v) larger situation use, relying on specific knowledge about the referent
(vi) larger situation use, relying on general knowledge
(vii) unfamiliarity uses

I will use examples from English to illustrate these various uses. Example (9) illustrates the strictly anaphoric use of the definite article. The referents of the cat and the dog are familiar to the hearer by virtue of having been previously introduced into discourse by means of the indefinite nominal expressions a cat and a dog.

(9) I’ve got a cat and a dog. The cat is grey and the dog is brown.

Example (10) illustrates a case of an associative anaphora. The use of the definite determiner in this case is justified by the fact that the referent of the the driver can be associated with the referent of the previously introduced nominal expression a taxi so that he is understood to be the driver of this taxi.
Finally, I got a taxi. *The driver* helped me with my bags.

Unlike the anaphoric uses of the definite determiner, the situational uses do not rely on the presence of a discourse antecedent. (11) and (12) exemplify the cases of visible and immediate situational uses, respectively. In these examples, the shared familiarity of the referents of *the chair* and *the kitchen* is due to the fact that the speaker and the hearer are located in the same physical context, where these nominal expressions have unique referents.

(11) Could you pass me *the chair*?

(12) Mike is in *the kitchen*.

With larger situational uses, the principle of the identification of the referent is the same, only the context is larger. Examples (13) and (14) below illustrate usage types (v) and (vi). Sentences similar to that in (13) are normally understood without further clarifications among the residents of the same country as the NE *the president* is most naturally understood to refer to the president of this country. The referents of such NEs like *the sun* or *the moon* are assumed to be familiar to the speaker as they are uniquely identified within the context of our galaxy.

(13) *The president* is on TV.

(14) *The sun* is shining.

The uses of *the* with an NE whose reference is identified by means of a modifier, a relative clause, a prepositional phrase, or an adjective such as *only, same, first* or *next* illustrated in examples (15) through (17) are all grouped together by Hawkins (1978) as unfamiliarity uses. As is pointed out by Lyons (1999), examples (15) and (16) resemble the associative use of the definite determiner exemplified in (10). The only difference between (10) and (15) and (16) is that in (15) and (16) the information required for the identification of the referent does not precede but follows the NEs. Therefore, Lyons (1999) identifies such uses of the definite determiner as cataphoric. Examples like (17), on the other hand, indeed appear to involve completely unfamiliar referents. For the use of the definite determiner to be licensed here, the hearer does not need to know to which school Mike and John go.

(15) *The conductor* who works on that train is my grandfather’s old friend.

(16) *The conductor* of that train is my grandfather’s old friend.
(17) John and Mike go to the same school.

Another important development in the familiarity theory of definiteness is the substitution of the notion of familiarity with the notion of identifiability (Lyons 1999). Lyons points out that the term familiarity is inaccurate in application to some uses of the definite determiner identified by Hawkins (1978). For instance, while in the case of strict anaphora the referent is truly familiar to the hearer, as it has been previously introduced into the discourse, in the case of associative uses the hearer needs to make an inference in order to be able to identify the referent. The same can be said about many situational uses of the definite determiner. Consider for instance example (18):

(18) A: Pass me the salt, please.
    B: Sorry, I don’t see it.
    A: It’s right behind the salad bowl.

In this example, the use of the definite determiner does not rely on the prior familiarity of the hearer with the referent of the salt. Instead, the speaker expects that the hearer will be in a position to identify the referent by searching in the immediate surroundings. As the example shows, such an expectation might not always be met.

Based on such examples, Lyons (1999) concludes that the definite determiner indicates that the hearer is considered to be in a position to identify the referent rather than that the referent is assumed to be familiar to the hearer. Therefore, he proposes to replace the notion of familiarity with the notion of identifiability. In doing so, Lyons does not reject familiarity but subsumes it under the notion of identifiability.

Uniqueness has been proposed as another semantic feature strongly associated with definiteness. Since Russel (1905), some scholars have argued that uniqueness is the basic requirement for the correct use of the definite article. Indeed, the use of the definite article the is in most cases only appropriate when the referent is unique in the context of the speaker’s and hearer’s shared situational or discourse knowledge. For instance, consider again example (11). In this example, the may only be used in a situation where there is only one chair identifiable to the hearer. If there is more than one chair, the use of the (followed by a singular NE) would be inappropriate. In such a situation, the speaker may either use a demonstrative if s/he wants a particular chair out of the chairs present in a situation or the indefinite determiner if any chair would do. However, uniqueness does not seem relevant for all the uses of the. For instance, the referent of the definite NEs the bank of the river in the following example is not unique as a river always has two banks.

(19) John sat on the bank of the river waiting for Mike.

The same, however, also holds for identifiability. As already observed above, the notion of identifiability cannot account for the use of the with NEs modified by such adjectives
as first, last, same or next whose referents are unidentifiable to the hearer. Also, identifiability cannot account for the use of the with non-referential NEs (see section 4.1.8). In both these cases, the use of the appears to rely solely on uniqueness.

Lyons (1999) concludes that only the combination of the criteria of uniqueness and identifiability may account for the whole range of the distribution of the definite article. Although both criteria do not seem to apply universally, in the vast majority of cases, NEs are treated as definite when the speaker assumes that there exists a unique referent (or group of referents) identifiable to the speaker that satisfies the nominal description.

4.1.8 Specificity and referentiality

As stated in section 4.1.1, NEs may be used in order to denote Kinds and properties and in order to refer to individuals. These two uses of NEs are also identified in the literature as non-referential or non-specific and as referential or specific, respectively. Here, I will use the term “specific”. Examples (20) and (21) illustrate specific and non-specific nominal expressions NEs in English. While the italicized NEs a suit and the winner in (20a) and (21) are specific as they refer to specific individuals, their counterparts in (20) and (21b) are non-specific as the context provided in the sentences suggests that no specific referent satisfying the nominal description is assumed to exist.

English (Lyons 1999: 168-67)

(20)  
  a. I’m going to buy a suit tomorrow – you’ll be horrified by the color.  
  b. I’m going to buy a suit tomorrow – even if I can’t find one I really like.  
(21)  
  a. Joan wants to present the prize to the winner – but he doesn’t want to receive it from her.  
  b. Joan wants to present the prize to the winner – so she’ll have to wait around till the race finishes.

While both indefinite and definite NEs may be used specifically and non-specifically, in the literature, the notion of specificity (and referentiality) has been primarily discussed in application to indefinite NEs. Following this tradition, I will continue the discussion of specificity based on the analysis of the distribution of indefinites.

4.1.8.1 Semantic specificity

In the literature, one finds several views on specificity. Some authors define specificity semantically. Under this approach, an NE is considered specific when it refers to a specific individual, object or event that is asserted to exist and non-specific when the NE describes a type without referring to any of its representatives in particular.
Semantic specificity is analyzed in terms of scope. The contrast such as the one between (20a) and (20b) and (21a) and (21b) is not available in all grammatical environments. As has been repeatedly demonstrated in the literature, the availability of specific and non-specific interpretation of an NE depends on the propositional modality of an utterance. Whereas in an irrealis environment (e.g., intentional verbs, modals) NEs may be ambiguous with regard to specificity, in a factitive environment, they can only be interpreted as specific. For instance, a museum in example (22) below may only be interpreted as specific: there exists a specific museum, that is, the one the speaker visited the day before uttering the sentence.

(22) I went to a museum yesterday.

In addition to the propositional semantics, the interpretation of indefinite NEs with regard to specificity may depend on their interaction with other quantified expressions. Consider the following classic example:

(23) Every student read a book.

The sentence in (23) can mean either that there is a specific book that every student that there was read, or that every student that there was s/he read a book, but not necessarily the same one. In the first case the referent of a book is specific and in the second case it is not.

As the examples demonstrate, under the semantic approach, the ambiguity with regard to specificity may only occur in so-called opaque contexts. The analysis proposed to account for the availability of specific and non-specific interpretations in opaque contexts is in terms of scope ambiguity. The opacity may be created by various operators such as negation, modal operators or intentional operators. NEs have an existential entailment as part of their meaning, expressed as the existential quantification of predicate logic. The ambiguity with regard to specificity is thus a matter of whether the existential quantifier is in the scope of the operator or vice versa. The NE is interpreted as specific when the existential quantifier has a wide scope and as non-specific when it has a narrow scope.

4.1.8.2 Pragmatic specificity

In addition to semantic, or scopal specificity, research into the semantics of indefinites distinguishes epistemic, or pragmatic, specificity (cf. Farkas 2002). The significance of the pragmatic dimension of specificity in the interpretation of indefinite NEs has been highlighted by Fodor and Sag (1982) (who use the term “referentiality”). According to Fodor and Sag, ambiguity with regard to referentiality is not always a matter of scope. A sentence like that shown in example (24) contains no intentional verbs, no modals, no negation and no quantifiers with which the indefinite noun could interact. Nevertheless,
as is pointed out by Fodor and Sag (1982), such sentences are ambiguous. The author of (24) "might be intending to assert merely that the set of students in the syntax class who cheated on the final exam is not empty; or he might be intending to assert of some particular student, […] that this student cheated” (256). This observation has led them to formulate a pragmatic definition of specificity in terms of speaker referential intent.

English (Fodor and Sag 1982: 355)

(24) **A student** in the syntax class cheated on the final exam.

The relevance of speaker referential intent has been also pointed out by Givón (1981, 1984). Givón demonstrates that there are languages where speaker referential intent determines the marking of indefinite NEs. One of such languages is Hebrew. In his work, Givón introduces a distinction between semantic and pragmatic referentiality. While the former stands for the supposed existence of the referent in the universe of discourse, the latter stands for speaker referential intent. Speaker referential intent depends on the importance of the specific identity of the referent for the point at issue. Givón observes that while pragmatic referentiality usually corresponds to semantic referentiality, it is ultimately pragmatic referentiality that determines whether an NE will have an overt determiner or not in languages like Hebrew. According to Givón, pragmatic referentiality usually implies topicality: NEs that are marked as pragmatically referential when they are introduced for the first time typically become the topic of the following discourse. The following examples from Hebrew illustrate the role of pragmatic referentiality versus semantic referentiality:

Hebrew (Givón 1981: 38-39)

(25) a. Axarey she-gamarti la-avod, yaratì la-xanut ba-tsad after that-finished.1SG to-work descended.1SG to-shop in-side ha-sheni shel ha-rexov, ve-kaniti sefer-xad, ve-az the-other of DEF-street and-bought.1SG book-IND and-then halaxti ha-bayta ve-karati oto ve-hu haya metsuyan… went.1SG to-home and-read.1SG it and-it was excellent ‘After I finished working I went down to the shop across the street and I bought a book, and then I went home and read it and it was excellent…’
b. Axarey she-gamarti la-avod, yaradti la-xanut ba-tsad after that-finished.1SG to-work descended.1SG to-shop in-side
ha-sheni shel ha-rexov, ve-kaniti befer-xad, ve-az
the-other of DEF-street and-bought.1SG book-IND and-then
halaxti ha-bayta ve-axalti ve-halaxti l-ishon
went.1SG to-home and-ate.1SG and-went.1SG to-sleep
‘After I finished working I went down to the shop across the street and I
bought a book, and then I went home and ate and went to sleep.’

While both examples represent a story that took place in the past (factive environment)
and ‘book’ in (25b) is semantically just as specific as in (25a), the specific indefinite
determiner xad is only appropriate in (25a). According to Givón, this has to do with
pragmatic referentiality. While in (25a) the specific identity of the book is relevant in the
following discourse, in the contexts of the story cited under (25b) the specific identity of
the book is not at issue: the rest of the story never mentions the book again.

Ionin (2006, and other work) proposes an account of specificity in terms of
noteworthiness, which is intended as an elaboration of the vague notion of referential
intent. Ionin uses the notion of noteworthiness in her account of the specific indefinite
determiner this in English and claims that it can also account for the behavior of specific
indefinite determiners in a number of other languages. Ionin argues that the crucial
factor determining the appropriateness of specific indefinite determiners is the presence
of a noteworthy property, which makes the referent uniquely identifiable to the speaker
and motivates his/her intent to refer to it. She illustrates this with the following examples:

English (Ionin 2006: 185)

(26)  a. I found this blue apple on my plate!
     b. *I found this apple on my plate!

Like Givón in his definition of pragmatic referentiality, Ionin observes that
specific indefinite NEs commonly introduce a new topic, which means that the referent
of these NEs is expected to recur in the subsequent discourse.

English (Maclaran 1982: 88, cited from Ionin 2006: 180)

(27)  a. He put on a/this 31 cent stamp on the envelope, so he must want it to go
     airmail.
     b. He put on a/this 31 cent stamp on the envelope, and only realized later that it
     was worth a fortune because it was unperforated.

Pragmatic specificity markers have been attested in a number of world
languages. It has been argued in the literature that indefinite determiners in creoles also
mark pragmatic specificity (e.g., Givón 1979, 1981, 1984; Bickerton 1981). Bickerton’s definition of specificity corresponds to Givón’s definition of pragmatic referentiality. According to Bickerton, grammatical rules related to specificity are sensitive to semantic as well as to pragmatic aspects of the notion. He states that NEs that do have a specific referent, whose exact identity is either unknown to the speaker or irrelevant to the point at issue, are also treated as non-specific and occur with a zero-determiner.

While Givón and Bickerton attribute the importance of specificity in the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles to the fact that it represents a universally prominent linguistic category, Aboh (2004c, 2006, and subsequent work) argues that specificity marking in Atlantic creoles represents a result of substrate influence. He observes that the distribution of indefinite determiners in a number of Atlantic Creoles (Haitian, Saramaccan, and Sranan) replicates the specificity-based pattern found in Gbe languages. Example (28) below illustrates specificity marking in Ewegbe. As it shows, in Ewe ádfe is only used when the speaker has a particular referent in mind. When the referent is unknown or irrelevant, the NE occurs without a determiner.

Ewegbe (Essegbey 1999: 43)

(28) a. Avu ádfe le áfeyá me.
    dog IND LOC house-DEF in
    ‘A certain dog is in the house’

    b. Avu le áfeyá me.
    dog LOC house-DEF in
    ‘There is a dog in the house’

The role of specificity in the distribution of indefinite NEs in creoles will be further discussed in chapter 8.

4.1.8.3 Specificity of definite NEs and topicality

In the beginning of section 4.1.8, I observe that specificity as defined in this section is mainly discussed in application to indefinites. Aboh (2004b,c, 2006, and subsequent work) proposes an alternative definition of specificity, which also applies to definite NEs. According to Aboh (2006: 224), “[S]pecificity and definiteness combine in some languages (e.g., Gungbe) leading to the following characterization:

(i) A specific definite noun phrase is strongly D(iscourse)-linked and represents a unique referent assumed to be known to both speaker and hearer, and which the speaker intends to refer to.
(ii) A specific indefinite noun phrase need not be D-linked. It represents an existing referent that the hearer may not know about, but which the speaker has in mind and intends to refer to.”

According to Aboh’s definition of specificity, both specific and non-specific indefinites are sensitive to the pragmatic factor of speaker referential intent. What distinguishes specific definite NEs is the fact that they are always D(iscourse)-linked and represent part of the speaker/hearer specific knowledge. In what follows, I will elaborate on Aboh’s definition of specificity of definite NEs highlighting the contrast between definiteness and specificity.

Unlike definiteness, specificity of definite NEs does not just presuppose that a particular referent is identifiable to the speaker and the hearer, but requires a particular type of shared identifiability, namely identifiability via a link with a discourse antecedent. According to this definition of specificity, only strictly anaphoric definites are [+specific]. All other uses of the definite determiner in languages like English, including associative anaphoric use, situational uses, and general knowledge based use (cf. Hawkins 1978), which do not involve a link with a discourse antecedent, are [-specific]. Thus, here we observe again that specificity is strongly associated with topicality.

The studies by Aboh (2004a and subsequent work) and Aboh and Essegbey (2010) demonstrate that some Niger-Congo languages possess grammatical markers of specific definite NEs. These elements, which may appear to be functionally parallel to definite articles in Germanic and Romance languages, are only used to mark specific definite NEs, while non-specific definites surface with a zero determiner. Such a specificity-based system of marking definite NEs can be, for instance, found in Gbe languages. The examples below are from Gungbe.

Gungbe (Aboh 2004a: 76; p.c.)

Strict anaphora

(29) Koku mën távò cè bò ìló ìmí ná xò távò ló.
Koku see.PFV table 1SG.POSS and say.PFV 3SG FUT buy table DEF
‘Koku saw my table and then said he would buy the/that table.’
Associative anaphora

(30) Ûn dó tāxí tè bò chɔfɛ̀ kùn hòn nà mì. Má
    1SG make taxi stand and driver open door give 1SG 1SG
    m̀n nú m̀nkò kpɔn.
    see thing like this  never
    ‘I stopped the taxi and the driver opened the door for me. I’ve never seen anything like this.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

(31) Ăxɔlù wè nò dú tɛví tìtan.
    King FOC HAB eat yam first
    ‘The king (over there/in general) eats the yam first.’

Definiteness-inducing general knowledge

(32) Xìa bìbélù!
    read bible
    ‘Read the Bible!’

Definiteness-inducing modifiers

(33) Ddwè dɛ̀ a m̀n tɔ̀ fɔtɔ̀ jì mÌxɔ̀ cè  wè
    Man REL 2SG see COP photo on brother 1SG.POSS FOC
    ‘The man you saw in the picture is my brother.’

As examples (29)-(33) demonstrate, in contrast to English, in Gungbe only strictly anaphoric definite NEs are introduced by an overt determiner; all other types of semantically definite NEs (associative anaphora, situational definite NEs, general knowledge-based definite NEs, and NEs containing definiteness-inducing modifiers) surface without a determiner.

While definite determiners in languages like English are used indiscriminately with both specific and non-specific definite NEs, specific definite interpretation can be unambiguously realized in these languages by means of demonstratives. Diessel (1999) lists the following uses of demonstratives: (i) situational use (pointing to objects in situational context); (ii) anaphoric use (tracking referents in the ongoing discourse); recognitional use (activating referents that belong to specific shared speaker/hearer knowledge); (iii) discourse deictic use (referring back to propositions); and (iv) recognitional use (activating specific speaker-hearer shared knowledge). Anaphoric and recognitional uses of demonstratives correspond to the distribution of specific definite
markers in languages like Gungbe. Below, I will illustrate and discuss these two functions.

As shown in examples (34) and (34), the anaphoric function of demonstratives is restricted to strictly anaphoric cases. Unlike definite determiners, demonstratives may not mark associative anaphora. According to Hawkins (1978), in contrast to definite determiners, demonstratives are characterized by a “matching constraint”: they instruct the hearer “to match the linguistic referent with some identifiable object” (154), which in case of the anaphoric use corresponds to the discourse antecedent.

English (my data)

(34) a. He bought a car in Germany. The/that car was very expensive.

b. He bought a car just a year ago and the/*that engine broke down already.

Unlike anaphoric demonstratives, recognitional demonstratives do not have a referent in the surrounding context, but instruct the hearer to match the referent of the NE with an object or individual present in the speaker and hearer shared knowledge. Thus, while anaphoric demonstratives mark the referent of the NE as discourse-old, recognitional demonstratives mark information that is discourse-new but hearer-old. Using the terminology from Chafe (1987, 1994) and Dryer (1996), Diessel (1999) observed that such information is unactivated but pragmatically presupposed. Diessel emphasizes that the recognitional use of demonstratives may only concern private or specific (cf. Himmelman 1996) information that the speaker and the hearer share due to common experience in the past, and not general cultural information shared by all members of the speech community. An example of the recognitional use of demonstratives is given below.

English (Gundel et al. 1993: 278)

(35) I could not sleep last night. That dog (next door) kept me awake.

The use of that in (35) is only felicitous when the interlocutors have shared private knowledge about a specific dog.

Similar examples may be found in Gungbe. The use of lɔ in the question utterance is only felicitous if the interlocutors have previously agreed that one of them would make a certain soup.
In addition to Gungbe and other Gbe languages, specificity markers similar to lɔ, may be found in other Niger-Congo languages, including Fula, Eastern Ijo, Mandinka and Yoruba (Bobyleva 2009). Some creolists (e.g., Aboh 2006; Stewart 2006; Guillemin 2009) argue that elements identified as definite determiners in creoles are also used to mark specificity. According to Aboh, the specificity-based use of the definite determiners he observed in such Atlantic creoles as Haitian, Sranan and Saramaccan results from the Gbe influence. These claims will be addressed in chapter 9.

As already observed above, Aboh’s definition of specific definite NEs correlates with the pragmatic definition of specific indefinite NEs that suggests that the latter denote referents that are considered by the speaker to be important for the subsequent discourse. Both pragmatically specific indefinite determiners and specific definite determiners, the way they are defined by Aboh, typically mark discourse topics. While pragmatically indefinite NEs serve to introduce new discourse participants which are likely to play an important role in the subsequent discourse, specific definite determiners serve as anchoring devices, which establish the topical role of new discourse participants. It is, therefore, not accidental that some languages use determiners to mark pragmatically specific indefinite NEs and specific definite NEs as they are defined by Aboh. As examples (28)-(33) demonstrate, Gbe languages belong to this type.

4.2 Structure

As stated in the Introduction, I will discuss the structure of NEs using the terminology and analytic tools proposed within the generative framework. In this section, I will discuss the structural representation of NEs, paying special attention to the DP hypothesis (Abney 1987) and proposals concerning the organization of the functional domain dominating the lexical NP projection.

4.2.1 Morphosyntactic features and their structural representation

In Section 4.1, I discussed the notions of individuation, quantity, definiteness and specificity and the way they affect the interpretation and the licensing properties of NEs.
Semantic properties that affect the licensing of a constituent are identified in the generative grammar as syntactic features. Syntactic features are atoms of linguistic structure, properties of the presumably universal syntactic structure. They determine the morphological shape of words and the way words are assembled into a syntactic structure, which is then interpreted for meaning by the discourse-semantic component of language (see Introduction). From this description, it follows that the primary function of morphosyntactic features is to relate form and meaning.

Assuming that individuation, quantity, definiteness and specificity are syntactic features implies that they are universally present in the structure of NEs. However, in the previous sections we have observed that these features are not cross-linguistically realized in the same way. For instance, while determiner use in Gbe languages is sensitive to specificity, in Germanic and Romance languages specificity is irrelevant to determiner use (see sections 4.1.8.2 and 4.1.8.3). This, however, does not imply that Romance and Germanic languages cannot encode specificity at all. Although the expression of specificity in Germanic and Romance languages is not grammaticalized, they may employ demonstratives and periphrastic means to express specificity. Thus, the same feature may be encoded morphologically in one language and lexically in the other. Morphosyntactic features may also have different morphological realizations across languages. For instance, in Germanic and Romance languages nominal plurality is expressed by means of suffixes, many Kwa languages employ free morphemes as plural markers, and in Bantu plurality is expressed within the system of nominal classes by means of class prefixes. Thus, while the features themselves are universal, languages have different means to express them. Languages differ with regard to the sets of features they grammaticalize and the morphosyntactic means used to realize the same feature vary cross-linguistically.

The set of features that the grammar of a language is sensitive to as well as the formal licensing of the features are defined in terms of principles and parameters. Principles are universal, i.e., common to all languages. They determine the universal properties of linguistic structure. For instance, they determine the ultimate set of features the syntax of natural languages can be sensitive to, blocking nonsensical grammatical rules such as, for instance, a special rule for all words that begin with t- or words uttered on a Friday, at ten thirty five. Also, principles delimit the range of the possible formal licensing of features, preventing languages from having two elements to express an exactly identical set of features in free variation.

While principles delimit the ultimate range of morphosyntactic variability, parameters determine the variants of morphosyntactic organization that are possible across languages. The set of features the grammar of a language is sensitive to as well as the kind of formal licensing the features receive in that language is all a matter of the particular parameter setting. For instance, different parameter settings determine the fact that some languages use determiners to express definiteness and others to express specificity.
4.2.2 NP and DP

The idea that syntactic structures are hierarchical in their nature is essential in generative grammar. Smaller structures are assumed to combine into larger structures, which can further combine into yet larger structures, and so on. This phenomenon of structure embedding is considered to be distinctive of human language only and is referred to as recursion. The hierarchical structures are organized into phrases. X-bar theory is the part of the grammar that regulates the structure of phrases. According to this theory, all phrases are headed by one head. The head is the most important element of the phrase as it projects its features to the phrasal level, thus determining the morphosyntactic behaviour of the phrase. As heads project their features to their phrases, phrases are said to be projections of their heads. In relation to the architecture of the phrase, the head is a zero-level projection, which is usually notated as X° or just X. X-bar theory distinguishes two further levels of projection. When a head combines with a complement, they form an intermediate X’ projection. The latter can combine with a specifier to form XP, the maximal projection of a phrase. The structure of a phrase is represented in (37). Note that the complement and the specifier are both maximal projections:

\[(37) \quad \begin{array}{c}
\text{XP} \\
\text{Spec} & \text{X'} \\
\text{ZP} & \text{X} \\
& \text{YP}
\end{array}\]

The hierarchical relations between the projections are defined in terms of c-command.

A node X c-commands a node Y iff:
(i) X does not dominate Y;
(ii) Y does not dominate X;
(iii) The first branching node Z dominating X dominates Y.

In early generative grammar, it was assumed that only lexical categories were able to project phrases. Initially, X-bar theory, the part of the grammar that regulates the structure of phrases, was developed for verbs, nouns, adjectives and prepositions. Later on, it was proposed that functional items, including inflection, are also able to project syntactic structures that conform to the X-bar scheme. In particular, the studies in the clausal (cf. Chomsky 1986) and nominal (cf. Abney 1987, Szabolcsi 1987) domains contributed to the development of this proposal.

Abney’s and Szabolcsi’s work, where they propose and advocate the DP hypothesis, changed the way in which the structure of NEs was analyzed. In traditional X-bar theory, NEs are analyzed as projections of the lexical category N(oun) and they are therefore structurally represented as NPs. Under this approach, determiners are
considered to be modifiers of the head noun, just like adjectives, numerals and demonstratives. The DP hypothesis (Abney 1987; Szabolcsi 1987), which is part of a more general theory of functional head discussed here in section 4.2.2, proposes that determiners head their own projection, DP, in which the determiner generated under D takes the NP as its complement.

4.2.3 The structure of the nominal functional domain

The extension of the X-bar theory to the non-lexical categories gave an impetus to the investigation of the functional domain, which led to further proliferation of functional projections. Projections, which were traditionally treated as unitary, were claimed to exhibit an articulated functional domain (cf. Cinque 1994, 1999; Pollock 1989; Ritter 1991, 1992; Rizzi 1997, 2001, 2004a,b, among others). Functional heads that make up such an articulated functional domain do not always strictly correspond to a certain lexical category. They represent morphosyntactic features and can thus be realized by a set of functional or lexical elements which express these features.

The assumption that the set of morphosyntactic features used in the languages of the world is universal (see section 4.2.1) and that the cross-linguistic variation is mainly due to the differences in the exhaustiveness of the overt morphological inventories which spell out these features gave rise to a hypothesis that “the distinct hierarchies of functional projections may be universal in the inventory of the heads they involve, in their number, and in their relative order” (Cinque 2002: 3). Given this assumption, the goal of the research into the functional domain is the systematic mapping of the presumably universal hierarchies of functional projections. The branch of generative grammar that takes on this enterprise is referred to as cartography (cf. in particular Rizzi 2004b; Cinque 2002; Belletti 2004).

After the introduction of the DP-hypothesis, much work has been done in the study of the organization of the functional domain dominating NP. It has been shown that the structure of DP parallels the layered structure of the sentence (CP). Szabolcsi (1987) argues that the structure of DP includes three layers. These are (a) the core predicate layer (the layer of the lexical noun head and its arguments), (b) the functional layer that consists of a number of functional projections that host agreement features and whose specifier positions are occupied by nominal modifiers (adjectives, numerals and demonstratives) and (c) the nominal left periphery that hosts the features expressed by nominal determiners. Following the analogy between DP and CP, some scholars have further suggested that the nominal left periphery, like the sentential left periphery, possesses an articulated structure, where each morphosyntactic feature is realized as an independent projection. These include, for example, the Number Phrase (NumP), which projects between D and NP and is the locus of number specification (Ritter 1992). Borer (2005) further proposes that one can distinguish two layers within NumP itself. These are Classifier Phrase (ClP), which encodes Individuation, and Quantity Phrase (QP), which encodes Quantity (i.e. singular vs. plural). ClP is realized by means of classifiers.
in languages like Chinese, but it may also be realized by means of the plural marker or
the indefinite determiner in languages like English. The quantity feature is also
expressed by means of the plural marker and the indefinite determiner which are thus
assumed to raise from CIP, where they are base-generated, to QP.

Following Rizzi’s (1997) analysis of the left periphery of the clause, Ihsane and
Puskás (2001) make a structural distinction between a functional projection in which
specificity is realized and another one which hosts definiteness. They argue that “[t]he
projection hosting the [+/- definite] feature syntactically corresponds to the clausal
Finiteness Phrase, the lowest projection of the left periphery, whereas the [+specific]
feature characterizes a projection parallel to the clausal Topic Phrase in that it hosts
information which has already been introduced in the discourse” (Ihsane and Puskás
2001: 39). In section 4.1.8, I already articulated the relationship between specificity and
topicality. The relevant functional projections in the nominal domain are referred to by
Ihsane and Puskás as Topic Phrase (TopP) and Definite Phrase (DefP). Based on the
assumption that the highest projections of the left periphery are linked to discourse,
Ihsane and Puskás propose a structure of the nominal left periphery in which TopP is
higher than the DefP:

(38) TopP  
   Spec  Top’  
      Top  DefP  
         Spec  Def’  
             Def  NP

As do Ihsane and Puskás (2001), Aboh (2004a) argues that the features
specificity and definiteness are associated with two distinct functional projections.
According to Aboh’s Split-D hypothesis, specificity and definiteness are realized in DP
and NumP, respectively:
Aboh (2004b, 2010) modifies this proposal along the lines proposed by Ihsane and Puskás, arguing that specificity marking corresponds to topic marking inside the nominal domain and that specificity markers are realized under TopP. Following the parallel between the nominal and the sentential domains, he argues that TopP is projected below DP. In Aboh’s proposal, D corresponds to C. D is solely viewed as a subordinator which turns the predicate NP into an argument and is not associated with the realization of definiteness, which is realized lower in the DP. In the present work, which focuses on the semantics of creole determiners, I follow Ihsane and Puskás (2001) in the assumption that the D-layer, which is responsible for the realization of the definiteness feature, is located under TopP, which is oriented towards discourse.

Building up on the work discussed above, I view the nominal structure as follows:
4.2.4 Non-overt features and the issue of the null D

The next question is, of course, whether all the layers in articulated DP always project. Here, I adhere to the general assumption that if a surface form is unspecified for a certain feature, the relevant functional head projects, if this form may nevertheless be interpreted for this feature. For instance, while definite NEs in English are not overtly specified for specificity, TopP still projects as they always receive specific or non-specific interpretation in discourse. Also, specificity in English may be expressed lexically, by means of adnominal demonstratives. The only condition under which the functional head does not project is when the NE is underspecified for the feature that heads this projection. For instance, according to Borer (2005), ClP projects only with nouns that refer to bouded entities, which always must check their individuation feature. When a noun refers to a mass and, therefore, cannot be individuated, ClP is absent from the structure.

In the context of the discussion of non-overt functional heads, the issue of the universality of D is particularly important. The central argument underlying the DP-hypothesis is that NP is predicative and may therefore only denote but not refer; D assigns reference and argumental status to NP. Under the assumption that only DPs can be arguments, the occurrence of determinerless NPs in argument positions is problematic. As mentioned in section 4.1.8.3, there are many world languages that either do not have definite determiners at all or have determiners but allow for determinerless nouns under certain syntactico-semantic conditions. Since creoles generally belong to the latter type of languages, the issue of the universality of D is extremely relevant for the present study.

The most wellknown solutions to the problem of determinerless NEs have been put forward by Longobardi (1994) and Chierchia (1998). According to Longobardi (1994), NEs always project a full DP regardless of whether they occur with an overt determiner or not. If a determinerless NE occurs in an argument position, N is assumed to have raised into the D position (overtly or covertly), or the NE is assumed to comprise a null D + N. According to Longobardi, the first scenario is applicable to proper names and generics, and the second to determinerless common nouns. Longobardi maintains that determinerless common nouns may only occur in lexically governed positions. Typically, a null D is lexically governed by V. While this observation is true for the Romance languages analyzed by Longobardi, it is not valid for many other languages of the world, including creoles.

Chierchia (1998) approaches the issue of the universality of D from the cross-linguistic perspective and proposes the Nominal Mapping Parameter, which allows for cross-linguistic variation in the denotations of NEs. The Nominal Mapping Parameter presumes that denotation of nouns varies across languages. According to Chierchia, languages vary as to whether nouns are stored in the lexicons as Kind-denoting terms, predicate-denoting terms or both. Kind-denoting nouns possess the status of arguments and, according to Chierchia, they are specified as [+arg]. Nouns that are [+arg] do not
need D to be used as arguments. Kind-denoting nouns can be found in languages like Chinese that have a generalized classifier system and no plural morphology. The fact that nouns in Chinese are inherently argumental accounts for the fact that determinerless NEs in this language may freely occur in argumental positions. In contrast to Chinese, in Romance languages NEs are predicates, and cannot function as arguments unless the category D is projected. D is thus considered to contain a semantic operator which triggers a shift from Predicate to Kind. Finally, there is another language type represented by Germanic and Slavic languages. They behave like Romance languages with regard to some NEs such as singular count nouns, and like Chinese with others such as mass and plural nouns. In these languages, NEs may be both predicative and argumental.

The crucial question in Chierchia’s proposal is how definite interpretation is obtained. He proposes that determinerless languages have a non-overt iota operator which is semantically equivalent to the definite determiner. In languages that do have a definite determiner, the iota operator is made unavailable by virtue of the following principle: “If there is a determiner D whose meaning is a particular type shifting, then use of that operation as an automatic type-changing factor is blocked” (Chierchia 1998: 15). Creole languages, in which determiners appear optional in certain semantico-syntactic contexts, present an interesting challenge to Chierchia’s Blocking Principle (see Chapters 7-9).

4.2.5 Word order and movement

In the empirical chapters of this book, we will observe that creole languages show significant word order variation in the nominal domain, often combining word order properties from their superstrate and their substrate languages.

It has traditionally been assumed that the phrase structure rules only determine the hierarchical relations between a head and its complement and a head and its specifier, but not their linear ordering. Under this assumption, the cross-linguistic variation in the ordering in complement-head and specifier-head sequences is considered to be a matter of fixing the so-called directionality parameter. A significant drawback of this analysis is that it allows for word order options that are not attested in natural languages. Therefore, a more restricted account of constituent ordering has been proposed. This alternative account is known under the name of antisymmetry theory (e.g., Kayne 1994). According to this theory, UG determines the base order of constituents; and divergent orders are generated by additional movement. This base order is derived from the hierarchical relationship of constituents. Precedence reproduces asymmetric c-command, which only works rightwards. The base order is thus always specifier-head-complement. An example of the base order is SVO order in the sentence. In the nominal domain, in the base order all determiners and modifiers precede the NP (Cinque 1996 and much related work). This is illustrated in the structural representation provided under (41) below.
If the surface word order deviates from the local hierarchical relations between a head and its complement or a head and its specifier, as defined in terms of c-command, then movement is assumed to have taken place. The moved element is assumed to have left a trace in the position it has vacated (its extraction site). The trace is an empty category, which preserves the thematic relations between the moved element and other constituents in a sentence. The moved element and its trace are linked: they form a chain. The presence of this chain allows us to interpret the moved element.

There are different types of movement which are distinguished on the basis of the type of element which is moved and on the basis of the landing site. Based on the first criterion, we can distinguish between head movement, when only the head of a projection moves, and phrasal movement, when the whole maximal projection

---

7 This part of the tree is adopted from Aboh (2010: 25) where he remains ambivalent as to whether modifiers are always maximal projections or whether they could also be heads (see Cinque 1994, 1996 and Panagiotid6is 2000 for discussion).
undergoes movement. Based on the second criterion, we can distinguish between A-movement, a movement to an argument position and A’-movement, a movement to a non-argument position.

Movement is constrained by the structure-preserving principle. According to this principle, phrases can only move to positions which are also labeled as phrases, and heads must only move into other head positions. Also, movement has to respect syntactic categories: NPs can only move to NP-positions, or to positions that are not specified for a syntactic category.

Movement may affect either the surface representation of a linguistic structure, identified as a phonetic form (PF) or a spell-out or the interpretation, the so-called logical form (LF). The former type of movement produces word orders different from the underlying base order and is characterized as overt movement. The latter type of movement has no bearing on the surface ordering of constituents and is referred to as covert movement.

In generative studies, the idea of movement is invoked to account for word order variations across languages, particularly for the deviations from the alleged base order cross-linguistically observed in word order patterns.
Part II

Analysis
Chapter 5

Forms

The present chapter gives an overview of elements used to realize individuation, number, identifiability and deixis in the creoles under study and discusses their etymology. Although the distribution of individuation, number and identifiability markers in creoles might be rather different from the distribution of their apparent Germanic and Romance counterparts, for the sake of convenience here I will refer to them using the traditional terms such as “(in)definite determiners” and “plural markers”, postponing the discussion of the semantics of these elements till chapters 7-9.

5.1 Indefinite determiners

Although creoles do not mark indefinite NEs in exactly the same way as their superstrate languages do, all the creoles considered here have indefinite determiners that appear functionally congruent to indefinite articles in their superstrate languages. Indefinite determiners in creoles are exceptionally uniform with regard to their etymology. In all but two creoles considered here, they are homophonous with and, presumably, historically related to the numeral ‘one’. The development of indefinite determiners from the numeral ‘one’ represents a universally prominent grammaticalization path (Givón 1981). The only two varieties that deviate from this general pattern are Jamaican Creole and Afrikaans. Jamaican Creole uses two indefinite determiners, wan ‘one/a’ and a. The latter transparently derives from the English indefinite determiner a. As for Afrikaans, similarly to Dutch, it makes a distinction between the stressed één ‘one’ and the unstressed een ‘a’.

Indefinite determiners used in the creoles studies are listed in table 5.1 together with their etymological sources. Since indefinite determiners in most creoles are formally indistinguishable from numerals, not all instances of these makers can be classified as indefinite determiners or numerals with full certainty. The discussion of the
distribution of indefinite determiners will take place in chapters 7 and 8. For the purposes of this section, a creole is considered to have an indefinite determiner when this element occurs in contexts where quantification is irrelevant and where the numeral interpretation is unlikely.

Table 5.1. The numeral ‘one’ and indefinite determiners in the creoles and their etymological sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superstrate</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Germanic/Romance* source form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>wampela</td>
<td>wampela</td>
<td>one + fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>één ‘one’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>en:n</td>
<td>en:n</td>
<td>één ‘one’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>een</td>
<td>één</td>
<td>één ’a’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>yon</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>enn</td>
<td>enn</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>on</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp./Port.</td>
<td>Papiamantu</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>São-Tome</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape-Verdean</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diu Portuguese</td>
<td>üü</td>
<td>un ‘one/a’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.2 Definite determiners

Next to indefinite determiners, most creoles in the sample also have definite determiners. In the majority of the creoles, definite determiners developed from superstrate deictic markers: demonstrative adjectives, demonstrative pronouns, or demonstrative reinforcers. In a few creoles, the form of the definite determiner directly corresponds to the form (or one of the forms) of the definite article used in their European superstrate. This is illustrated in table 5.2 below.

---

8 As indefinite articles in Romance languages are homophonous with the numeral ‘one’, it cannot be established with certainty whether it was ‘one’ or the indefinite article that served as the source for indefinite determiners in creoles. Here, we can base our judgments on the analogy with Germanic creoles.
Table 5.2. Definite determiners in the creoles and their etymological sources.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superstrate</th>
<th>Definite article</th>
<th>Developmental path</th>
<th>Germanic/Romance source form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Jamaican</td>
<td>di/de</td>
<td>def. article</td>
<td>the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>da^&gt;(n)a den</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>die 'that' (com.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>die 'that' (com.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>die</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>die 'that' (com.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>là 'there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>là 'there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>là 'there'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Chabacano</td>
<td>el</td>
<td>def. article</td>
<td>el 'the' (masc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>none</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish/Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>ese 'that' (masc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saô-Tome</td>
<td>se</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>esse 'that' (masc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape-Verdean</td>
<td>kel</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>aquele 'that yonder' (masc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kes</td>
<td></td>
<td>aqueles 'that yonder' (pl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diu Portuguese</td>
<td>es</td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>esse 'that' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iku</td>
<td></td>
<td>aquele 'that yonder' (masc. sg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The development of definite articles from deictic elements, particularly, demonstrative adjectives, is cross-linguistically very common. Diachronic studies (e.g., Bruyn 1995) illustrate how this development took place in creoles. While in some creoles (e.g., Sranan or Berbice Dutch) definite determiners appear to have completely lost the demonstrative semantics of their superstrate etymons, in other creoles, definite articles still preserve deictic force. This has, for instance, been observed with respect to the element la in many French-based creoles (c.f. Valdman 1978:191; Neumann 1985:132), although, with the exception of Louisiana Creole, all French-based Creoles possess alternative demonstrative forms. There are also creoles where the same form is used as a demonstrative and as a definite determiner. These are, for instance, Negerhollands, Santome, Cape-Verdean, and Diu Portuguese.

The fact that definite determiners in most creoles derive from deictic markers and are sometimes formally indistinguishable from them, coupled with the fact that elements identified as definite determiners in creoles function differently from Germanic and Romance definite articles, raises questions with regard to the status of these elements (see chapter 9). For the purposes of this chapter, the term “definite determiner” is used as a cover term for morphemes which are (either categorically or optionally) used to mark semantically definite NEs. Demonstrative forms, if those are used to mark definiteness without expressing deixis, are also viewed here as definite determiners. In
some of the creoles under study, the use of demonstratives does not transcend to
definiteness marking. Such creoles are considered not to have a definite determiner.

5.3 Demonstratives

Since most creoles in the sample developed definite markers from elements that are used
in their Germanic and Romance superstrates as markers of deixis, it is interesting to
consider how deixis is expressed in creoles. As observed in section 5.2, in some of the
creoles under study, namely Negerhollands, Santome, Cape Verdean Creole, and Diu
Portuguese, the same form is employed as a definite determiner and as a demonstrative.
This form typically derives from the adnominal demonstrative employed in the
superstrate. Other examples of creole adnominal demonstratives that derive from
adnominal demonstratives of the superstrate are Jamaican Creole dis (<English this),
da(t) (<English that) and dem (<English them), Tok Pisin dispela (<English this +
fellow), Chabacano (e)sté ‘this’ (<Spanish este ‘this’), (e)se ‘that’ (<Spanish ese ‘that’),
and akél ‘that yonder’ (<Spanish aquel ‘that yonder’), Palenquero ete ‘this’ (<Spanish
este ‘this’), ese (variant é) ‘that’ (<Spanish ese ‘that’) and aké ‘that yonder’ (Spanish
aquel ‘that yonder’). In these creoles, definiteness is either expressed by means of an
alternative form, typically derived from the superstrate definite article (Jamaican Creole
and Chabacano), or not expressed at all (Tok Pisin and Palenquero).

In a number of the creoles considered, adnominal demonstratives appear to be
etymologically related to demonstrative pronouns in their superstrate languages. These
creoles are Sranan, Berbice Dutch, Haitian, Mauritian, and Lesser Antillean Creole. In
early Sranan deixis was expressed by means of three prenominal forms dis(i), da and
dem, which functioned as demonstratives and definite markers. While prenominal dis(i) is still
occasionally used as a demonstrative in modern Sranan, da and den have completely lost
their deictic force; they are used as definite markers only. Da has become reduced and is
now pronounced as a. In order to express deixis, a and den have to combine with
postnominal deictic markers dis and dati. Unlike the early Sranan prenominal disi and
da, postnominal dati and disi are likely to have developed not from the English
adnominal demonstratives this and that but from the demonstrative pronouns disi ‘this
(one)’ and dati ‘that (one)’, attested in early Sranan (see Bruyn 1995 for a slightly
different proposal).

Similarly to Sranan, Berbice Dutch has two demonstratives, di ‘this’ (<Dutch
die ‘that’) and dida ‘that’ (<Dutch die daar ‘that there’), which combine with the
definite determiner di in the following way: di...di and di...dida. In Dutch, the form die
functions as an adnominal demonstrative and as a demonstrative pronoun. The
combination with the locative adverb is however only possible for the pronominal die.
When daar combines with the adnominal die, it cannot immediately follow it: the should
always occur at the right edge of the NP, as in die man daar ‘that man there’. The
postnominal position of Berbice Dutch di and dida represents another argument against
the possibility of their relationship to the Dutch adnominal demonstratives, which are always prenominal. Furthermore, di and dida also function as demonstrative pronouns in Berbice Dutch. All this suggests that Berbice Dutch di and dida should be traced back to pronominal usages of die and die daar in Dutch.

All the French creoles in our sample also derive their adnominal demonstratives from French demonstrative pronouns. This generalization is, in fact, true for the majority of the known French-based creoles, with the exception of Guyanese (cf. Déprez 2006). In Haitian Creole, there are two demonstratives: [+/-proximate] sa and [-proximate] sila, which derive from the French demonstrative pronouns [+/-proximate] ça and [-proximate] cela/ceux-là. Mauritian Creole and its offshoot Seychellois display only one adnominal demonstrative sa, which has the same etymology as sa in Haitian Creole. The form sa is also used as an adnominal demonstrative in most varieties of Lesser Antillean Creole, such as Guadeloupean, Dominican, and Saint-Lucian. Martinican Creole employs the form ta instead of the widespread sa (cf. Gadellia 1997, 2007; Déprez 2006).

In many creoles, the expression of deixis involves the use of elements etymologically related to Germanic/Romance demonstrative reinforcers, which develop from the locative adverbs ‘here’ and ‘there’ (c.f. Bernstein 1997). Examples of such deictic elements are Jamaican Creole ya (<English here) and de (English there), Sranan dja ‘here’ (<English here) and drape ‘there’ (<Sranan da presie ‘that place’ (cf. Arends 1989)), Afrikaans hier ‘here’ (<Dutch hier ‘here’), daar ‘there’ (Dutch daar ‘there’), doer ‘there yonder’ (innovation, based on daar), Papiamentu aki ‘here’ (<Spanish aquí ‘here’), ei ‘there’ (<Spanish allí ‘there’), aya ‘yonder’ (<Spanish allá ‘yonder’), and Cape Verdean Creole li ‘there’ (Portuguese ali ‘there yonder’). In the creoles listed above, demonstrative reinforcer-like elements occur either in combination with adnominal demonstratives or in combination with definite determiners which are etymologically related to superstrate adnominal demonstratives. For instance, in Jamaican Creole ya and deh combine with dis, dat and dem to form the constructions dis…ya, dat…deh and dem…ya/deh and in Sranan similar constructions a…dja/drape and den…dja/drape are formed with the definite determiners a and den. As I shall more comprehensively argue in chapter 6, such constructions go back to demonstrative reinforcer constructions in Germanic and Romance languages.

5.4 Plural markers

Plural marking is the aspect of the nominal morphosyntax which shows most diversity across creoles. The forms that have been recruited to fulfill the function of plural markers in creole languages go back to a variety of sources.
5.4.1 Germanic/Romance-derived plural inflection

Several creoles in the sample make use of the Germanic/Romance-derived plural inflection -(e)s (or Dutch -en). Fossilized remnants of Germanic and Romance plural inflectional morphology are found in many creoles. Such forms are not treated as plural, and can be used to refer to both singular and plural referents (like any other bare noun, see section 7.1). Consider, for instance Sranan susu ‘shoe/shoes’ < English shoes + a paragogic vowel or Tok Pisin anis ‘ant/ants’ < English ants. But there are also creoles where superstrate-like plural inflectional morphology is used as a productive means of plural formation. This group is represented here by Jamaican Creole (cf. Patrick 2004; 2009; Bobyleva 2011b), some varieties of contemporary Tok Pisin (cf. Romaine 1992; G. Smith 2002; Bobyleva 2011b), Afrikaans, and Cape Verdean Creole. According to Lorenzino (2000), Spanish-like inflectional plural marking can also be found in Chabacano. It is however not clear whether plural inflection in Chabacano is used productively (Grant 2008: 179, ft.7; Peter Steinkrüger, p.c.). Instances of Dutch-like plural inflection are also found in Negerhollands.

5.4.2 Germanic/Romance-derived plural demonstratives and quantifiers

In some creoles, plurality may be expressed by means of elements which do not function as the main/only means of plural marking in their superstrates but which do convey plural semantics. For instance, in some creoles NEs are marked as plural by means of elements that derive from the plural forms of superstrate demonstratives. Jamaican Creole, Sranan, and Cape Verdean Creole are the only creoles in the sample which have adopted the number distinction of the superstrate demonstrative paradigm. Jamaican Creole uses three prenominal demonstratives dis ‘this’, dat ‘that’ and dem ‘these/those’. In addition to deixis, these forms are specified for number. In Sranan, the forms a and den, which have lost the deictic properties of their English etyma that and them, and perform a function similar to that of definite articles, also specify the number feature of NEs. The same holds for Cape Verdecian Creole, where in addition to plural inflection, number may be expressed by means of the demonstratives/definite determiners kel (singular) and kes (plural), which derive from the Portuguese distal demonstrative aquel ‘that (yonder)’ and aqueles ‘those (yonder)’. The prenominal plural marker se attested in many varieties of Lesser Antillean Creole also derives from a demonstrative. Its etymon is the French plural demonstrative ces ‘these/those’. Unlike the creoles discussed above, Lesser Antillean Creoles has only adapted the plural form of the French demonstrative (singular definite NEs in Lesser Antillean Creole may be marked by means of the postnominal form la). Considering that Modern French plural suffixes on the noun are often not pronounced and that articles and demonstratives are thus the only consistent
overt markers of plurality, the adaptation *ces* as a plural marker is not surprising. Similarly to the Jamaican, Sranan and Cape Verdean Creole number markers derived from demonstratives, *se* has preserved the deictic and [+definite] features of its French etymon.

Another group of superstrate adnominal elements that serve as sources of creole plural markers are plural quantifiers. In Tok Pisin, the plural on NEs is marked by means of the form *ol*, e.g. *ol man* ‘(the) men’ (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 117), which transparently derives from English *all*. While the form *ol* has been grammaticalized as a plural marker, the quantifier function is commonly performed by the stronger form *olgeta*, which derives from English *altogether*. In Diu Portuguese, plurality can be optionally expressed by means of the form *tud*, which derives from Portuguese *tudo* ‘all’. In Diu Portuguese, *tud* is ambiguous between a plural marker and a quantifier: *tud adiv* ‘all foxes/foxes’ (Cardoso 2009: 119). Mauritian Creole also developed a plural marker from a quantificational element. The form *bann* used as in *bann butej la* ‘the bottles’ (Alleesaib 2009: 2) is derived from the French noun *bande* ‘group’. Most likely, the grammaticalization of *bann* as a plural marker goes back to its use in the construction *enn bann* NP (< French *une bande de* NP ‘a group of NP’), which is attested in Mauritian creole prior to the occurrence of *bann* as a plural marker (Guillemin 2009). According to Guillemin, in Mauritian Creole, this construction acquired the semantics of a proportional quantifier, with the meaning of ‘many’, ‘a lot’. The multiple functions of *bann* in contemporary Mauritian Creole are discussed by Alleesaib (2005).

### 5.4.3 Germanic/Romance-derived 3Pl pronouns

Many Atlantic Creoles employ a form homophonous to the 3Pl pronoun as a nominal plural marker. In most creoles, this form goes back to the strong (emphatic) form of the 3Pl pronoun of the superstrate. Among the creoles under study, this group is represented by Jamaican Creole, Negerhollands, and Haitian Creole. Jamaican Creole *dem* goes back to English *them*, Negerhollands *sini* (of which the older form is *sender*) is historically related to West Flemish/Zeelandic Dutch *zijnder* ‘they’ (emphatic, contraction of *zij ander* lit. ‘they other’), and Haitian Creole *yo* derives from French *eux* ‘they’ (emphatic). The homophony of the plural markers and 3Pl pronouns in Jamaican Creole, Negerhollands, and Haitian Creole is demonstrated in examples (42)-(44) below:

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 340; Sistren 1986: 7)

(42) a. Leff* de gun dem* yah…

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{leave DEF gun PL here} \\
\text{‘Leave the guns here…’}
\end{align*}
\]
b. Big people have *dem* rum and drink it as *dem* like.
   big people have 3PL rum and drink it as 3PL like
   ‘Grown-ups have their rum and drink it as they like.’

Negerhollands (Van Rossen & Van Der Voort 1996: 259)

(43) *Sini* a ki *disman sini* loo jeet.
   3PL PST look DEF thief PL PROG eat
   ‘They saw the thieves eating.’

Haitian Creole (Holm 1953: 81)

(44) a. Li achté *bagay yo*.
   2SG buy thing PL
   ‘He bought the things.’

   b. *Yo* tout kouri.
   3PL all run
   ‘They all ran.’

Although based on this parallel between Sranan *den* and the colloquial English demonstrative *them*, Sranan has been grouped together with the creoles that employ forms of superstrate plural demonstratives to mark plurality on the noun, it may be also viewed as a creole that uses the 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker. As demonstrated in examples (45), the plural definite determiner *den* in Sranan is homophonous to the 3Pl pronoun.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 63, my data)

(45) a. *U bj-a fu lus ala den apresina…*
   1SG PST-have PREP let all DEF.PL orange
   ‘We had to leave all the oranges…’

   b. *Den e lesi buku*.
   3PL PROGR read book
   ‘They are reading a book/books.’

The same is observed in Jamaican Creole: not only the Jamaican Creole postnominal plural marker *dem* but also the prenominal demonstrative *dem* is homophonous with the 3Pl pronoun.

Possible triggers for the development of 3Pl pronouns into adnominal plural markers will be discussed in section 5.4.6.
5.4.4 Substrate-derived plural markers

Among the creoles under study, we also find creoles that have adopted plural markers employed in their substrates. These creoles are Chabacano and Palenquero. The Chabacano plural marker *manga* transparently derives from the homophonous Tagalog plural marker *manga* (or *mga*). Compare:

Chabacano (Whinom 1956: 24)

(46) **su mana compañera**

3SG.POSS PL friend

‘her friends’

Tagalog (Schachter and Otanes 1972: 111)

(47) **Mga abogado ang mga lalaki.**

PL lawyer COP PL man

‘The men are lawyers’

In Palenquero, the plural is marked by means of the form *ma*, used as in *ma besína* ‘female neighbors’ (Schwegler 2007: 215). The substrate languages of Palenquero, Kikongo and Kimbundu, belong to the Bantu branch of Niger-Congo languages. In Bantu, number (together with a gender-like feature) is expressed in the system of noun classes, which are distinguished by mean of prefixes (Carstens 1993). The form *ma* appears to function as the plural prefix of noun classes V, XI, XIV, XV in Kikongo (Laman 1964) and as the plural prefix of noun classes IV, V, VI, VII, VIII in Kimbundu (Chatelain 1888-89). As *ma* was not the only prefix used with plural noun classes in Kikongo and Kimbundu, the question arises as to why *ma* was selected to serve the function of the plural marker in Palenquero. I believe that the following two factors might have served to promote the choice of *ma* over the other plural class prefixes. Firstly, *ma* is used with more plural classes than any other prefix, which makes it a “default” choice. Secondly, in many noun classes it occurs in opposition to a zero singular prefix, which makes it perceptually more salient in comparison to other plural prefixes that function in opposition with overt singular prefixes. The frequency and saliency of *ma* may have conspired to make it the “best” candidate (see also Smith 2009).

5.4.5 Substrate-derived 3Pl pronouns

The group of creoles that use a form homophonous to the 3Pl pronoun to mark plural on nouns also contains creoles where this form derives from the form of the 3Pl pronoun in one of their substrates. Among the creoles studied here, plural markers/3Pl pronouns
with substrate origins are found in Papiamentu and Santome. The homophony of plural markers and 3Pl pronouns in these creoles is demonstrated in examples (48)-(49) below:

Papiamentu (Kouwenberg and Murray 1994: 49; Dijkhoff 1983: 218)

(48) a. e auto nan
   DEF car   PL
   ‘the cars’

   b. Nan ta kria baka.
   3PL DUR keep cow
   ‘They keep cows.’

Santome (Ferraz 1979: 122, 22)

(49) a. (i)ne mwala
   PL woman
   ‘the women’

   b. I’ne na ko’se ’pisi ’godó fa.
   3PL NEG know fish fat NEG
   ‘They don’t know what good fish is.’

Both Papiamentu nan and Santome (i)ne are traced back either to the Edo 3Pl pronoun irā (Maurer 2002) or to the Kimbundu 3Pl ene (Rougé 2004).

Another creole that can be included into this group is Berbice Dutch. In Berbice Dutch, the plural is marked by means of the suffix -apu, e.g. namblu-apu ‘the horses’ (Kouwenberg 2007: 453). The form -apu derives from the major (or, perhaps, the only) substrate of Berbice Dutch, Eastern Ijo. In Eastern Ijo, the form ápu functions as a 3Pl pronoun, which is used to refer to humans and has the meaning of ‘persons’. Together with [+human], [-plural] bo ‘person’; [-human], [-plural] ye ‘thing’; [-human], [+plural] dí ‘things’, ápú belongs to the class of replacive pronouns. Replacive pronouns occur in a number of syntactic contexts as anaphors. Their function is, thus, to replace NEs previously introduced into the discourse. The parallel between Berbice Dutch and Atlantic creoles where the form recruited as a plural marker goes back to a regular personal pronoun, is thus only partial. Also, -apu is not used as a 3Pl pronoun in Berbice Dutch. The Berbice Dutch 3Pl pronoun is en(i), which transparently derives from the Eastern Ijo personal 3Pl [+animate] pronoun ini (see examples (50) and (51)).
Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1993: 238)

(50)  *en(i) bi oprop oko*

3PL say pig too
‘they say pig too’

Eastern Ijo (Jenewari 1977: 251)

(51)  Gogó ori `eréme belemááři kúma *ini*, ingba o

Gogo 3SG.M woman love-GEN but 3PL 3PL 3SG.M
belema-∅-áä.
love-GEN-NEG-NSM
‘Gogo loves his wifes but they do not love him.’

5.4.6 More on 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker

As observed in sections 5.4.2 and 5.4.5, quite a few creoles under study mark the plural
by means of a form that is homophonous with a 3Pl pronoun and/or derives from it in
either their superstrate or their substrate. In addition to the creoles considered here, this
strategy of plural marking is found in nearly all English-based and some French-based
Atlantic creoles. While the feature is very common among Atlantic Creoles with
different lexifiers, creoles spoken outside of the Atlantic area do not display this
feature. This has given rise to the idea that the use of the 3Pl pronoun as a plural

10 In the literature, Tok Pisin has also been listed among creole languages that use 3PL pronouns as plural
markers. In contemporary Tok Pisin, the form of the plural marker *ol* is homophonous with the 3Pl pronoun.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäuser et al. 2003: 92)

(i)  *Ol* i fiksim gut.

3PL PM fix-it good
‘They fixed it properly.’

Since many Eastern Oceanic languages use plural markers which are related to 3Pl pronouns (Keesing 1988;
Lynch et al. 2002), the homophony of the 3Pl pronoun and the plural marker in Tok Pisin was interpreted by
some scholars as evidence of substrate influence (Goulden 1990; Faraclas 2007).

Raga (Crowley 2002: 628)

(ii)  *Ira* tuturani *ra*-m bano.

PL European 3Pl-CONT go
‘The Europeans were going.’
marker must be a Niger-Congo-derived feature. The advocates of the substratist approach to creole genesis have repeatedly pointed out that the use of the 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker is attested in a number of potentially relevant Niger-Congo substrates of Atlantic Creoles.

The substratist argument has been almost unanimously accepted among creolists. As observed by Boretzky (1983: 91), “this means of forming the plural appears to be one of those undisputed cases in which West African influence is generally recognized” (the English translation is quoted from Holm 1988: 193). A closer examination of the (West) African substrate, however, reveals that the substratist argument relies on a very shaky empirical basis.

As observed in section 5.4.5, in Papiamentu, Santome, and Berbice Dutch, the form of the plural marker has Niger-Congo origins. Papiamentu nan and Santome ine are traced back either to the Edo 3Pl pronoun irã (Maurer 2002) or to the Kimbundu 3Pl ene (Rougé 2004). Berbice Dutch -apu derives from the Eastern Ijo replacive pronoun ápú. None of these forms is used as a nominal plural marker in their source languages. In Edo, number on nouns is rarely marked. Only a few nouns have singular and plural forms, which are distinguished by means of changing prefixes (Dunn 1968: 207). In Kimbundu, as well as in other Bantu languages, number is expressed within the noun class system (see section 5.4.4). Also in Eastern Ijo, ápú does not belong to regular means of plural formation. Nouns in Eastern Ijo are commonly marked for plural by means of the affixal form a (which only occurs in NEs that contain a prenominal modifier), or by means of the plural form of the definite determiner (Jenewari 1977: 193-194). The only context in which Eastern Ijo ápú resembles plural marking is when it is used in combination with other nominals, which then function as modifiers of ápú.

Arosi (Lynch and Horoi 2002: 565)

(iii)  

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{irau} & \quad \text{gare-na} \\
\text{PL} & \quad \text{child-3SG}
\end{align*} \]

‘his children’

(iv)  

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{Na} & \quad \text{ani} \quad \text{mwaeraha} \quad \text{a-daau} \\
\text{DET} & \quad \text{DEM} \quad \text{DET} \quad \text{chief} \quad \text{POSS-3PL}
\end{align*} \]

‘This is their chief.’

A diachronic survey of the pronominal systems of Tok Pisin and its earlier varieties, however, suggests that the homophony of the plural marker with the 3Pl pronoun observed in contemporary Tok Pisin is unlikely to be the result of etymological relatedness. In Samoan Plantation Pidgin, the predecessor of Tok Pisin, the form ol was used as a pronominal pluralizer. One finds mi ol for ‘we’, yu ol for ‘you (plural), and em ol for ‘them’. Thus, the form of the 3Pl pronoun was not just ol; it was composed out of the person marker em and the plural marker ol. The contemporary shape of the 3Pl pronoun results from the drop of the person marker. The grammaticalization of the quantifier ol (in competition with the alternative form olgeta ‘all’) as a nominal plural marker began much earlier, before the establishment of the form ol as the 3Pl pronoun (cf. Mühlhäusler 1981). It thus appears that the homophony of the plural marker and the 3Pl pronoun observed in contemporary Tok Pisin results from two independent developments.
(52) ini mì ama ɓe opu apu.
3PL DEM town of big person
‘They are important personalities in this town’

On the whole, the use of the 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker appears to be far less common among Niger-Congo languages than it has often been assumed. The languages cited by advocates of the substrate origins of this feature in creoles are listed in table 5.3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Branch</th>
<th>Individual representatives</th>
<th>Mentioned in:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gbe (Gà, Aja, G)</td>
<td>Parkvall 2000: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akan (Twi, Fante)</td>
<td>Parkvall 2000: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Igbo</td>
<td>Parkvall 2000: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ebiro</td>
<td>Parkvall 2000: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mande</td>
<td>Bambara</td>
<td>Boretzky 1983: 88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mandinka</td>
<td>Goodman 1964:46; Hancock 1986: 94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantic</td>
<td>Fulfülde</td>
<td>Parkvall 2000: 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chadic</td>
<td>Hausa</td>
<td>Parkvall 2000: 95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3. Niger-Congo languages claimed to display the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature.

The reader must have noticed that the number of languages in table 5.3 is quite small. In addition to that, the examination of the historical connections between Atlantic Creoles and the languages of West Africa shows that not all the languages cited in table 5.3 are equally relevant for the validity of the substratist argument. Consider table 5.4 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Creole</th>
<th>PIM=3Pl</th>
<th>Substrate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>+ mainly Kwa (Gbe, Akan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>+ Kwa (Gbe), Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>+ Kwa (Gbe), Bantu, Benue-Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+ mainly Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>+ mainly Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesser Antillean Creoles</td>
<td>- Kwa (Gbe), Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>Santome Creole</td>
<td>+ Kwa (Gbe), Bantu, Benue-Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(and other Gulf of Guinea Creoles)</td>
<td>- Atlantic, Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape Verdean</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>+ Kwa (Gbe), Bantu, Benue-Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>- Bantu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.4. Atlantic Creoles with and without the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature and their important substrate languages.
The table demonstrates that the use of the 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker is attested only in those creoles under study that have Kwa (specifically, Gbe) languages as (one of) their main substrate(s). Gbe languages are often alluded to by advocates of the substratist account of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in creoles. The most frequently cited Gbe language in the context of this discussion is Ewegbe. According to older descriptions of this language (e.g., Westermann 1930), the plural of nouns is formed by adding the 3Pl form of the personal pronoun to the singular form. Indeed, the form of the Ewegbe plural marker wó is homophonous with the weak form of the 3Pl pronoun wó. This is illustrated in example (53) below.

Ewegbe (Aboh 2004a: 81)

(53) Ama kpo devi a wó, e be wó yi suku.
Ama see child DET PL 3SG say 3PL go school
‘Ama saw the children, he said they go to school.’

However, a look into the pronominal system of Ewegbe and other closely related Gbe languages sheds doubts on the received assumption that the homophony observed in (53) is indicative of etymological relatedness.

As table 5.5 shows, Ewegbe has distinct weak and strong forms of personal pronouns. While wó is the weak form of the 3Pl pronoun, the strong form is wó-á-wó. The strong form represents a compound consisting of the weak form of the personal pronoun (which functions as the person marker) + definite article + plural marker (Aboh 2004a: 135-136). The structure of the strong pronouns is the same as that of plural noun phrases. Compare, for instance, to devi-a-wó ‘the children’ (Aboh 2004c: 81). The parallel shows that the same strategy, involving the plural marker wó, is used to form plural of nouns and of pronouns. The same is observed in Fongbe and Gungbe, where the plural of both nouns and pronouns is indicated by the marker lé. Compare the strong forms of pronouns in Fongbe and Gungbe to the following examples of plural nouns: Fongbe às:n lé ‘the crabs’ (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 39) and Gungbe távò lé ‘the tables’ (Aboh 2004a: 81). Note that unlike wó, lé is not homophonous with the 3Pl pronoun, which has the form yé in Fongbe and Gungbe. The lack of homophony

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ewegbe</th>
<th>Fongbe</th>
<th>Gungbe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>weak</strong></td>
<td><strong>strong</strong></td>
<td><strong>weak</strong></td>
<td><strong>strong</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st person</td>
<td>mí</td>
<td>mí-á-wó</td>
<td>mí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
<td>mí</td>
<td>mí-á-wó</td>
<td>mí</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
<td>wó</td>
<td>wó-á-wó</td>
<td>yé</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5. Weak and strong forms of plural pronouns in Ewegbe, Fongbe, and Gungbe (Westermann 1930; anonymous: III, 2-3; Aboh 2004a: 129).
between the plural marker and the 3Pl in Fongbe and Gungbe suggests that in Ewegbe this homophony may be accidental and thus not indicative of etymological relatedness.

The same conclusion holds for some other languages cited by the substratist researchers as potential sources of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in Atlantic creoles, for instance, for Bambara. In modern day Bambara, nouns are pluralized by means of the suffix -w, e.g., muso-w ‘women’. Like in Gbe languages, pronouns in Bambara have weak and strong forms. The weak form of the 3Pl pronoun is ù. The form ù is assumed to be the source form of the plural marker. However, this derivational path appears unlikely if we take into consideration that the older form of the Bambara plural marker is lù (cf. Kastenholz 1989). Nowadays, this form can be found in strong pronouns such as the 3Pl pronoun o-lù. Given this, it is far more likely that the modern form of the plural marker w goes back to the older form lù. As for the weak form of the 3Pl pronoun ù, it appears to represent the contraction of the strong form o-lù (which is a combination of the 3rd person marker o with the plural marker lù). Under this analysis, the resemblance between the modern plural suffix and the weak form of the 3Pl pronoun appears to be accidental.

Thus, while all the languages considered above share the property of using the same form as a nominal and as a pronominal plural marker, only in Ewegbe and in Bambara does the plural marker show partial resemblance to the 3Pl pronoun. Among the languages listed in table 5.3, the use of the same plural marker for nouns and for pronouns is also observed in Mandinka and Akan. Similarly to Fongbe and Gungbe, these languages do not display any resemblance between the plural marker and the 3Pl pronoun. It is thus not clear to me why these languages were cited as potential sources of the ‘plural marker=3Pl pronoun’ feature in creoles. Below, I will briefly consider the relevant evidence from these languages.

Let us first consider a close relative of Bambara Mandinka, which also belongs to the Mande language group. In Mandinka, the form of the plural marker is lu or nu, e.g., dìnding-o-lu ‘the children’ (Rowlands 1969: 38). This form is used to pluralize both nouns and pronouns. Like in Bambara and the Gbe languages considered above, pronouns in Mandinka have a weak and a strong form. The strong forms of Mandinka plural pronouns represent a compound composed of the person marker (homophonous to the weak form of the plural pronoun), the emphatic marker te and the plural marker lu: nì-te-lu ‘we’ (strong), i-te-lu ‘you’ (strong), and aìl-te-lu ‘they’ (strong) (Rowlands 1969: 55). As these examples demonstrate, the weak form of the 3Pl pronoun ì(i) does not show any resemblance to the plural marker.

As for Akan, it uses several different means of plural formation. The suffix -nom, which functions as a (associative) plural marker with some nouns (such as proper names or kinship terms), is also used as a pronominal pluralizer (see example (54)). Similarly to Fongbe and Gungbe lë and Mandinka lu, Akan -nom does not seem to be etymologically related to the 3Pl pronoun.
Akan (Christaller 1875: 39, my data)

(54) a. onua-nom
     brother-PL
     ‘brothers’

     b. eno-nom
     it-PL
     ‘they’ (for things)

Thus, the use of the same marker to form the plural of nouns and pronouns appears to be common among at least Kwa and Mande languages. The homophony between this marker and the 3Pl pronoun among these languages is, however, rare and likely to be accidental.

The only language from the list given in table 5.3 where one does observe a clear case of homophony between the plural marker and 3Pl pronoun is Yoruba. Yoruba marks plurality by means of the preposed freestanding morpheme àwọn. As demonstrated in the examples below, this morpheme is homophonous with the 3Pl pronoun.

Yoruba (Ajiboye 2005: 243, 245)

(55) a. Mo bí àwọn ọmọ
     1SG born PL child
     ‘I have children.’

     b. Mo rí àwọn
     1SG see 3PL
     ‘I saw them.’

Next to Ewegbe, Yoruba has very often been cited by the advocates of the substrate account of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in creoles (e.g., Boretzky 1983). Parallels with Yoruba only do not, however, appear sufficient to conclude that the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in Atlantic creoles represents a result of substrate influence.

The issue of substrate influence in the development of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in Atlantic creoles appears very puzzling. While the restriction of this feature to Kwa- (Gbe-) related creoles is strongly suggestive of substrate influence, the substratist argument appears to lack the most important evidence, namely the presence of straightforward sources of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in the relevant substrate languages. It appears that while there seems to be a connection between having Gbe languages as (one of) the main substrate(s) and the use of the 3Pl pronoun as a
plural marker, the parallel between Gbe languages and Atlantic Creoles is not as straightforward as it has been commonly assumed. Below, I propose a possible solution to this puzzle.

First of all, the development of adnominal plural markers from 3Pl pronouns is cross-linguistically not uncommon. This observation contrasts with that of Parkvall (2000) who, advocating the idea of substrate origins of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in creoles, states that the grammaticalization of 3Pl pronouns as plural markers is “cross-linguistically rare” (Parkvall 2000: 93). While this might be true for plural markers of the type of Romance and Germanic plural inflection, it is certainly not true for plural demonstratives and determiners, which very often have pronominal origins, similarly to their singular counterparts. As we shall see in chapter 7, creole 3Pl-derived markers identified in this chapter as plural markers are in fact determiner-like elements, which in addition to number express such notions as definiteness and specificity.

In addition to the fact that the development of adnominal demonstratives and determiners from demonstrative and personal pronouns is cross-linguistically common, it is also attested in a number of the superstrate languages of Atlantic Creoles. The case of English has already been discussed in section 5.4.2, where it was argued that the Jamaican demonstrative dem and the Sranan definite determiner den go back to the colloquial English demonstrative them, which itself derives from the strong form of the 3Pl pronoun them. In Spanish and in Portuguese, both singular and plural definite determiners derive from 3rd person pronouns. Maurer (2002) proposes that the use of Santome inen as a plural definite determiner could have been based on the pattern of Portuguese los.

The idea that the reanalysis of 3Pl pronouns as plural determiners represents a common grammaticalization path, which is also instantiated in the superstrate languages of the creoles considered does not account for the fact that this reanalysis pattern is only found in Atlantic creoles. I believe that associative plural marking might be the missing link with the Niger-Congo substrate. In the Niger-Congo substrates of Atlantic creoles, plural markers are also used as markers of associative plural (see section 7.5.3). The same function is observed with 3Pl-derived plural markers in Atlantic creoles. 3Pl pronouns are cross-linguistically very often recruited to perform this function as the semantics of associative plural makes 3Pl pronouns the most straightforward choice. It could thus have been the case that the reanalysis of 3Pl pronouns as plural markers went in the following steps:

3Pl pronoun > associative plural marker > regular plural marker

In English-based creoles, the recruitment of the 3Pl pronoun as an associative plural marker is likely to have been co-promoted by the use of the 3Pl pronoun as an associative plural marker in colloquial English. The English associative plural marking construction is exemplified in (56). The role of this construction in the development of
the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in creoles has been pointed out by Mufwene (1986).

English (Mufwene 1986: 40)

(56)  *John and them* have left.
     ‘John and company have left.’

While in many English-based creoles associative plural is expressed similarly to additive plural, by means of the postposed 3Pl-derived plural marker, in a few English-based creoles, we find the form *and them*. For instance, in Trinidadian Creole, this form functions as a marker of associative and regular plural. The latter function is however more often fulfilled by means of the plural inflection -(e)s.

The argumentation given here suggests that the patterns presents in the substrate and superstrate languages together with the universal grammaticalization trends could have converged to favor the emergence of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in Atlantic creoles.

5.5 Summary and concluding remarks

As demonstrated in this chapter, few of the creoles under study adopted grammatical markers of plurality and (in)definiteness directly from their superstrate languages. The overwhelming majority of the creoles developed plural markers and (in)definite determiners anew through reanalysis/grammaticalization of lexical or (more semanticized) grammatical items with a similar meaning and/or function. To a lesser extent, this also holds for creole demonstratives. While superstrate adnominal demonstratives are often recruited to perform the function of definite determiners in creoles, other, more salient means are utilized to express deixis.

The loss of superstrate morphology is considered to be diagnostic of the process of creolization. Interestingly, not all the creoles studied here conform to this generalization. A number of the creoles considered display Germanic/Romance plural inflection; some use superstrate-derived indefinite and definite determiners. In most cases, one observes a clustering of superstrate-derived features in one creole. For instance, Jamaican Creole, Afrikaans and Chabacano all have superstrate-derived plural inflectional morphology as well as indefinite and definite determiners that derive from indefinite and definite articles of their superstrates. This is not accidental. These creoles are known to have emerged and developed in an extensive contact with their superstrates.

As for the creoles that have developed determiners and plural markers anew, we can observe that indefinite and definite determiners developed in a rather uniform way. Indefinite determiners in most of the creoles under study go back to the numeral ‘one’.
As for definite determiners, these developed from adnominal demonstratives or, less commonly, from other deictic elements, such as demonstrative pronouns or demonstrative reinforcers. These developments represent cross-linguistically prominent grammaticalization paths.

The origins of creole plural markers appear to be much more diverse. In addition to superstrate-derived plural inflection, the creoles studied use plural markers with the following etymological sources: plural forms of superstrate adnominal demonstratives, superstrate quantifiers and quantifier-like elements such as ‘all’ and ‘a group of’, substrate plural markers, and superstrate and substrate 3Pl pronouns. 3Pl pronouns represent a particularly common source of plural markers, as far as Atlantic Creoles are concerned. In the literature, this feature is commonly described as a grammatical calque from the Niger-Congo substrates. However, as I extensively argue in the present chapter, this account is not sufficiently supported by the data. I therefore propose an alternative account of the development of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in Atlantic Creoles, which emphasizes the role of associative plural marking as a possible primary trigger for the reanalysis of 3Pl pronouns as plural markers.
Chapter 6

Structures

In Chapter 5, I considered the forms the creoles studied employ as plural markers, (in)definite determiners and demonstratives and had a look into their etymology. This chapter is concerned with the structural properties of these elements. It covers such topics as loss of agreement, preservation of/changes in the word order in NEs, as well as the selectional properties of creole nominal markers.

6.1 Number, gender, and agreement

With respect to nominal morphosyntax, the property that distinguishes all the creoles in the sample from their superstrate languages is the (near) lack of number and gender agreement. Nouns in Germanic and Romance languages are specified for gender (with the exception of English) and are categorically marked for number. Modifying nominal elements often show number and gender agreement with the head noun. In Dutch, French, Spanish, and Portuguese, articles, demonstratives, and adjectives all bear number and gender marking. In English, number agreement is found with demonstratives. In contrast, neither number nor gender agreement is systematically present in creoles.

To begin with, nouns in creoles are not specified for gender and are not categorically marked for number. As we shall see in chapter 7, bare nouns may refer to both singular and plural entities. As for the overt realization of number, only in a few creoles is this done by means of plural inflection. In the majority of the creoles studied here, number is expressed by means of freestanding number markers or determiners.

Also, creoles generally make use of a reduced paradigm of determiners and demonstratives in comparison to their superstrates. As sections 5.2 and 5.3 demonstrate, demonstratives and definite determiners are usually adopted without gender and number specifications. Jamaican Creole, Sranan and Cape Verdean are the only creoles that preserved number distinctions in their demonstrative/definite determiner paradigms. The only two creoles in the sample that have both inflectional number morphology and
number distinctions in their demonstrative/definite determiner systems are Jamaican and Cape Verdean. Number agreement between nouns and demonstratives or definite determiners is, however, strongly disfavored in these two creoles (see Patrick (2009) for Jamaican Creole and Baptista (2002) for Cape Verdean Creole).

In the literature, the loss of inflectional morphology and agreement has been considered from various perspectives and characterized as the result of substrate influence (e.g., Lefevre 1998), target language reduction/simplification, characteristic of imperfect L2 acquisition (e.g., Plag 2008b), or elimination of semantically vacuous features (e.g., Aboh 2006).

The substrate-oriented analysis of the loss of inflectional morphology and agreement is, for instance, advocated by Lefebvre (1998), who argues that the morphosyntax of NEs in Haitian Creole is patterned on Gbe languages, specifically, Fongbe. According to Lefebvre, the lack of number inflection and agreement that distinguishes the Haitian Creole nominal system from that of French is also a result of Gbe influence.

While it is true that certain Niger-Congo languages, such as Gbe or Yoruba, do not have grammatical gender, do not express number inflectionally, and have no number or gender agreement in the NE, not all Niger-Congo languages pattern in this way. Among the Niger-Congo languages that are likely to have played a role in the development of many of the Atlantic creoles studied here (see table 1.2), inflectional plural marking is, for instance, found in Akan (Adu-Amankwah 2003), Eastern Ijo (Jenewari 1977) and Mandinka (Rowlands 1969). Eastern Ijo (Jenewari 1977) has a sex-based gender system partially reminiscent of those found in Germanic and Romance languages. Bantu languages are well known for having extremely complex noun class systems based on number and gender-like semantic distinctions. Some of the substrate languages listed above also display agreement in the noun phrase, which involves determiners, demonstratives, and other nominal modifiers.

Inflectional plural marking is also attested in some of the non-Niger-Congo substrates of the creoles under study (see table 1.2) such as Khoikhoi, an important substrate of Afrikaans, and Gujarati, the main substrate of Diu Portuguese (cf. Hagman 1977 for Khoikhoi; Cardona 1965 for Gujarati). Khoikhoi, Gujarati, and Tagalog, the main substrate of Chabacano, also have sex-based gender systems (cf. Hagman 1977 for Khoikhoi; Cardona 1965 for Gujarati; Schachter & Otanes 1978 for Tagalog).

While in some cases (e.g., Berbice Dutch, whose main substrate is Eastern Ijo), Afrikaans (whose important substrate is Khoikhoi) or Cape Verdean Creole (whose important substrate is Mandinka) it may be argued that the presence of inflectional morphology in a creole is related to the presence of inflectional morphology in the substrate, such correspondences are not systematic. On the whole, inflectional morphology in creoles is usually more reduced compared to their source languages; and creoles never display morphological marking of number or gender agreement. Given that

---

11 In Eastern Ijo, there are two overlapping systems: one is based on animacy, and another – on gender.
similar processes of loss of inflectional morphology and agreement are attested in creoles with different superstrate and substrate languages, a universalist account of this phenomenon appears more attractive (see section 6.5 for further discussion). While superstrate-derived demonstratives and definite determiners in creoles are devoid of the number and gender specifications present in their Germanic and Romance etyma, creoles have developed alternative ways to express number. Instead of using portmanteau morphemes, many creoles realize definiteness/deixis and number by means of two separate forms. This is illustrated in examples (57)-(65) below.

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 340)

(57) \[ \text{de gun dem} \]
\[ \text{DEF gun PL} \]
\[ \text{‘the guns’} \]

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler 1981: 53)

(58) \[ \text{ol dispela bisnesman} \]
\[ \text{PL DEM businessman} \]
\[ \text{‘these businessmen’} \]

Negerhollands (Van Rossen & Van Der Voort 1996: 259)

(59) \[ \text{di difman sini} \]
\[ \text{DEF thief PL} \]
\[ \text{‘the thieves’} \]

Haitian Creole (Lefebvre 1998: 85)

(60) \[ \text{krab la yo} \]
\[ \text{crab DEF PL} \]
\[ \text{‘the specific crabs’} \]

Lesser Antillean Creole (Martinique) (Déprez 2001: 55)

(61) \[ \text{se tab la} \]
\[ \text{PL table DEF} \]
\[ \text{‘the tables’} \]
Mauritian Creole (my data)

(62) bann zozo la
      PL   bird   DEF
  ‘the birds’

Papiamentu (Kouwenberg and Murray 1994: 49)

(63) e auto nan
      DEF   car   PL
  ‘the cars’

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 209)

(64) ese ma konejo
      DEM  PL  rabbit
  ‘these rabbits’

Chabacano (Whinom 1956: 51)

(65) el manga pariente
      DEF  PL  relative
  ‘the relatives’

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2008: 42)

(66) inen ome se
      PL  man  DEF
  ‘the men’

The expression of definiteness/deixis and plurality by two distinct freestanding morphemes is also found in (some of) the substrate languages of many of the creoles listed above, for instance, in Gbe that constitutes an important substrate component of Jamaican Creole, Negerhollands, Haitian, Lesser Antillean Creole, Papiamentu, and Santome, and in Tolai, an important substrate of Tok Pisin.

Gungbe (Aboh 2004a: 77)

(67) távò l@ l@
      table  DEF  PL
  ‘the specific tables’
Tolai (Mosel 1984: 60)

(68) a umana davai
DET PL tree
‘the trees’

However, many other relevant substrate languages, such as Akan (one of the substrates of Jamaican Creole and Negerhollands), Bantu languages (one of the substrates of Jamaican Creole, Lesser Antillean Creole, Mauritian Creole, Papiamentu, and Santome), Edo (one of the substrates of Jamaican Creole, Papiamentu, and Santome), and Tagalog (an important substrate of Chabacano) do use portmanteau markers. I, therefore, believe, that, similarly to the loss of agreement, the substitution of synthetic structural properties by analytic ones instantiates universal processes characteristic of unguided L2 acquisition and contact language formation.

6.2 Word order

This section deals with the word order within NEs. It considers the ordering of nominal modifiers (adjectives, numerals and demonstratives) plural markers, and determiners.

6.2.1 Adjectives and numerals

As far as numerals are concerned, similarly to their Germanic and Romance superstrates, all the creoles considered here invariably place them before the noun. The substrate languages of the creoles under study, however, vary with regard to the placement of numerals. Many Niger-Congo languages, including Gbe (Westermann 1930; Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002; Aboh 2004a), Akan (Christaller 1875; Welmers 1964), Edo (Dunn 1964), Kikongo (Bentley 1887), Mandinka (Rawlands 1969), and Temne (Wilson 1961) place numerals postnominally. This does not, however, hold for all the representatives of the Niger-Congo family that played a role in the development of the creoles under study. For instance, in Eastern Ijo numerals are prenominal (Jenewari 1977). The prenominal placement of numerals is also observed in Tolai, an important substrate of Tok Pisin (Mosel 1984), in Khoikhoi, an important substrate of Afrikaans (Hagman 1977), in Tagalog, an important substrate of Chabacano (Schachter and Otanes 1972), and in Gujarati, an important substrate of Diu Portuguese (Cardona 1965). Considering the diversity with regard to the placement of numerals observed among the substrate languages, it appears likely that the prenominal placement of numerals uniformly observed in the creoles is based on the Germanic and Romance pattern.

While numerals in both Germanic and Romance languages always precede the head noun, the two language groups differ with regard to the placement of attributive adjectives. In English and Dutch, adjectives always occur in the prenominal position. In
contrast, French, Spanish and Portuguese have both prenominal and postnominal adjectives, the letter ordering being the default. The pre- or postnominal placement of adjectives is not free, and depends on the semantic type (i.e. absolute vs. relative meaning) of the adjective. Some adjectives may occur both pre- and postnominally, with consequences for the interpretation (for a detailed discussion of this phenomenon see Cinque 1990, 2010; Bernstein 1992; DeGraff and Mandelbaum 1992, and works cited there). While ‘my old friend’ in English, is ambiguous between ‘someone who has been my friend for a long time’ and ‘my friend, who is aged’, in Spanish and Portuguese, postnominal ‘old’ always receives the absolu tive interpretation (as in examples (69a) and (70a)), whereas the interpretation of prenominal ‘old’ is subject-oriented (cf. Jackendoff 1972) or metaphorical (as in examples (69b) and (70b)).

Spanish (my data)

(69) a. mi amigo viejo
   1SG.POSS friend old
   ‘my aged friend’

b. mi viejo amigo
   1SG.POSS old friend
   ‘my friend, whom I have known for a long time’

Portuguese (my data)

(70) a. o meu amigo velho
    DEF 1SG.POSS friend old
    ‘my aged friend’

b. o meu velho amigo
    DEF 1SG.POSS old friend
    ‘my friend, whom I have known for a long time’

In creoles with Germanic superstrates, both numerals and adjectives always occur prenominally. As for Romance creoles, they have prenominal and postnominal adjectives. On the whole, the postnominal placement of adjectives appears to be the default tendency in most Romance creoles studied here. Sometimes, postnominal adjectives in creoles display ambiguity between the absolutive and the relative interpretation, while in their superstrates the relative interpretation is only available in the prenominal position. Consider, for instance the following example from Angolar, an offshoot of Santome:
Angolar (Lorenzino 2007: 18)

(71) una ḍme pobi
    IND man poor
    a. ‘a man who is not rich’
    b. ‘a man who inspires pity’

Compare to Portuguese (Lorenzino 2007: 18):

(72) a. um homem pobre
    IND man poor
    ‘a man who is not rich’

    b. um pobre homem
    IND poor man
    ‘a man who inspires pity’

The same kind of ambiguity can be observed in the following example from Palenquero:

Palenquero (Schwegler and Green 2007: 294)

(73) Yo sendá ri ese rasa grande ke e ma Palenkero.
    1SG descend from DEM race great REL COP PL Palenquero
    ‘I am from this great race that is the Palenqueros.’

In accordance with the system described in the beginning of this section, “[i]n Spanish, prenominal grande means ‘great’, whereas postnominal grande corresponds to ‘big’” (Schwegler and Green 2007: 294).

Some Romance creoles appear to have adopted the adjective placement rules from their superstrate languages. For instance, Haitian Creole parallels French in distinguishing adjectives with subject-oriented, relvative meanings and adjectives with absolute meanings by placing them in different positions with respect to the head noun (cf. Savain 1993; Valdmann 1978; Mather 2005). This is demonstrated in examples (74a-b) from Haitian Creole, which are shown to parallel (75a-b) from French.

Haitian Creole (Mather 2005: 69, 70)

(74) a. gwo pwason
    big fish
    ‘(a) big fish’
As already observed above, the postnominal placement of adjectives, which seems to be the default option in the majority of the Romance creoles under study, also prevails in their superstrate languages. Many substrates of the Romance creoles considered here also display postnominal adjective placement. Postnominal adjectives are, for instance, found in Gbe (cf. Lefebvre and Brausseau 2002; Aboh 2004a, 2010), Bantu (Bentley 1887), Mandinka (Rowlands 1969), Temne (Wilson 1961), Wolof (Njie 1982; Sauvageot 1965), Edo (Dunn 1968), and Malagasy (Bennett 1986). The preference for the postnominal placement of adjectives in Romance creoles could thus be, in principle, also ascribed to substrate influence. This possibility is, however, less likely considering that (i) while we find only postnominal adjectives in the substrates, Romance creoles show (remnants of) variation which closely resembles the Romance pattern and (ii) Germanic creoles with the same substrates never display postnominal adjectives.

One creole that provides strong evidence in favor of the substratist account of adjective placement is Diu Portuguese. Diu Portuguese is the only Romance creole under study in which the default position of adjectives is prenominal (Cardoso 2009). With regard to this property, Diu Portuguese appears to parallel its major substrate Gujarati, which displays prenominal placement of adjectives (cf. Cardona 1965). It is, however, also important to note that Portuguese allows for both postnominal and prenominal adjectives and that the prenominal adjective placement thus does not go against the structural organization of NEs in the superstrate. I therefore believe that the role of substrate influence observed in the establishment of the postnominal placement of adjectives in most Romance creoles under study and prenominal placement of adjectives in Diu Portuguese was in the reinforcement of the patterns present in the superstrate.

Summing up, I conclude that with regard to the ordering of numerals and adjectives, creoles closely resemble their superstrate languages, while substrate influence appears to be limited.
6.2.2 Indefinite determiners

As observed in chapter 5, in the majority of the creoles under study, the form of the indefinite determiner derives from the superstrate numeral ‘one’. As the examples below demonstrate, indefinite determiners also preserve the morphosyntactic properties of their superstrate etyma. The same holds for creole indefinite determiners that derive from Germanic/Romance indefinite articles. The ordering properties of indefinite determiners in the creoles under study are demonstrated in examples (76)-(90) below.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 137)

(76) a. one man
    IND man
    ‘a man’

b. a car
    IND car
    ‘a car’

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 57)

(77) wan tori
    IND story
    ‘a story’

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 134)

(78) wangepela tok
    IND language
    ‘a language’

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1993: 164)

(79) en tun
    IND field
    ‘a field’

Negerhollands (Van Rossem and Van der Voort 1996: 259)

(80) een venstər
    IND window
    ‘a window’
Afrikaans (my data)
(81) ’n baba
IND baby
‘a baby’

Haitian Creole (Hall 1957: 77)
(82) you kad
IND bed
‘a bed’

Mauritian Creole (Guillemin 2009: 208)
(83) enn fam
IND woman
‘a woman’

Lesser Antillean Creole (St. Lucian) (Carrington 1984: 110)
(84) jõo kutla
IND cutlass
‘a cutlass’

Papiamentu (my data)
(85) un auto
IND car
‘a car’

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 204)
(86) un pílo
IND basket
‘a basket’

Chabacano (Grant 2007: 184)
(87) un tyenda
IND store
‘a store’
6.2.3 Definite determiners

In contrast to indefinite determiners, the ordering of definite determiners in creoles shows more diversity. Definite determiners that derive from the superstrate adnominal demonstratives and definite articles follow the ordering properties of their etyma and occur at the left edge of the noun phrase. Sranan a and den, Jamaican di, Berbice Dutch di, Negerhollands dī, Afrikaans die, Papiamentu e, Chabacano el, Cape Verdean kel and kes, and Diu Portuguese es and iksl all conform to this generalization. This is demonstrated in the following examples:

Sranan (my data)

(91) a. a man
    DEF.SG  man
    ‘the man’

b. den su
    DEF.PL  shoe
    ‘the shoes’
Jamaican Creole (my data)

(92) \textit{di} \textit{gyal}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{girl} \end{tabular}
‘the girl’

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 440)

(93) \textit{di} \textit{kui}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{cow} \end{tabular}
‘the cow’

Negerhollands (Van Rossem and Van der Voort 1996: 254)

(94) \textit{di} \textit{kining}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{king} \end{tabular}
‘the king’

Afrikaans (my data)

(95) \textit{die} \textit{burger}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{citizen} \end{tabular}
‘the citizen’

Papiamentu (Lorenzino 2000: 31)

(96) \textit{e} \textit{hômber}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{man} \end{tabular}
‘the man’

Chabacano (Whinom 1956: 24)

(97) \textit{el} \textit{sol}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{sun} \end{tabular}
‘the sun’

Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2002: 28)

(98) \textit{kel} \textit{omi}
\begin{tabular}{l}DEF \textit{man} \end{tabular}
‘the man’
6.2.4 Plural markers

Like other nominal constituents considered above, plural markers often inherit the ordering properties of their etyma. In all the creoles studied with superstrate-derived plural inflection, this inflection displays morphosyntactic behavior that is identical to the plural inflection in Germanic and Romance, in that it attaches to the right of the head noun.
Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 111)

(103) thirty year-ṣ
     thirty year-PL
     ‘thirty years’

Tok Pisin Creole (Mühlhäuser et al. 2003: 196)

(104) naintin     yia-ṣ
     nineteen year-PL
     ‘nineteen years (old)’

Afrikaans

(105) a. tafel-ṣ  b. boek-e
     Dutch: tafel-ṣ          boek-en\(^\text{12}\)
            table-PL              boek-PL
     ‘tables’                    ‘books’

Cape Verdean (Baptista 2002: 38)

(106) rapariga-ṣ
     Portuguese: rapariga-ṣ
                young.woman-PL
                ‘young women’

Plural markers that derive from superstrate demonstrative adjectives also inherit the morphosyntax of their etyma. Like English them, French ces and Portuguese aqueles, Sranan EC den, Jamaican dem, Lesser Antillean FC se, and Cape Verdean kes all occur at the left edge of the noun phrase.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 63)

(107) den     apresina
     DEF.PL  orange
     ‘the oranges’

\(^{12}\) Afrikaans replicates the allomorphy of plural marking observed in Dutch.
Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 104)

(108) *dem* big farmer-s  
    DEM.PL big farmer-PL  
    ‘those big farmers’

Lesser Antillean Creole (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

(109) *sé* makak la  
    DEF.PL macaque DEF  
    ‘these macaques’

The same can be said with regard to Tok Pisin *ol*, Mauritian Creole *ban*, and Diu Portuguese *tud*. All these markers derive their morphosyntax from the superstrate. This is not surprising given that all these elements were (and sometimes still are) used in their original lexical meanings in the creoles prior to becoming grammaticalized as plural markers. Examples (110a) and (111a) illustrate the use of Tok Pisin *ol* and Mauritian Creole *ban* in their lexical meanings. These examples are contrasted with examples (110b) and (111b), where the same elements are used as markers of plurality. Example (112) from Diu Portuguese demonstrates the ambiguity of the element *tud*.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 74, 117)

(110) a. *Ol* de ting long jumi.  
    all day think PREP 1PL.INCL  
    ‘All day think about us.’

b. *Ol* man bungim em…  
    PL man meet 3SG  
    ‘The men met her…’

---

13 The Tok Pisin plural marker *ol* can also occur in positions atypical for the English quantifier. When it co-occurs with adjectives and demonstratives, it may occur in the leftmost position (*ol*-ADJ/DEM-N), intervene between the modifier and the head noun (ADJ/DEM-*ol*-N), or surface in both these positions (*ol*-ADJ/DEM-*ol*-N). The first, English-like pattern is, however, far more common than the other two (cf. G. Smith 2002: 67-68). Furthermore, *ol* may surface postnominally as well as prenominally and postnominally at the same time. Based on the written sources it is, however, impossible to say whether postnominal *ol* instantiates a plural marker or a resumptive 3Pl pronoun.
Mauritian Creole (Alleesaib 2005)

(111) a. enn gran bann zanfan
    IND big group child
    ‘a big group of children’

b. bann zanfan
    PL child
    ‘(the) children’

Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 119)

(112) ikal tud adiw
    DEM all/PL fox
    ‘all the foxes/the foxes’

Let us now turn to the substrate-derived plural markers. Chabacano *manga* seems to be identical to its Tagalog etymon with regard to its syntactic behavior. In Chabacano, *manga* always immediately precedes the head noun, thus following other adnominal elements, such as definite markers (113a), demonstratives (113b), and numerals (113c). Similar ordering patterns are observed in Tagalog (114).

Chabacano (Whinom 1956: 51; McKaughan 1954: 208)

(113) a. el manga pariente
    DEF PL relative
    ‘the relatives’

b. este manga canjero
    DEM PL crab
    ‘these crabs’

c. dos mana amigo
    two PL friend
    ‘two friends’

Tagalog (my data)

(114) a. lahat ng mga aso
    all DET PL dog
    ‘all the dogs’
b. dalawang mga aso
   two PL dog
   ‘the two dogs’

The only type of prenominal modifiers that follows *mga* in Tagalog are adjectives. In Chabacano adjectives are, however, always postnominal.

The morphosyntactic properties of the Palenquero plural marker *ma*, on the other hand, are quite distinct from those of its Kikongo/Kimbundu etymon, the class prefix *ma*. While in both the creole and its substrates *ma* appears to the left of the noun, in Kikongo and Kimbundu *ma* has the status of an inflectional affix, while in Palenquero it is a freestanding morpheme. Whereas determiners and demonstratives in Palenquero cannot intervene between *ma* and the head noun, *ma* can be separated from the noun by numerals and adjectives. According to Moñino (2007), despite its Bantu origins, the morphosyntactic behavior of *ma* is patterned on Spanish NEs. He shows that *ma* typically appears in the positions where in Spanish one would expect the plural articles *los/las* (115a) or the plural inflection on an article or a demonstrative (115a-b). The examples below are given with Spanish word-for-word glosses to illustrate Moñino’s observation.


(115) a. *ma* ocho boliba
   PL eight bolivar
   Spanish *los* ocho bolívares
   ‘the eight bolivars’

   b. un *ma* ría
    IND PL day
    Spanish uno -s días
  ‘several days’

   c. ése *ma* tabáko
     DEM PL cigar
    Spanish esto -s cigarros
    ‘these cigars’

However, as is pointed out by Schwegler (2007), some instances of *ma* cannot be accounted for in terms of calquing of the Spanish word order patterns. In Palenquero data, one finds instances of doubled *ma*. All the examples of doubled *ma* provided by Schwegler (2007) involve *ma* in combination with a demonstrative (116).
Rare examples like (116) cannot be said to invalidate Moñino’s (2007) analysis. They do, however, reveal an important difference between the Palenquero and the Spanish constructions of the type given in example (115c). They show that when \textit{ma} occurs in-between the demonstrative and the noun, it pluralizes the noun and not the demonstrative – unlike the plural inflection \textit{-s} in \textit{esto-s} (which according to Moñino provided the structural pattern for the Palenquero sequence \textit{ese ma}). This suggests that the alleged morphosyntactic parallels in the nominal domain between Palenquero and Spanish may be of a rather superficial nature.

The reiterated occurrence of \textit{ma} is, on the other hand, reminiscent of agreement between the demonstrative and the head noun, as attested in both Spanish (117) and Kikongo (118).

Spanish (my data)

(117) \textit{esta-s} \textit{mujer-es}  
\hspace*{1cm} \text{DEM-PL woman-PL}  
\hspace*{1cm} ‘these women’

Kikongo (Chatelain 1888-89)

(118) a. \textit{ri-longa} \textit{-e-ri/ri-ri}  
\hspace*{1cm} \text{CLPR-plate DEM-CLPR}  
\hspace*{1cm} ‘this plate’  

b. \textit{ri-longa} \textit{ri-o/ri-o-ri-o}  
\hspace*{1cm} \text{CLPR-plate DEM-CLPR}  
\hspace*{1cm} ‘that plate’ (not far)  

c. \textit{ri-longa} \textit{ri-ná}  
\hspace*{1cm} \text{CLPR-plate CLPR-DEM}  
\hspace*{1cm} ‘that plate’ (yonder)  

The doubling of the plural marker may, of course, also result from a language-internal development, as it appears to be the case in Tok Pisin (see fn. 13). Neither number agreement nor (optional) doubling of the plural marker is mentioned in the
descriptions of the substrate languages of this creole (cf. Mosel 1980, 1984; Crowley 2002; Lynch and Horoi 2002).

The morphosyntactic properties of the Berbice Dutch plural marker -apu may also be considered in the light of substrate as well as superstrate influence. Plural inflection -apu, which derives from the Eastern Ijo [+human; +plural] replacive pronoun āpú, always occurs immediately following the head noun (119). In Eastern Ijo, āpú is a free morpheme. It may, however, also combine with other nominals to form a compound nominal expression with [+human; + plural] reference. In this case, it always occupies the position at the right of the compound (120).

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 445)

(119) nama-apu
   animal-PL
   ‘animals’

Eastern Ijo (Jenewari 1977: 231)

(120) opu apu
   big  HUM.PL
   ‘big people’

It is, however, also conceivable that the morphosyntax of the Berbice Dutch -apu has been patterned on the morphosyntax of the plural inflection -en/-s.

Finally, let us consider plural markers that developed from superstrate and substrate 3Pl pronouns. 3Pl-derived plural markers are found in the prenominal as well as in the postnominal position in the creoles under study. The prenominal pattern is found in Sranan and Jamaican Creole (as well as in a bunch of other Atlantic English-based creoles) and in Gulf of Guinea Portuguese-based Creoles represented in the sample by Santome.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 63)

(121) den apresina
   DEF.PL orange
   ‘the oranges’

Jamaican Creole (my data)

(122) dem bwai
   DEM.PL boy
   ‘the boys’
The English creole prenominal *DEM* can be argued to follow the ordering properties of the colloquial English demonstrative *them*, e.g. *them boys* ‘those boys’. The triggers of the prenominal placement of the Santome plural marker *inen* are less evident. As already mentioned in section 5.4.5, neither Kikongo nor Edo, the two possible source languages of the form *inen*, uses the 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker. Considering that similarly to other 3Pl-derived plural markers discussed here, *inen* expresses plurality in combination with definiteness (see section 7.4.1), its ordering properties could be patterned on the ordering properties of (plural) definite determiners in the contributing substrate languages (i.e. Kwa (Gbe), Edo or Kikongo) or in Portuguese. In Gbe languages, determiners are always postnominal. Consider the examples from Gungbe and Ewegbe below:

**Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)**

(124) àgásá   \<i>lɔ</i>  
  crab   DEF  
  ‘the crab’

**Ewegbe (Aboh 2004a: 81)**

(125) devi   \<i>a</i>  
  child   DEF  
  ‘the child’

The same holds for definite plural markers in Gbe languages (see examples (126) and (127)).

**Ewegbe (Aboh 2004a: 81)**

(126) devi   \<i>wo</i>  
  child   DEF PL  
  ‘the children’
Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)

(127) àgásá lɛ lɛ
  crab DEF PL
  ‘the crabs’

However, in two other important substrates of Santome – Edo and Kikongo – we find prenominal determiners:

Edo (Omoregbe and Aigbedo 2012: 137)

(128) nɛ ᛑ ga
  DEF chair
  ‘the chair’

Kikongo (Bentley 1887)

(129) e mbele
  DET knife
  ‘the knife’

As demonstrated in example (118), plural marking in Kikongo is also prenominal. The same holds for Edo, where we find vestiges of the noun class system similar to the one found in Bantu languages (Omoregbe and Aigbedo 2012).

Also in Portuguese, the definite determiner always occupies the position to the left of the noun phrase (130).

Portuguese (my data)

(130) os menino-s
  DEF.M.PL boy-PL
  ‘the boys’

Let us now turn to the creoles that display a postnominal 3Pl-derived number marker. In the sample, this pattern is attested in Jamaican Creole, Negerhollands, Haitian Creole, and Papiamentu.
As already observed above, the postnominal occurrence of a freestanding plural marker is observed in Gbe languages (126)-(127), which constitute an important substrate component of all the four creoles cited above. What we do not find in Gbe is the (obligatory) co-occurrence of the plural marker with the definite determiner, observed in two out of the four creoles cited here, namely Jamaican Creole and Negerhollands14. In section 6.3, I will argue that this pattern is superstrate-derived.

### 6.2.5 Demonstratives

Demonstratives in creoles can occur in various positions. Many of them can be shown to derive their syntactic properties from their superstrate etyma. Similarly to definite determiners, creole demonstratives that derive from Germanic/Romance adnominal demonstratives always precede the head noun, occupying the same position at the left edge of the noun phrase as their superstrate etyma. This holds for early Sranan _disi, da,_

---

14 Although the plural marker _yo_ can co-occur with the determiner _la_ in some varieties of Haitian Creole, the occurrence of _yo_ is not morphosyntactically dependent on the presence of _la_.
and *den*, Jamaican Creole *dis, dat*, and *den*, Tok Pisin *dispela*, Negerhollands *dit*\(^{15}\), Afrikaans *dié*, Chabacano *e)sté, (é)se*, and *aké*, Palenquero *ete, ese*, and *aké*, Cape Verdean Creole *kel* and *kes*, and Diu Portuguese *es* and *ikol*:

Early Sranan (Arends and Perl 1995: 148)

(135) *dis* netti
DEM night
‘this night’

Jamaican Creole (my data)

(136) *dis* man
DEM man
‘this man’

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 93)

(137) *dispela* taim
DEM time
‘this time’

Afrikaans (Deumert 2004: 193)

(138) *dié* boek
DEM book
‘this book’

Chabacano (Whinom 1956: 51)

(139) *este* vieja
DEM old woman
‘this old woman’

Palenquero (Schwegler and Green 2007: 293)

(140) *ese* kaddera
DEM pot
‘that pot’

\(^{15}\) No examples of *di* used as an adnominal deictic marker were found in the available Negerhollands data. As a definite marker, *di* is always prenominal.
Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2007: 68)

(141) *kes* mininu
DEM.PL child
‘these children’

Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 126)

(142) *es* igrej
DEM church
‘this church’

Postnominal demonstratives and demonstrative reinforcers in creoles typically derive their syntactic properties from the superstrate demonstrative reinforcer constructions. For instance, Jamaican Creole *ya* and *deh* may either attach to the demonstrative (143a), follow the noun phrase (143b), or occur in both positions (143c).

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 46, 123; Afflick 2007)

(143) a. dem ting-s *deh*
DEM thing-PL REINF
‘those things’

b. dis *yah* kind a life
DEM REINF kind PREP life
‘this kind of life’

c. dis *ya* man *ya*
DEM REINF man REINF
‘this man’

All these patterns are also attested in (colloquial) English (Norval Smith, p.c.). Consider the following examples:

English (my data)

(144) a. this here man

b. this man here

c. this here man here
Sranan *dja* and *drape* have a more restricted syntactic distribution, and may only occur postnominally.

Sranan (Bruyn 1994: 265)

(145) den pikin *drape*
DEF.PL child REINF
‘those children’

The same holds for Tok Pisin *ya*. Note, however, that unlike the demonstrative reinforcers in Jamaican Creole and Sranan, *ya* in Tok Pisin is not dependent on the presence of a prenominal marker.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 115)

(146) man *ya*
man DEF
‘the man’

Papiamentu *aki, ei,* and *aya* exemplified in (147) also seem to have derived their ordering properties from their Spanish etyma, which also occur at the right edge of the NE (148).

Papiamentu (Kouwenberg and Murray 1994: 37)

(147) e pòrtràt *aki*
DEF picture REINF
‘this picture’

Spanish (Roehrs 2009: 51)

(148) el libro viejo este de *aquí*
DEF book old this of here
‘this old book here’

The same holds for Cape Verdean Creole demonstrative reinforcer *li* (149) and its Portuguese etymon (150):
Cape Verdean (Baptista 2008: 67)

(149) kel kaza li
DEm house REINF
‘this house’

Portuguese (my data)

(150) aquela mulher ali
DEm woman REINF
‘this woman there’

The only language in the sample that does not fit into the general pattern is Afrikaans. In Afrikaans, demonstrative reinforcers *hier*, *daar* and *doer* attach to the left of the adnominal demonstrative *die*:

Afrikaans (Deumert 2004: 193)

(151) Hier-die/daar-die boek is interessant.
REINF-DEM/REINF-DEM book COP interesting
‘This/ that book is interesting.’

This ordering pattern is neither found in Dutch, which only has postnominal demonstrative reinforcers (152), nor in any of the substrate languages of Afrikaans (Den Besten 1988).

Dutch (my data)

(152) die man daar
DEm man REINF
‘that man there’

Pauwels (1959) proposes that the unusual REINF-DEM ordering found in Afrikaans developed as a result of the reanalysis of the colloquial Dutch construction exemplified in (153) below:

Dutch (my data)

(153) Zie je daar die man met de grote hoed?
see 2SG there DEM man with DEF big hat
‘Do you see there, that man with the big hat?’
Den Besten (2008) justly points out that unlike *hierdie/daardie* in Afrikaans, in Dutch, this is a sentence-initial structure, where *daar* and *die man* represent two separate constituents (both on prosodic and on syntactic grounds). He admits, however, that it is not clear to what extent these structural and prosodic differences could have influenced the judgments of the second language learners (Hans den Besten, p.c.).

Creole demonstratives derived from superstrate demonstrative pronouns (see section 5.3) do not have a common position in the creoles under study. While *disi* and *dati* in modern Sranan, *dī* and *dīda* in Berbice Dutch, *sa* and *sila* in Haitian Creole, *sa* and *ta* in Lesser Antillean Creoles, and *se* in Santome all follow the noun phrase, *sa* in Mauritian Creole as well as in its offshoot Seychellois is prenominal.

With regard to the syntax of Sranan *disi* and *dati* as well as Berbice Dutch *dī* and *dīda*, I assume that it is likely to be patterned on the syntax of Germanic demonstrative reinforcers. In addition to the postnominal position, an important property that Sranan *disi* and *dati* and Berbice Dutch *dī* and *dīda* share with English and Dutch demonstrative reinforcers is the dependency on the prenominal markers of deixis/definiteness (cf. Bernstein (1997) for an analysis of the demonstrative reinforcer construction in English). Like Sranan *disi* and *dati* (154) and Berbice Dutch *dī* and *dīda* (155), English and Dutch demonstrative reinforcers may not occur on their own, but require the presence of a prenominal demonstrative adjective (156)-(157).

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 60, 57)

(154) a. ̀ā san dis
       DEF.SG thing this 'this thing'

   b. den sort sort tor dati
       DEF.PL sort sort story that 'those different stories'

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1993: 156)

(155) a. dī gutw-ap di
       DEF thing-PL DEM 'these things'

   b. dī gutu dida
       DEF thing DEM 'that thing'
Bruyn (1995) proposes a different account of the development of postnominal demonstratives in Sranan. According to Bruyn, the postnominal placement of *disi* and *dati* can be attributed to substrate influence. Demonstratives in Gbe languages and in Kikongo, the most important substrate languages of Sranan, occur in the postnominal position (cf. Westermann 1930; Lefebvre and Brausseau 2002; Aboh 2004a for Gbe languages; and Chatelain 1888-89; Bentley 1887 for Kikongo). In Gbe they may also co-occur with definite determiners (see examples (158)-(159)). In neither of these two languages are postnominal demonstratives dependent on the presence of any prenominal markers like they are in Sranan and in English. Thus, while I admit that the prevalence of postnominal demonstratives in the substrate component of Sranan could have promoted the placement of *disi* and *dati* in the postnominal position, I maintain that the syntactic pattern of DEF-N-DEM in Sranan derives from the English DEM-N-REINF structure (see also Aboh 2006 for a similar analysis).

Kikongo (Chatelain 1888-89)

(158) *ri-*longa e-*ri*ri-ri
    CP-plate DEM-CP
    ‘this plate’

Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)

(159) a. àgásá éhè
    crab DEM
    ‘this crab’

b. àgásá éhè l5
    crab DEM DEF
    ‘this specific crab’

In Eastern Ijo, the most important substrate of Berbice Dutch, deictic modifiers also co-occur with definite determiners. Furthermore, like in Berbice Dutch, the definite
determiner and the deictic modifier in Eastern Ijo occupy positions to different sides of
the head noun. However, while in Berbice Dutch the definite determiner is prenominal,
and the deictic marker is postnominal, in Eastern Ijo the ordering of these elements is the
reverse.

Eastern Ijo (Jenewari 1977: 209)

(160) \textit{mí} \textit{tu} \textit{bó} \textit{bè}
DEM child DEF
‘this (aforementioned) child’

I therefore assume that while the development of the demonstrative +
determiner structure in Berbice Dutch may be accounted for in terms of superstrate-
substrate feature convergence, the ordering of the elements in this structure was
determined by the syntactic rules of the superstrate.

Both superstrate and substrate influence also appear to be plausible in the case
of Santome \textit{se} exemplified in (161) below:

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 47)

(161) \textit{mwala} \textit{se}
woman DEF
‘the woman’

On the one hand, the postnominal syntax of this element could have been
patterned on the syntax of demonstratives in the substrate languages. The most important
substrate languages of Santome, Edo, Gbe and Kikongo, all have postnominal
demonstratives. The relevant examples from Kikongo and Gbe are given in (158) and
(159) above. Below I provide examples from Edo:

Edo (Dunn 1968: 209)

(162) a. \textit{òwa} \textit{nà}
house DEM
‘this housea.

b. \textit{ôkhùo} \textit{nì}
woman DEM
‘that woman’

On the other hand, Alexandre and Hagemeijer (2007: 47) draw a parallel
between the function of \textit{se} in constructions like (163), where \textit{inen} expresses plurality and
definiteness and *se* reinforcers the definiteness feature, and the function of demonstrative reinforcers in Germanic and Romance languages. Such demonstrative reinforcer constructions also occur in Portuguese (see example (150)).

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 45)

(163) \* *in\*en  *mina*  *se*  
\*  PL  man  DEF  
‘the children’

Note, however, that unlike Germanic/Romance demonstrative reinforcers, *se* is syntactically independent:

Let us now consider the French Creole deictic marker *sa* (or *ta*). While the use of this marker is a feature common to most French-based creoles, its position with regard to the head noun as well as with regard to other nominal markers shows variation (cf. Détérez 2006). In Mauritian Creole and its offshoot Seychellois, *sa* occurs at the left edge of the noun phrase, preceding the head noun as well as other prenominal markers (164)-(165). In Haitian Creole and Lesser Antillean Creole, it occurs to the right of the head noun (166)-(169), and in some varieties of Lesser Antillean it also follows the postnominal definite determiner (169).

Mauritian Creole (Guillemin 2009: 225)

(164) a.  *sa*  *disab*  *la*  
\*  DEM  sand  DEF  
‘this sand’

b.  *sa*  *bann*  *zozo*  *la*  
\*  DEM  PL  bird  DEF  
‘these birds’

Seychellois (Gadelii 2007: 245; Bollée 1977: 37)

(165) a.  *sa*  *zom*  
\*  DEM  man  
‘this man’

b.  *sa*  *ban*  *zako*  
\*  DEM/DEF  PL  monkey  
‘these/the monkeys’
Haitian Creole (Hall 1957: 139, 85, 81)

(166) a. bag sa
   ring DEM
   ‘this/that ring’

b. lò sila
   time DEM
   ‘that time’

c. piti sa-a
   little DEM-DEF
   ‘this/that child’

d. tout moun sila yo
   all person DEM PL
   ‘all those people’

Lesser Antillean Creole (St. Lucian) (Déprez 2007: 267)

(167) kat mile sa la
   four mule DEM DEF
   ‘those four mules’

Lesser Antillean Creole (Martinican) (Déprez 2007: 267)

(168) bel kay ta la
   beautiful house DEM DET
   ‘this beautiful house’

Lesser Antillean Creole (Guadeloupean) (Gadelii 2007: 244)

(169) liv la sa
   book DEF DEM
   ‘this/that book’

The prenominal placement of sa instantiates the nominal syntax of the superstrate. Observe that in examples (164)-(165) sa occurs in the position typically occupied by demonstrative adjectives in French, that is, at the left edge of the nominal expression. Compare examples (164b) and (165b) to the following example from French:
French (my data)

(170) **cette** bande de jeune-s (lá)
    DEM.F.SG group of youth-PL there
    ‘this group of youths (there)’

Additional evidence can be obtained from Réunionnais, another French-based creole that displays prenominal **sa**. In this language, the singular demonstrative modifier **sa** occurs in complimentary distribution with the plural form **se**. The latter transparently derives from the plural form of the French demonstrative modifier **cet(te)**. Both **sa** and **se** parallel the syntactic distribution of the French demonstrative adjectives:

Réunionnais (Baker 2002: 15)

(171)  a. **sa** kaz la
    DEM house DEF
    ‘this house’

    b. **se** kaz la
    DEM house DEF
    ‘these houses’

The development of postnominal **sa** is more puzzling. First of all, in contrast to the prenominal **sa**, which invariably occurs at the left edge of the noun phrase in all the creoles examined here, postnominal **sa** (or **ta**) can occur in different positions. In Haitian, St.Lucian and Martinican creoles, it immediately follows the noun phrase, while in Guadeloupean Creole it typically surfaces to the right of the definite determiner **la**.

With regard to Haitian Creole, Lefebvre (1998) claims that the position of the demonstratives in this creole is patterned on the nominal syntax of Gbe languages. As illustrated in example (172), just like **sa** and **sila**, demonstratives in Gbe languages occur to the right of the head noun, but precede the definite determiner and the plural marker.

Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c)

(172)  a. àgásá **éhè** **ló**
    crab DEM DEF
    ‘the specific crab’

    b. àgásá **éhè** **lé**
    crab DEM PL
    ‘the crabs’
Given the extensive parallelism between Haitian Creole and Fongbe with regard to the nominal morphosyntax, I believe substrate influence must have played an important role in the development of the postnominal placement of demonstratives in Haitian Creole. Substrate influence (Gbe or Kikongo) can also account for the postnominal placement of *sa* (or *ta*) in the varieties of Lesser Antillean Creole.

More intriguing is the variation observed with regard to the relative ordering of the demonstratives and the definite determiners observed in these creoles. As demonstrated in example (172), Gbe languages show a DEM-DEF order. The DEM-DEF, i.e. *sa-la*, ordering is also suggested by the relative ordering of the demonstratives and the demonstrative reinforcer *la* (the etymon of the French creole definite determiner) in French:

French (my data)

(173) **ce livre là**
   DEM book REINF
   ‘this book there’

(174) **Tu veux ceci ou bien cela?**
   2SG want DEM or well DEM
   ‘Do you want this or that?’

As is observed by Déprez (2006), the *sa-la* order is also the most common one among the French-based creoles. The only deviating case is Guadeloupean, which shows the reverse *la-sa* ordering. This ordering cannot be traced back to the patterns found in the source languages of Guadeloupean Creole, and I therefore consider it to be a language-internal innovation.

### 6.3 Co-occurrence and interdependencies between nominal markers

Throughout this chapter, we regularly observed that deictic markers and plural markers either tend to co-occur with or are even dependent on the presence of other nominal elements, typically definite markers. In this section, we shall consider the origins of this phenomenon.

In quite a few of the creoles studied here (Jamaican Creole, Sranan, Tok Pisin, Berbice Dutch, Afrikaans, Haitian Creole, Mauritian Creole, Antillean Creole, Papiamentu, and Cape Verdean Creole), the expression of deixis (either obligatorily or optionally) involves either two deictic markers, a demonstrative adjective and a demonstrative reinforcer, or a deictic marker in combination with a definite marker.

The dependency of demonstrative reinforcers (or elements derived from demonstrative reinforcers) on adnominal demonstratives (or elements derived from
adnominal demonstratives) found in Jamaican Creole (143), Sranan (145), Papiamentu (147), and Cape Verdean Creole (149) can be straightforwardly traced back to the demonstrative reinforcer constructions in their Germanic and Romance superstrates (cf. Bernstein 1997). Although the demonstrative reinforcer construction in Afrikaans displays the REINF-DEM-N ordering pattern unattested in Dutch, in which the demonstrative reinforcer always follows the head noun, I believe that the development of this construction in Afrikaans may still be partially due to superstrate influence.

The structural pattern that goes back to the Germanic/Romance demonstrative reinforcer constructions also appears to have influenced the syntactic properties of some creole demonstratives that are not etymologically related to demonstrative reinforcers. As I argue in section 6.2.5, Sranan [a/den N disi/dati] and Berbice Dutch [di N di/dida] are likely to have been patterned on the demonstrative reinforcer constructions of English and Dutch, respectively. While the structural pattern remained the same, the slots of the structure occupied by locative adverbs in English and Dutch were filled by elements that derive from demonstrative pronouns in these two creoles.

Interestingly, not in all creoles are elements derived from demonstrative reinforcers dependent on the presence of prenominal markers of deixis/definiteness. For instance, while the Tok Pisin deictic marker  ya may be combined with the demonstrative dispela, as in dispela lain Siapan ya ‘this Japanese group here’ (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 102), it usually occurs on its own (see example (146)). The same holds for French creole la (100)-(102).

With regard to  la in French-based creoles, some researchers have proposed that its syntactic properties parallel those of the definite determiner in Gbe languages (cf. Lefebvre 1998; Aboh 2004c, and other work). Gbe languages lack prenominal determiners altogether and the postnominal definite determiner in Gbe is syntactically independent (see examples (124)-(125)). However, I believe that the syntactic independence of  la is related to the reanalysis of  la, which involved the loss of the strong deictic semantics present in its etymon. This reanalysis lead to the decomposition of the DEM-N-REINF structure.

This speculation finds support in the diachronic data. For instance, with regard to Mauritian Creole, Guillemin (2009: 148) observes: “In early M[auritian] C[create], the demonstratives ç̣a…là seem to pattern exactly like in French in that the demonstrative precedes the noun, là is postnominal, and, initially là is not used independently of ç̣a”. The reanalysis of  la as a marker of definiteness and specificity, which, according to Guillemin, took place around 1820, lead to its syntactic independence from the demonstrative  sa. The syntactic independence of  la from  sa in Mauritian Creole can therefore be characterized as a later development (The French arrived in Mauritius in 1721). In the second half of the 18th century, slaves from Bantu- and Malagasy-speaking areas prevailed, while Gbe-speaking slaves were numerically dominant in the early stages of creolization (Baker 1982, 1984). This makes it less likely that Gbe languages had an influence on the development of the structural properties of  la.
The syntactic independence of *ya* in Tok Pisin is probably also the result of its reanalysis. While *ya* can perform the function of a situational and discourse deictic marker, it performs a number of other functions such as, for instance, focus marking.

While French creole *la* itself is syntactically independent, adnominal demonstratives in French-based creoles often either require or favor its presence. In the DEM-N-*la* pattern found in Mauritian Creole and Réunionnais (see examples (164) and (171)), which clearly goes back to the demonstrative reinforcer construction in French, exemplified below in (175), the dependency has been reversed.

French (my data)

(175) *cette* table *là*

DEM.SG.F table there

‘that table there’

The same pattern can be observed in Lesser Antillean Creoles, where the element *se* derived from the plural form of the demonstrative adjective *ces*, functions as a plural marker.

Lesser Antillean Creole (Martinican) (Déprez 2001: 55)

(176) *se* tab *la*

PL table DEF

‘the tables’

Lesser Antillean Creole (St. Lucian) (Carrington 1984: 67)

(177) *se* mamaj *la*

PL child DEF

‘the children’

Compare to French:

(178) *ces* table-*s* *là*

DEM.PL table-PL there

‘those tables there’

A similar pattern is observed in Santome, where the prenominal plural marker *inen* strongly favors the postnominal definite marker *se* (cf. Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007). As already mentioned above, Alexander and Hagemeijer (2007) point out parallels between *inen* N *se* and Germanic/Romance demonstrative reinforcer constructions.
In some of the creoles studied here, for instance in Jamaican Creole and Negerhollands, postnominal plural markers obligatorily co-occur with prenominal definite markers. The expression of plurality in these two creoles always involves the DEF-N-PL construction, which also appears to be structurally patterned on the superstrate demonstrative reinforcer construction. While the semantic relationship between Jamaican Creole di and dem or Negerhollands di and sini is not identical to that between demonstrative adjectives and the demonstrative reinforcers, on the abstract, structural level, the two constructions appear alike. The DEF-N-PL construction is found in some other creoles under study, namely Berbice Dutch and Papiamentu. The co-occurrence of the plural marker with the definite article in these creoles is, however, optional (cf. Kouwenberg 1994, 2007; Dijkgraaf 1983).

6.4 Summary

This section provides an overview of the main observations with regard to the morphosyntactic organization of NEs in the creoles under study. The examples below illustrate the ordering of adjectives, numerals, determiners, plural markers, and demonstratives with regard to the head noun as well as the ordering of the co-occurring determiners, plural markers, and demonstratives with regard to each other.

With regard to the nominal functional domain, represented by adjectives and numerals, creoles closely resemble their superstrates. This is captured in (179) and (180) below:

(179) **NUM ADJ N**
Found in all the Germanic creoles under study and Diu Portuguese.

(180) **NUM N ADJ/NUM ADJ N**
Found in all the Romance creoles under study with the exception of Diu Portuguese.

The same can be said about the indefinite determiners, which in nearly all of the creoles under study derived from the numeral ‘one’. The ordering of indefinite determiners is illustrated in (181):

(181) **IND N**
Found in all the creoles under study

Significantly greater variation is observed with regard to the placement of the elements which represent the nominal left periphery, that is, definite determiners, plural markers, and demonstratives. Examples below illustrate the ordering of definite determiners in relationship to the head noun (182), the ordering of plural markers in relationship to the
head noun and the markers of definiteness (definite determiners or demonstratives) with which they frequently co-occur (183), and the ordering of demonstratives and demonstrative reinforcers in relationship to the head noun, each other, and definite determiners with which they frequently co-occur (184).

(182) a. **DEF N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>\textit{di}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>\textit{a}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>\textit{di}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>\textit{di}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>\textit{die}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychellois</td>
<td>\textit{sa}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td>\textit{el}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>\textit{e}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean Creole</td>
<td>\textit{kel}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diu Portuguese</td>
<td>\textit{ikol}</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **N DEF**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>\textit{la}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian Creole</td>
<td>\textit{la}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean Creole</td>
<td>\textit{la}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santome</td>
<td>\textit{sa}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(183) a. **DEF N PL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>\textit{di}</td>
<td>\textit{N dem}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>\textit{di}</td>
<td>\textit{N -apu}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>\textit{di}</td>
<td>\textit{N sini}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>\textit{e}</td>
<td>\textit{N nan}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. **PL N DEF/DEM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean Creole</td>
<td>\textit{se la}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian Creole</td>
<td>\textit{ban la}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santome</td>
<td>\textit{inen se}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. **N DEF PL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>\textit{la yo}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d. **DEF/DEM PL N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seychellois</td>
<td>\textit{sa ban}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td>\textit{el manga}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diu Portuguese</td>
<td>\textit{ikol tud}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>\textit{ese ma}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. **PL DEM N**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>\textit{ol dispela}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data considered in this chapter demonstrate that the structural organization of the nominal domain in the creoles under study is largely based on the patterns provided in the superstrate input. Not only adjectives and numerals, but also definite determiners, demonstratives and plural markers in most creoles under study have Germanic/Romance etyma. Creoles typically developed nominal markers through reanalysis/grammaticalization of superstrate-derived lexical and functional items with a similar semantics and function. Such markers preserved much of the structural properties of their etyma. This is clearly observed in the ordering properties of determiners, plural markers and demonstratives as well as in the syntactic interdependencies between these elements. This presents evidence in favor of the superstratist approach to creole genesis, which suggests that the process of restructuring of the superstrate material during creolization depended solely on the variants and developmental directions available in the superstrate (cf. Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Chaudenson 2003, and other work).

It should, however, be pointed out that superstrate-derived material was rarely transferred into creoles without undergoing change. The modifications of the superstrate structures are likely to have taken place due to universal tendencies observed in L2 acquisition and the development of contact languages or under the influence from the L1 of creole creators, identified as the substrate languages of creoles.
The best example of universally-driven modifications is the loss (or drastic reduction) of inflectional morphology and number and gender agreement. Although some researchers have claimed that the development of analytic structures in creoles may be a result of substrate influence, the cross-creole nature of this phenomenon makes a universalist account more plausible.

Within the view on creolization as a result of imperfect L2 acquisition, a number of ideas have been put forward with regard to the loss of inflectional morphology and agreement. Quite a common assumption is that these properties were not perceptually salient enough to be acquired by L2 learners, who have limited access to the target language (e.g., Bickerton 1981). Apart from the fact that the notion of perceptual saliency appears rather vague, this view does not explain the fact that while some creoles considered here did acquire the plural inflectional morphology of their superstates, none of the creoles displays number agreement. In the literature, one finds several alternative accounts concerning the loss of agreement in creoles.

For instance, Aboh (2006) argues that purely structural features that are not interpretable at the discourse-semantics interface are the most likely ones to be eliminated in a language contact situation. Agreement features are clearly of this type. Aboh’s account explains why plural inflection, which realizes a semantically interpretable feature, is most likely to be preserved in creoles.

It is important to point out that the loss of grammatical distinctions does not affect all contact languages in the same way. In the case of rudimentary pidgins, which represent the most minimalistic means of communication, we can observe that they do not only lack grammatical markers of semantically uninterpretable features but also often leave semantically interpretable features unmarked. According to Givón (1979) pidgins represent a “pragmatic mode” of communication, in that features which are expressed grammatically in mature language systems are deduced from the situational context. On the other hand, if we look at contact varieties identified in the literature as mesolectal creoles, semicreoles or colonial dialects (see chapter 2), we note that these languages often preserve a great deal of semantically interpretable grammatical distinctions present in the superstrate together with the relevant superstrate morphology.

Plag (2008a) does not believe in the significance of the semantic value of grammatical features. Instead, he emphasizes the significance of the distinction between inherent and contextual morphology in L2 acquisition. Booij (1996, cited from Plag 2008a: 119) defines inherent inflection as “the kind of inflection that is not required by the syntax but has syntactic relevance. Examples are the category number for nouns, comparative and superlative degree of the adjective, and tense and aspect for verbs”. Contextual inflection, on the other hand, is inflection which is “dictated by syntax, such as person and number markers on the verbs that agree with the subject and/or objects, agreement markers for adjectives, and structural case markers on nouns”.

According to Plag, if creoles preserve any inflectional morphology at all, they show a very strong preference for inherent morphology. In order to account for this fact, Plag appeals to the Processability Theory, which aims at accounting for the fact that
learners follow a well-defined universal path in the morphosyntactic development of their L2. According to this theory, “there is a universal, implicational hierarchy of processing procedures derived from the general architecture of the language processor” (Plag 2008a: 120). These processing procedures include (i) lemma access, (ii) the category procedure, (iii) the phrasal procedure, (iv) the sentence procedure (S-procedure), and (v) the subordinate clause procedure. Assuming that L2 acquisition gradually proceeds through these stages, the Processibility Theory predicts that L2 learners would acquire inherent morphology earlier in the acquisition process than contextual morphology the way it is defined by Booij. For instance, with regard to the nominal domain, the theory predicts that “plural marking on nouns occurs already at stage 2, while NP agreement becomes possible only at stage 3, when intraphrasal exchange of grammatical information has become available” (Plag 2008a: 124). Based on the parallels between interlanguages and creoles, Plag formulates his Interlanguage Hypothesis of creole genesis, according to which creoles are essentially conventionalized interlanguages of an early stage. Going against the view advocated by Aboh (2006) and some other creolistists, Plag specifically emphasizes the fact that within the Processibility Theory, “the semantic value expressed by inflectional affixes does not seem to determine their survival”, as even “meaningless” inherent features (such as conjugation class) take precedence over potentially more “meaningful” contextual features (such as agreement or case assignment). He concludes that “[p]reservation of inflectional markers seems therefore to be primarily a question of processability rather than a question of semantic transparency or communicative relevance”.

While at the first glance Plag’s analysis seems to account for the phenomena observed in the structural organization of creole NEs, some of the data considered in this chapter poses serious problems for Plag’s Interlanguage Hypothesis of creolization. Plag’s analysis is based on instances of loss of superstrate inflectional morphology and agreement. Loss of agreement is, however, observed not only on superstrate-derived but also on substrate-derived markers. One such example is the Kikongo/Kimbundu-derived class prefix *ma*, which lost its class specifications in Palenquero. The loss of agreement in learners’ L1 cannot be accounted for within Plag’s scenario, which only seeks to explain the loss of agreement in target language-derived items. Other evidence against the interlanguage hypothesis of creolization can be found in Aboh (f.c.), who points out that creole languages manifest various types of concord phenomena which in terms of Booij (2005) can be regarded as agreement. On the whole, considering what we know about the history of creole languages and the structure of creole-speaking communities, the idea that creoles are simply fossilized interlanguages represents an oversimplification of the process of creole genesis.

I am, therefore, inclined to adhere to Aboh’s (2006) perspective on the loss of inflection and agreement in creoles. While the adoption of superstrate interpretable grammatical distinctions in creoles is variable, semantically uninterpretable, non-
transparent features that do not facilitate (and perhaps even complicate) successful communication are doomed to be eliminated in creoles.

Regardless of how one interprets the loss of inflectional morphology and gender and number agreement in creoles, one still needs to account for the fact that none of the creoles under study displays agreement within the nominal domain in the contemporary stage of their development. In the sample under study, there are two creoles that have both inflectional number morphology and number distinction in their demonstrative/definite determiner systems. These are Jamaican Creole and Cape Verdean Creole. As observed in section 6.1, both creoles strongly disfavor number agreement. Since the contemporary speakers of these creoles speak these languages natively, the principles that apply during L2 acquisition and contact language formation should not constrain linguistic competence of these speakers. McWhorter (2001), who interprets this persisting tendency towards the use of analytic structures as an indicator of creoles’ structural simplicity, argues that this tendency is related to the fact that creoles, being relatively young languages, have not had enough time to develop “ornamental” properties, that is, properties that are unnecessary for the immediate needs of communication. In order to verify this claim, it may be interesting to compare the observations made with regard to creoles to results from diachronic research into the development of agreement in other, non-creole languages.

Let us now turn to modifications of the superstrate material under substrate influence. These modifications mainly concern changes in word order patterns. As is apparent from the discussion presented in this chapter, in many cases substrate structural influence seems to be limited to the reinforcement of patterns present in the superstrate languages. For instance, while the postnominal placement of deictic elements, definite determiners and plural markers has often been attributed to substrate influence, it appears that in many cases the syntax of such postnominal elements is likely to be essentially patterned on the syntax of the superstrate demonstrative reinforcement.

Some creoles display apparently significant deviations from the structural patterns found in their superstrates. For instance, in a number of creoles one finds morphosyntactically independent postnominal definite determiners (e.g., Tok Pisin, Haitian Creole, Mauritian Creole, Lesser Antillean Creole, and Santome) and freestanding determiner-like plural markers (e.g., Haitian Creole, Papiamentu). This pattern of nominal structural organization, which is not attested in any of the superstrate languages, parallels the structures found in many of the substrate languages of the creoles concerned (e.g., Gbe languages), and it could, therefore, be interpreted in favor of Lefebvre’s (1998) view on creolization. I would, however, treat these as well as some other instances of postnominal markers as cases of reinforcement of the pattern present in the superstrate. In creoles that nowadays display syntactically independent postnominal markers, these markers can often be shown to have developed from syntactically dependent postnominal elements at some point in creole history and/or they can be argued to occupy the originally demonstrative reinforcer slot.
The structural organization of creole NEs clearly shows that creoles generally make a more extensive use of the postnominal space than their superstrates. While the activation of this space might be the result of substrate influence, the potential to use this space was already present in the superstrate languages.

Although such cases are rare, there are also a few creoles in my sample that have adopted nominal elements directly from their substrate languages. While in some cases (e.g., Chabacano marker *manga*) these markers preserved the structural properties of their substrate etyma, in other cases (e.g., Palenquero plural marker *ma*) the structural properties of the substrate-derived items appear to have been modified under superstrate influence.

Summing up, the development of the creole nominal structures appears to be the result of a complex interaction of the following processes: (a) adoption of superstrate and substrate nominal elements, together with the function and the structural properties they possess in the source language; (b) reduction of the range of overt grammatical specifications present in the superstrate and substrate nominal elements; (c) development of new analytical markers through reanalysis/grammaticalization of superstrate- and substrate-derived functional and lexical items; (d) modification of the structural properties of the superstrate-derived items based on the patterns of the structural organization of NEs present in the superstrate and/or substrate and/or independent language-internal developments; (e) modification of the structural properties of superstrate-derived items based on the patterns of structural organization of NEs present in the superstrate and/or other substrates and/or due to independent language-internal developments.

The analysis of creole nominal structures reveals the role of superstrate and substrate influence as well as universal tendencies in creole formation. It also shows that internal factors such as the semantic interpretability of a given feature as well as external factors such as the amount/intensity and duration of contact with the superstrate may affect the outcome of language contact. I thus conclude that the material considered in this and the previous chapter can be interpreted in favor of the perspective on creole genesis advocated by Mufwene (2000, and other work) and Aboh (2006, and other work).
Chapter 7

Individuation and number

On the whole, creole languages behave rather differently from their Romance and Germanic superstrates with regard to the marking of NEs for individuation and number. In Germanic and Romance languages, mass and count nouns show different morphosyntactic behavior. These differences are evident if we compare the marking of indefinite mass and count nouns. While mass nouns are typically used in their bare form, count nouns should be always overtly individuated by means of an indefinite determiner or plural marking. In addition to individuating the reference of the NE, indefinite determiners and plural markers also specify it as singular or plural, respectively. This is illustrated in the following examples from Dutch and Spanish:

Dutch (my data)

(185) a. Ik   wil  *kaas/*een kaas/*kaz-en\textsuperscript{16}
   1SG want  cheese/IND cheese/chees-PL
   ‘I want cheese.’

   b. Ik   heb  *(een) hond.
   1SG have  IND dog
   ‘I have a dog.’

   c. Ik   heb  drie hond-*\textsuperscript{(en)}
   1SG have  three dog-PL
   ‘I have three dogs.’

\textsuperscript{16} The expressions *een kaas “a cheese” and *kazen “cheeses” are grammatical when kaas “cheese” is used to refer individually, to a sort or a wheel of cheese.
Spanish (my data)

(186) a. Quiero *un queso/*un queso/*quesos.\(^{17}\)
    want cheese/IND.SG.M cheese/cheese-PL
    ‘I want cheese.’

b. Tengo *(un) perro.
    have IND.SG.M dog
    ‘I have a dog.’

c. Tengo tres perros.(s).
    have three dog-PL
    ‘I have three dogs.’

The semantic differences between nouns that are used to refer to bounded, countable entities and nouns that are used to refer to unbounded, uncountable masses paralleled by the systematic differences in their morphosyntactic behavior underlie the traditional assumption that the specification of nouns as count or mass is part of their lexical semantics (see section 4.1.2)

In contrast to their superstrates, creole languages do not systematically treat count and mass nouns differently in the morphosyntax. Although most creoles do have indefinite determiners and plural markers which show formal and/or functional resemblance to their Germanic and Romance counterparts, not only mass but also singular and plural referents may be denoted by bare nouns in creoles.

The wide distribution of bare nouns in creoles has been interpreted in several ways. In the break-in-transmission scenarios of creole genesis (see chapter 2), the occurrence of bare nouns in creoles is interpreted as a result of the loss of the superstrate morphology which took place in the early stages of creole formation, which are by some researchers believed to have represented pidginization. The broad range of interpretative possibilities of bare nouns and the contextual dependency of the interpretations are regarded as features of the “pragmatic mode” of communication characteristic of pidgins (see Givón 1979). The presence of pragmatic organizational principles in creoles is attributed to underdevelopment of morphosyntactic means.

Mufwene (1981) proposes an account of bare nouns in creoles which appeals to the notion of (non)-individuation. Following Allan (1980), who claimed that while nouns do have “countability preferences”, they receive count (individuated) or mass (non-individuated) interpretation in actual use, Mufwene argues that the ability to be individuated and counted is a characteristic of NEs and not of lexical semantics of nouns. In contrast to the binary opposition between count and mass nouns, Mufwene

\(^{17}\) The expressions *un queso* “a cheese” and *quesos* “cheeses” are grammatical when *queso* “cheese” is used to refer individually, to a sort of cheese.
perceives individuation as a scalar category. While bare nouns convey the non-individuated, mass-like interpretation, the use of determiners and plural marking in various degrees contributes to the individuation of reference.

Stewart (2006) proposes an alternative view on the distribution of bare nouns in Jamaican Creole, arguing that they behave like set nouns, as defined by Rijkhoff (2002). According to Rijkhoff, the major property of set nouns is that they are not associated with either singularity or plurality. They denote a set which may consist of one or multiple individuals. I will provide a more extensive discussion of these proposals in the subsequent sections of this chapter.

As for the sources of the distributional properties of bare nouns in creoles, in addition to the drastic simplification of the morphosyntactic apparatus of Germanic and Romance languages, which in most scenarios of creolization is interpreted as an outcome of imperfect L2 acquisition, some researchers (e.g., Lefebvre 1998) have also invoked the possibility of substrate influence. According to Lefebvre, the distribution of bare nouns in Haitian Creole shows close resemblance to the distribution of bare nouns in one of its major substrates, Fongbe. The ability to use bare nouns to denote singular and plural referents is also characteristic of other Niger-Congo languages, such as Akan (Christaller 1897), Edo (Dunn 1968) or Yoruba (Ajiboye 2005). It is, however, not shared by all representatives of the Niger-Congo family. For instance, in Bantu languages nouns are always marked for singular or plural by means of nominal prefixes (Leston Buell, p.c.).

As bare nouns may be used to refer to singular and plural individuals, the distribution of singular and plural number markers is constrained by semantic and discourse-pragmatic factors other than the individuated and singular/plural interpretation of the NE. The distribution of the indefinite determiner is in addition to individuation and singular number often constrained by specificity.

With regard to overt plural marking in creoles, it has often been observed that its use is restricted to definite NEs. The dependency of plural marking on definiteness, which has particularly often been observed in Atlantic Creoles, has been attributed to substrate influence (e.g., Lefebvre 1998). The dependency of plural marking on definiteness is indeed observed in many Kwa languages such as Fongbe or Gungbe (cf. Levebre and Brousseau 2002; Aboh 2004a) as well as in Benue-Congo languages such as Yoruba (Ajiboye 2005). As we shall see in this chapter, while definiteness does play an important role in the distribution of plural marking in many of the creoles under study, it does not exhaustively describe it.

In what follows, I will consider the ways in which individuation and number is marked in the creoles under study. Section 7.1 deals with the distribution and interpretation of bare NEs. Section 7.2 discusses the use of the indefinite determiner as a marker of individuation and singular number. Section 7.3 discusses the occurrences of Germanic- and Romance-derived inflectional plural marking in creoles. Finally, section 7.4 is devoted to the discussion of other types of creole plural markers. Section 7.5 presents the discussion of the findings in the light of the issue of creole genesis.
7.1 Bare NEs and individuation

In the introduction to this chapter, I observe that Germanic and Romance languages treat mass and count nouns differently in morphosyntax. However, not all scholars share the idea that mass vs. count distinction represents part of the lexical semantics of nouns that morphosyntax is sensitive to. In section 4.1.4, as well as in the introduction to this chapter I already discussed the alternative approach to the lexical semantics of nouns advocated by such researchers as Alan (1980), Mufwene (1981) and Borer (2005). Alan (1980) observes that the same noun stem may be specified as mass or as count in syntax. For instance, while in examples (187) and (188), *cake* and *beer* are used to refer to unbounded masses, *a cake* and *a beer* in (187) and (188) have a count interpretation as they refer to bounded units, *a cake* and a bottle/glass of beer.

(187)  
  a. Hetty likes to gorge herself on *cake*.
  b. Whenever Hetty gobbles down *a cake* her diet starts tomorrow.

(188)  
  a. John loves *beer*.
  b. Can I have *a beer*?

Based on this observation, Mufwene (1981) introduces the categories of *individuated* and *non-individuated* defining them as “basic units of number delimitation” that “combine indiscriminately with mass and count nouns” (225). According to Mufwene, the opposition between “individuatedness” and “non-individuatedness” is not a binary but a scalar one. He argues that while zero marking, cross-linguistically associated with mass nouns, which are the prototype of non-individuatedness, always suggests the non-individuated interpretation, plural marking and (in)definite determiners to varying degrees contribute to individuation. Based on the multiple parallels between bare (i.e. determinerless) plurals and mass nouns pointed out in the literature (e.g., Carlson 1977), Mufwene proposes that bare plurals are the least individuated after mass nouns. The highest on the individuatedness scale are, according to Mufwene, NEs introduced by definite and indefinite articles, which always produce the individuated interpretation.

Based on the study of individuation marking in English, French, Lingala and Jamaican Creole, Mufwene (1981) observes that languages differ with regard to the ways in which they express the various degrees of individuation in their morphosyntax. While English uses bare NEs only with nouns that denote unbounded masses and occasionally generic referents, with regard to Jamaican Creole, Mufwene argues that it systematically treats mass (189), generic (189) and existential plural NEs (189) as non-individuated thus marking them all by means of zero.
Jamaican Creole (Mufwene 1981: 230, 227, 229)

(189) a. *Wata de aal uova di tiebl ina im afis.*
   water COP.LOC all over DEF table in 3SG office
   ‘There is water all over the table in his office.’

   b. Myeri laik *papawo.*
   Mary like papaw
   ‘Mary like papaw/papaws.’

   c. *Buk de aal uova di tiebl ina im afis.*
   book COP.LOC all over DEF table in 3SG office
   ‘There are books all over the table in his office.’

Whenever the individuated interpretation is implied, (in)definite determiners are used (190).

Jamaican Creole (Mufwene 1981: 230)

(190) *Di/wan buk de pan di tiebl ina im afis.*
   DEF/IND book COP.LOC on DEF table in 3SG office
   a. ‘The book is on the table in his office.’
   b. ‘There is a book on the table in his office.’

Mufwene’s ideas with regard to the nature of mass/count distinction and individuation provide an interesting insight into the semantics of the noun in creoles and other languages of the world. However, his analysis overlooks the fact that the reference of bare nouns in creoles may be individuated. This is illustrated in example (191) below, where the bare NE *mongoose* is used to refer to a certain individual mongoose, although the identity of this mongoose might be unknown to the speaker.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 11)

(191) Mama, it look like *mongoose* gone wid yuh chicken.
   mama it look like mongoose gone with 2SG chicken
   ‘Mama, it looks like a mongoose has stolen your chicken.’

Based on similar observations, Mufwene’s analysis has also been challenged by Stewart (2006). Stewart demonstrates that bare NEs with plural reference have a distributive reading in Jamaican Creole. This is for instance the case in the example cited here under (192):

Jamaican Creole (Stewart 2006: 204)

(192) **Chii bwai** kil dem faada.
    three boy kill 3PL father
    ‘Three boys killed their father.’

According to Stewart, this example may only have the distributive reading “each of the three boys killed his own father”, which suggests that the referent of *chii bwai* is perceived as three individuals of the kind BOY and not as an undelimited collective set.

Many of the creoles considered here behave similarly to Jamaican Creole in showing the ability to use bare nouns to denote not only non-individuated mass-like, but also singular and plural individuated entities. Below I provide a few examples of creoles where bare NEs may be used for mass, singular and plural reference at least as freely as in Jamaican. The examples below are from Tok Pisin, Berbice Dutch, Lesser Antillean Creole, and Diu Portuguese. The (a), (b), and (c) examples illustrate the use of bare NEs to denote mass, singular individual and plural individual referents, respectively. The italicized NE in the examples below may differ with regard to their specificity and definiteness values, but we shall ignore this for the time being.

Tok Pisin (Mühläusler et al. 2003: 121, 117, 209)

(193) a. ol i mumuir **kaikai**
    3PL PM cook food
    ‘they cooked food’

    b. ...ol man i kam banisim rot.
       PL man PM come block road
       ‘...the men came and blocked the road.’

    c. ...i gat mama got wantaim **tupla pikinini** bl=em.
       PM get mana goat with two child POSS=3SG
       ‘...there was a mother goat and her two children.’

---

18 The availability of singular and plural individuated interpretation for bare nouns is related to the functions available for (in)definite determiners and plural markers. For instance, when the use of the indefinite determiner in a creole is restricted to specific indefinite NEs, all non-specific indefinite singular NEs will surface unmarked. Similarly, when plural marking is only used when an NE is definite, all indefinite plural NEs receive zero marking. The role of specificity and definiteness in the marking of creole NEs will be discussed in sections 7.2 and 7.3, as well as in chapters 8 and 9.

(194) a. …ba alma di gut-ap in das p=iš fri, fi̱kri, ri̱fi, mel.
    but all DEF thing-PL 3PL HAB give=1PL free sugar rice flour
    ‘…but all the things they gave us for free, sugar, rice, flour.’

b. …iši bi iši ma kopu kui an iši kopu-te en kui...
    1PL say 1PL IRR buy cow and 1PL buy-PF IND cow
    ‘…we said we would buy a cow and we bought a cow…’

c. Oli melkë mete s:igrød iš das haf kop...
    only milk with cigarettes 1PL HAB have buy
    ‘Only milk and cigarettes we would have to buy…’

Lesser Antillean Creole (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

(195) a. bèl plézi ou ka fè moin.
    nice pleasure 2SG IPFV give 1SG
    ‘You are giving me some good pleasure.’

b. Moin kè voyé on moun chèché kaka-tig meme.
    1SG IPFV send IND person search poopoo-tiger same
    ‘I will send someone to get a real tiger turd.’

c. i kasé dizuisanzasyèt…
    3SG break 1800.plate
    ‘He broke 1800 plates’…

Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 137, 150, 123)

(196) a. El tó bebe-s co leyd.
    3SG IMPF.NPST drink-INF only milk
    ‘He only drinks milk.’

b. elz vidi faz-e kaz si d-elz jût t-iñ diñer.
    3PL IRR.PST make-INF house if of-3PL together have-PST money
    ‘They would have made a house if they had money.’

c. Lisa te doz gat dët d-el kaz
    Lisa have.NPST twelve cat inside of-3SG.F house
    ‘Lisa has twelve cats at home.’
The fact that bare NEs in creoles can be used to denote singular and plural individuals suggests that nouns in creoles conform to Rijkhoff’s (2002) description of set nouns. As I briefly mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the analysis of creole nouns as set nouns has already been proposed by Stewart (2006) in her work on Jamaican Creole. As the reader may recall from the description of Rijkhoff’s (2002) classification of lexical noun types (see section 4.1.2), the major property of set nouns (as opposed to singular object nouns in languages like English, which in the absence of plural marking always denote singular individuals) is that they are not associated with either singularity or plurality. They denote a set which may consist of one or multiple individuals. The form of a set noun provides no information as to whether what is denoted by this noun is a singleton or a collective set. Thus, unmarked nouns in set noun languages are underspecified for number and subsume under one denotation what is described by singular and plural nouns in languages like English.

Alternatively, one could look at the distribution of bare NEs in creoles from the perspective proposed by Borer (2005). Under Borer’s universalist definition of the lexical semantics of nouns as unstructured stuff (see section 4.1.3), the differences between creole languages and languages like English would boil down to the differences in the ways they map this universal lexical semantics onto different types of referents, or, in other words, in the licensing properties of individuation. In both creoles and Germanic and Romance languages, individuation would be assumed to be the property of the Cl(assifier) P(hrase), with the only difference that while in Germanic and Romance languages NEs must be overtly marked in order to receive an individuated interpretation, in the creoles NEs may receive an individuated interpretation in the absence of morphological individuation marking.

Rijkhoff (2002) and Borer (2005) offer two quite different perspectives on the distribution of bare NEs in creole. In order to evaluate the applicability of their proposals to the creoles under study, additional evidence concerning the distribution of overt plural markers is required. This evidence will be discussed in the subsequent sections.

7.2 Overt markers of individuation and singularity

The fact that determinerless NEs may in many creoles be used to denote singular individuals suggests that the use of the indefinite determiner is not required in order to obtain the singular individual interpretation. This suggests that semantic factors other than individuation and singularity may determine the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles. As will be demonstrated in chapter 8, specificity appears to play an important role in the distribution of indefinite determiners in many creoles. Certain instances of indefinite determiner use can however be shown to be driven by the need to express individuation and singularity.

Bare nouns are ambiguous with regard to individuation and number. While the discourse or situational context usually provides the information necessary for the
disambiguation of the reference of a bare noun, this is not always the case. This is illustrated in example (197) from Jamaican Creole, where the italicized NE *pumpkin* may be interpreted as referring to a mass, a singular or a plural entity.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 9)

(197) …we decide seh we haffi have *pumpkin* too.

1PL decide COMP 1PL have.to have pumpkin too

‘…we decided that we had to have a pumpkin/pumpkins/some pumpkin too’

The indefinite determiner, which expresses inviduation and singularity unambiguously, may be used in cases where the distinction between a non-individuated and individuated and singular and plural interpretation is important. For instance, it can be used with nouns that normally denote undelimited mass to mark them as referring to a singular individual, a certain unit of the mass.

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 51)

(198) Not a man eat, not a man drink. Ah say not *a food*

NEG IND man eat NEG IND man drink 1SG say NEG IND food
taste, not *a rum* drink.

taste NEG IND rum drink.

‘No one should eat, no one should drink. I say, no [piece of] food should be
tasted, no [sip of] rum should be drunk.’

Similar function is observed with the indefinite article in Germanic and Romance languages. For instance, the use of the indefinite article with the noun *beer* in example (188b) cited in the beginning of this chapter indicates that the reference is made to a certain unit of beer, that is, a glass or a bottle. The same individuating function is performed by the indefinite article *un* in the Spanish example below: the article indicates that the noun *café* refers to a cup of coffee.

Spanish (my data)

(199) *Voy a tomar un café.*

go.PRS.1SG PURP take-INF IND.SG.M coffee

‘I am going to have a coffee.’

Other instances of the indefinite determiner can be shown to specify number. For instance, in the following example from Papiamentu, the bare NE *yu*, denotes a Kind and is, therefore, not specified for number. The NE *un yu* is unambiguously interpreted as denoting just one child.
Papiamentu (Kester and Schmitt 2007: 123)

(200) a. Bo tin yu? Si, mi tin yu.
   2SG have child Yes 1SG have child
   ‘Do you have children? Yes, I have a child/children.’

   b. Bo tin yu? Si, mi tin un yu.
   2SG have child Yes 1SG have IND child
   ‘Do you have children? Yes, I have a child.’

When the indefinite determiner occurs with NEs in the scope of negation, the singular semantics of the indefinite determiner emphasizes negation. This is demonstrated below in example (201) from Tok Pisin and example (202) Berbice Dutch. In these cases, it is, however, not clear whether we are dealing with the indefinite determiner or with the numeral ‘one’.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 83)

(201) I no gat wanel f na dai em etpela de-s i sting
   PM NEG have IND man PM die 3SG eight day-PL PM stink
   pinis na em i kirap.
   COMPL and 3SG PM get.up
   ‘There is nobody who is dead for eight days and is putrid who can get up.’

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1993: 361)

(202) Skelpata na buha en gutu ka, bikas o banggi tigri ma
   turtle NEG say IND thing NEG because 3SG afraid tiger IRR
   b=ori.
   kill=3SG
   ‘Turtle does not say a thing, because he is afraid Tiger will kill him.’

7.3 Overt markers of individuation and plurality

A number of the creoles under study have inherited the Romance and Germanic type of plural marking from their superstrate languages. In these creoles, plurality may be marked on the noun by means of the plural inflectional morphology. These creoles are Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin, Afrikaans, Cape Verdean, and, marginally, Chabacano. According to Grant (2007) and Armin Schwegler (p.c.), -s does not seem to be productive in contemporary Chabacano. In the other four creoles listed above, the plural
marker -s is used productively (cf. Patrick 2009 on -s in Jamaican Creole; Romaine 1992 on -s in Tok Pisin; Baptista 2002 on -s in Cape Verdean).

In (Standard) Afrikaans, the distribution of the plural markers -s and -e closely resembles the distribution of their Dutch counterparts, -s and -en. In Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin, and Cape Verdean Creole, plural entities may be also denoted by means of bare NEs and -s is used variably. In addition to the external factors such as age, socio-economic status, and educational level, the use of -s as opposed to zero has been shown to be governed by a number of linguistic factors. The linguistic factors underlying the distribution of plural inflection has been investigated by Patrick (2009) for Jamaican Creole, Romaine (1992) for Tok Pisin, and Baptista (2001) for Cape Verdean (compared to Guinea-Bissau Creole, Guinea-Casamance Creole, Nigerian Pidgin English and Ghanaian Pidgin English).

The major factors that determine the use of -s as opposed to zero are animacy and humanness. The sensitivity of inflectional plural marking to animacy has been observed in all the creoles investigated in the studies mentioned in the previous paragraph. In addition to animacy, Baptista (2003) observes the effects of definiteness and episodic tense. The role of definiteness and episodic tense in the distribution of -s is secondary. These factors may only affect the distribution of -s with inanimate NE. Animate NEs may be overtly pluralized by means of -s without being definite or occurring in the context of episodic tense. Patrick (2009) states that definiteness does not play a role in the distribution of -s in Jamaican Creole. Romaine (1992) does not make any observations with regard to the role of definiteness in the distribution of -s in Tok Pisin.

Animacy effects on plural marking are cross-linguistically common. Typological studies of plural marking demonstrate that overt plural markers commonly favor animate nouns over inanimate ones. This is attributed to the fact that individuation and number are considered more relevant when the referent is human or animate than with inanimate referents, which may be conceived of as undifferentiated mass (Comrie 1989).

In Bobyleva (2007), I observe that in addition to animacy and other referential properties of NEs -s is used when the plural interpretation is important for the point at issue and needs to be emphasized. Consider the following examples from Jamaican Creole:

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 82, 90)

(203) a. Dis yah funeral is one whe’ people go-ing to remember DEM REINF funeral COP one REL people go-PROG to remember and talk about fe generation-s. and talk about for generation-PL

‘This funeral is a funeral that people are going to remember and talk about for generations’
In these examples, the plural interpretation of the italicized nouns is clearly central to the content of the message.

As observed in chapter 4, Borer considers the English plural inflection -s as an instantiation of the classifier function and analyses it as the head of ClP, which is responsible for partitioning out or dividing stuff into atomic, countable parts. Despite the fact that inflectional plural marking in the creoles considered here is not used categorically with all semantically plural nouns, it does not show any distributional properties qualitatively different from those of -s in English. I, therefore, assume that -s in these creoles functions in the same way as it does in English. It overtly indicates that the noun refers to multiple individuals. This function of -s clearly manifests itself in examples like (203).

The variable occurrence of -s in creoles can be easily accommodated within Borer’s universalist approach to the lexical semantics of nouns. Under Borer’s account, the differences between set noun languages and singular object noun languages boils down to the differences in the ways they map this lexical semantics onto different types of referents, or, in other words, in the licensing properties of individuation. With regard to the creoles considered here one could conclude that the licensing properties of individuation are variable and constrained by a number of other parameters (e.g., animacy and definiteness).

The variable use of -s in creoles does, on the other hand, poses serious problems for Rijkhoff’s (2002) classification of lexical noun types, which assumes that the differences in the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs are indicative of different lexico-semantic properties of the nouns that head them. As observed in section 7.1, nouns in the creoles under study, appear to behave like set nouns in Rijkhoff’s classification in that they can be used to refer to singular and multiple individuals in their bare form. This observation also holds for Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin and Cape Verdean Creole. According to Rijkhoff (2002), number marking of Germanic and Romance type would only be compatible with singular object noun languages like English. This assumption is based on the analysis of the Germanic and Romance count nouns as denoting singular individuals and the related analysis of the Germanic and Romance plural marker as a multiplier, which attaches to the unmarked form of a count noun, thus taking a singular individual and returning a plural individual. Under this analysis, set nouns, which denote sets that are ambiguous between singulative and collective interpretations, should not be compatible with -s. This makes the occurrence of -s in set noun languages problematic.

Interestingly, Rijkhoff (2002) observes that some languages display split plural marking systems, treating inanimate nouns as set nouns and animate nouns as singular
object nouns. This characterization appears to apply to Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin, and Cape Verdean. However, it does not capture the variability of inflectional plural markers in these creoles. While -s does favor animate and human nouns over inanimate ones, its use is not categorically constrained by animacy. It is not categorical with animate NEs and may occur with inanimate NEs. Since the distribution of -s in these creoles is governed by tendencies rather than rules, each noun may in principle denote a plural referent in its bare form or be marked with -s. Under Rijkhoff’s view, the only possible interpretation of Jamaican, Tok Pisin and Cape Verdean data is that nouns in these creoles have two lexical entries: one with the semantics of a set noun and another one with the semantics of a singular object noun. One is activated when a noun occurs in its bare form and the other when it combines with the plural marker -s. Such a rule would obviously go against the Principle of Economy, which has been repeatedly shown to play an important role in the organization of the language system. I, therefore, conclude that the data considered in this section presents evidence in favour of Borer’s and against Rijkhoff’s claims. I believe that while Rijkhoff’s classification is useful as a typology of the licensing properties of NEs the idea that the cross-linguistic differences in the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs are indicative of different lexico-semantic properties of the nouns that head them should be reconsidered.

7.4 Creole plural markers as markers of collectivity

In this section, I will argue that elements that are often identified in the creole literature as plural markers should be rather characterized as markers of collectivity, or collective aspect markers, in Rijkhoff’s (2002) terminology. In sections 7.4.1-7.4.4, I will discuss the major constraints on the distribution of these plural markers and consider their special functions. In section 7.4.5, I will offer an analysis of these plural markers from the typological perspective proposed by Rijkhoff (2002).

7.4.1 Definiteness and specificity effects on the distribution of plural markers

In many creoles, definiteness plays the crucial role in the distribution of overt plural marking. In some creoles, plural marking is expressed by means of the plural form of the definite determiner. In chapter 5, I mention that plural definite determiners are found in Sranan and Cape Verdean Creole. Examples from these two creoles are given below:
Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 62)

(204) Dan di m k å oso, dan den suma aksi pe then time ISG come PREP home then DEF.PL person ask where m opo. ISG come-from ‘Then when I came home then the people asked where I came from.’

Cape Verdean (Baptista 2002: 103)

(205) E mi ki ta fika ku kes minizu. FOC 1SG REL IPFV stay with DEF.PL child ‘It is me who stays with the kids.’

Haitian Creole plural marker *yo* could, in principle also be described as the plural form of the definite determiner: in some varieties of Haitian (Vernet 1973)\(^1\), *yo* is used in complementary distribution with the singular definite determiner *la*. Also in Santome, the form *inen* may be used on its own to express plurality and definiteness. The marker *se* which is sometimes described as a definite determiner (in addition to being a demonstrative) (cf. Ferraz 1979, Lucchesi 1993) is used to express other features next to definiteness (see chapter 9). Examples demonstrative the use of Haitian Creole *yo* and Santome *inen* are given below:

---

\(^1\) According to some sources (e.g. Lefebvre 1998) Haitian Creole *yo* may combine with *la*:

Haitian Creole (Lefebvre 1998: 85)

(i)  krab la yo crab DEF.DEF.PL ‘the crabs’

Vernet (1973) observes that the combination *la yo* is restricted to certain dialects of the creole. Vernet specifies that the use of *la* and *yo* within the same DP is characteristic of the northern dialect. In the dialect spoken in the central part of the island and *la* and *yo* are in strict complementary distribution. This latter is also the case in the data I have considered. As far as this dialect is concerned, *la* and *yo* realize two mutually exclusive sets of features [+definite, -plural] and [+definite, +plural], respectively:

Haitian Creole (Deprez 2006: 72)

(ii)  kat liv yo/*la four book DEF.PL/DEF.SG ‘the four books’

In the data I have examined (Hall 1953), I found no instances of *la* and *yo* used together.
Haitian Creole (Hall 1959: 79)

(206) Papa mâjé nâ-salô, *timoun-yo* mâjé nâ-kwizin…
papa eat PREP-living.room child-DEF.PL eat PREP-kitchen
‘Father ate in the living room, the children ate in the kitchen…’

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 40)

(207) *Inen funxonaria* ska bi golo pixi blatu ô.
DEF.PL functionary DUR go search fish cheap EMPH
‘The employees are searching for cheap fish.’

With the exception of Cape Verdean Creole, where indefinite NEs may be marked for plural by means of inflection (see section 7.3), indefinite plural NEs are not marked for number in these creoles:

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 60)

(208) Of sontrô i bê-bai *joka* fu *knopo*…
or sometime 2SG PST-IPFV-buy marble for button
‘Sometimes you bought marbles for buttons…’

Haitian Creole (Hall 1959: 76)

(209) Si ou pa-bâ mwê, m-ap-fê *zôbi* prâ ou.
If 2SG NEG-give 1SG 1SG-IPFV-CAUS zombie take 2SG
‘If you don’t give [it] to me I’ll make zombies get you.’

Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2007: 71)

(210) N odja *pasaru* riba di kaza
1SG see bird top of house
‘I see birds on top of the house.’

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 46)

(211) N konsê *dexi mosu*…
1SG know ten boy
‘I know ten boys…’

While Sranan *den*, Haitian *yo*, Cape Verdean *kes* and Santome *inen* are used to realize the features [+definite; +plural] on their own, in several creoles under study
plural markers obligatory occur in combination with a definite determiner. These creoles include Jamaican Creole, Negerhollands and Lesser Antillean Creole. The Jamaican Creole plural marker *dem* and Negerhollands plural marker *sini* may be combined either with the definite determiner or with some other adnominal markers of definiteness (e.g., a possessive pronoun). The Lesser Antillean plural marker *se* always requires the presence of the definite determiner *la* (which unlike Jamaican Creole *di* and Negerhollands *di* is not in complementary distribution with possessive pronouns). Like Sranan *den*, Haitian Creole *yo*, Cape Verdean *kes* and Santome *inen*, Jamaican *dem*, Negerhollands *sini* and Lesser Antillean *se* are restricted to definite NEs (212)-(214).

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 327)

(212) *Who a go feed him pickney dem now?*  
Who PROG go feed 3SG child PL now  
‘Who is going to feed his children now?’

Negerhollands (Van Rossem and Van der Voort 1996: 260)

(213) *Di difman sini a kuri…*  
DEF thief PL IPFV run  
‘The thieves ran…’

Lesser Antillean Creole (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

(214) *sé timoun an=moin=la ké joué avè sa*  
PL child of=1SG=DEF FUT play with DEM  
‘My children will play with it.’

In Jamaican Creole (mesolect), in addition to the combination *di*/POSS…*dem* illustrated in (212), I have encountered several instances of *dem* without *di* in combination with indefinite NEs (215). Such examples are, however, extremely rare.

20 While in Jamaican Creole, the instances of *dem* with non-definite NEs are rare, in Krio and Belizean Creole, they can be found in abundance. In these two languages the 3Pl-derived plural marker may be used to mark definite, (specific) indefinite and generic NEs:

Krio (Saidu Bangura, p.c.)

(i) *Di bɔ̀bɔ̀ den kɔ̀r go den tri bag den na mi pikindan.*  
DEF boy PL carry go DEF.PL three bag PL PREP 1SG child.PL  
‘The boys carried the three bags to my children.’
Some boys are standing on the corner.

With the exception of Jamaican Creole, where indefinite plural NEs may be marked by means of plural inflection (see section 7.3) and, occasionally, by means of dem, indefinite NEs in these creoles receive zero plural marking. This is demonstrated in examples (216)-(218) below:

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 51)

(216) ...so dem kill plenty fowl an’ goat an’ gather yam an’ banana...
so 3PL kill plenty fowl and goat and gather yam and banana
‘...so they killed a lot of fowls and goats and gathered yams and bananas...’

Negerhollands (Van Rossem and Van der Voort 1996: 256)

(217) ...di kining ha fo gi am feiflik patakón mi twee
def king have PURP give 3SG fifty patakon and two
ton suku.
barrel sugar
‘...the king has to give him fifty patakon and two barrels of sugar.’

Lesser Antillean Creole (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

(218) ...i kasé dizuisan zasyèt...
3SG break 1800 plate
‘...he broke 1800 plates...’

The examples cited above demonstrate that in a number of creoles under study, number is expressed only in combination with definiteness, by means of a determiner-like element. The specification of the creole determiner-like plural markers as [+definite] appears to represent a heritage of their superstrate etyma: demonstratives and 3Pl

(ii) Sam bɔbɔ den bin kam ask fɔ yu.
some boy PL PST come ask for 2SG
‘Some boys came asking for you.’

(iii) Mango den swiit pas apul den.
mango PL sweet pass apple PL
‘Mangoes are sweeter than apples.’
pronouns. It is, however, likely that [+definite] elements were selected to perform the function of number marking in creoles either due to the fact that plural marking in the substrate is restricted to [+definite] NEs or because of a universal tendency to restrict overt number marking to definite NEs.

As far as the creoles considered above are concerned, substrate influence appears to be a likely explanation. In Gbe languages, which constituted an important substrate component of all of the creoles considered above, plural marking also only occurs on definite NEs. This is demonstrated in example (219) from Fongbe.

Fongbe (Lefèbvre and Brousseau 2002: 39)

(219)  \(\text{às} \text{ô} \text{n} \ lë\)

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a.] ‘the crabs’
  \item [b.] ‘some crabs’
\end{itemize}

The association between overt plural marking and definiteness is, however, not restricted to Atlantic and Indian Ocean creoles which have Gbe languages among their important substrates and where plural markers derive from [+definite] elements. The effects of definiteness on the distribution of plural markers is observed in most of the creoles under study. In addition to the creoles discussed above, this group includes Tok Pisin, Berbice Dutch, Papiamentu, Palenquero, Chabacano, and Diu Portuguese. While plural marking in these creoles is not restricted to definite NEs, the overt expression of number is clearly favoured by definiteness. In many of them, plural marking is (nearly) categorical with definite NEs and variable with indefinite NEs. Below, I shall discuss the distribution of plural markers in each of these creoles individually.

Among the creoles listed in the previous paragraph, the strongest sensitivity to definiteness is observed in Palenquero and Diu Portuguese. The occurrence of plural marking with indefinite NEs is very rare in these creoles. In the early works on Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983; Megenney 1986; Faingold 1994), the language was described as having a determiner system consisting of three markers, un, ma and un ma. The marker un which bears the features [-definite, -plural] was considered to perform the function of an indefinite determiner. The marker ma was analyzed as a plural definite determiner, and un ma as a marker of plural indefinite NEs. Under this analysis, zero-marked nouns are always interpreted as [+definite, -plural]. Schwegler (2007) challenges this description of the Palenquero determiner system, demonstrating that definite plural NEs are not always marked by ma and that ma (alone) may also occur with indefinite plural and generic NEs. Based on these observations he reconsiders the interpretative properties of bare NEs, arguing that they are unspecified for number. According to Schwegler, as well as Moñino (2007), the use of ma and un ma is contextually dependent. They function to add optional information and to eliminate possible ambiguity. This tendency in the distribution on ma may suggest that
the marker should be less common with definites, whose referential properties are already familiar or at least identifiable to the discourse participants. This is, however, not the case. The distribution of ma in the data sample published in Friedemann and Patiño (1983) suggests that definite NEs with plural reference are nearly always marked by means of ma. Definite NEs receive plural marking even when plurality of the referent has been explicitly stated in the preceding discourse, as well as in the NE itself. Examples like (220) below are very common in the data. According to Moñino (2007, cited in Schwegler 2007: 220), “the omission of ma (in bare nouns) is linked to the availability of verbal or non-verbal contextual cues” but “the primary reason for the frequent use of ma+noun is almost certainly unrelated to speakers’ need for disambiguation.” Thus, while the presence of contextual indicators of plurality facilitates the omission of ma, ma is not always omitted in contexts where the discourse content or situation suggests plural reading.

Based on the data I have considered, I conclude that although the description of ma as a plural definite determiner might be not completely accurate, definiteness does play an important role in the distribution of ma. In the data published in Friedemann and Patiño (1983), I have not encountered any instances of the marker with indefinite NEs, apart from cases where ma occurs in the construction un ma, which appears to be restricted to specific indefinite NEs. The semantic contexts favorable for the occurrence of ma are illustrated below.

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 207, 243)

(220) í á miní pogke í tamba kelá si ané m
1SG PST go because 1SG was.going stay if 3PL 1SG.OBJ
paga-ba ocho boliba. Pero kumo ané pagá mí ma ocho
pay-PST.IPFV eight bolivar but as 3PL pay 1SG.OBJ PL eight
boliba nu, í á miní.
obolivar NEG 1SG PST go
‘I went because I was going to stay if they were going to pay me eight bolivars. And as they did not pay me the eight bolivars, I went.’

(221) Pero á tené un ma ria ke ngineo á enfemmá.
but PST have IND PL day REL Guinean PST sick
‘But there were days when the Guinean got sick.’

Another creole in which overt plural marking is associated with definiteness is Diu Portuguese. According to Cardoso (2009: 174), the Diu Portuguese plural marker tud, is “strongly favored by definiteness”. He observes that “tud overwhelmingly occurs associated to a demonstrative”.

[Palindrome Check]
Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 174-75)

(222) *ikol tud koyz ki liv-o nə museum father Marian ki*
DEM PL thing REL take-PST LOC museum father Marian REL
lev-o, nə?
take-PST Q
‘Wasn’t it father Mariano who took those things to the museum?’

The use of *tud* is, however, irregular. Both definite and indefinite NEs may receive plural interpretation without overt plural marking in Diu Portuguese:

Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 331)

(223) Yo nə ten muyt famil, *doyz irmə, subrig, mi fil i*
1SG NEG have much family two sister nephew 1SG.POSS child and
*nan.*
grandchild
‘I don’t have much family, two sisters, nephews, my children and grandchildren.’

In Berbice Dutch, Tok Pisin and Papiamentu, the occurrence of plural marking with indefinite NEs is rather common. Kouwenberg (2007) observes that interaction with definiteness represents an aspect of the distribution of the Berbice Dutch plural marker in which it differs from the majority of Caribbean creoles. The use of -*apu* with definite (224) and indefinite NEs (224) is demonstrated below:

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1994: 360, 371)

(224) a. *Tigri jigri doto-tε so o lahan-tε tigrə met fi tok-
PL*  
‘Tiger’s wife died, so she left Tiger and his children.’

b. …*ken-ap jen=də dan, en jef di man…*
person-PL be=there there 3PL eat DEF man
‘…there are people over there, they ate the man…’

Example (225) demonstrates the optionality of -*apu* with indefinite NEs.
Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1993: 371)

(225) Di kjaptn bor-te ardaz nau bi wel jen mja pil, musu
DEF captain pass-PFV orders now COMP well 2PL make arrow much

'...the Captain passed orders that, well, you must make arrows, lots of arrows....'

In addition to marking definite and indefinite NEs, -apu may also occur with generics. While most NEs with generic reference in Kouwenberg’s (1993) data are bare, as observed in Kouwenberg (2007), in addition to bare NEs (226a), generic NEs in Berbice Dutch may also occur in the form of definite singular NEs (226b), definite plural NEs (226c), and indefinite plural NEs (226d).

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 444-445)

(226) a. Bakofu mete kukrit, ju kan jefi eni ka.
   banana with maripa 2SG can eat 3PL NEG
   ‘Bananas and maripa palmnuts, you can’t eat them (under certain circumstances).’

b. Di jėrma doko gau-gau
   DEF woman pull quick-quick
   ‘Women paddle with short, quick strokes.’

c. Di boko-apu bin di dodo kene.
   DEF Amerindian-PL PST DEF dead person
   ‘Amerindians used to be scared of the dead.’

d. Eni bi eni das mini nama-apu keke hatibeš-apu.
   3PL say 3PL HAB swallow animal-PL like bush.deer-PL
   ‘They say they swallow animals, such as bush deer.’

The distribution of -apu requires further investigation. For the time being, I conclude that -apu is nearly categorical with definite NEs and variable with indefinite NEs and generics.

More is known about the distribution of plural marking in Tok Pisin and Papiamentu. The distribution of the Tok Pisin plural marker ol has been described in a thorough diachronic study of plural marking in Tok Pisin performed by Mühlhäusler (1981). In Tok Pisin, plural marking occurs with both definite and indefinite NEs. This is illustrated in examples (227a-b). Since Tok Pisin does not have grammaticalized
articles (see chapter 9), definite or indefinite interpretations are often context-based. Example (227b) is an opening of a story. The referent of ol tupela meri is thus not yet known to the hearer. The NE can therefore be characterized as indefinite.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 143)

(227) a. Ol pikinini mipela i no save Tok Pisin.
   PL child 1PL PM NEG know Tok Pisin
   ‘Our children don’t know Tok Pisin.’

   b. Orait, ol tup-ela meri ol painim pis…
      alright PL two woman 3PL catch fish
      ‘Well, two women went to catch fish…’

Observe also that ol can be combined with quantifiers with indefinite semantics:

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler 1981: 53)

(228) ol sampela bisnesman
   PL some businessman
   ‘some businessmen’

Plural nouns marked by means of ol may also have a generic interpretation:

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 79)

(229) Orait na, ol man blog Wapak ol-i-save-go log bush.
   All.right and PL man POSS Wabag PL-PM-HAB-go PREP bush.
   ‘All right, the Wabag men (habitually) go into the bush.’

While definiteness does not play an important role in the distribution of ol it is constrained by other factors, namely animacy and subjecthood (Mühlhäusler 1981). As Mühlhäusler observes, these two parameters are indicative of the prominence of the referent in discourse. Based on Mühlhäusler’s observations, I believe that the distribution of ol might be sensitive to topicality. This, however, needs to be further investigated.

Dijkhoff (1983) proposes a detailed analysis of the distribution of the Papiamentu plural marker nan. According to Dijkhoff, the distribution of nan is constrained in the following ways: it is obligatory with existentially presupposed NEs, context-dependent with existentially asserted NEs (i.e. it only occurs when the plural interpretation cannot be deduced by the immediate context), and never occurs with existentially hypothesized NEs. While Dijkhoff’s category “existentially presupposed”
corresponds to definite, her definitions of the categories “existentially asserted” and “existentially hypothesized” are not completely clear. For instance, she considers NEs like `buki` in (230) to be existentially hypothesized, whereas I would treat them as existentially asserted.

Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 219)

(230) Mi a kumpa `buki`.
   1SG PST buy book
   ‘I have bought a book/books.’

Her other example of existentially hypothesized NEs are NEs with generic (Kind) interpretation. However, I do not believe that generic NEs should be considered within the category of existentially hypothesized. On the other hand, examples like (231) are categorized by Dijkhoff as existentially asserted. She motivates the omission `nan` by the fact the verb `piki` in this context has the feature [+plu] and requires a plural object, which renders overt plural marking redundant. I would rather consider `shimaruku` in this example as a Kind-denoting NE.

Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 218)

(231) Maria ta `piki `shimaruku/`shimaruku-`nan`.
    Maria IPFV gather `shimaruku/shimaruku-PL
    ‘Maria is gathering `shimarukus`.’

Using the terminology employed here (see chapter 4) and combining Dijkhoff’s observations with observations made by Kester and Schmitt (2007) and by myself, I modify Dijkhoff’s proposal in the following way: `nan` is

(i) obligatory with definite NEs;

Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 219)

(232) Unda bo `buki-`nan` ta?
    where 2SG book-PL COP.LOC
    ‘Where are your books?’
variable with (semantically) specific indefinite NEs\textsuperscript{21};


(233) a. \textit{Kachó-nan} a keda grita henter nochi.
    Dog-PL IPFV stay shout entire night
    ‘Dogs kept barking all night.’

    b. Mi a kumpra \textit{kas}.
    1SG PST buy house
    ‘I bought a house/houses.’

(ii) does not occur with non-specific indefinite NEs and generics.

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmitt 2007: 123)

(234) a. Bo \textit{tin} \textit{yu}? Si, mi \textit{tin} \textit{yu}.
    2SG have child yes 1SG have child
    ‘Do you have children? Yes, I have children/a child.’

    b. \textit{Muhé} ta compañera di \textit{hombre}.
    Women COP companion of man
    ‘Women are companions of men.’

With regard to the distribution of \textit{nan} with indefinite specific NEs, Dijkhoff (1983) proposes that the non-redundancy constraint (see section 7.4.2) represents the decisive factor. While Kester and Schmitt (2007) also discuss the fact that \textit{nan} cannot co-occur with plural numerals and quantifiers in indefinite NEs, they point out that the distribution of \textit{nan} with specific indefinite NEs is constrained in several other ways. With regard to examples like (230) and (233b), Kester and Schmitt observe that bare (determinerless) plural NEs are not felicitous in object position unless they contain a modifier. In their paper, they illustrate this observation with the following examples:

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmitt 2007: 116)

(235) a. Mi ta mira *\textit{buki-nan/buki} riba mesa.
    1SG PRS see book-PL/book on table
    ‘I see books on the table.’

\textsuperscript{21} The role of pragmatic specificity on the use of \textit{nan} with semantically specific indefinite NEs needs to be further investigated.
b. Mi ta mira **buki-nan** na spañó riba mesa.
   1SG PRS see books-PL PREP Spanish on table
   ‘I see Spanish books on the table.’

This and some other distributional properties of **nan**, such as marking of NEs which have a contrastive/focus reading, lead Kester and Schmitt (2007) to argue that the use of **nan** may have to do with backgrounderng (as defined by Geurts 2003). However, their claims are not elaborate enough and require further assessment.

Chabacano is another creole where the plural marker (nearly) always occurs with definite NEs and shows sensitivity to specificity with indefinite NPs. As examples (236) illustrate, definite and specific indefinite NEs usually receive overt plural marking.

Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 221, 220)

(236) a. **Su mana amigo** talya ta espera konele.
   3SG. POSS PL friend there PROG wait 3SG.OBL
   ‘His friends were there waiting for him.’

   b. Ya serbi le el komida na **mana plato baho**…
   PST serve 3SG DEF food PREP PL plate shallow
   ‘He served the food on shallow plates…’

Non-specific indefinite NEs usually do not combine with **manga**:

Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 221)

(237) Ya manda le kon Juan anda compra **olya** na merkado.
   PST send 3SG OBL Juan go buy clay.pot PREP market
   ‘She sent Juan to by clay pots at the market.’

In Mauritian Creole, definiteness plays a role to the extent that definite NEs marked with the postnominal **la** (see chapter 9) are always marked by **bann** when they have a plural reference. Thus, only (238), and not (238) can have a plural interpretation.

Mauritian Creole (Alleesaib 2005)

(238) a. **Butej la** ranpli.
   bottle DEF full
   ‘The bottle is full.’
NEs marked by bann alone may have a definite as well as an indefinite interpretation:

Mauritian Creole (Allesaib 2005)

(239) Bann zelev inn reini dan la kur lekol.
     PL pupil COMPL assemble at yard school
a. ‘The pupils assembled at the school yard.’ (Context: Where are the pupils?)
b. ‘Pupils assembled at the school yard.’ (Context: What happened?)

The use of bann with both definite NEs (not marked by la) and indefinite NEs is variable. With regard to the use of bann in Seychellois, the close relative of Mauritian, Bollée (1977) observes that it is restricted to specific NEs. Allesaib’s (2005) work, however, demonstrates that NEs marked by bann may have a wide and a narrow scope interpretation, and may thus be interpreted as semantically specific and non-specific. This is demonstrated in example (240) below.

Mauritian Creole (Allesaib 2005)

(240) Sak profeser inn ekrir bann liv lor lesklavaz.
     each professor COMPL write PL book about slavery
a. ‘Each professor has written books about slavery.’ (not the same ones)
b. ‘Each professor has participates in the writing of a specific set of books about slavery.’

Principles underlying the distribution of Mauritian bann require further investigation.

Summing up, definiteness appears to play an important role in the distribution of plural markers in the majority of the creoles under study. As far as Atlantic and Indian Ocean creoles with a Gbe substrate are concerned, the restriction of overt plural marking to definite NEs can be viewed as a result of substrate influence. However, the fact that the sensitivity of plural marking to definiteness is observed in many other creoles with diverse substrates suggests that this may be due to the fact the sensitivity or dependency of plural marking on definiteness represents a universally prominent tendency in reference marking. The dependency of the expression of plurality on definiteness is observed in many languages of the world.

In many creoles where definiteness does not constrain the use of plural marker categorically and where plural markers are also used with indefinite NEs, the distribution of plural markers with indefinite NEs appears to be sensitive to specificity as
well as to the related category of topicality. The role of specificity and topicality in the distribution of plural markers in creoles needs to be further investigated.

7.4.2 The non-redundancy principle

Another constraint which affects the use of plural marking in creoles is the non-redundancy principle. According to this principle, overt plural marking may be considered optional, disfavored or excluded in presence of other indicators of plurality such as plural numerals or quantifiers. While the non-redundancy principle affects the use of overt plural marking in nearly all creoles, the conditions on which it applies may vary. For instance, in Jamaican Creole the presence of plural numerals and quantifiers allows the omission of *dem* with definite plural NEs:

Jamaican Creole (Stewart 2006: 241)

(241) *Di tuu bwai (dem)* dong a road.
  DEF two boy PL down PREP road
  ‘The two boys are down the road.’

This is not possible in creoles where the same form functions as a definite determiner and as a plural marker. Example (242) illustrates that in Haitian Creole, *yo* is obligatory with definite plural NEs regardless of the presence of other contextual indicators of plurality.

Haitian Creole (Deprez 2006: 72)

(242) *kat liv yo/*la*  
  four book DEF.PL/DEF.SG
  ‘the four books’

In contrast to Jamaican Creole and similarly to Haitian, in Papiamentu, the non-redundancy principle is overruled by definiteness. The Papiamentu plural marker *nan* is used with all definite NEs regardless of the considerations of non-redundancy. When it comes to the use of *nan* with specific indefinite NEs, the non-redundancy principle plays an important role. According to Dijkhoff (1983), *nan* is only used when other indicators of plurality are absent and it is thus always omitted when an NE contains numerals (243) or quantifiers (244).
Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 218)

a. *dos kas nan
two house PL

b. *hopi buki nan
many book PL

The examples considered above suggest that the application of the non-redundancy principle may be constrained in terms of the referential properties of NEs (i.e. definiteness) and that the sensitivity of plural marking to the non-redundancy principle may have the status of a rule, in which case plural marking in the presence of contextual indicators of plurality is excluded (like in Papiamentu, in case of specific indefinite NEs), or a tendency, in which case plural marking in the presence of other indicators of plurality is disfavored or optional (like in Jamaican Creole). In most of the creoles under study for which I had the relevant information or sufficient data in order to establish the role of the non-redundancy principle in the distribution of overt plural marking, its application appears optional. This holds for Jamaican Creole dem, Tok Pisin ol, Mauritian Creole bann, Berbice Dutch -apu, Cape Verdean -s. In Chabacano and Diu Portuguese plural marking is excluded in the presence of other means of quantification.

In addition to the tendency to omit plural marking when plurality is marked by means of numerals or quantifiers, the non-redundancy principle may lead to the omission of plural marking with NEs that are commonly or in a given context likely to refer to a pairs or to plural entities. This is illustrated in examples (245) and (246) from Jamaican Creole. Eyes usually come in pairs; and one usually has to wash more than one plate.

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 163; Sistren 1986: 3)

(245) Aye, check me eye how dem red.
      EXCL check 1SG eye how 3PL red
      ‘Look at my eyes, how red they are.’
A similar tendency has been observed by Kouwenberg with regard to Berbice Dutch. According to Kouwenberg (2007: 441, fn. 9), plural marking is disfavored with NEs referring to body parts which naturally come in pairs.

Further, in creoles that have several morphological markers of plurality, the co-occurrence of these markers in one NE is usually disfavored. With regard to Jamaican Creole, Patrick (2004) observes that the prenominal demonstrative *dem* strongly disfavors postnominal plural marker *dem*. In his corpus of over 3600 tokens of semantically plural nouns, he found only one such case. Normally, when demonstrative *dem* is used, plural marker *dem* is omitted, as in (247).

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 29)

(247) some a *dem* farmer from Back Road
    some PREP DEM.PL farmer from Back Road
    ‘some of those farmers from Back Road’

While the co-occurrence of *-s* with the postnominal plural marker *dem* is perfectly grammatical, it is also relatively infrequent. NEs are much more often marked by one of the two markers than by both. Below I provide an example of a definite NE marked for plural only by means of *-s*:

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 32)

(248) …*dem* never consider *di* small farmer-*s*.
    3PL NEG.PST consider DEF small farmer-PL.
    ‘…they did not consider the small farmers.’

The same tendency is observed by Baptista (2002) for Cape Verdean Creole. According to Baptista, *-s* and *kes* are very rarely used together.

The tendency to avoid the use of two means of plural marking in one NE is in line with the general scarcity of agreement in creoles. It should be, however, pointed out that one creole in my sample appears to deviate from this tendency. In Tok Pisin, NEs are more frequently marked by *ol*…-*s* than by *-s* only. This observation has been made by Romaine (1992) and it is also supported by the data published in Mühlhäuser et al. (2003).

In some of the creoles under study, plural marking may be omitted on topical NEs whose discourse antecedents are marked for plural. This tendency has been observed in Palenquero (249) and Chabacano (250).
7.4.3 Some special properties of creole plural markers

While in sections 7.4.1 and 7.4.2 it was shown that plural markers in creoles may be excluded or considered optional in contexts where plural marking in their Germanic and Romance superstrates always ought to be used, in the present section we shall see that some creole plural markers may appear in contexts where plural marking in Germanic and Romance languages would be considered ungrammatical.

7.4.3.1 Plural marking with plural, collective and mass nouns

The most important restriction on the use of overt plural marking in Germanic and Romance languages has to do with the distinction between count and mass nouns. As is known, plural marking in these languages is categorically restricted to count nouns. In some of the creoles considered here, plural marking is attested not only with NEs headed by nouns that are used to refer to individuals, but also with NEs with inherently plural, collective and even mass referents.

Examples of plural marking with plural and collective nouns may be found in several creoles. For instance, in many creoles, plural marking is optionally realized with
the noun ‘people’, which is lexically specified as plural or collective. This is illustrated in the following examples from Jamaican Creole, Papiamentu, and Palenquero:

Jamaica Creole (Thelwell 1980: 105)

(251) Is why him have fe handle de people dem so?
   ‘Why does he have to treat the people like that?’

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmitt 2007: 115)

(252) Después ku hende-nan a keha nan a drecha e película.
   ‘After some people complained, they fixed the film.’

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 213)

(253) …i ma jende ta esé poso ya pa poné suto agua akí.
   ‘…and the people are already making wells to provide us with water here.’

In Tok Pisin, as well as in Krio Pichi (an offshoot of Krio spoken on the island of Bioko, Equatorial Guinea), plural markers are also attested with mass nouns:

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler 1981: 50)

(254) ol plaua i sot
   ‘a shortage of flour’

Krio Pichi (Yakpo 2009: 65)

(255) dan smɔl smɔl wàtà dɛn
   ‘that little bit of water’

7.4.3.2 Plural marking with conjoined NEs

Another special property in the distribution of plural marking in creoles is the marking of conjoined NEs. This phenomenon has been described for Jamaican Creole (Bobyleva 2011b) and Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983)
Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 31; Sistren 1986: 63)

(256) a. Wash you hand-s and foot dem...
    wash 2 hand-PL and foot PL
    ‘wash your hands and feet…’

b. …mi no see me bredda and sister dem...
    1SG NEG see 1SG brother and sister PL
    ‘I did not see my brother and sister’

Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 223)

(257) a. e kuchú ku forki-nan
    DEF knife and fork-PL
    ‘the knives and the forks’

b. e kuchu i e forki-nan
    DEF knife and DEF fork-PL
    a. ‘the knife and the forks’
    b. ‘the knives and the forks’

Note that while the general pattern in Jamaican Creole and Papiamentu is rather similar, there are some differences. In Jamaican Creole, the conjoined NEs may be bare but semantically plural (e.g., foot in (256)), they may be overtly marked for plural by means of -s or supplition (e.g., hands in (256)), or semantically singular (e.g., bredda and sister in (256)). Example (256) clearly demonstrates that dem functions as a marker of the whole conjoined structure, and not as a marker of each noun within that structure. As for Papiamentu nan, when the NEs are conjoined by means of the comitative marker ku, both NEs are always interpreted as plural. When nouns are conjoined by means of i, the first noun may be interpreted as singular or as plural and while the second noun is always plural. Thus, unlike dem, depending on the type of conjunction nan functions as a marker of each NE within the conjunction as well as of the conjoined phrase as a whole. This observation is supported by the fact that while dem can always be repeated after every single NE in the conjoined phrase (i), nan may only be repeated when the NEs are conjoined by means of i. When NEs are conjoined by means of ku, nan may occur only after the last NE (ii-iii).

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 51)

(i) Den the king invite up all the people dem and all the musician dem an’
    Then DEF king invite up all DEF people PL and all DEF musician PL and
    the dancer dem…
    DEF dancer PL
    ‘Then the king invited all the people and all the musicians and the dancers…’

Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 223-224)

(ii) e kuchu-nan i e forki-nan
    DEF knife-PL and DEF fork-PL.
    ‘the knives and the forks’
7.4.3.3  **Associative plural marking**

Another special function often observed with plural markers in creoles (3Pl-derived plural markers in particular) is associative plural marking. In contrast to regular, additive plural marking, which gives the meaning of “several instances of X”, a combination of an NE with an associative plural marker has the meaning of “X and his/her associates”. Instances of associative plural marking have been attested in all the creoles under study that employ the form of the 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker, with the exception of Negerhollands (Hans den Besten, p.c.) (258)-(261).

Jamaican Creole (Roberts 1973, cited from Patrick 2004: 37)

(258) Miss *Waaka dem* laaf afta im.  
miss Walker PL laugh after 3SG  
‘Miss Walker and the others laughed at him.’

Haitian Creole (DeGraff 2007: 117)

(259) Alelouya! *Divalye yo* pati!  
alleluia Divalye PL leave  
‘Alleluia! The Duvalier gang is gone!’

Papiamentu (Dijkhoff 1983: 223)

(260) *Maria-nan*  
Maria-PL  
‘Maria and her group of friends/relatives etc.’

Santome  
(lingweb.eva.mpg.de/apics/index.php/The_Associative_Plural_28Feature_24_29)

(261) *ine Pedu*  
PL Pedu  
‘Pedu and his family/friends’

(iii) *kuchá-nan ku forki-nan*  
knife-PL and fork-PL
The use of plural markers for associative plural marking is also found in creoles where plural markers are not etymologically related to 3Pl pronouns, for instance, in Tok Pisin and Mauritian Creole.

Tok Pisin (Faraclas 2007: 367)

(262) Waga ol i kam
Waga PL PM come
‘Waga and his people came’

Mauritian Creoles (Alleesaib 2005)

(263) Mo inn truv bann Zidane jer.
1SG COMPL see PL Zidane yesterday
‘I saw Zidane and his group of friends yesterday.’

While associative plural marking is most frequently observed with proper names, it may also occur with kinship terms (264)-(265), names of professions and titles (266)-(267), as well as with names of places (268). In this latter case, associative plural marking signifies that the reference is made to the inhabitants of the place or the people associated with the institution.

Jamaican Creole (Afflick 2007)

(264) Mama dem nuh ha nuh whole heap a money…
mama PL NEG have NEG whole heap PREP money
‘Mama and the others [who lived with her] did not have a lot of money.’

Guyanese Creole (Mufwene 1986: 45)

(265) Maj waif dem da kip ap bat a e go.
1SG.POSS wife PL IPFV keep up but 1SG.NOM NEG go
‘My wife and the rest [of my family] still go [to church] but I don’t go.’

Principense (an offshoot of Santome) (Maurer 2009: 33)

(266) Ine pêzdêntê xiga ontxi.
DEF.PL president arrive yesterday
‘The president and his escort arrived yesterday.’
7.4.4 Creole plural markers as collective aspect markers

The distribution of creole plural markers in the creoles under study considered in 7.4.1-7.4.3 demonstrates that plural marking in these creoles is not just optional but fundamentally different from inflectional plural marking in Germanic and Romance languages. In addition to showing sensitivity to the referential properties of NEs (i.e. its definiteness and specificity value) as well as to the non-redundancy principle, the plural markers considered in 7.4.1-7.4.3 display a number of special distributional processes: they occur not only with NEs headed by nouns that are used to refer to individuals, but also with inherently plural, collective and even mass nouns, they may mark two or more conjoined NEs together as a group and are used for associative plural marking. All these “special” uses of the creole plural markers bring out the fact that they conceptualize plurality in a way fundamentally different from the plural markers of the Germanic and Romance type. Instead of pluralizing (i.e. multiplying) the referent of the NE, they convey information about the type of the referent, signifying that it represents a group, a collective entity. I, therefore, propose to characterize them as collectivity markers. While plural markers of the Romance and Germanic type mark the NE as denoting multiple individuals, collectivity markers only imply that the referent is made up of multiple individuals or some kind of individual parts, but do not directly apply to these individuals.

Rijkhoff (2002) observes that morphemes that are used to express the notion of plurality in set noun languages can be typically characterized as collective aspect markers. Collective aspect markers are semantically different from plural markers in languages like English. Their function is to specify the kind of the set in question as a collective set. The creole plural markers discussed in this section appear to fit this description.

Having identified the type of elements creole plural markers considered in this section belong to, let us now try to establish their position in the architecture of NEs. Based on the idea that dem marks the referent of the noun as a collective (as opposed to an individuated) entity, Stewart proposes that dem is functionally congruent to the
English plural marker -s. In her structural analysis of Jamaican Creole DP, she assumes that *dem* is also realized in the head of ClP, which hosts either the individuating or the group-forming function. In support of this analysis, Stewart argues that overt collectivity marking excludes the possibility of an individuated interpretation in JC. According to Stewart, sentences like (269a) as opposed to sentences like (192) repeated here under (269b) can only receive a collective reading, that is, “The three boys jointly killed their father”.

Jamaican Creole (Stewart 2006: 204)


\[
\text{DEF three boy PL kill 3PL father}
\]

‘The three boys killed their father.’

b. *Chiī bwai* kil dem faada.

\[
\text{three boy kill 3PL father}
\]

‘Three boys killed their father.’

However, neither Durrleman-Tame’s (2008) nor my own informants support Stewart’s argument, stating that both collective and distributive readings are available for sentences like (269).

If Stewart’s analysis is correct, we would expect *dem* to be in complementary distribution with the plural inflection -s, which represents another productive means of plural marking in Jamaican Creole. This expectation is, however, not borne out by the data. While the occurrence of -s together with *dem* is not very common, it is perfectly grammatical (270). Similar examples are abundant in Tok Pisin (271).

Jamaican Creole (Thelwell 1980: 368)

(270) Tell you confederate-s *dem*...

\[
\text{tell 2 confederate-PL PL}
\]

‘Tell your confederates…’

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäuser et al. 2003: 198)

(271) …*mi salim ol buk-s…*

\[
\text{1SG sell PL book-PL}
\]

‘…I sell books…’

The fact that *dem* and *ol* can co-occur with -s makes the idea that they realize the same structural position untenable. If we want to sustain the idea that -s performs an individuating function hosted under ClP, then we have to look for an alternative solution.
for *dem* and *ol*. As demonstrated in section 7.4.1, creole plural markers often show sensitivity to such features as definiteness, specificity or discourse prominence. This suggests that these markers are realized in the left periphery of DP, the layer of DP which is oriented towards discourse (cf. Aboh 2004a, 2006, 2010).

7.5 Discussion

7.5.1 A new system of number marking in creoles and its possible origins

The data discussed in this chapter demonstrates that most of the creole languages considered here differ quite significantly from their Germanic and Romance superstrates in the way they realize individuation and number. Based on the behavior of bare nouns and non-Germanic/Romance plural markers, the creoles under study fit Rijkhoff’s (2002) description of set noun languages. Set nouns in their bare form are not specified for number and can denote either singleton sets or collective sets. Overt number marking is, therefore, not required to obtain singular or plural interpretation and morphemes that seem to fulfill a function similar to plural markers in Germanic and Romance turn out to function as markers of collectivity. Thus, number in set noun languages is expressed in terms of the singulative-collective opposition. This is different from languages like English where number is expressed in terms of the opposition between singular and plural individuals. Whether or not one agrees with Rijkhoff’s (2002) typology of lexical noun types, it is clear that at least as far as licensing properties of individuation and number are concerned, creoles are very different from their superstrates.

As I mention in the introduction to this chapter, the acquisition of set-noun-like morphosyntactic behavior by Romance- and Germanic-derived nouns has been accounted for in terms of substrate influence and in terms of deflection characteristic of contact language formation and, specifically, pidginization.

Nouns in the substrate languages of some of the creoles cited above also show the morphosyntactic behavior characteristic of set nouns. This holds for many relevant Niger-Congo substrates (see introduction) as well as for the Austronesian substrate of Tok Pisin. Lynch et al. (2002) observe that bare NEs in Eastern Oceanic languages can usually be used to express both singular and plural meanings. In Tolai, a later substrate layer of Tok Pisin, most nouns are also characterized as transnumeral (Mosel 1984). This does not however hold for all the creoles under study that show set-noun-language-like behavior. For instance, in Kikongo, which is an important substrate of several Atlantic Creoles under study and the important sole substrate of Palenquero, NEs are always marked as singular or plural by means of class prefixes. Nevertheless, Palenquero nouns behave very similarly to nouns in creoles like Haitian, Sranan, or Jamaican, which have set noun languages among their important substrates. It could, therefore, be argued that creole languages like Palenquero present evidence in favor of the universalist approach to the development of the set noun feature in creoles, under
which the loss of inflection is accounted for in terms of the dynamics characteristic of contact language development.

Based on the evidence considered here, I conclude that the wide range of distribution of bare NEs in creoles results from the loss of inflection characteristic of L2 acquisition and contact language formation. Substrate influence could have, however, reinforced this tendency.

7.5.2 Distribution of creole plural markers: universal principles of reference marking or substrate influence?

As bare nouns in creoles can be used to refer to plural entities, the use of overt plural marking to express plurality is optional. In this chapter, we observed that the distribution of plural markers in creoles is often constrained by other factors in addition to the plurality of the referent. These factors are animacy, definiteness, specificity, and the non-redundancy constraint.

As is observed in section 7.3, animacy is a universally prominent factor underlying the use of overt plural marking (cf. Comrie 1981; Haspelmath 2005). The same holds for the non-redundancy constraint. The effects of the non-redundancy constraint are often found in other areas of creole grammar, for instance, tense marking (cf. Winford 2001). Rijkhoff (2002) observes that overt collective aspect marking in set nouns languages is commonly sensitive to the non-redundancy effects.

The situation with definiteness and specificity is less clear. With the exception of the superstrate-derived plural markers in Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin and Afrikaans, plural marking in the creoles under study show sensitivity to definiteness. In section 7.4.1, I propose that in some creoles the categorical restriction of plural markers to definite NEs may be due to substrate influence, which promoted the selection of [+definite] superstrate items to perform the function of plural markers in creoles. This proposal can account for the fact that creoles like Jamaican, Sranan, Negerhollands, Haitian, Lesser Antillean, Papiamentu, Santome and Cape Verdean show a categorical restriction of plural marking to definite NEs. Based on the parallels in the behaviour of the Palenquero plural marker ma and the Spanish definite determiner observed by Moñino (2007) one could describe the definiteness-based use of ma as a replication of the Spanish pattern of definite determiner use.

While the idea of source language influence looks appealing as far as the cases listed in the previous paragraph are concerned, it does not account for the fact that creole plural markers whose etyma or functional counterparts are not specified as [+definite] also show sensitivity to definiteness. These are, for instance, such creoles as Palenquero, Berbice Dutch, Mauritian Creole, Diu Portuguese, as well as Cape Verdean Creole (see section 7.3). Plural marking in these creoles clearly favors definite NEs but also variably occurs with indefinites. The evidence from these creoles suggests that the association between plural marking and definiteness may belong to the universal principles of reference marking. Corbett’s (2000) typological study of number marking shows that the
association between plural marking and definiteness is attested in a number of unrelated languages of the world. This association also shows in languages like Germanic or Romance, in which definite determiner and demonstratives also realize number.

Next to the definiteness-based distribution of plural markers, in this chapter we also observed that in those creoles where plural marking variably occurs with indefinite NEs, it often shows sensitivity to specificity and/or topicality. The spread of overt plural marking to specific indefinite NEs could represent the next stage in the grammaticalization of plural marking. This would follow the grammaticalization path identified by Greenberg (1978) for definite determiners. Further, diachronic investigation is required to substantiate this proposal.

7.5.3 Associative plural marking: a substrate-derived feature

One property of creole plural markers that is commonly taken to represent a result of substrate influence is associative plural marking. Associative plural marking is observed in many Niger-Congo substrates of the Atlantic Creoles. Many of these languages use the same morpheme as a marker of associative and additive plural, similarly to creoles. This is demonstrated in examples (272)-(275) below.

Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)

(272) *Dôñá lé* ná wá kpôn mì.
Dona PL FUT come look 1SG.ACC
‘Dona and his family will visit me.’

Akan (Christaller 1875: 34)

(273) Kwasi-*nom*
Kwasi-PL
‘Kwasi and his followers’

Yoruba (Rowlands 1969: 196)

(274) *àwọn* Táiwò
PL Taiwo
‘Taiwo and his family/schoolmates/friends’

Mandianka (Rowlands 1959: 38)

(275) Báakari-nyo-*lu*
Bakari-NS-PL
‘Bakari and those with him’
Associative plural marking is not restricted to Atlantic Creoles. For instance, the feature is also found in Mauritian Creole and in Tok Pisin (see section 7.4.3.3). The substrate languages of these creoles also display associative plural marking. As far as Mauritian Creole is concerned, in addition to Gbe, which is an important early substrate of the creole (cf. Baker 1982, 1984) associative plural marking realized by the same morpheme as regular plural marking is found in its other important substrate Malagasy:

Malagasy (http://wals.info/datapoint/36A/wals_code_mal)

(276)  *Ry*    Paoly
      DET.PL Paul
   ‘Paul and associates.’

As far as Tolai, the main substrate of Tok Pisin is concerned information on associative plural marking in this language is not available. The feature, however, appears to be common among the languages of Papua New Guinea (Daniel and Moravcsik 2011).

While the idea of substrate origins of associative plural marking in creoles is commonly accepted, some researchers point out the existence of associative plural marking in the superstrate languages. Mufwene (1986) demonstrates that associative plural marking by means of *and them* is also available in some dialects of English. This is demonstrated in example (56) repeated here for the sake of convenience under (277):

English (Mufwene 1986: 40)

(277)  *John and them* have left.
   ‘John and company have left.’

Mufwene (1998) observes that the form way of associative plural marking is used in African-American Vernacular English:

African-American Vernacular English (Mufwene 1998: 73)

(278)  *Felicia an’ them* done gone.
      Felicia and 3PL COMPL gone
   ‘Felicia and her company are already gone.’

And, as I already pointed out in chapter 5, associative plural marking by means of *and them* is also found in Trinidadian Creole:
Trinidadian Creole (my data)

(279) I talk-ed to my daughter an’ dem.

1SG.SUBJ talk-PST to 1SG.POSS daughter and 3PL

‘I talked to my daughter and the others [the part of the family that lives in the same household].’

Thus, as far as these creoles are concerned, the development of associative plural marking may be viewed as a case of substrate/superstrate convergence.

7.5.4 Superstrate-like number marking in creoles

As already observed in the previous section, nouns in some creoles deviate from the set noun-like behaviour to various extents. These deviations, which are found in Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin, Afrikaans and Cape Verdean, represent a result of supersrate influence. These creoles show instances of number marking of the Germanic and Romance type, which is reflected in the use of the Germanic/Romance inflectional plural marking. What distinguishes these creoles is that they emerged and developed in a close contact and/or have intensified the contact with their superstrate as a result of recent socio-economic developments.
Chapter 8

Indefinite determiners and specificity

It has repeatedly been pointed out in the literature that the distributional properties of elements that are identified as indefinite determiners in creoles are very different from those of the indefinite articles in their superstrates. In Germanic and Romance languages, indefinite articles invariably mark indefinite singular NEs that are headed by count nouns regardless of whether they are used to refer to specific individuals or objects or to denote Kinds. This is illustrated in examples (280) and (281) below. While the italicized NEs in (280a) and (281a) are specific, in (280b) and (281b) the same NEs may have both a specific and a non-specific interpretation. The latter is favored in the given context.

English (my data)

(280) a. I’ve got a cat and a dog. The cat is black and the dog is white.

b. I would like to have a cat and a dog when I grow up.

Spanish (my data)

(281) a. Tengo un gato y un perro. El gato es negro y el perro es blanco.

‘I have a cat and a dog. The cat is black and the dog is white.’

b. Quisiera un gato y un perro cuando sea grande.

‘I would like to have a cat and a dog when I grow up.’

In many creoles, the use of indefinite determiners with NEs headed by nouns that denote discrete entities (and thus appear identical to Germanic and Romance count nouns with regard to their lexical semantics) is variable. In chapter 7, we have seen that creole languages behave differently from their superstrates with regard to the expression
of individuation. While in Germanic and Romance languages individuation is always expressed overtly (which implies that indefinite singular count nouns always occur with an indefinite determiner, regardless of their specificity value), in creoles overt marking of individuation is not required in order for an NE to be interpreted individually. While indefinite determiners may be used to convey individuated singular reading, their use in this function is optional. If indefinite determiners are not required to mark indefinite NE as individuated and singular, the question arises as to what other factors govern their distribution.

Several researchers (e.g., Bickerton 1981; Givón 1981, 1984; Aboh 2004c, 2006) claim that the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles is sensitive to specificity. According to these researchers, overt indefinite determiners in creoles are only used with specific indefinite NEs, while non-specific NEs surface unmarked.

In chapter 4, I distinguish between semantic specificity, which is measured in terms of scope, and pragmatic specificity, which appeals to the state of mind of the speaker (crucially, his/her referential intent). The accounts of determiner use in creoles define specificity as a pragmatic notion. According to Bickerton, not only NEs that don’t have a specific referent but also NEs that have a specific referent whose exact identity is either unknown to the speaker or irrelevant to the point at issue are treated as non-specific and occur with a zero-determiner. While Givón uses the term referentiality instead of specificity, his definition of referentiality parallels the definition of specificity used by Bickerton. As already mentioned in chapter 4, crucial in Givón’s analysis of the distribution of referential indefinite determiners is the distinction between semantic and pragmatic referentiality. While the former stands for the supposed existence of the referent in the universe of discourse, the latter stands for speaker referential intent. Speaker referential intent depends on the importance of the specific identity of the referent for the point at issue. Givón observes that while pragmatic referentiality usually corresponds to semantic referentiality, it is ultimately the pragmatic referentiality that determines whether an NE will have an overt determiner or not. Aboh’s definition, inspired by Ionin’s (2006) analysis of specificity, also appeals to the speaker’s state of mind and referential intent.

The three authors cited above propose rather different accounts of the development of the specificity-based pattern of indefinite determiner use in creoles. Bickerton maintains that marking specificity instead of definiteness represents an unmarked option in UG. Givón proposes a grammaticalization-oriented account of the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles. Based on a comparative analysis of a number of languages, he argues that the use of indefinite determiners with specific indefinite NEs only represents an early stage in the grammaticalization of the indefinite determiner. Aboh, on the other hand, argues that the distribution of indefinite determiners in a number of Atlantic Creoles (Haitian, Saramaccan, and Sranan) replicates the specificity-based pattern found in Gbe (Fongbe, Ewegbe, and Gungbe), their main substrate languages. The distribution of the indefinite determiner in Gbe languages is illustrated in example (28) repeated here as (282):
As examples (282a-b) show, in Ewe, the specific indefinite determiner \( \dot{a}d\dot{e} \) is only used when the speaker has a particular referent in mind. When the referent is unknown, the NE occurs without a determiner.

In this chapter, I intend to verify the claim with regard to the role of (pragmatic) specificity in the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles and address the question of whether the distributional properties of creole indefinite determiners may be attributed to language universals or to substrate influence.

Considering that the pragmatic definition of specificity appeals to such subjective categories as speaker knowledge and referential intent, the question arises as to how one can establish whether or not an NE is pragmatically specific based on the written corpus data. Below, I list the objective criteria that can be used in order to establish the pragmatic specificity value of NEs. Firstly, all pragmatically specific NEs are always also semantically specific. Thus, only semantically specific NEs may qualify for being pragmatically specific. Semantic specificity can be objectively measured in terms of scope. As observed in chapter 4, the availability of wide and narrow scope interpretations depends on the syntactic environment in which an NE occurs. For instance, as observed in chapter 4, NEs that occur in the factive environment are semantically specific and all NEs that occur in the scope of negation are semantically non-specific. The type of the proposition does not, however, always unambiguously determine the interpretation of an NE as a specific or non-specific unambiguously. For instance, NEs that occur in the scope of modals, conditionals or future tense may be interpreted as specific as well as non-specific. In addition to that, not all semantically specific NEs are also pragmatically specific. Thus, in order to establish whether or not one is dealing with a pragmatically specific or pragmatically non-specific NE, one has to rely on contextual clues. As observed in Givón (1981, 1984), Pesetsky (1987), Abah (2004b), and Ionin (2006), as well as some other research into specificity, specificity is tightly related to topicality. Specific NEs typically introduce new discourse topics. Subsequent mentions of the referent may, therefore, be taken as a “physical” measure of specificity. I will therefore use examples of topical, recurring NEs to illustrate the marking of pragmatic specificity.
8.1 Creole indefinite determiners as specificity markers

In most of the creoles under study, one finds numerous examples that suggest that pragmatic specificity determines the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles. This is illustrated in examples (283)-(300), which illustrate the specificity-based pattern of determiner use as it is described in the introduction to this chapter.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 23, 148)

Specific

(283) When me look up di road, me see one man a come down when 1SG look up DEF road 1SG see IND man PROG come down like sweet boy. Him have on felt hat, and him a carry walking stick like sweet boy 3SG have on felt hat and 3SG PROG carry walking stick umbrella. Him say: “Morning, Miss Essie”.

‘When I looked up the road, I saw a man coming down like a sweet boy. He was wearing a felt hat and he was carrying a walking stick umbrella. He said: “Morning, Miss Essie”.

Non-specific

(284) …for she did waan me fi have man wid car. PURP 3SG.F PST want 1SG PURP have man with car ‘…cause she wanted me to have a man with a car.’

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 58, 78)

Specific

(285) A ten da da i bj-abi wan man, den ben-kar Bakbort DEF time DEM then 2SG PST-have IND man 3PL PST-call Bakbort a skoro. M a man dat ben-ogri… PREP school but DEF.SG man DEM PST-naughty ‘At that time you had one guy they called Bakbort at school. But that man was naughty…’
Non-specific

(286) den man dat n a nen.
DEF.PL man DEM NEG have name
‘Those men don’t have a name/names.’

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 115, 110)

Specific

(287) Em nau, wanpela man i go stap long longwe ples. Orait wanpela
And now IND man PM go stay PREP faraway place then IND
meri i go na lukim dispela man. <…> Na man ya laik givim
woman PM go and see DEM man and man DEM want give
kaikai long dispela meri.
food PREP DEM woman
‘There was this man who went to a distant place and stayed there. Then this
woman went and saw this man. And this man wanted to give food to this
woman.’

Non-Specific

(288) Meri tu i ken tok sapos yu gat tok.
woman too PM can talk if 2SG have speech
‘The women too can talk if they have something to say.’

Berbice Dutch (Kouwennerg 2007: 440)

Specific

(289) …iši bi iši ma kopu kui an iši kopu-tɛ en kui…
1PL say 1PL IRR buy cow and 1PL buy-PFV IND cow
‘we said we would buy a cow and we bought a cow’

Non-Specific

(290) …iši bi iši ma kopu kui an iši kopu-tɛ en kui…
1PL say 1PL IRR buy cow and 1PL buy-PFV IND cow
‘we said we would buy a cow and we bought a cow’
Haitian Creole (Hall 1953: 73, 105)

Specific

(291) You abitā t-ap-dèsān nā-machē avèk you bourik épi IND peasant PST-PROG-descend PREP-market with IND donkey and you kabrit. Trouvè li vini pasè dévā twa volé. Youn nā-twa IND goat happen 3SG come pass before three thief one PREP-three mēsi yo di: “Sa nou parié m-ap-prā kabrit-la. You dézièm man DEF.PL say what 2PL bet 1SG-PROGR-take goat-DEF IND second di: “Si ou prā kabrit-la, mwē-mēm m-ap-prā bourik-la”’. say if 2SG take goat-DEF 1SG-self 1SG-PROG-take donkey-DEF ‘A peasant was going down to market with a donkey and a goat. It happened that he came across three thieves. One of the three men said: “What do you bet if I get the goat?” A second said: “If you get the goat, I’ll get the donkey.”’

Non-specific

(292) Mwē grāgou, bā mwē moso viān. 1SG hungry give 1SG piece meat ‘I am hungry, give me a piece of meat.’

Papiamentu (Kester ans Schmitt: 118, 112)

Specific

(293) Mi a kumpra un bolo. 1SG PST buy IND cake ‘I bought a cake.’

Non-specific

(294) Maria kier kasa ku brasileño. Maria want marry with Brazilian ‘Marian wants to marry a Brazilian.’
Cape Verdean (Lucchesi 1993: 95; Baptista 2007: 72)

Specific

(295) Primeru ta parse ù varil n’ or, n’ aza du sew, First IPFV appear IND barrel PREP air PREP wing of sky kome varil ta fladu di zpli. as barrel IPFV call of zeppelin ‘Firstly a barrel would appear in the sky, and the barrel was called zeppelin.’

Non-Specific

(296) Si bu ten terenu di fase, bu ta pidi djuda. If 2SG have terrain to make 2SG IPFV aks help ‘If you have a terrain to make, you can ask for help.’

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 55, 48)

Specific

(297) N tê ùa mosu ku ùa mina mwal. Mina sa ni kwarenta 1SG have IND boy and IND child woman Girl COP in forty tal. Mosu sa ni xinkwenta. something boy COP in fifty ‘I have a boy and a girl. The girl is in her forties. The boy is fifty.’

Non-specific

(298) Inen san se ê, toma kopu da mu. DEF.PL lady DEF EMPH bring glass give me ‘Hey ladies, bring me a glass.’

Diu (Cardoso 2009:155, 132)

Specific

(299) Ū jungly jat vey i amar-o pe d-ikol lion IND jungly jat come.PST and tie-PST leg of-DEM lion e-r pu kum-e a el. COP-PST PURP eat-INF DAT 3SG ‘A jungly jat came and tied the leg of the lion, he intended to eat him.’
Non-specific

(300)  aŋũ  jët  pãd  abr-i  kõk  sê  \textit{fak}.
\begin{verbatim}
  some  people  can.NPST  open-INF  coconut  without  knife
\end{verbatim}
\begin{quote}
  ‘Some people can open coconuts without a knife.’
\end{quote}

8.2 Indefinite determiners with non-specific NEs

While the data presented in 8.1 seems to suggest that specificity plays an important role in determining the marking of indefinite NEs in many of the creoles under study, the specificity criterion does not apply categorically. In virtually all of the creoles under study, including many of the creoles cited in section 8.1, the indefinite determiner may also occur with non-specific NEs.

Examples below illustrate the use of indefinite determiners with non-specific NEs in Jamaican Creole, Sranan, Tok Pisin, Berbice Dutch, Haitian Creole, Papiamentu, Cape Verdean Creole, Santome and Diu Portuguese. In section 8.1, it was demonstrated that non-specific NEs in these creoles may surface determinerless. Examples (301)-(308) show that they may also occur with an indefinite determiner.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 215, 143)

(301)  Me  threaten  Ole  Massa  seh  me  a  go  look  \textit{one bad man}
\begin{verbatim}
  1SG  threaten  Ole  Massa  COMP  1SG  PROG  go  look  IND  bad  man
fi  deh  wid.
\end{verbatim}
\begin{quote}
  ‘I threatened Ole Massa that I was going to look for a bad man to be with.’
\end{quote}

(302)  Me  aunty  never  have  \textit{a  man},  so  she  do  all  a  di  work  fi
\begin{verbatim}
  1SG  aunty  NEG.PST  have  IND  man  so  3SG.F  do  all  of  DEF  work  for
her-self
3SG.F-REFL
\end{verbatim}
\begin{quote}
  ‘My aunty did not have a man, so she did all the work herself.’
\end{quote}

\[23\] Jamaican Creole indefinite determiners \textit{wan} and \textit{a} are not identical with regard to their distributional properties. The differences between the two determiners will be discussed in detail in section 8.5.2.
Sranan (De Drie 1985: 18)

(303) Dan mi ben suku fu bay wan pikin bōto nanga wan pikin srepi
then 1SG PST search to buy IND small boat with IND small tug
fu mi srefi.
for 1SG self
‘Then I was looking if I could by a little boat with a small tug for myself.’

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 234)

(304) Longpela taim na mi lukim wanpela naispela meri olsem yu ia.
Long time and 1SG look IND nice woman like 2SG FOC
‘For a long time I have been looking for a nice woman like you.’

Haitian Creole (Hall 1953: 75)

(305) S-ou pa-rété, m-ap-ba ou you kal.
If-2SG NEG-stop 1SG-FUT-give 2SG IND beating
‘If you don’t stop, I will give you a beating.’

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmidt 2007: 122)

(306) Mi no a mira un mancha riba suela.
1SG NEG PST see IND spot on floor
a. ‘I didn’t see a particular spot on the floor.’
b. ‘I did not see any spots on the floor.’

Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2007: 65)

(307) Ora k’ e subi, bu ta panha-l, bu abri-k un garafa.
hour REL it raise 2SG IPFV take-it 2SG open-it with IND bottle
‘When it is raised, you open it up with a bottle.’

Diu (Cardoso 2009: 217)

(308) Ŭ istor… kwol a kōt-a?
IND story which IRR.NPST tell-INF
‘A story…Which one should (I) tell?’

Thus, many of the creoles cited in section 8.1 as examples of languages with specificity marking, realize specificity variably, allowing for both zero and overt marking of non-specific indefinite NEs. Although in this study I did not perform a
systematic quantitative analysis of the data, a first approximation suggests that the frequency of the overt indefinite determiner with non-specific NEs differs across the creoles, as well as across different varieties of the same creole. For instance, overt marking of non-specific NEs appears to be more frequent in Jamaican Creole than in Sranan. On the other hand, while in the Sranan data from Voorhoeve (1962) I hardly encountered any instances of the indefinite determiner with non-specific NEs, in the data from De Drie (1985) they are abundant.

In a number of creoles under study, the overt marking of both specific and non-specific indefinite NEs represents the default option. The occurrence of indefinite NEs without an overt determiner is largely restricted to a few specific syntactic contexts (see section 8.4). These creoles include Negerhollands (309)-(310), Afrikaans (311)-(312), Lesser Antillean Creole (313)-(314), Mauritian Creole (315)-(316) and Chabacano (317)-(318).

Negerhollands (Rossem and Van der Voort 1996: 268, 256)

**Specific**

(309) Een tid da ha een noli. Am ha kaa koo hou, am one time there have IND donkey 3SG have PERF come old 3SG na kan werak.

NEG can work

‘Once upon a time there was a donkey. He had grown old, he could not work.’

**Non-specific**

(310) …am fo gi am nu fo di crop twee ton suku mi twaləf 3SG MOD give 3SG now for DEF crop two barrel sugar with twelve patakón mi een kui.

patakón with IND cow

‘…he had to give him now for the crop two barrels of sugar with twelve patakón and a cow’
Afrikaans (Scholz 2011b,a)

Specific

(311) Onder die dooie-s is ’n federale regter met meer as 40 jaar ervaring.

‘Among the dead there is a federal judge with more than forty years of experience.’

Non-specific

(312) Vrou-e se aspirasie is om te trou, as hulle kan, met ’n man wat beter opgelei is, meer verdien…

‘Women’s aspiration is, if they can, to marry a man who is well-educated, earns more...’

Lesser Antillean (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

Specific

(313) Mé, koman zòt pé travay kon sa san chanté on ti chanson? but how 3PL can work like DEM without sing IND little song

‘But how can you work like this without singing a little song?’

Non-specific

(314) Mé, mi on bèl ti chanson zòt pé chanté: “dan a Zanba kasé…”

‘But here is a little song you may sing: “Zanba’s tooth broke…”’
Mauritian Creole (Guillemin 2009: 176, 71)

Specific

(315) *Ein' gros cerf qui té bête.*
IND big stag COMP PST stupid
‘There was a big stag who was stupid.’

Non-specific

(316) Alors, mo pena *enn zarden?*
so 1SG NEG IND garden
‘Don’t I have a garden, then?’

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 198, 222)

Specific

(317) *Es’ é un mujé lo ke sé bibiba por ayá por el Prado… Ese mujé á sé jumaba mariuana… el á teneba nuebe moná baron, ese mujé.*
DEM COP IND woman it that REFL live PREP there PREP DEF Prado… DEM woman IPFV REFL smoke marijuana 3SG IPFV have nuebe moná baron, *ese mujé.*
nine child male DEM woman
‘This was a woman who lived over there, in El Prado. This woman smoked marijuana. She had nine sons, this woman.’

Non-specific

(318) Nda=mi *un tragito d=ese kammante ke á ten mucho kaló.*
give=1SG IND mouthful of=DEM painkiller because it have many hot
‘Give me a mouthful of this painkiller because it is very hot.’
Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 218, 219)

Specific

(319) Abia un reina ke ya perde su anilyo de brilyante. Ya have IND queen REL PST loose 3SG.POSS ring of diamond PST
manda le kon todo su mana basilyo asta kon el mana manda order 3SG OBL all 3SG.POSS PL subject up.to OBL DEF PL
animal buska el anilyo.
animal look.for DEF ring
‘Once upon a time there was a queen who lost her diamond ring. She ordered all of her subjects including the animals to look for the ring.’

Non-specific

(320) Ya kontesta el aninipot si pwede kon=ele dale un lus
PST answer DEF firefly if can OBL=3SG give IND light
ke pwede ele karga…
REL can 3SG carry
‘The firefly answered that if possible he would like her to give him a light which he could carry.’

8.3 No indefinite determiner with specific indefinite NEs

In a few creoles under study, the occurrence of the indefinite determiner is variable not only with non-specific but also with specific indefinite NEs. Zero-marked specific indefinites appear to be particularly frequent in Tok Pisin, and are also not rare in Haitian Creole (at least as far as the data I have consulted are concerned).

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 233)

(321) Mi painim naispela meri na mi gat traipela laik long=en.
1SG find nice woman and 1SG have big desire PREP=3SG
‘I found a nice woman and I like her very much.’
Haitian Creole (Hall 1953: 74)

(322) Mama-m té-bâ-m **ti-plat** pou-té-mâjé. Ti-kouzé-m-nâ mama-1SG PST-give-1SG little-plate for-PST-eat little-cousin-1SG-DEF vini prà **ti-plat** mwê, l-alé avèk lakay li épi lâdêmê li come take little-plate 1SG 3SG-go with house 3SG then next.day 3SG môté lakay mama-m avèk **ti-pla-la**… go.up house mother-1SG with little-plate-DEF ‘My mother had given me a little dish for eating. My little cousin came and took my little dish; he went with it to his house and then the next day he came up to my mother’s house with the little dish…’

Cases of zero-marked specific indefinites were also attested in Sranan (Bruyn 1995) and in Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2007) (although, according to Lucchesi (1993), all specific indefinite NEs are regularly marked by the indefinite determiner in Cape Verdean Creole).

8.4 Contexts that favor bare NEs

In some contexts, where Germanic and Romance languages typically use overt indefinite determiners, creoles favor bare nouns. These contexts are considered below.

8.4.1 Predicate nominals

Attributive predicate nominals (including complements of the copular verb ‘become’ and equatives ‘like’ and ‘as’) are often cited as a type of context where creoles tend to use bare NEs. In the creoles under study, one also finds many examples of bare NEs in these contexts. Such examples are given below under (323)-(328).

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 16)

(323) She **a** murderer!
3SG.F COP murderer ‘She is a murderer!’

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 57)

(324) Ma da u b-e-poti su lek dulpal.
But then 1PL PST-IPFV-put shoe like goalpost ‘But then we put shoes as a goalpost.’
Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 235)

(325) **Em longpela rot.**
3SG long road
‘It’s a long road.’

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 446)

(326) **Da hiri so êke drai-te potë man.**
COP here FOC 1SG turn-PFV old man.
‘This is where I got old.’

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 199)

(327) **El era mucha buena persona.**
3SG COP many nice person
‘She was a very nice person.’

Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 165)

(328) **Leslie ê bêy piken baba ê.**
Leslie COP.NPST very small baby COP.NPST
‘Leslie is a very small baby.’

Although zero-marking of predicate nominals is generally more common than the use of overt determiners, in some creoles, indefinite determiners are also not infrequent in this context.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 137)

(329) **me woulda like be a nurse.**
1SG would like COP IND nurse
‘I would like to be a nurse.’

Sranan (DeDrie 1985: 17)

(330) **Mi granma ben de wan põti frow.**
1SG grandmother PST IPFV IND poor woman
‘My grandmother was a poor woman.’
Tok Pisin (Sankoff and Mazzie 1991: 19)

(331) Em wanpela wantok bilong mipela ia.
3SG IND friend POSS 1PL FOC
‘He is a friend of ours.’

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 447)

(332) Jack wa da en loi took.
Jack PST COP IND lazy child
‘Jack was a lazy child.’

Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 154)

(333) Jacob e ū kob.
Jacob COP.NPST IND snake
‘Jacob is a snake.’

In those creoles where the indefinite determiner does not seem to show sensitivity to specificity (see section 8.2), the occurrence of predicate nominals with an indefinite determiner represents the majority pattern or is categorical. Examples from these creoles are given below:

Afrikaans (Scholz 2011b)

(334) Ek wil liwer ’n huisvrou wees.
1SG want rather IND housewife COP.INF
‘I’d rather be a housewife.’

Lesser Antillean Creole (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

(335) mamèl-a-ou, gwosè a on zéléfan
udder-POSS-2SG big PREP IND elephant
‘Your udder is big like an elephant.’

Mauritian Creole (Guillemin 2009: 172)

(336) Mo enn esklav lager.
1SG IND slave war
‘I am a slave of war.’
8.4.2 Complements of prepositions

Bare indefinites are also often found inside PPs.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 57)

(338) ...mi ma mek mi a _prenasi_.
1SG mother make 1SG PREP plantation
‘My mother made me on a plantation…’

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 4)

(339) Mama sleep on a wood bed wid _mattress_ mek up a banana mama sleep on IND wood bed with mattress make up PREP banana trash stuff inna _crocus bag_.
trash stuff in crocus bag
‘Mama slept on a wooden bed with a mattress made of banana plant stuffed in a crocus bag.’

The tendency is observed in many creoles (as well as in other languages of the world with variable indefinite determiner use). In one of the creoles under study, the omission of determiners with complements of prepositions is nearly categorical. This creole is Chabacano. While the indefinite determiner in this creole regularly occurs with argumental NEs (regardless of their specificity value), examples of the indefinite determiner with complements of prepositions are extremely scarce, zero determiner being the default marking option in this syntactic context. Grant (2007) makes the same observation based on his data.

Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 209-210)

(340) Si komachíng ya kohe kon kabáw y kyere ele machaka kon DEF monkey PST catch OBL turtle and want 3SG smash OBL kabáw kon _palo_.
turtle with stick
‘Monkey caught Turtle and wantd to smash Turtle with a stick.’
8.5 Discussion

In this section, the observations made above will be interpreted in the light of the issues of creole genesis and development. In the introduction to this chapter, I presented the universalist and substratist accounts of the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles. Both accounts are based on the generalization that creole indefinite determiners only occur with specific indefinite NEs. As observed in section 8.1, the distributional properties of the overt indefinite determiners in the creoles under study can in many cases indeed be captured in terms of specificity. However, in none of the creoles does the distribution of the indefinite determiner fully conform to the specificity-based pattern. The indefinite determiner also occurs with non-specific NEs. The frequency of indefinite determiner use in this context differs across creoles. While in some of them the specificity value of an NE nearly always determines whether or not the overt indefinite marker is used, in other creoles the indefinite determiners appear less sensitive to the specificity-based constraint and tend to behave like a general marker of indefiniteness. In a few creoles from the latter group, the distribution of indefinite determiners closely resembles the distribution of indefinite articles in Germanic/Romance languages. On the other hand, there are also creoles where the indefinite determiner is used variably not only with non-specific but also with specific indefinite NEs.

Since indefinite determiners in the creoles under study do not always obey the specificity-based constraint and sometimes even appear to be completely insensitive to it, neither the universalist nor the substratist accounts of indefinite determiner use can fully account for the data considered. In view of the fact that the creoles under study display both similarities and differences in the way they use indefinite determiners, it appears that the distributional properties of indefinite determiners in these creoles have been shaped by a combination of universal and language-specific factors.

8.5.1 Specificity-based pattern: unfinished grammaticalization or substrate influence?

Looking at the development of nominal markers in creoles from the perspective of the break-in-transmission creolization scenario, one could suppose that Germanic/Romance indefinite articles did not survive during the development of the creole, thus making it possible for bare (determinerless) nouns to be used in all argument positions. The exact referential properties of such NEs relied on the discourse, situational context or the knowledge of the world. As creoles became the major means of communication in creole communities which were acquired as L1 by the children born in the colonies, there emerged functional pressures to express referentiality (and individuation) overtly.

The indefinite determiner is one of such means. Like in most languages of the world, in creoles, the lowest numeral ‘one’ was recruited to perform this grammatical function. According to Givón (1981, 1984), ‘one’ is uniquely fit to perform the function
of the indefinite determiner. Being a quantifying expression, it implies referentiality (since having quantity implies having existence/reference) without implying prior familiarity. Therefore, it is suited for the introduction of new referents into discourse. On the other hand, it can also give the interpretation of ‘one of the type’ and it can thus make it possible for the hearer to identify the referent as a representative of a certain type by its connotational or generic properties.

Although the development of indefinite determiners from ‘one’ represents a universal grammaticalization path, languages may differ in the extent to which this process of grammaticalization has proceeded. According to Givón (1984), one can distinguish the following stages in the development of ‘one’ into an indefinite determiner:

Stage 0: no systematic coding of indefinite specific vs. non-specific NEs
Stage I: ‘one’ or its reduced variant marks indefinite specific NEs only
Stage II: ‘one’ or its reduced variant marks indefinite specific and some non-specific NEs
Stage III: a reduced variant of ‘one’ marks all indefinite NEs

According to this scheme, ‘one’ first goes through the stage where it only marks specific indefinites, and then expands its distribution to non-specific NEs.

According to Givón (1981, 1984), creoles manifests Stage I of this development. Although this generalization is not supported by the data considered in this chapter, one could still assume that the sensitivity to specificity observed in the distribution of indefinite determiners in some of the creoles under study is the heritage of the Stage I state. Such a scenario is, however, not supported by the available diachronic data.

For instance, Bruyn’s (1995, 2007) diachronic research into the distribution of the indefinite and definite determiners in Sranan also leads her to question the validity of Givón’s proposal. Bruyn observes that the indefinite determiner *wan* was already used as a marker of indefinite singular NEs in the earliest available sources. Already at this stage, which reflects the state of affairs about one hundred years after Sranan is assumed to have emerged, *wan* occurred with specific indefinite as well as with non-specific NEs. Further, Bruyn observes that the distribution of this marked has not significantly changed overtime. While one could still hypothesize that the major developments in the function of *wan* took place prior to the stage reflected in the earliest available sources, given the apparent lack of any substantial developments after 1765, such a hypothesis appears improbable. While this incomplete evidence from one creole is not sufficient to disprove Givón’s analysis, it challenges the idea that creoles start out at Stage 0 and then gradually undergo unidirectional development towards later stages.

---

24 In order to avoid confusion I will substitute the term “referentiality” used by Givón with the term “specificity” adopted here.
As an alternative to unfinished grammaticalization, one could look at the development of the specificity-based pattern of indefinite determiner use from the perspective of substrate influence. As pointed out by Lefebvre (1998) and Aboh (2004c, 2006), the sensitivity of (in)definite determiners to specificity observed in some Atlantic creoles shows close resemblance to the principles of indefinite determiner use found in Gbe languages. However, it is questionable whether the similarity between the creoles and their substrates in this respect can be interpreted as evidence of substrate influence. Specificity represents a universally prominent constraint on the distribution of indefinite determiners and it has been attested in many unrelated languages of the world such as Hebrew, Chinese, Turkish, Russian, and Samoan, to give just a few examples. The sensitivity of the indefinite determiner to specificity has also been observed in some creoles that are not historically related to Gbe languages, such as Berbice Dutch or Hawaiian Creole (Bickerton 1974). The research into L1 and L2 acquisition of determiner systems in languages like English shows that both children and adults whose L1 does not have determiners make a common mistake of using the English determiners to mark specificity instead of definiteness (Ionin et al. 2004, 2008; Schaeffer and Mathewson 2005). All this suggests that it is unlikely that substrate influence played the crucial role in the development of the specificity-based constraints on the indefinite determiner use in Atlantic Creoles.

I therefore conclude that sensitivity to specificity observed in the distribution of indefinite determiners many creoles derives from the universal principles of reference marking and discourse organization. This conclusion holds regardless of whether or not the distribution of indefiniteness markers evolved according to the scheme postulated by Givón.

8.5.2 Definiteness-based pattern: grammaticalization or superstrate influence?

The accounts of the distribution of indefinite determiners in creoles discussed in the introduction to this chapter mainly focus on their specificity-based behaviour. The current state of affairs in the creoles under study is, however, much more diverse. In none of the creoles does the distribution of the indefinite determiner fully conform to the specificity-based pattern. While in some creoles specificity plays an important role in the choice between an overt indefinite determiner and zero, in other creoles, indefinite determiners tend to behave like general markers of indefiniteness. On the other hand, there are also creoles where the indefinite determiner is used variably not only with non-specific but also with specific indefinite NEs.

One way to account for the development of creole indefinite determiners towards the definiteness-based pattern is from the perspective of grammaticalization the way it is envisaged by Givón. The majority of the creoles, in which the indefinite determiner occurs systematically with specific indefinites and variably with non-specific NEs, can be placed somewhere in-between Stage I and Stage II. While some creoles, for
instance Jamaican Creole, appear to be closer to Stage II, others, like Berbice Dutch, are
closer to Stage I. A number of creoles, such as Negerhollands, Afrikaans, Mauritian,
Palenquero and Chabacano, appear to come close to Stage III. On the other hand, the
irregular marking of specific indefinites observed in a few creoles, including Tok Pisin
and Haitian Creole, is a phenomenon that goes back to Stage 0.

While Givón’s analysis predicts that languages with specific indefinite markers
will at some point develop towards the definiteness-based pattern, it does not explain the
diversity we observe across creoles. Another question is of course whether the
grammaticalization analysis is supported by the diachronic data.

The present study does not include diachronic analysis. The results of the
diachronic research into the distribution of indefinite determiners available for a few of
the creoles considered here, also lead to rather diverse observations with regard to the

For instance, Guillemin’s (2011) study of the development of the determiner
system of Mauritian Creole shows that while in the early creole (to be more precise,
prior to the beginning of the 19th century) there was no grammatical indefiniteness
marking, in the modern Mauritian, the indefinite determiner *enn* is used with both
specific and non-specific indefinite NEs. Although from Guillemin’s research it follows
that at some point in the history of the creole the numeral *enn* became grammaticalized
as an indefinite determiner, it is unclear whether the grammaticalization of *enn*
proceeded following the steps postulated by Givón.

In their study of (in)definiteness marking in Tok Pisin, Sankoff and Mazzie
(1991) observe that while in the data from the first half of the 20th century there is an
overall trend towards the increase in the overt marking of NEs in comparison to the early
stages of the language (the second half of the 19th century), where nouns most frequently
occur in their bare form, their research into the development of *wanpela* as a marker of
referential indefinite nominal expressions between 1920 and 1970 shows that the use of
this marker is not systematic and that there was no change in any direction over this
period of fifty years. The authors conclude that Tok Pisin does not show the
grammaticalization of *wanpela* as a dedicated marker of specific indefinite NEs. In other
words, they observe no tendency in the development of Tok Pisin towards stage I of
grammaticalization of the indefinite determiner that is assumed to be characteristic of the
prototypical creole determiner system.

As already observed in section 8.5.1, similar observations are made by Bruyn
(1995, 2007), who does not observe any unidirectional developments in the distribution
of the indefinite determiner *wan* in Sranan, which is used as a marker of specific as well
as non-specific indefinites in the earliest available sources. In accordance with Givón’s
grammaticalization scenario, one could expect an increase in the use of the indefinite
determiner with non-specific NEs. No such increase is, however, observed in Sranan.

Summing up, the gradual grammaticalization of the indefinite determiner
proposed by Givón does not provide a fully adequate model to account for either
synchronic or diachronic creole data. Based on the evidence considered here, I conclude
that while grammaticalization of indefiniteness marking through the reanalysis of a form derived from the numeral ‘one’ does take place creoles, it is not clear whether the distributional properties of creole indefinite determiners can be fully accounted for in terms of grammaticalization.

I believe that the main drawback of Givón’s account is in the assumption that the development of ‘one’ into the indefinite determiner is unidirectional and that in each language it starts out at Stage 0 and is directed towards the final Stage 3. In assuming this, Givón overlooks the fact that the indefinite determiner is used not only as a marker of the indefinite reference, but also as a means to express individuation and singularity (see chapter 7) and that there are languages where the distribution of the indefinite determiner remains at the intermediate Stage 1 for ages.

Further, in addition to universal functional pressures (i.e., the necessity to express referentiality, individuation and number) that set in motion the process of grammaticalization, the development of the discourse-semantic and distributional properties of indefinite determiners in creoles may be influenced by a number of external factors that characterize the environment in which these creoles have developed and are spoken. Specifically, the development of indefinite determiners towards general indefiniteness markers can be accounted for in terms of superstrate influence. Below, I shall illustrate the importance of this factor based on what is known about the history and the socio-linguistic profiles of the creoles under study focusing on the case of Jamaican Creole.

In addition to allowing for singular indefinite NEs to occur without a determiner, Jamaican Creole has two overt indefinite determiners: \textit{a} and \textit{wan}. This variation is an instance of the variation between the acrolectal and basilectal forms typical of the Jamaican Creole mesolect\textsuperscript{25}. Although such variations are often considered to instantiate language-externally motivated code-switches, the distribution of allegedly competing basilectal and acrolectal forms often appear to be linguistically constrained (Patrick 1999, 2009; Bobyleva 2009, 2011b). The linguistic aspects of the variation between \textit{a}, \textit{wan} and zero, have interesting implications for the discussion of the factors underlying the development of the distributional properties of indefinite determiners in creoles.

Bobyleva (2009) performed a study of the linguistic distribution of the indefinite determiners in Jamaican Creole based on the corpus data sourced from Sistren

\textsuperscript{25} The contemporary linguistic situation in Jamaica is often cited as a typical example of the post-creole speech continuum. Throughout its history the creole has co-existed with English, which has always remained the official language of Jamaica. As a result of the continuous contact between the two languages, combined with the pressures from English as the model of correctness and the language of bigger opportunities, very few (if any) Jamaicans use the “deep”, basilectal creole captured in Bailey (1966). The speech of the majority of creole speakers, depending on their socio-economic status, level of education, urban vs. rural background (and perhaps a bunch of other factors), can be placed somewhere in between the basilect and the local standard of English (cf. Patrick 2005). This “in-between” variety (or, according to some scholars, varieties) is referred to as mesolect. This latter is linguistically characterized by the variation between the assumingly basilectal, acrolectal and mesolectal forms.
(1986), fifteen women’s life stories transcribed from tape around 1980. With the exception of four stories, told in Jamaican English, the rest of the data could be characterized as Jamaican Creole mesolect. The authors of the eleven stories in the mesolect use all the three forms of the indefinite determiner in their speech, with varying relative frequencies. The study aimed to find out whether the Jamaican Creole indefinite determiners were sensitive to specificity and whether the specificity constraint applied equally to wan and a? Three hypothetical scenarios appeared possible:

In the first scenario, depicted in figure 8.1a both overt indefinite determiners are sensitive to specificity. In the second scenario, figure 8.1b, only the basilectal forms, i.e. wan and zero, distribute in accordance with the specificity-based principle, while a occurs in accordance with the rules of English and is therefore not sensitive to specificity. In the third scenario, in figure 1c, the grammar is mixed, the specificity constraint applies variably, and the three markers are used interchangeably.

The data analysis has shown that specific indefinite NPs are always overtly marked in Jamaican Creole either by means of wan or by means of a; non-specific indefinite NEs may appear with wan or a or without an overt determiner. Thus, it appears that while the zero indefinite determiner in Jamaican Creole is restricted to non-specific NEs, wan and a may are not categorically restricted in terms of specificity.

However, the quantitative analysis of the distribution of these two markers shows that they are not used in the same way. It appears that out of 141 tokens of wan, 85 (that is 60%) occur with specific indefinite NEs and 56 (that is 40%) occur with non-specific NEs. As for a, out of the total of 447 tokens, only 122 (that is 27%) occur with

---

26 By “creole grammar” I refer to the alleged prototypically creole indefinite determiner use described by Bickerton (1981) and Givón (1981, 1984).
specific indefinites, the remaining 225 (that is 73%) are found with non-specific NEs. This clearly shows that specificity has a larger impact on the distribution of *wan* than on the distribution of *a*. The investigation of the role of factors such as animacy and syntactic position, which are related to specificity, gave conforming results. Specific indefinites typically introduce new discourse topics. A prototypical topic is human. The form *wan* occurred with NEs referring to humans in 47% of cases, with animate NEs (referring to non-humans) in 1% of cases and with inanimate NEs in 52% of cases. In case of *a*, the distribution between this semantic groups was 20%, 2%, and 78%, respectively. Also, *wan* appeared to favor NEs in subject position, while *a* was more frequent with objects and complements of prepositions. Unlike *a* and zero, *wan* never occurred with predicate nominals in my data\(^{27}\).

Summing up, these findings indicate that the specificity constraint has a larger impact on the distribution of *wan* than on the distribution of *a*. The distribution of the indefinite determiners in Jamaican Creole can be schematically represented in the following way:

![Diagram of the distribution of 'wan', 'a', and '∅' in Jamaican Creole]

Figure 8.2. The distribution of *wan*, *a* and zero in Jamaican Creole.

The distribution depicted in Figure 8.2 lies in-between the hypothetical scenarios 8.1b and 8.1c.

What do the results of this study tell us about the factors underlying the development of discourse-semantic properties of indefinite determiners in creoles? I

\(^{27}\) This finding is in contrast with Bailey (1971) who provides examples of *wan* in the following context:

Jamaican Creole (Bailey 1971: 346)

(i) Im ena *wan* priti gyal fi-truu
    3SG PST IND pretty girl PREP-true
    ‘She was a really nice girl.’
believe that the distributional differences between the creole and the English-like forms of the indefinite determiner in Jamaican Creole show evidence of superstrate influence. Specifically, the fact that the distribution of the creole form *wan* is closer to the alleged creole prototype while the distribution of the English-like form *a* shows more affinity with the distribution of the indefinite article in English is likely to result from the fact that the discourse-semantic and distributional properties of these forms have been influenced by the English indefiniteness-based pattern of determiner use to different extents.

A comparison between Jamaican Creole and Sranan supports this conclusion. The two creoles have the same superstrate and similar substrates, but the amount of contact with the superstrate is very different. While Jamaican Creole developed in a continuous contact with English, in Surinam, the direct influence from the varieties of English spoken by the British has only lasted for thirty years. Surinam started out as an English colony in 1651, but as early as 1667 it was conquered by the Dutch. By 1680 almost all British slave-owners left the colony with their slaves. The slave population of Surinam, however, continued speaking the English-based creole, and Dutch influence hardly penetrated beyond the level of lexicon. The different amount of contact with the superstrate has had a significant impact on the linguistic properties of the creole languages developed in Jamaica and Surinam. Jamaican Creole, in particular its most widely spoken mesolectal variety, shows much more affinity with English than Sranan. This may be also observed in the distribution of the indefinite determiners: while in both creoles, the indefinite determiners may appear with specific indefinite as well as with non-specific NEs, the occurrence of the indefinite determiner (both *a* and *wan*) with non-specific Nes is relatively more frequent in Jamaican Creole than it is in Sranan (at least, as far as the data I have consulted are concerned).

Jamaican Creole is not the only language in the sample where the tendency to use the indefinite determiner as a general indefiniteness marker can be claimed to result from superstrate influence. Other languages that appear to display superstrate influence in this respect are, for instance, Afrikaans and Chabacano. Both languages developed in a quite extensive contact with their superstrates (see chapter 2). Also, the rapid development of Mauritian *enn* into the general indefinite determiner attested by Guillemin (2009) may be related to the influence from French (cf. Mahadeo 1981).

I believe that the discussion in this and the previous section illustrates that while the development of some kind of indefinite marker from the numeral ‘one’, as well as the tendency to use this marker with specific indefinite NEs and in order to disambiguate between individuated and non-individuated and singular and plural readings are universally driven, the extension in the use of the indefinite determiner to the cases of non-specific indefinites may be also due to a number of individual factors such as, for instance, contact with the superstrate. In contrast to the pure grammaticalization analysis, the analysis that takes into account both universal functional pressures and contact-induced change allows us to account not only for cross-
creole similarities but also for the variation with regard to the use of indefinite determiners observed among creoles.
In chapter 4, definiteness was defined in terms of identifiability and uniqueness: an NE is definite when its referent is assumed by the speaker to be uniquely identifiable to the hearer in a given discourse or situational context. This definition of definiteness is based on the distribution of the definite article in languages like English. The literature on definiteness identifies a large array of factors that grammatical definiteness in languages like English may rely on. The most comprehensive overview of these factors is provided by Hawkins (1978) (see section 4.1.4). These factors include previous discourse knowledge, situational knowledge, general knowledge of the world as well as the presence of linguistic indicators of definiteness such as superlative adjectives or relative clauses. The cross-linguistic research into the behavior of definite determiners, however, shows that not all markers that appear functionally parallel to English *the* are sensitive to all these factors. While in English, the article is “a default form that must occur in a definite noun phrase in the absence of a semantically fuller definite determiner” (Lyons 1999: 52), there are many languages in which the definite determiner can be omitted where the situational or discourse conditions for definiteness are satisfied. Given these cross-linguistic differences in distribution of definiteness-marking elements, it cannot be assumed that what resembles definiteness in certain languages is exactly the same semantic category as in other languages. Definiteness is thus only one of a number of categories which serve to guide the hearer in working out how the entities referred to fit into discourse. Other strategies that are employed to mark the status of nominal referents as given, familiar to discourse participants are specificity and topicality. As I observe in chapter 4, in some languages elements that appear to be functionally similar to English *the*, at a closer examination, appear to perform the function of specificity or nominal topic marking rather than definiteness marking.

Languages with dedicated nominal topic markers are found among the substrate languages of the creoles considered here. For instance, Aboh (2004b) describes the Gungbe definite determiner-like element *i3* as a nominal topic marker. In his other work
(e.g., Aboh 2004a,c, 2006) he analyses it as a specific definite determiner. For the sake of convenience, I repeat Aboh’s definition of specificity, which he uses in application to definite NEs. According to Aboh (2006: 224), “[a] specific definite noun phrase is strongly D(iscourse)-linked and represents a unique referent assumed to be known to both speaker and hearer, and which the speaker intends to refer to”. Aboh’s definition of specificity of definite NEs in terms of discourse-linking differs considerably from the definition of specificity in terms of referential intent I use here (see section 4.1.8 and chapter 8). In order to avoid confusion I will use the term “nominal topic marker” in application to elements like l5 and reserve the term “specificity” for the sense in which I define it here.

Gungbe examples illustrating the distribution of l5 have already been provided in chapter 4. However, I will repeat them here for the sake of convenience. As the examples demonstrate, l5 is restricted to discourse-linked NEs, thus signalling that the reference of an NE should be established through a link with a discourse antecedent (341) or with NEs that has an antecedent in the shared private speaker and hearer knowledge, based on their previous common experience (342).

Gungbe (Aboh 2004a: 76; p.c.)

(341) Kókú m̀n kù m̀n távò cè bò d̀ ì́nì ná xó távò l5.
Koku see.PFV table 1SG.POSS and 3SG  FUT buy table DEF
‘Koku saw my table and then said he would buy the/that table.’

(342) A: Fítè wè núṣ̀nú l5 tè?
Where FOC soup DEF  COP
B: Núṣ̀nú l5 tò távò jì.
Soup DEF COP table on
‘Where is the soup?’
‘The soup is on the table.’

In other contexts where languages like English employ the definite article (cf. Hawkins 1978), Gungbe normally displays bare NEs.
Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)

Associative anaphora

(343) Ûn dó tâxî tê bò chàfè kùn hòn nà mì. Má 1SG make taxi stand and driver open door give 1SG 1SG môn nú mònkhò kpën.
see thing like this never
‘I stopped the taxi and the driver opened the door for me. I’ve never seen anything like this.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

(344) Axèlu wè nò dù têví titan.
King FOC HAB eat yam first
‘The king (over there/in general) eats the yam first.’

Definiteness-inducing general knowledge

(345) Xíla bìbèlù!
read bible
‘Read the Bible!’

Definiteness-inducing modifiers

(346) Dàwè ḍè ñè mòn tò jò tô jì mìxò cè wè.
Man REL 2SG see COP photo on brother 1SG.POSS FOC
‘The man you saw in the picture is my brother.’

A number of other Niger-Congo languages, including some of the potentially relevant substrate languages of the creoles considered here, such as Yoruba, Fula, and Mandinka, also use elements that resemble definite determiners to mark NEs as discourse-linked rather than as definite.

The Yoruba postnominal determiner nàà, which performs a function similar to that of ldí in Gungbe, is described by Ajiboye (2005) as a salience marker with the semantics of ‘that very’. It not only conveys that the referent of an NE is identical to the referent previously introduced into the discourse, but also emphasizes the identity, conveying that it is somehow remarkable. Examples like (347) suggest the analysis of nàà as a contrastive topic marker. Note that nàà here is used in combination with a focus marker ni. Much literature on contrastive topic marking analyses contrastive topic as focused (e.g., Krifka 2008 and other work).
Yoruba (Ajiboye 2005: 205)

(347) Tàkúté Olú mú òyà.
   trap   Olu   hold   grass-cutter
   Olú gbé òyà lolé.
   Olu   carry   grass-cutter   go-house
Olú gbé òyà lólé.
   Olu   carry   grass-cutter   go-house
Óyà nàà ni wón fí je-yán.
   grass-cutter   DEF   FOC   3PL   use   eat-pounded.yam
‘Olu’s trap caught a grass-cutter. Olu carried the grass-cutter home. The very
grass-cutter served as meat with which they ate pounded yam.’

Arnott (1970: 138) describes determiners in Fula as referentials with the
semantics of ‘the one referred to’, ‘the one in question’. The use of determiners in Fula
is illustrated below:

Fula (Arnott 1970: 138)

(348) a. Hokk-am deptere nden.
   book   DEF
   ‘Give me the book we were talking about.’

b. mi’anndaa baccel ngel.28
   child   DEF
   ‘I don’t know the child mentioned’

Specificity marking is also found in Mande. Unlike the markers discussed
above, the affixal marker -o(o) does not make a distinction between definite and
indefinite NEs. But with regard to its pragmatics, it appears to have much in common
with Yoruba náà According to Rowlands (1969: 150), the effect of using -o(o) is to
focus the attention of the hearer upon the person or thing denoted by the noun. Used
with a noun on its first occurrence it signals “take note of a particular object to which I
am referring”. At a repetition it signals “take note that the object now referred to is the
same as referred to before”. This is illustrated in example (349) below. The first instance
of bòotoo ‘bag-TOP’ introduces a new discourse topic. The use of the suffix -o(o)
indicates that the identity of the referent is important for the point at issue. As the reader
may remember from chapters 4 and 8, this function is associated with indefinite
determiners that are sensitive to pragmatic specificity. The use of -o(o) with the
subsequent mentions of the noun ‘bag’ indicates that the NE should be interpreted as co-
referential with the discourse antecedent. As example (349) illustrates, in this function

28 As the source of this example does not provide the glosses, I only glossed the parts of the examples that are
relevant for the discussion.
-o(o) may be used in combination with a demonstrative, which is a cross-linguistically common means of discourse topic tracking (cf. Diessel 1999).

\[(349) \]  y’aa bùla boot-oo kóno l ye boot-oo dáa siti…
\[\text{bag-TOP bag-TOP} \]
\[\text{a be wó boot-oo le kóno Súluu nàata a y’aa tára jée} \]
\[\text{DEM bag-TOP}^{29} \]
‘They put him inside a bag and then tied up the mouth of the bag…
While he was in that bag Hyena came along and found him there.’

Similarly to Yoruba saliency nàà, -o(o) may expresses the semantics of ‘that very’, ‘that particular’.

Mandinka (Rowlands 1959: 152, 153)

\[(350) \]  a. í kèe
\[\text{2SG.POSS husband} \]
‘your husband’

\[\text{b. íla nyìng kè-o mang ké hâdamaidingo ti} \]
\[\text{husband-DET}^{30} \]
‘This husband of yours is not a human being.’

\[(351) \]  a. wò tûma b. wò tûm-o
\[\text{DEM time DEM time-DET} \]
‘at that time’ ‘at that particular time’

In some literature on the distribution of creole definite determiners, it has been observed that elements that are identified as definite determiners in creoles can be omitted where the situational or discourse conditions for definiteness are satisfied, similarly to nominal topic markers in Niger-Congo languages. Aboh (2004c, 2006) argues that the distribution of definite determiners in such creoles as Haitian, Saramaccan and Sranan is constrained in the same way as the distribution of specific definite markers in their substrates. Similar claims have been put forward by Guillemin (2009) with regard to Mauritian Creole and by Lefebvre (1998) with regard to Haitian

\[\text{29 As the source of this example does not provide the glosses, I only glossed the parts of the examples that are relevant for the discussion.} \]
\[\text{30 As the source of this example does not provide the glosses, I only glossed the parts of the examples that are relevant for the discussion.} \]
Creole (although Lefebvre uses the term “anaphoricity” instead of “specificity” or “topicality”).

Another way to look at the distributional properties of definite determiners in creoles is from the perspective of grammaticalization. As we observed in chapter 5, in most creoles definite determiners developed from demonstrative adjectives and other deictic markers (e.g., demonstrative reinforcers). The development of the definiteness semantics as it is described for definite articles like the is considered to represent an extension of the deictic function of demonstratives as a result of a long gradual process of grammaticalization. The distribution of definite determiners observed in creoles at the current stage of their development can be analyzed as a stage in the grammaticalization of demonstratives into general definiteness markers. This analysis is pursued by Bruyn (1995).

As already observed in chapter 4, demonstratives may be used in only a subset of cases where one finds definite articles in languages like English. According to Lyons, demonstratives can only have the strictly anaphoric use and the visible situational use, and they cannot be used as markers of associative anaphora or in situations where the referent is not visible. This is demonstrated in examples (352) and (353) below.

(352) a. He bought a car in Germany. *That/the car* was very expensive.

   b. He bought a car just a year ago and *the/#that engine* already broke down.

(353) a. Look at *the/#that* car across the street (Context: The car is visible to the interlocutors.)

   b. *The/#that cat* is around the corner. (Context: The car is not visible to the interlocutors and has not been previously introduced in into discourse.)

Another context where demonstratives may overlap with and are often even more felicitous than definite determiners, pointed out in Diessel (1999) is so-called recognitional use. Recognitional demonstratives instruct the hearer to match the referent of the NE with an object or individual present not in the ongoing discourse but in the speaker and hearer shared knowledge (see section 4.1.8.2).

Context: The speaker and the hearer(s) know the neighbor and have a share experience of having problems with him.

(354) *That neighbor* is so annoying!

Hawkins (1978) proposes that, as opposed to definite determiners, demonstratives are characterized by a “matching constraint”, they instruct the hearer “to match the linguistic referent with some identifiable object” (154).
While demonstratives possess a much more restricted range of distribution than definite articles in languages like English, they share many distributional properties with nominal topic markers, including tracking discourse topics (anaphoric use) and making reference to entities that represent part of the shared private speaker/hearer knowledge (recognitional use). The nominal-topic-marker-like behavior of creole determiners may therefore also be accounted for from the grammaticalization perspective.

In the subsequent sections, I will consider (i) whether definite determiners in creoles show deviations from the definiteness-based pattern of determinant use found in their superstrates and (b) whether these deviations (if present) support the claim that definite determiners in creoles function as discourse topic markers or the claim that they are not fully grammaticalized.

9.1 Deviations from the definiteness-based pattern: evidence for nominal topic marking?

Among the creoles considered here, I distinguish two groups of creoles which show deviations from the definiteness-based pattern of the definite determiner use. The first group is represented by creoles which do not have a dedicated definite determiner. The second group is represented by creoles that do have a definite determiner which is distinct from a demonstrative but use this definite determiner in a way significantly different from the way in which definite articles are used in Germanic and Romance languages.

9.1.1 Creoles without a dedicated definite determiner

The group of creoles that do not have a dedicated definite marker distinct from a demonstrative is represented by Tok Pisin, Palenquero, Santome, Cape Verdean Creole, and Diu Portuguese. In all these creoles the marking of semantically definite NEs shows significant deviations from the definiteness marking patterns observed in their superstrate languages. As demonstratives do cross-linguistically, Tok Pisin dispel and ia, Palenquero ese, Cape Verdean kel/kes, and Diu Portuguese es and ilk function to point to (and to locate) objects and individuals in the spatio-temporal context of the speech situation and as discourse-anaphoric devices. These two uses of demonstratives are illustrated below for each of the creoles. The (a) examples illustrate the situational use, and the (b) examples the discourse-anaphoric use.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 92, 84, 126)

(355) a.  Dispela meri i toktok, lukim em i lap.
         DEM woman PM talk look 3SG PM laugh
      ‘This girl is talking, see how she is laughing.’
b. …wanpela man i go stap long longwe ples. Orait wanpela
IND man PM go stay PREP faraway place Okay IND
meri i go na lukim dispela man. Em i kambek na i
woman PM go and see DEM man 3SG PM come.back and PM
stap long ples bilong=en. Na man ya laik givim kaikai
stay PREP place POSS=3SG and man DM want give food
long dispela meri.
PREP DEM woman
‘A man went to a distant place and stayed there. Then a woman went and saw
that man. She came back to her village and stayed there. And this man wanted
to give food to this woman.’

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 213, 214)
(356) a. Suto á ten ke ba a kobá andi ese kamino pa meté ma
1PL PST have REL go to dig LOC DEM road to put PL
tubo.
tube
‘We had to go and dig this road to put tubes.’

b. Á sé mina limpio, pero ese agua, kuando sé pone a
it REFL look clean but DEM water when REFL put PREP
kusiná, á sé botá un nata. i ese nata é susio.
boil it REFL appear IND skin and DEM skin COP dirty
‘It looks clean, but this water, when it cooks, there appears a skin, and this
skin is dirty.’

Cape Verdean (Baptista 2002: 58, 2007: 68)
(357) a. Kel omi e pretu.
DEM man COP pretu
‘This man is black.’

b. Panha lenha na montadu, bende… Bende kel fixinhu de lenha
take wood PREP grove sell sell DEM piece of wood
‘I would take the wood in the grove and sell it. I would sell that little piece of
wood.’
Diu Portuguese (Cardoso 2009: 126)

(358) a. Aki aki, ne es igrej.
here here PREP DEM church
‘Here, here, in this church.’

b. yo larg-o karssaw i vey dapo\c{c} crocodile foy ali kaz d
1SG drop-PST heart and come then crocodile go there house of
irm\={a}, foy ver pu ik\={a}l karssaw.
sister go see.INF DAT DEM heart
‘I dropped [my] heart and came here. Then the crocodile went to the sister’s
house, he went to check on the heart.’

With regard to marking of abstract definiteness which does not rely on the location of
the referent in the spatio-temporal context of the speech situation or anaphoric reference,
the creoles behave differently. In Palenquero, abstract definiteness is never marked by
means of ese. Semantically definite referents are realized as bare NEs when they refer to
singular entities and are often marked by means of the plural marker ma when they have
a plural interpretation (see chapter 7). Examples below illustrate the marking of singular
definites in a number of contexts distinguished by Hawkins (1978) as requiring the use
of the definite article in English.

Palenquero (1983: 211, 240, 210)

Associative anaphora

(359) Kuando í mini en Pakua, entonse kamino á taba malo.
when 1SG return in Pakua then road PST COP bad
‘When I returned to Pakua, the road was bad.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

Context: The speaker is talking about the problems in his community.

(360) Ta semblalo un pokito pogke tiela á-ta mu susio.
PROG collect IND little because earth COP-PROG very dirty
‘[They] are sawing little because the soil [here] is dirty.’
Definiteness-inducing modification

(361) **Agua i suto sé bebé é agua i loyo, agua sucio.**
water REL 1PL REFL drink COP water PREP creek water dirty
‘The water that we drink is water from a/the creek, dirty water.’

As an alternative to zero-marking, singular definite NEs in Palenquero may be marked with the Spanish-derived definite determiners *el* or *la*.

Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 234)

(362) **Pero el año pasado á rendí un poko majaná ke pa suto asé fieta.**
but DEF year last PST unite IND little guy REL for 1PL make feast
‘But last year a few guys came together to organize a celebration.’

Another creole where abstract definite determiners generally surface unmarked is Santome. According to Tjerk Hagemeijer (p.c.), the marker *se* only marks definiteness together with deixis or when NEs have a familiar discourse antecedent. Alexandre and Hagemeijer (2007) define *se* as a demonstrative and a marker of specificity.

In Tok Pisin, the use of *dispela* and *ia* is also largely restricted to strictly anaphoric definites. Other types of definite NEs, including associative anaphora, situational definites and NEs containing definiteness-inducing modifiers are commonly not overtly marked for definiteness:

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 92, 120)

Definiteness-inducing situational context

Context: The interlocutors visited the same workshop.

(363) **PDF woksap i gutpela.**
PDF workshop PM good
‘The PDF workshop is fine’

Definiteness-inducing modification

(364) **kayemu bilong mama bilong mi**
uncle POSS mother POSS 1SG
‘the uncle of my mother’

Sankoff and Mazzie (1991) attest rare instances of *dispela* and *ia* as markers of associative anaphora. However, given the scarcity of such examples, it is difficult to
make any sound generalizations about the effects of abstract definiteness on NE marking in Tok Pisin.

While in Palenquero, Tok Pisin, and Santome, definiteness only appears to be marked in combination with a deictic feature, in Cape Verdean Creole *kel* and *kes* may occur with definite NEs without expressing demonstrative force or realizing anaphoric reference (see section 9.2). The use of *kel/kes* with definite NEs is, however, irregular. As observed by Baptista (2007), in Cape Verdean Creole the presence of definite determiners is generally not required to obtain the definite interpretation. Furthermore, the occurrence of *kel/kes* as a marker of definiteness represents a marked strategy: “[a]s a rule, C[ape] V[erdean] C[reole] does not mark its NPs as being definite by means of overt determiners” (Baptista 2007: 68). The examples below illustrate the distribution of bare definites in Cape Verdean Creole.

Cape Verdean Creole (2002: 88; 2007: 72, 81)

**Associative anaphora**

(365) N ta mete dentu kaza N ta fitxa *porta*, so pa-N k-odja.
    1SG IPFV out inside house 1SG IPVF close door only for-1SG NEG-see
    ‘I go inside the house and close the door so that I don’t see anything.’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

(366) Ma N ta trabadja gosi ku *kanbra*.
    but 1SG IPFV work now with city.hall
    ‘But I work now with the city hall.’

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(367) *Omi* ki *ben* *odja-bu* e nha pai.
    man REL come see-2SG COP 1SG.POSS papa
    ‘The man who came to see you is my father.’

The occasional use of demonstratives to mark definiteness is also found in Diu Portuguese. The use of Diu Portuguese demonstratives *es* and *ikal* with definite NEs is, however, highly irregular (Cardoso 2009).

**9.1.2 Creoles with a dedicated definite determiner**

Next to creoles that do not have a dedicated definiteness marker, we find a number of creoles with a dedicated definiteness marker that show remarkable deviations in the marking of definite NEs from their superstrates. This group is represented by the French-
Based creoles under study.

As I mention in the introduction to this chapter, several French-based creoles have been described in the literature as displaying nominal topic marking of the Gbe type. For instance, Lefebvre (1998) characterizes Haitian Creole determiner *la* as a marker of anaphoric definites. A similar characteristic of Haitian Creole *la* is given in Aboh (2006) who describes it as a marker restricted to discourse-linked NEs. The same claims have been made with regard to Mauritian Creole *la* by Guillemin (2009). As far as the work cited above is concerned, the most comprehensive description of the discourse-semantic properties of the definite determiner is presented by Guillemin (2009). Guillemin illustrates the distribution of the Mauritian Creole definite determiner *la* using Hawkins’ (1978) classification. Her examples are cited under (368)-(375) below.

Mauritian Creole (Guillemin 2009: 67-71).

**Strict anaphora**

(368) Fred ti pe diskit *enn liv interesan* dan so klas.  
Fred PST PROG discuss IND book interesting in POSS class
Mo ’n al diskit *liv la* vek li apre.  
1SG COPML go discuss book DEF with 3SG after
‘Fred was discussing an interesting book in his class. I went to discuss the book with him afterwards.’

**Associative anaphora**

(369) Mari ti arete pu get *enn lakaz*. *Laport* ti uver.  
Mary PST stop PURP look IND house door PST open
‘Mary stopped to look at a house. The door was open.’

**Visible situation use**

Depending on whether there is just one or more than one bucket in the situational context and on whether the speaker wants to identify the only relevant bucket or place the bucket within the spatial range of the speech act, either (370) or (370) may be used.

(370) a. Pas mwa *seo*, do.  
   pass 1SG bucket DM  
   ‘Pass me the bucket, please.’

b. Pas mwa *sa seo la*, do.  
   pass 1SG DEM bucket DEF DM  
   ‘Pass me this bucket, please.’
Immediate situational uses (the object is invisible)

   NEG go there chum dog FUT bite 2SG  
   ‘Don’t go in there, chum. The dog will bite you.’

Larger situational uses, relying on specific knowledge about the referent

(372) Larenn Langleter  
    queen England  
    ‘the Queen of England’

Larger situational uses, relying on general knowledge

(373) *Lalinn* turn our later.  
    moon revolve around earth  
    ‘The moon revolves around the Earth.’

Unfamiliarity uses

(374) Mo byen rapel *kumansman lager* ...  
    1SG well remember beginning war  
    ‘I remember the beginning of the war very well …’

(375) Mo fam ek mwa partaz *mem sekre*  
    1SG wife and 1SG share same secret  
    ‘My wife and I share the same secret.’

The distribution of *la* the way it is described by Guillemin suggests that his marker functions similarly to the nominal topic marker in Gbe languages. However, other French-based creoles considered here, show a considerable number of counterexamples to the idea that *la* replicates the distribution of the Gbe nominal topic marker. First of all, both Haitian and Lesser Antillean creoles display instances of *la* that resemble the use of definite articles in Germanic and Romance languages (see examples in section 9.2). As for the deviations from the definiteness-based pattern observed in these creoles, they do not exactly correspond to the distributional pattern of nominal topic markers. Below, I discuss contexts which favor the omission of *la* in Haitian and Lesser Antillean creoles.

Often, *la* is omitted in the presence of definiteness-inducing modifiers such as possessive pronouns and relative clauses. This is demonstrated in examples (376) and (377).
(376) Rivé douvan kaz a Konpè Zanba, i vuvê on ti pyé-gonbo arrive in.front house PREP friend Zanba 3SG see IND small tree-gonbo douvan pòt-la, i kuéy on gonbo, i ë fè on ti dlo-gonbo in.front door-DEF 3SG cook IND gonbo 3SG make IND little water-gonbo, ë simé douvan pòt a Konpè Zanba, ë i pran and put.it in.front door PREP friend Zanba and 3SG take mandoline-a-y, ë i komansé joué. mandolin-PREP-3SG and 3SG begin play

‘[He] arrived at Zamba’s house, he saw a small gonbo tree in front of the door, he cooked a gonbo, made a little gonbo sauce, and put it in front of Zanba’s door, and he took his mandolin and began to play.’

Haitian Creole (Hall 1953: 77-76)

(377) Pou tout ti-dëzòd m-kônê fè, li bat mwê. for all little-misdeed 1SG-know do 3SG beat 1SG

‘For all the little misdeeds I used to do, she beat me.’

A similar tendency has been observed by Baptista (2002, 2007) with regard to Cape Verdean Creole:

Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2007: 81)

(378) Omi ki ben odja-bu e nha pai. man REL come see=2SG COP 1SG.POSS papa

‘The man who came to see you is my father.’

The omission of definite determiners in these contexts can be attributed to the non-redundancy principle: when the nominal description itself already conveys the definite reading, the use of the definite determiner is superfluous.

Zhribi-Hertz and Glaude (2007) cite examples which bring out another important difference between Haitian Creole la and definite articles in languages like French. Recall from section 4.1.8 that not only indefinite but also definite NEs may be ambiguous with regard to semantic specificity. In Germanic and Romance languages, both specific and non-specific definite NEs appear with a definite determiner. For the sake of convenience, I repeat the relevant examples below:
English (Lyons 1999: 167)

(379)  a. Joan wants to present the prize to the winner – but he doesn’t want to receive it from her.

     b. Joan wants to present the prize to the winner – so she’ll have to wait around till the race finishes.

This is not the case in Haitian Creole. Zhribi-Hertz and Glaude (2007) present contrasting examples from Haitian Creole and French. These examples are cited below. They show that while in French, similarly to English, NEs marked by means of the definite article may receive a specific as well as a non-specific interpretation, in Haitian Creole NEs marked by means of la may only have a specific referent. The use of la with non-specific NEs is infelicitous.

French (Zhribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: 276)

(380) Sonnez: le boucher va vous servez.
     ring DEF butcher will 2PL serve
     ‘Ring the bell: the butcher [a specific one or whichever one is in duty] will come and serve you.’

Haitian Creole (Zhribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: 276)

(381) Sonnen: bouche a ap vin sè vou.
     ring butcher DEF FUT come serve 2PL
     ‘Ring the bell: the specific butcher will come and serve you.’
     *‘Ring the bell: the butcher [whichever one is in duty] will come and serve you.’

My interviews with the native speakers have demonstrated that the same holds for Mauritian Creole.

Mauritian Creole (Guillaume Fon-Sing, p.c.)

(382)  a. Sonn laclos: bouse la pou vin servi twa.
     ring bell butcher DEF FUT come serve 2SG
     ‘Ring the bell: the specific butcher will come and serve you.’

     b. Sonn laclos: bouse pou vin servi twa.
     ring bell butcher FUT come serve 2SG
     ‘Ring the bell: the butcher [whichever one is on duty] will come and serve you.’
I believe that the deviations from the definiteness-based pattern observed above represent heritage of the deictic etymon of the French creole *la* and can therefore be interpreted in the light of the incomplete grammaticalization account described in the introduction to this chapter.

That *la* in French-based creoles can express a deictic feature has been repeatedly observed in the literature (e.g., Valdman 1978:191; Neumann 1985:132; Goodman 1976: 46). In the creoles under study, we find examples where *la* clearly functions as a deictic marker. Consider the following two examples from Mauritian Creole:

**Mauritian Creole (Guillaume Fon-Sing, p.c.)**

**Context:** The interlocutors are sitting together at the table.

(383) a. (eski) to kav pas mwa *disel*?
   Q 2SG can pass 1SG salt
   ‘Could you pass me the salt?’

   b. (eski) to kav pas mwa *disel* *la*?
   Q 2SG can pass 1SG salt DEF
   ‘Could you pass me the salt?’

While a bare NE is perfectly acceptable in this context, *la* can be used to emphasize that the salt is located in the physical context. According to Guillome Fon-Sing (p.c.), (383) is only possible when accompanied by a pointing gesture.

Similar examples can be found in Lesser Antillean Creole and in Haitian Creole. Zribi-Hertz and Glaude (2007) characterize Haitian Creole *la* as a weak deictic marker, which coexists in the creole with the strong deictic marker *sa*. According to Zribi-Hertz and Glaude, the difference between *la* and *sa* (which obligatory co-occurs with *la*), is that while the former only presupposes that the referent is located somewhere in the physical or discourse space, without necessarily expressing deixis (384), the latter may only be interpreted as a maker of deixis (384).

**Haitian Creole (Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: 277)**

(384) a. Pòl akri *lèt* a.
   Paul write letter DEF
   ‘Paul wrote the/this/that letter.’

   b. Pòl akri *lèt* *sa* a.
   Paul write letter DEM DEF
   ‘Paul wrote this/that letter.’
The deictic feature in the semantics of the French creole definite determiners can account for the deviations in the use of these markers from the definiteness-based pattern of the Romance and Germanic type. In the beginning of this section we observed that demonstratives are distinguished from definite markers in terms of the so-called matching constraint, which implies that a demonstrative always instructs the hearer to match the referent of the NE with a directly identifiable entity. In Mauritian Creole, where la may only be used with NEs that refer to entities that are present in discourse or physical space, the matching constraint applies strictly. In Haitian Creole and Lesser Antillean creole the matching constraint appears to have weakened to the extent that the identification of the referent may need to involve inference (as for instance in cases of the associative anaphoric use). However, NEs marked with la still cannot have a Kind referent in these creoles.

The data considered in this section shows that while the distribution of the definite determiner in some creoles (e.g., Mauritian) may be interpreted in favor of substrate influence, there is also convincing evidence showing that the deviations from the definiteness-based pattern we observe in the distribution of creole definite determiners may be attributed to the presence of the deictic feature in the semantics of creole definite determiner, which is likely to represent the legacy of its superstrate etyma.

The incomplete grammaticalization account has an advantage of being universally applicable to all creoles in which the definite determiner is homophonous with and/or etymologically derived from a deictic marker. As observed in section 9.1.1, the creoles without a dedicated definite marker either (e.g., Palenquero, Tok Pisin) do not mark definiteness beyond deixis at all or only do so occasionally (e.g., Cape Verdean, Diu Portuguese). These creoles also present evidence in favour of the incomplete grammaticalization account.

### 9.2 Approximating the definiteness-based pattern

While the literature on the discourse-semantic properties of creole definite determiners primarily focuses on the use of bare NEs in contexts where Germanic and Romance languages would always require a determined NE, among the creoles under study one finds quite a few creoles in which the distribution of definite determiners approximates the definiteness-based pattern. Interestingly, this group is predominantly represented by creoles with Germanic superstrates such as Sranan, Jamaican Creole, Negerhollands, Berbice Dutch, and Afrikaans. But it also includes a couple of Spanish-based creoles: Chabacano and Papiamentu. To illustrate the distribution of definite determiners in these creoles, I adopt a simplified version of Hawkins’ (1978) classification. Examples below illustrate the following uses of definite determiners in Jamaican Creole, Sranan, Negerhollands, Berbice Dutch, Afrikaans, Chabacano, and Papiamentu: direct anaphora, associative anaphora, definiteness-inducing situational context, and definiteness-inducing modification.
Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 3, 63; my data; Sistren 1986: 12)

Strict anaphora

(385) Di square have a upstairs shop and a big old parish church. Me never like di church.

‘The square had an upstairs shop and a big old parish church. I didn’t like the church.’

Associative anaphora

(386) Me stepmadda tek khaki cloth and mek one lickle dolly gem=me.

‘My stepmother took khaki cloth and made a little dolly for me.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

Context: The interlocuters live in the same household.

(387) Go get di brum an go swip uot di shaad.

‘Go get the broom and go sweep out the shed.’

Definiteness-inducing modification

(388) In di evening me get conscious and feel di result a di beating.

‘In the evening I regained my consciousness and felt the result of the beating.’
Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 62, 74, 65, 58)

**Strict anaphora**

(389) …da j bj-a *wan ptjin kritji*. Da m denk a *kritji* no dipi.
then 2SG PST-have IND small creek then 1SG think DEF creek NEG deep
‘Then there was a small creek. Then I thought the creek was not deep.’

**Associative anaphora**

(390) Dûs noo mj um wakti fu artji oten mi e-gwe...
thus now 1SG to wait PREP hear when 1SG IPFV-go.away
Pan, mi tjis a *boskop* a oso.
Pang 1SG get DET message PREP house
‘Thus now I had to wait to hear when I was going away. Pang, I got the message
at home...’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

Context: The life story recorded in the end of the 1950s from a 40-year-old informant. *A oorlog* is used to refer to the World War II.

(391) Da pan *a oorlog* broko.
Then pang DET war break
‘Then pang the war broke out.’

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(392) D a *man dat e-kar i* kon.
Then DET man COMP IPFV-call 2SG come
‘Then the man who called you came.’
Negerhollands (Van Rossem and Van der Voort 1996: 258, 260, 241, 256)

**Strict anaphora**

(393) Weni em a rak a paat, am a fid *een hon*. Am a se:
when 3SG PST hit PREP road 3SG PST find IND dog 3SG PST say
wamaa ju loo blaas soo? *Dë hont* see: mi meesër loo loo mata
why 2SG IPVF blow so DET dog say 1SG master IPFV go kill
mi.
1SG
‘When he reached the road, he found a dog. He said: Why are you panting like
this. The dog said: My master will go and kill me.’

**Associative anaphora**

(394) Di difman sini a kuri staa *sin hus* mi sin jit. Di noli
DEF thief PL PST run leave 3PL house with 3PL food DEF donkey
a hoopoo *dë doo*.
PST open DEF door
‘The thieves ran away from their house and food. The donkey opened the door.’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

(395) Na *di slaventidt*, ers di neger sender ha krii fri.
PREP DEF slave.time before DEF negro PL PST get free.
‘During the times of slavery, before the Negroes got freedom.’

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(396) Dan di kining a rup Tekoma mi Anáánsi *di twee fan sinu*
then DEF king PST call Tekoma with Anansi DEF two of 3PL
mangkandu.
together
‘Then the king called Tekoma and Anansi, the two of them together.’
Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 1991: 352, 360, 349, 348)

Strict anaphora

(397) Ori ha dri, twε jεrma, te en ma. Di mantoko masi nili
3SG have three two woman with one man DEF man.child must nearly
pote pote ma as εke.
old-old more than 1SG
‘She had three, two girls and a boy. The boy must be nearly as old as I am.’

Associative anaphora

(398) So skelpata mu-te mini jεrma, mini-ta jε tok-apu, mini-te
so turtle go-PFV eat 3SG wife eat-PFV 3SG child-PL eat-PFV
jε wari, di=skilit-apu,
3SG house DEF=skeleton-PL
‘So Tortoise went (and) swallowed his wife, swallowed his children, swallowed
his house, the skeletons, his skeletons that he has.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

Context: There is just one creek in the place where the informant comes from.

(399) εke ban-te di krεkε ben…
1SG born-PST DEF creek inside
‘I was born on the creek…’

Definiteness-inducing modification

(400) εk wa hab en, di lasti sosro…
1SG PST have one DEF last sister
‘I had one, the last sister…’
Afrikaans (my data)

**Strict anaphora**

(401) Maak ’n holte in die grond, voer-uit met *matige kol-e* make IND hole in DEF ground covered with moderate coal-PL and plaas die pot op *die kol-e.* place the pot on DEF coal-PL

‘Make a hole in the ground, fill it with middle-sized coals and place the pot on the coals.’

**Associative anaphora**

(402) In die vorige ongeluk het *’n vierjarige seuntjie* ernstige in DEF previous accident have IND four-year-old boy grave burn-PL opgedoen… Kyk of *brandwond-e aan die arms, bors, nek en gesig opgedoen.* have 3SG burn-PL at DEF arm-PL breast, neck and face gained

‘In the last accident, a four-year-old boy badly burned himself. He’s got burns on the arms, neck, breast, and face.’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

Context: Instructions for an exercise in a schoolbook.

(403) **Skryf kort sinn-e oor hierdie letter-s.** write short sentence-PL about this letter-PL

*Die prent* kan jou help om op woord-e te besluit. *DEF picture can 2SG.OBL help PURP on word-PL PURP decide*

‘Write short sentences about this letters. The picture can help you to choose the words.’

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(404) Ons word belinvloed deur *die omgewing waarin ons leef.* 1PL COP influenced through DEF environment in.which 1PL live.

‘We are influenced by the environment in which we live.’
Strict anaphora

(405) Mi a kumpra un bolo. E bolo a wòrdu kome den 10 minüt.
1SG PST buy IND cake DEF cake PST been eaten in ten minute
‘I bought a cake. The cake was eaten in 10 minutes.’

Associative anaphora

(406) Mi a kumpra un bolo. E karma no tabata mashá.
1SG PST buy IND cake DEF frosting NEG COP good
‘I bought a cake. The frosting was not very good.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

Context: A fragment from the fairy-tail *Puss in Boots*, the cat instructs the field workers about what to say when the local king passes by.

(407) Scucha, e rey ta pasa djis aki.
Listen DEF king IPFV pass soon here
‘Listen, the king will soon be passing here.’

Definiteness-inducing modification

(408) Pronto el a bai busca e cosnan cu e pushi a
Quickly 3SG PST go look.for DEF thing-PL REL DEF cat DEF
pidié.
ask
‘Quickly, he went to look for the things the cat asked.’
Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 208, 207, 210, 207)

**Strict anaphora**

(409) El gabilan tyene un anilyo byen bonito. Byen enkantaw el galyina kon este anilyo. Un dia ya presta le kon el anilyo galyina kon este anilyo. Un dia ya presta le kon el anilyo.

‘The hawk had a beautiful ring. The hen was very enchanted with this ring. One day he borrowed the ring to use.’

**Associative anaphora**

(410) Kwando ta bolbe ya si Juan ya pasa le na un when IPFV return PST DEF.PN John PST pass 3SG PREP IND rio. Byen bonito gayót el agwa… river well beautiful fall DEF water

‘When John was returning, he passed by a river. The water was flowing so beautifully…’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

Context: The speaker is in the river; the hearer is standing on the bank.

(411) Si kyere bos kohi kon-migo toma bos todo=el agwa d=el rio. if want 2SG catch OBL-1SG take 2SG all=DEF water of=DEF river

‘If you want to catch me, drink all the water in the river.’

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(412) Un dia el nana di Juan ya manda kon-ele kompra sal na tyangge. One day DEF mother of Juan PST send OBL-3SG buy salt PREP market

‘One day the mother of Juan sent him to buy salt at the market.’

In a number of Romance creoles discussed in sections 9.1.1 and 9.1.2 as examples of creoles in which definite determiners show deviations from the definiteness-based pattern, definite determiners are, in fact, able to cover the same range of uses as definite determiners in the creoles cited above. These creoles are Haitian
Creole (413)-(416), Lesser Antillean Creole (417)-(420) and Cape Verdean Creole (421)-(424). The difference between these creoles and Sranan, Jamaican Creole, Berbice Dutch, Negerhollands, Afrikaans, Papiamentu, and Chabacano is in the regularity of overt marking of definite NEs.

Haitian Creole (Hall 1953: 138, 164, 94; Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007: 281)

Direct anaphora

(413) Vwala you mama ki té-gê you bel pitit fi…
Voila IND mother REL PST-have IND beautiful little girl
tout moun ki té-vini mâdé pou ti-fi-a li pa-té-vlé.
all man REL PST-come ask for little-girl-DEF 3SG NEG-PST-want
‘There was a mother who had a beautiful daughter…everybody who came to ask for the girl, she didn’t want.’

Associative anaphora

(414) Kòmè tòtu bare, l-ap-chaché mét kò li â-ba fèy,
sister tortoise catch 3SG-PROG-search put body 3SG LOC-under leaf
mê tôtô Jâ fini pa-wè li. A-lè-ki-ôle bagay-la
but uncle John COMPL NEG-see 3SG LOC-time-REL-time thing-DEF
gatè.
spoil
‘Sister Tortoise was caught, she tried to hide under the leaves, but Uncle John finally saw her. Then the situation was spoiled.’

Definiteness-inducing situational context

(415) Chémiz sou-ou-a pa-sâblé chémiz ou…
shirt on-2SG-DEF NEG-seem shirt 2SG
‘The shirt on you does not look like your shirt…’

Definiteness-inducing modification

(416) Mori Pòl achte a.
codfish Paul buy DEF
‘The codfish which Paul bought.’
Lesser Antillean Creole (http://creoles.free.fr/Cours/lespri.htm)

**Direct anaphora**

(417) Aaa Konpè Lapin di: “Aaan Zanba, ki malè! Koman sa té rivé ou, non!!!” Alôr, Zanba di: “Ebin, monchè, sè arivé: an té kontan 2SG DM so Zanba say well my.dear it happen DEM PST happen ou, DEM PST happen ou, non!!!”

Then Zanba said: “Well, my dear, that’s how it happened: I wan enjoy music-DEF tooth-DEF break 1SG.not.care PREP DEM so brother Lapin di: “Mé ka ou ké fè épi dan-la?’”

‘Aaa, said Rabbit. Aaa Zanba, how unfortunate! How did that happen to you!!!’

Then Zanba said: “Well, my dear, that’s how it happened: I wan enjoying the music, my tooth broke, I don’t care about that!” Then Rabbit said: “But what are you going to do with that tooth?’

**Associative anaphora**

(418) Lapin ramasé on koko; i pran-y, i koupé têt-la, é i pati.

‘Rabbit picked up a coconut; he took it, he cut off the head, and he went away…’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

(419) I tonbé douvan on gran pyé-koko: on pyé-koko èspanyol, 3SG fall in.front.of IND big tree-coconut IND tree-coconut Spanish and REL PST full monkey 3SG say look PL monkey-DEF yes, 3PL ugly Ka zòt ka santi!’

‘He fell in front of a big coco-tree, a Spanish coco-tree, that was full of monkeys. And he said: “Look at these monkeys! Yes, they are ugly…! How they stink!”

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(420) toulezòt frè-la ki té la all.the.other brother-DEF REL COP there

‘all the other brothers that were there’

**Strict anaphora**

(421) Panha lenha na montadu, bende... Bende *kel fixinhu de* lenha. wood.

‘I would take the wood in the grove and sell it. I would sell that little piece of wood.’

**Associative anaphora**

(422) Mo la e sima Merka, *kes arvi*. si txuba sta ku bentu, say there COP like America DEF tree if rain is with wind

si arvi rebenta, da na bo, la me bu fika.

if tree collapse fall PREP 2SG there itself 2SG stay

‘I tell you, over there it is just like in America, the trees, if the rain comes with strong winds, if the trees collapse and they fall on you, there you stay.’

**Definiteness-inducing situational context**

(423) N ta munda *kel azagua* mi so.

1SG IPFV weed DEF azagua 1SG REFL

‘I weed during the rainy season on my own.’

**Definiteness-inducing modification**

(424) *Kel omi ki’ N odja na merkadu* era bu pai.

DEF man REL 1SG see PREP market was 2SG papa

‘The man that I saw at the market was your father.’

Regardless of the fact that definite determiners in some creoles are used with much less regularity than their Germanic and Romance conterparts and do not fully replicate the discourse-semantic and grammatical properties of Germanic and Romance definite articles the development of the definiteness-based behavior of definite determiners in creoles deserves attention. As I already point out above, most accounts of the distribution of definite determiners in creoles focus on the deviations from the definiteness-based pattern and neglect the definite-article-like-behavior. Section 9.4.1 will be dedicated to this issue.
9.3 Contexts that favor determinerless NEs

While the creoles considered here show variability with regard to the distribution of definite determiners, ranging from nearly categorical definiteness marking to the lack of marking of definiteness beyond deixis, there is one property common to most creoles studied here. This property is the possibility of omitting definite determiners with semantically definite NEs under certain conditions. Some of these conditions has been already discussed in section 9.1.2 based on the data from the French-based creoles. Here I will discuss a number of other contexts in which bare definites are common in the creoles under study.

9.3.1 NEs with unique referents

The uniqueness of the referent in question represents a prominent condition favorable for the omission of definite determiners in creoles. In order for the definite determiner to be omitted, the uniqueness feature needs to be firmly established in the common discourse. The uniqueness may be either absolute or bound to a particular context. Examples of absolutely unique NEs are words denoting entities like ‘sun’ or ‘moon’. Consider some examples:

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 447)

(425) *Sono* das mja lombo fi tke.
   sun HAB make bed for 1SG
   ‘The sun makes (it) hard for me [to work in the field]’

Cape Verdense Creole (Baptista 2007: 74)

(426) *Sol* ta ben mas txeu, ta da kumida mas txeu.
   Sun IPFV come more a.lot IPVF give food more a.lot
   ‘The sun comes out more, there is more food.’

Good examples of NEs that have a unique referent within a given situational context are NEs that refer to features of local geography and are well-established in the community usage. For instance, in Jamaican Creole, *yaad* ‘yard’ also has the meaning of ‘home’, and it is often used to refer to Jamaica. In this case, it occurs without the definite determiner:
Jamaican Creole (my data)

(427) Noweh noh betta dan yaad.
Nowhere NEG better than yard
‘No place is better than Jamaica.’

A similar example can be found in Sranan, where foto ‘town’ is always used to refer to Paramaribo.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 3)

(428) Da m k a foto.
then 1SG come PREP town
‘Then I came to town.’

Kouwenberg (2007) cites similar examples from Berbice Dutch, where birbişi ‘river’ is used to refer to the Berbice River, kreke to the Wiruni Creek, and stati ‘town’ to New Amsterdam.

Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007: 48)

(429) ekë wa stup-a so, kreke ben, ofru Hilda-apu.
1SG PST live-IPFV so creek inside over Hilda-PL
‘I was living over there, in the Wiruni Creek, across from Hilda and her family.’

Another group of NEs of this type are titles and names of professions that within the context of a particular community or institution refer uniquely to a particular individual.

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 14)

(430) Den dem laugh after me when teacher a beat me.
Then 3PL laugh after me when teacher IPFV beat me
‘Then they laughed after me when the teacher was beating me.’

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 71)

(431) …i n e-wroko, Richard?
2SG NEG IPFV-work Richard
We, nee, m tek ontslag a bas.
well no 1SG take dismissal PREP boss
‘You are not working, Richard?’
‘Well, no, I took a dismissal from the boss.’
Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2007: 75)

(432) N ben ta ntende kuse ki xefri ta kanbersa-m
1SG PST IPFV understand thing REL chief IPFV talk-1SG
‘Little by little, I got to understand what the chief is talking to me about.’

9.3.2 Discourse topics

Another type of definite NEs that in some creoles tend to receive zero-marking are discourse topics. The referents of topical NEs are firmly established in discourse, which makes their identity obvious to discourse participants. This tendency is illustrated below in an example from Sranan.

Sranan (De Drie 1985: 40, from Bruyn 2007: 368-369)

(433) … a pernasi pe Opoko gebore, pe Atyopi gebore, a
DEF plantation where Opoko born where Atyopi born DEF
granmasra dati ben de wan wreedaadige granmasra. […]
plantation.owner DEM PST COP IND evil plantation.owner
Ma a pernasi dati tussyuru sroysi e broko. […]
but DEF plantation DEM always sluice IPFV break
Pernasi feti fu sungu bika sroysi boro…
plantation fight for sink because sluice have.holes
‘But now, the plantation where Opoko was born, where Atyopi was born, that plantation owner was a cruel plantation owner. […] But that plantation, [its] sluice(s) was/were always breaking down. […] The plantation was about to flood because the sluice(s) was/were cracked.’

In the first sentence pernasi, which is specified as the one where Opoke and Atyopi, two of the speaker’s children, were born, is marked by means of the definite determiner a. Then the plantation is referred to again and this time pernasi is introduced by the demonstrative a…dati, which establishes its status as a current discourse topic. On subsequent mentions, the plantation is referred to by means of a bare NE. In her analysis of this example, Bruyn (2007: 368) observes: “[T]he topicality of this plantations as well as the identity are established firmly enough to make the use of a def[inite] article superfluous”.

A similar pattern of determiner use with topical NEs has been described for several other creoles. For instance, with regard to Santome, Alexandre and Hagemeijer (2007) observe that after the introduction of a new Topic into discourse, on its second occurrence it is often anchored by means of se. With the subsequent occurrences of the topical NE, se is usually dropped. This is illustrated in example (434) below:
Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 55-56)

(434) Avia ūa sungê ku mina sun. Sun se sa ve ketekete. Sun se sa ai, sun ka sam=e
was IND man with child man man DEF COP old IDEOPH Mina se sa ai, sun ka sam=e
Child DEF COP here man IPFV call=3SG
‘Once upon a time there was a man (formal) with his child. The man was very old. This child here, the man calls him.’

Sometimes, the overt anchoring of a new discourse topic may be skipped. In this case, a bare noun occurs on the second mention of the referent. This pattern illustrated in example (435) is, however, less common.

Santome (Alexandre and Hagemeijer 2007: 55)

(435) N té ūa mosu ku ūa mina mwala. Mina sa ni kwarenta
1SG have IND boy and IND child woman child COP in forty
tal. Mosu sa nix in kwenta.
something boy COP in in fifty
‘I have a boy and a girl. The girl is in her forties. The boy is fifty.’

A similar tendency has been observed for Lesser Antillean Creole (Gadelii 2007), Haitian Ceole (Joseph 1988; Aboh and Degraff 2010), Cape Verdean Creole (Baptista 2000), Berbice Dutch (Kouwenberg 2007), and several other creoles studied here.

9.3.3 Complements of prepositions

Another context which favors definite determiner omission is defined syntactically as NEs inside (primarily locative) PPs. In many creoles, definite determiners are more easily omitted with NEs that are complements of locative prepositions than with NEs in argument positions. The same tendency has been observed in chapter 8, with regard to indefinite determiners. Definite determiner omission in this this context is illustrated below in examples from Sranan, Negerhollands, Haitian, and Papiamentu.
Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 60)

(436) …dan w e-kon lat a skoro […] then 1PL IPFV-come late PREP school
Da masra ‘Van der Geld’ ben-tnap a mofo doro. then mister Van der Geld PST-stand PREP mouth door
‘Then we came late to school […] Then mister Van der Geld stood in the door opening.’

Negerhollands (Van Rosse and Van der Voort 1996: 255)

(437) …alma di suku sinu wa sinu gooi a ton fo ma rhum all DEF sugar PL REL 3PL throw PREP barrel to make rum
fo di foléégen week.
for DEF next week
‘…all the sugar [canes] that they threw in the barrel to make rum for the next week.’

Haitian Creole (Hall 1953: 77)

(438) Li mété-m kouché a-pa nâ-salô. 3SG put-1SG sleep apart PREP-living.room
‘she put me to sleep apart in the living room.’

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmidt 2007: 122)

(439) Mi no a mira un mancha riba suela. 1SG NEG PST see IND spot on floor
‘I did’t see a particular spot on the floor.’ / ‘I did not see any spots on the floor.’

In Chabacano, the omission of definite (and indefinite) determiners with complements of prepositions has a nearly categorical status.

Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 207)

(440) Ya pone ele el sal na rio […] ya diriti ya el sal PST put 3SG DEF salt PREP river PST dissolve now DEF salt na agwa. PREP water
‘He put the salt in the river. The salt had now dissolved in the water.’
9.3.4 Zero determiner or no determiner: a syntactic analysis

While in chapter 9.4 I will argue that the pragmatic triggers for the omission of overt definiteness marking in the cases considered above are similar, these NEs are clearly not all the same with regard to their specificity value. While topical and uniquely referring NEs are always semantically and pragmatically specific, complements of prepositions are generally distinguished by lower discourse prominence than NEs in subject and object positions. I therefore believe that they can be considered pragmatically non-specific. This seems to suggest that the omission of definite determiners is not sensitive to specificity and that the zero determiner is not specified for specificity. This is the conclusion made by Bruyn (1995, 2007) based on Sranan data. On the basis of examples like (433), Bruyn argues that zero determiners in Sranan are not restricted to non-specific NEs, but are open to both non-specific as well as specific definite interpretation. Consequently, she concludes that zero determiners in Sranan do not “express a distinctive value and should be regarded as merely nothing” (Bruyn 1995: 81). In what follows, I will argue that pragmatically non-specific definite NEs and uniquely referring and topical NEs are fundamentally different with regard to their underlying structure.

I believe that pragmatically non-specific definite NEs realize their [-specific] feature value through a zero determiner in the underlying structure. This is exemplified in (441) below, which represents the structure of the Papiamentu NE *riba suela* ‘on the floor’ from example (439):

(441) 
```
(PP Spec P' P spec Top' riba Spec Top' Top DP [-spec] Spec D' D NP suela)
```

Such NEs demonstrate that overt definite determiners are sensitive to pragmatic specificity. As for uniquely referring and topical determinerless NEs, they neither support nor violate the specificity- and definiteness-based principles of determiner use,
as in contrast to non-specific bare NEs they do not have a zero determiner in the underlying structure. In their referential properties, uniquely referring and discourse prominent topical NEs are akin to proper names. I therefore assume that, similarly to proper names (cf. Longobardi 1994), they have no determiner at all and receive a specific definite interpretation by virtue of raising to Spec-TopP. This is exemplified in (442), which represents the structure of the NE *yaad* from example (427).

Regardless of the differences in the structural representation, the possibility of zero-marking of both pragmatically non-specific and uniquely referring and topical NEs distinguishes the creoles under study from their superstrates. The observed differences in the distribution of creole definite determiners and their apparent Germanic/Romance counterparts suggest that despite the similarities observed in section 9.2, definite markers in creoles have a different discourse-semantic content and grammatical status than definite articles in Germanic and Romance languages. In the next section, I will elaborate on this idea.

### 9.4 Discussion

In this section, I shall interpret the observations made above in the light of the creole genesis debate and discuss the applicability of the accounts of the distribution of definite determiners in creoles mentioned in the introduction to this chapter to the data considered here. As the reader may recall from the introduction, the existing approaches to the distribution of definite determiners in creoles focus on the deviations from the Germanic/Romance definiteness-based pattern of determiner use and propose to account for them in terms of substrate influence or in terms of incomplete grammaticalization. In this chapter, it was demonstrated that the creoles under study do not behave uniformly with regard to the marking of definite NEs. While some creoles under study show
significant deviations from the Germanic and Romance definiteness-based pattern in allowing for bare definites in a wide range of contexts or even not marking definiteness beyond deixis at all, one also finds creoles in which the distribution of definite determiners closely resembles the distribution of their superstate counterparts. On the other hand, despite the considerable variation in the use of definite determiners, many creoles are similar with respect to the contexts which favor bare definites. This complex picture suggests that multiple factors should have affected the distribution of determiners in the creoles. Below, I will attempt to identify these factors. Section 9.4.1 is dedicated to the analysis of the factors underlying the occurrence of bare definites; section 9.4.2 deals with the factors underlying the distribution of overt definite markers in creoles and focuses on the development of the definiteness-based pattern.

9.4.1 Deviations from the definiteness-based pattern: unfinished grammaticalization or substrate influence

In this section, we will focus on creoles that show considerable deviations from the definiteness-based pattern of determiner use the way it is described in Hawkins (1978).

The behaviour of definiteness markers in such creoles has been described in the literature from the perspective of unfinished grammaticalization and from the perspective of substrate influence.

The point of departure of the unfinished grammaticalization approach is that definite determiners in many creoles develop from deictic markers. The deviations from the definiteness-based pattern observed in the behavior of creole definite determiners are are attributed to the incomplete bleaching of the deictic semantics they have inherited from their etyma.

The unfinished grammaticalization approach is supported by the evidence from creoles that do not have a dedicated definite marker different from the demonstrative, which in some of these creoles may be employed to perform a definite-determiner-like function. As observed in section 9.1.1, such creoles either do not mark definiteness beyond deixis at all (e.g., Palenquero or Tok Pisin) or do so irregularly (e.g., Cape Verdean Creole or Diu Portuguese).

In some of the creoles that do have a dedicated definite marker distinct from a demonstrative this marker shows evidence of the incomplete bleaching of the deictic feature. A good example is French Creole la, which goes back to the French postnominal demonstrative reinforcer la. In section 9.1.2, I demonstrate that this marker can be used to express (weak) deixis and argue (together with Zribi-Hertz and Glaude 2007) that some of the the constraints in the distribution of this marker (such as the restriction to specific definite NEs) can be attributed to the fact that it is not a true definite determiner but a weak deictic marker which can perform a definite determiner-like function. Also, the sensitivity of la such to pragmatic principles as the principle of non-redudnancy supports the idea of its incomplete grammaticalization.
The substrate-oriented research offers a different perspective on the distributional properties of creole definite determiners. As observed in the introduction to this chapter, substrate languages of some of the creoles under study display a different strategy of reference marking, which relies on the status of the referent in discourse rather than on the definiteness feature. While Germanic and Romance languages, all definite NEs indiscriminately, languages like Gungbe and Yoruba only mark those definite NEs that refer to a previously introduced discourse antecedent. Therefore, they have been characterized in the literature as nominal topic markers (e.g., Aboh 2004b).

The idea of substrate influence has been invoked in the literature to account for the anaphoric/topic marking function of the creole definite determiners (cf. Lefebvre 1998; Aboh 2004c, 2006; Guillemin 2009). In this chapter, I observe that in no creole under study is the use of elements identified as definite determiners restricted to the marking of topical NEs. I do not, however, take this to imply that substrate influence did not play any role at all in the establishment of the development of creole definite determiners. In what follows, I will argue that despite the fact that creoles do not fully replicate the distribution of nominal topic markers in Niger-Congo languages, certain aspects of the behavior of Niger-Congo nominal topic markers might have affected the development of the discourse-semantic properties of definite determiners in creoles.

Let us first of all have a closer look at the discourse-semantic properties of nominal topic markers in Niger-Congo languages. In the introduction to this chapter, following Aboh (2004a,b, 2010), I characterize them as dedicated markers of discourse-linked NE. However, this characteristic does not fully describe their distribution. First of all, nominal topical markers are not used categorically. With regard to the use of l杰 in Gungbe, Aboh observes that it tends to be omitted with established discourse topics. As we observed in section 9.3.2, the same tendency is observed with regard to definite determiners in creoles. Importantly, this tendency is also cross-linguistically characteristic of anaphoric demonstratives. As far as demonstratives are concerned, their omission with established discourse topics is attributed to the fact that demonstratives are attention focusing devices (cf. Diessel 1999). The same seems to be true for nominal topic markers of the Gungbe type. Below I will discuss examples that illustrate the emphatic, attention focusing function of nominal topic markers.

Enoch Aboh (p.c.) observes that l杰 in Gungbe may be used not only with discourse-linked but also with situational definites when certain pragmatic conditions are satisfied. Consider, for instance, examples (443). Both are possible in the same context: the interlocutors are sitting together at the table. In a neutral situation, the use of l杰 is disfavored. The use of the determiner puts emphasis on the referent of the NE, thus conveying an emotional attitude of the speaker. The use of l杰 after xelâk杰5 is, for instance, plausible when the speaker has been trying to reach the salt for quite some time and nobody would bother to pass it to him.
Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)

Context: The interlocutors are sitting together at the table.

(443) a. Zé *xwla*$ká ñá mí.
take salt give ISG
‘Give me the salt.’

b. Zé *xwla*$ká $ló ñá mí!
take salt DEF give ISG
‘Give me the salt!’

In certain contexts, when the referent itself or its behavior is remarkable, the emphatic $ló$ is obligatory. This is demonstrated in example (444) below.

Gungbe (Enoch Aboh, p.c.)

Context: The interlocutors look out of the window and one of them suddenly sees a man flying by. He exclaims:

(444) Kpón *dáwè* *(ló)!*
look man DEF
‘Look at this guy!’

Recall that we also observed the expression of emphasis on the referent in question (or its certain qualities) with the nominal topic markers in Yoruba (347) and Mandinka (350)-(351). This suggests the emphatic feature maybe characteristic of elements that perform the function of nominal topic markers and that their functioning is not restricted to the marking of discourse topics. Further investigation is required to shed more light on this issue.

The data considered here shows that Niger-Congo nominal topic markers show properties which in Germanic and Romance languages are associated with demonstratives and that these properties are not restricted to the tracking of discourse topics. Similarly to demonstratives, nominal topic markers may function as attention focusing devices and convey speaker’s emotional attitude.

I thus believe that in addition to the fact that demonstratives are semantically and phonologically more salient than definite articles, the converging semantic and pragmatic properties of nominal topic markers and Germanic and Romance demonstratives might have been the reason why demonstratives, and not definite determiners (whose distribution does not always rely), were selected to perform the function of NE markers in creoles. The distributional properties of these newly developed markers might have been further affected by the properties of the contributing
languages as well as the universal processes such as grammaticalization. These further developments will be the focus of the next section.

9.4.2 The development of the definiteness-based pattern: grammaticalization or superstrate influence

In section 9.4.1, I attempted to account for the deviations from the definiteness-based pattern in the behaviour of creole definite determiners. This section focuses on the development of the definite-article-like behavior of definite determiners observed in a number of the creole under study.

While the idea of unfinished grammaticalization of creole definite markers can be supported by the fact that they display incomplete bleaching of the deictic feature, the idea of grammaticalization as a trigger for the development of definiteness marking in creoles remains speculative if it is not supported with diachronic evidence.

Diachronic research into the distribution of definite determiners in creoles presents us with different results. While Bruyn’s (1995, 2007) research on Sranan shows an increase in the use overt definiteness marking overtime, these findings are not replicated in other diachronic research into creole NEs. According to Guillemin’s (2009) diachronic analysis of the distributional behavior of la in Mauritian Creole, this marker, which initially only functioned as a demonstrative reinforcer, was reanalyzed as a syntactically independent nominal topic marker. While the data presented here demonstrates that the use of la is not restricted to this function, it is nevertheless clear that la is constrained in its distribution more than the definite determiners in Sranan. Sankoff and Mazzi (1981), who investigated the changes in the distribution of dispela and ia between 1920 and 1970, found no signs of development towards the definiteness-based pattern. Although Tok Pisin is a relatively young creole, which only emerged in the second half of the 19th century and is therefore considerably younger than the majority of the creoles considered here, Sankoff and Mazzi’s results question the fact that the grammaticalization of definiteness will never take place in Tok Pisin. After all, plenty of much older languages of the world have not grammaticalized definiteness marking.

Given this, it is important to understand why some creoles develop in the direction of definiteness marking and others don’t. I believe that one of the possible answers to this question can be found if we also consider the factor of superstrate influence.

Among the creoles where the distribution of definite determiners closely resembles the Germanic/Romance definiteness-based pattern we find a number of creoles that have developed in a very close contact with their superstrate languages. These are, for instance, Jamaican Creole, Afrikaans and Chabacano. Note also that two of these creoles – Jamaican and Chabacano – differ from the majority of the creoles considered here in that they have adopted the definite determiners of their superstrate languages (see chapter 5).
The correlation between the regularity with which the definite determiner is used in a creole and the high intensity/long duration of the contact between this creole and its superstrate which we seem to find in these creoles can, however, only be proven to exist if we can demonstrate that the lack of intense and prolonged contact between a creole and its superstrate produces significantly different results. In Bobyleva (2011a), I compare the use of definite determiners in Jamaican Creole and Sranan.

Both creoles developed in the latter part of the 17th century in the plantation colonies of the British as a result of contact between the British settlers and the West African (Kwa (Gbe), Benue-Congo, and Bantu) slaves. Despite their common socio-historical and linguistic sources, Jamaican Creole and Sranan have a quite different linguistic history, the main difference being the amount of contact with their main lexifier, English. As already observed in section, 8.4, Jamaican Creole developed in a continuous contact with English, which has always remained the official language of the colony. Combined with the pressure from English as a language of prestige and socio-economic growth, the contact between English and Jamaican Creole gave rise to a situation where very few (if any) Jamaicans use the “deep” creole, referred to as *basilect*. The majority of Jamaicans, especially in the urban areas, speak a variety (or varieties) in between the basilect and English, so-called *mesolect*, creating a creole-to-English speech continuum.

The linguistic situation of Surinam is very different. The direct influence from the varieties of English spoken by the English only lasted thirty years. Surinam started out as an English colony in 1651 but in 1667 it was taken over by the Dutch. By 1680 almost all English slave-owners had left the colony with their slaves. The slave population of Surinam, however, continued speaking an English-based creole, and the Dutch influence hardly penetrated beyond the level of lexicon.

The different amount of contact with the lexifier has had a significant impact on the linguistic properties of the creole languages that developed in Jamaica and Surinam. Jamaican Creole, in particular its most widely spoken mesolect variety, shows much more affinity with English than Sranan. In what follows, I will demonstrate that this also holds for the distribution of the definite determiner.

In both creoles, the definite determiners commonly tend to follow the definiteness-based patterns. One does, however, find several differences between them, which seem to be significant for the superstratist argument. For instance, while *di* in Jamaican Creole systematically occurs with so-called unfamiliar definites (cf. Hawkins 1978), that is NEs modified by an ordinal numeral, an adjective in the superlative form or the adjectives *same, only, last*, or *next*, definite determiners in Sranan appear to behave less systematically when modifiers of the aforementioned types are involved. Also, the omission of the definite determiner with unique NEs is less regular in Jamaican than in Sranan (see example (445), where the nouns *sun* and *sky* that denote unique entities are overtly marked), and the omission of the definite determiner with Topic NEs has not been attested in the Jamaican Creole data I have consulted.
Further, in contrast to Sranan, in Jamaican Creole one may find semantically vacuous instances of the definite determiner which parallel the distribution of the in English. As demonstrated in (446) and (447), generic NEs in both creoles commonly occur without a determiner.

Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 62)

(446) Soso Tamkaman mag sjwen dape.
     only Tamka.man may swim there
    ‘Only Tamka men may swim there.’

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 45)

(447) Member seh man a green lizard.
    remember COMP man COP green lizard
   ‘Remember that men are green lizards.

However, in Jamaican Creole, in contrast to Sranan NEs that are marked as definite may also receive a generic interpretation:

Jamaican Creole (Stewart 2007: 397)

(448) Di manguss chrikifai.
    DEF mongoose cunning
   a. ‘The mongoose (over there) is cunning.’
   b. ‘The mongoose (in general) is cunning.’

The same holds for so-called weak definites (cf. Poesio 1994; Carlson & Sussman 2004). While in Sranan these are always marked by means of bare NEs (449), in Jamaican creole both bare NEs (450) and NEs marked with di (451) are possible:
Sranan (Voorhoeve 1962: 59)

(449) Taka, u bê-luku san a strati.
Say 1PL PST-PROG-look thing PREP street
‘Say, we were looking at things in the street.’

Jamaican Creole (Sistren 1986: 62, 75)

(450) She use her to carry di excess load pon her head
She use 3SG.F.OBL to carry DEF excess load on 3SG.F.OBL head
when she going to market.
when 3SG.F.NOM go-PROG to market
‘She used her to carry the excess load on her head when she was going to the market.’

(451) Mr Iris have to be on the road by six thirty…
Mr Iris have to be on DEF road by six thirty
‘Mr Iris had to be on the road by six thirty…’

The differences between Jamaican Creole and Sranan discussed above show that the former has more affinity with English with regard to the definite determiner use than the latter. The semantically vacuous instances of the definite determiner observed in Jamaican Creole are important as they show that it not only employs the same semantic principle of definite determiner use as English but also shows parallels to English in some distributional properties of the definite determiner, which do not straightforwardly follow from this semantic principle. Thus, the expectation based on the differences in the linguistic history of the two creoles is borne out by the data.

A comparison of the distribution of overtly marked and bare definites in Cape Verdean and Santome (Lucchesi 1993) also supports the idea that superstrate influence might have played an important role in the development of definiteness marking in creoles. According to Lucchesi, the overt marking of definite NEs is more common in Cape Verdean than it is in Santome. This correlates with the fact that Cape Verdean developed in a closer contact with Portuguese than Santome (cf. Baptista 2002).

9.4.3 Interpreting the special cases of bare definites

In section 9.3, we observed that despite the variation in the distribution of overt definite determiners, creoles share the property of allowing bare definite NEs in a number of specific contexts. These contexts are NEs with unique referents, topical NEs, and complements of (locative) prepositions.

Uniquely referring NEs very often receive zero-marking not only in creoles but also in other languages of the world. Proper names, which can be considered the
prototype of uniquely referring NEs, are bare in most world languages. As I state in section 9.3, I believe that uniquely referring NEs whose unique status is firmly established in the community usage are perceived as proper names and interpreted in the same fashion. The reference of proper names and uniquely-referring NEs is always unambiguous, which renders the use of the definite determiner superfluous. I therefore believe that the omission of definite determiners with unique NEs is governed by the non-redundancy principle.

The same principle can be made responsible for the omission of definite determiners with topical NEs. Definite determiners in creoles are used to anchor newly introduced discourse participants but tend to be omitted with established discourse topics. As already pointed out in section 9.4.1, this behavior of creole definite determiners parallels the behavior of anaphoric demonstratives. As observed in Diessel (1999) and work cited there, the anaphoric use of demonstratives is particularly common with the second mention of a newly introduced referent, when the topical status of this referent is being established. Once a new discourse participant has been established as a discourse topic, it is usually tracked by third person pronouns, NEs marked by means of definite determiners (if the latter are available), or bare NEs. This restriction in the use of demonstratives is related to the fact that demonstratives are attention-focusing devices. When the attention of the hearer is already focused on a referent, the use of a demonstrative becomes redundant and less marked strategies of referent tracking are preferred. The same tendency is observed with nominal topic markers. The general strategy can be thus described as follows: use more informative and salient markers to establish the discourse topic and less informative/salient ones to track the established discourse topic. Such a strategy is clearly based on the non-redundancy principle.

The non-redundancy principle is also likely to be responsible for the omission of definite determiners with NEs containing definiteness-inducing modifiers, discussed here in section 9.1.2 on the basis of the data from several Romance creoles.

In the case of topical and uniquely referring NEs, the redundancy of overt definiteness marking appears to be caused by the discourse prominence of their referents. When as a result of its recurrent mention, the specific referent of an NE has been activated and firmly established in the current discourse or within the community use, overt definiteness marking becomes unnecessary in order to establish the identity of the referent. With NEs containing definiteness-inducing modifiers are concerned, the redundancy of the definite determiner is caused by the presence of other (lexical) indicators of definiteness inside the NE. (Recall from chapter 7 that the same principle has been invoked to account for the omission of plural marking with NEs that contain other indicators of plurality such as plural numerals and quantifiers.)

As for the omission of definite determiners with complements of locative prepositions, I believe it can be accounted for in terms of pragmatic non-specificity. In section 9.1, I observe that definite determiners in (at least) some creoles are not used with semantically non-specific NEs. While definite complements of locative prepositions may be semantically specific when they denote specific referents that are
assumed to exist, they may be pragmatically non-specific in that their identity is not important for the point at issue. NEs inside locative PPs often have less discourse prominence than subjects and objects.

Summing up, the non-redundancy principle appears to be crucial for the omission of definite determiners with topical, uniquely referring as well as pragmatically non-specific NEs. As observed by Kouwenberg (2007), the reasons behind the omission of determiners with uniquely referring and topical NEs and pragmatically non-specific definites may be similar. She points out that in both cases the identity of the referent is not at issue, either because it is considered unimportant or because it is self-evident.

The sensitivity of creole definite determiners to such discourse-pragmatic principles as non-redundancy, which allows for their omission with semantically definite NEs, presents evidence for the incomplete grammaticalization of these markers.

The ability to use a zero definite determiner with pragmatically non-specific definite NEs (cf. section 9.3.4 for the structural analysis) observed in creoles is particularly informative in this respect as it clearly demonstrates that the syntactic status of creole definite determiners is different from the syntactic status of definite articles in Germanic and Romance languages. In addition to expressing the semantics of definiteness, definite articles in Germanic and Romance languages perform the syntactic function of turning a nominal predicate into a referring expression and assigning it the status of an argument. According to Abney (1987), this justifies the analysis of definite articles as heads of the functional projection DP. In creoles, not only determined but also determinerless NEs can be used referentially and receive a definite interpretation. This suggests that even in creoles like Jamaican and Chabacano, which closely resemble the definiteness-based pattern and allow for bare definite NEs only occasionally, definite determiners are not (yet) fully grammaticalized DP heads.

Uniquely referring and topical NEs are treated in a special way in many world languages and receive zero-marking even in languages with fully grammaticalized definiteness marking. Zero-marking of some uniquely referring NEs is, for instance, observed in Germanic and Romance languages. Consider, for instance English God, Dutch God ‘God’, French Dieu ‘God’, Spanish Dios ‘God’, and Portuguese Deus ‘God’. This suggests that zero-marking of uniquely referring NEs is not always indicative of the unfinished grammaticalization of the definite determiner. On the other hand, even among languages with grammaticalized definite articles, in some languages this process of grammaticalization appears to have gone further than in others. For instance, in Portuguese proper names of persons can be used with a definite article, such as, for instance, o Roberto (lit.) ‘the Roberto’ or a Ana (lit.) ‘the Ana’. In Greek, the use of the definite article with proper names is obligatory.

On the whole, one can observe that while some languages disallow or disfavor zero marking of proper names, uniquely referring NEs, and topical NEs, other languages allow or even require the presence of a definite determiner in these contexts. The spread of definite articles to contexts where its presence is superfluous may be indicative of the
fact that the definite article is being reinterpreted as a desemanticized noun marker (cf. Greenberg 1978). The fact that all creole languages strongly disfavour definite determiners in such contexts again supports the idea that they are markers with a heavy semantic content and that they instantiate earlier stages of grammaticalization than definite articles in their superstrate languages.
Part III

Synthesis
Chapter 10

Discussion and conclusions

This study set out to examine the properties of creole NEs with the intention to obtain findings relevant for the ongoing creole genesis debate. Before the main conclusions in this respect, I will first summarize the background of the study, review its main aims, and present a brief overview of the chapters.

In the course of the history of creole studies, quite a number of conflicting ideas concerning the birth and development of these languages have been expressed. Among the major sources of creole structure, scholars distinguished the input from the source languages (i.e. substrates and superstrates), and UG. The focus certain researchers put on one of these sources coupled with the denunciation of the others has produced the substrate, superstrate, and universalist approaches to creole genesis which, in their radicalism, deny each other completely. Next to theories highlighting the role of one of the sources of creole languages, we find research that focuses on the processes underlying the development of creoles such as L2 acquisition and grammaticalization.

Research carried out prior to this study, (Aboh 2004c, 2006; Bobyleva 2006) had already provided strong evidence that none of the factors mentioned above, taken in isolation, could account for the properties of creole NEs. This study set out to substantiate this conclusion. The main research questions of the study are revisited below:

(i) How is the structural organization and interpretation of NEs in creole languages different from/similar to the structural organization and interpretation of NEs in their superstrate and substrate languages?

(ii) How does the substrate and superstrate input affect the developing creole? Does it remain unchanged or does it undergo restructuring as a result of interaction with other contributing linguistic systems, adaptation to the new creole system, or any other factors?

(iii) Can all properties of creole NEs be accounted for in terms of substrate or superstrate influence or a combination thereof? Are innovative properties of
creole NEs, unattested in their source languages, suggestive of the role of universal principles in creole genesis?

(iv) Which factors, linguistic or non-linguistic, control the competing influences of substrate and superstrate languages and universal principles?

The current study attempted to provide answers to these questions by performing a systematic comparative analysis of NEs in fifteen creoles contrasted to their superstrate and substrate languages.

The book begins with an extensive introductory part, which sets the stage for the analysis providing the necessary background with regard to the linguistic and socio-historical factors underlying contact language formation and creolization (chapter 2), currently prominent views on the issue of creole genesis (chapter 3) and the functions, semantics and structure of NEs (chapter 4).

Chapters 5-9 deal with different aspects of creole NEs. Chapter 5 focuses on the etymology of creole nominal markers. Chapter 6 discusses the structural organization of NEs in creoles. Chapters 7-9 are concerned with the distribution of overt nominal markers as opposed to bare NEs. Chapter 7 deals with the expression of individuation and number. Chapter 8 discusses the marking of indefinite NEs. And chapter 9 deals with the marking of definite NEs.

The sections that follow list the major empirical observations concerning the form and distribution of creole NEs (section 10.1), consider what these observations can tell us about the sources of creole languages and processes involved in the development of creoles, and factors that affect the outcome of language contact (10.2). After having looked at the implications of the findings of the study for the issue of creole genesis, the focus will be on its relevance for the existing views on the structural and interpretational properties of NEs and the typology of nouns and nominal markers (section 10.3). Finally, the limitations of the study will be discussed by sketching some open issues and proposing directions for further research (section 10.4).

10.1 Major empirical observations

This section, presents a list of the major empirical observations concerning creole NEs arrived at in this study. These start with a number of general observations concerning the etymology, formal properties and distribution of creole nominal markers. Subsequently, there will be a characterization of plural markers, indefinite determiners, and definite determiners according to the same parameters.
Etymology

- Creoles rarely adopt plural markers and (in)definite determiners directly from their source languages.
- The overwhelming majority of creoles develop plural markers and (in)definite determiners anew through reanalysis/grammaticalization of lexical or (more semantically) grammatical items with a similar meaning and/or function.
- The form of these items is always derived from one of the source languages.
- With few exceptions, creole nominal markers are superstrate-derived.

Structure

- Creole nominal markers have lost the number and gender distinctions their etyma express in the source languages. Creoles disfavor agreement and double expression of the same feature.
- The ordering and the selectional properties of nominal elements are largely based on the patterns provided in the superstrate input.
- The deviations from the superstrate patterns with regard to word order and selectional properties of nominal elements result from substrate influence and language-internal developments.

Distribution

- Creole languages use bare NEs in a wider range of contexts than their superstrates. Bare NEs may have an individuated and a non-individuated, a singular and a plural, an indefinite and a definite and a non-specific and a specific interpretation.
- The distribution of overt markers in creoles is commonly affected by the following factors: (i) the non-redundancy principle, (ii) referential properties of the NE such as animacy, specificity, and definiteness, and (iii) discourse prominence of the NE.

Indefinite determiners

Etymology

- Indefinite determiners (unless directly adopted from the superstrate) always derive from the superstrate numeral ‘one’.
Structure

- Indefinite determiners occur at the left edge of the NE, paralleling the ordering properties of their superstrate etyma (the numeral ‘one’) as well as indefinite articles in Germanic and Romance languages (which also historically derive from the numeral ‘one’).

Distribution

- In many creoles, the use of indefinite markers is sensitive to specificity. The application of the specificity constraint is, however, never categorical. Its impact varies across creoles.

Definite determiners

Etymology

- Definite determiners (unless directly adopted from the superstrate) always develop from superstrate deictic elements, demonstratives or demonstrative reinforcers. The derivation of definite determiners from the demonstrative reinforcers is particularly common among French-based creoles.

Structure

- Definite determiners typically derive their ordering properties and selectional properties from their superstrate etyma.
- The most common deviation is the syntactically independent occurrence of post-nominal definite determiners, which derive from demonstrative reinforcers. In Germanic and Romance languages, demonstrative reinforcers are always syntactically dependent on prenominal markers of deixis.

Distribution

- The marking of definite NEs varies greatly across creoles, ranging from the marking of definiteness only in combination with deixis to nearly categorical definiteness marking. In certain contexts, the omission of definite determiners is particularly common across creoles. These are non-specific NEs, NEs with low discourse prominence, NEs containing definiteness-inducing modifiers, topical NEs and uniquely referring NEs.
Plural markers

Etymology

- The origins of plural markers are rather diverse. In addition to plural markers directly adopted from superstrate and substrate languages, creoles mark plurality by means of plural forms of superstrate demonstratives, superstrate-derived lexical items with plural/collective semantics, and superstrate- and substrate-derived 3Pl pronouns. 3Pl pronouns represent a particularly common source of plural markers, as far as Atlantic Creoles are concerned.

Structure

- The formal properties of creole plural markers typically parallel those of their superstrate and substrate etyma, when the latter are used adnominally in the source language.
- When the etyma of creole plural markers are not used adnominally, the acquisition of an adnominal function is accompanied by the development of new structural properties.

Distribution

- The use of overt plural markers in creoles is often sensitive to the presence of other indicators of plurality, as well as the referential properties of the NE (i.e. animacy, specificity, and definiteness).
- In some creoles, plural markers are also used to express the associative plural

10.2 Implications for the issue of creole genesis

A comprehensive discussion of the implications of the observations made above for the issue of creole genesis was presented in chapters 5-9. The observations listed above have important implications for the creole genesis debate. Some aspects of the etymology, structural properties and distribution of creole nominal markers have been already invoked by several scholars in the literature on creole genesis. In the chapters of the book, I interpret the findings listed above putting my own interpretation next to the views expressed by other researchers. In this section, focus is on the major theoretical implications of the findings of this study.
10.2.1 Etymology and Structure

The etymology and the structural properties of creole nominal markers bring out the role of superstrate languages in creole creation: nominal markers which develop through adaptation and reanalysis of superstrate lexical and functional items with a similar semantics and function typically preserve the structural properties of their etyma.

The advocates of the view on creole genesis as a result of gradual restructuring of the superstrate (e.g., Chaudenson 2003) interpret this in favor of the idea that superstrate languages were the languages targeted by creole creators and that the process of restructuring of the target material, which took place during unguided second language acquisition, depended solely on the variants and developmental directions available in the superstrate.

It should, however, be pointed out that superstrate-derived material was rarely transferred into creoles without undergoing change. The most common phenomenon affecting creole nominal markers is the reduction of the range of overtly realized grammatical features, specifically instantiated in the loss of number and gender agreement. With regard to this aspect of the process of creolization, I adhere to the view expressed by Aboh (2006), that purely structural features that are not interpretable at the discourse-semantics interface are the most likely ones to be eliminated in a language contact situation. Agreement features clearly belong to this type. In the literature, it has been observed that the lack of agreement is a feature creoles share with interlanguages. Based on this parallel, the loss of agreement in creoles has been analyzed by some authors as a typical outcome of imperfect L2 acquisition (see, for instance, Plag 2008b, who claims that creoles represent interlanguages of an early stage). As demonstrated in this study, in creolization the loss of agreement may affect not only superstrate-derived but also substrate-derived items. Among such examples is the Kikongo/Kimbundu-derived class prefix *ma* which lost its class specifications in Palenquero. The loss of agreement in learners’ L1 obviously cannot be accounted for in terms of imperfect L2 acquisition. It is therefore concluded in the present study that the loss of agreement in creolization primarily has to do with the fact that the expression of agreement is uninformative and does not contribute to the efficiency of communication.

Further, it should be emphasized that the superstrate input can be adopted in creoles in several different ways, whereby the function and structure of superstrate-derived items may remain largely unchanged or be modified to varying degrees. For instance, superstrate-derived nominal markers in creoles may develop through:

(i) Acquisition of superstrate grammatical markers of plurality and (in)definiteness in the function they perform in the superstrate

(ii) Reanalysis of superstrate functional and lexical items and structures, whereby they acquire a new function.
An example of (i) is the acquisition of superstrate plural morphology observed in Jamaican Creole, Tok Pisin, Afrikaans and Cape Verdean Creole. Examples of (ii) are, the development of creole indefinite and definite determiners from superstrate-derived numerals and demonstratives, the development of creole plural markers from superstrate-derived 3Pl pronouns or the development of creole deictic markers from superstrate-derived demonstrative reinforcer constructions of the type DEM-N-here/there.

The reanalysis of the function of superstrate-derived items can represent the result of grammaticalization and substrate influence. As argued in chapters 5, 8 and 9, the development of indefinite determiners from the numeral ‘one’ and definite determiners from deictic markers are examples of grammaticalization, which is likely to have taken place without the influence of any of the contributing languages. The reanalysis of 3Pl-pronouns as plural markers is often considered in the literature to instantiate the reanalysis of the function of superstrate-derived items based on the way in which similar items are used in the substrate. As argued in chapter 7, the idea of the substrate origins of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in creoles is rather questionable. Some functional properties of creole 3Pl-derived plural markers are, however, likely to be patterned on the functional properties of their substrate counterparts. Associative plural marking is an example of such functional properties.

The reanalysis of the superstrate input may not only involve a modification of the function of the superstrate-derived lexical and functional items and structures but also affect the structural properties of the reanalyzed elements. In addition to the loss of gender and number agreement particularly common in creoles, the following types of restructuring can be distinguished:

(i) Superstrate-derived items acquire new structural properties based on the pattern of other superstrate structures.
(ii) Superstrate-derived items acquire new structural properties under influence of the substrate structural patterns.

(i) is, for instance, represented in the development of the deictic expression of the type DEF-N-DEM and of definite plural NEs of the type DEF-N-PL (where the plural marker is a free-standing determiner-like element) based on the DEM-N-here/there pattern. The DEF-N-DEM pattern is found in several creoles such as for instance, Sranan and Berbice Dutch. In the DEF-N-DEM structure, the slot originally filled by locative adverbs, is filled by a deictic element that derives from a demonstrative pronoun. In this structure, demonstrative pronouns are reanalyzed as adnominal markers of deixis. A detailed discussion of this phenomenon is provided in section 6.2.5. As for the DEF-N-PL pattern, it is, for instance, attested in Jamaican Creole and Negerhollands. In the DEF-N-PL structure, the slot of the demonstrative reinforcer is filled by an element which is derived from a 3Pl pronoun. In this structure, 3Pl pronouns are reanalyzed as adnominal markers of plurality (and definiteness).
(ii) is represented by syntactically independent postnominal elements, definite determiners and determiner-like plural markers. Such markers are found in several of the creoles under study: Tok Pisin, Haitian Creole, Mauritian Creole, Lesser Antillean Creole and Santome. Consider, for instance, Haitian Creole, where both definite determiners la (sg.) and yo (pl.) as well as demonstratives sa and sila are postnominal. In Germanic and Romance languages, one does not find syntactically independent postnominal markers. Demonstrative reinforcers, which occur in this position, are always syntactically dependent on the presence of prenominal markers of deixis. In this respect, Germanic and Romance languages can be contrasted with the substrates of most of the creoles listed here. In many Niger-Congo languages, determiners, plural markers, and demonstratives are all postnominal.

The development of structural patterns unattested in Germanic and Romance superstrates may be interpreted as counterevidence to Chaudenson’s (2003 and other work) claim that creole languages lack positive transfer of obviously non-European features. The phenomena observed in (ii) seem to lend support to Lefebvre’s (1998) view on the process of creolization, which suggests that the structural organization of creoles is derived from the substrate. I would, however, treat these and as well as some other instances of postnominal markers (see (i)) as cases of convergence, reinforcement of the pattern present in the superstrate under the influence of a similar pattern present in the substrate (cf. Chaudenson and Mufwene 2001; Mufwene 2001; Chaudenson 2003). The structural organization of creole NEs clearly shows that creoles generally make a more extensive use of the postnominal space than their superstrates. The “activation” of this space is likely to be the result of substrate influence but the “potential” to use this space was already present in the superstrate languages.

Many structures involving postnominal elements are patterned on the superstrate demonstrative reinforcer constructions. In creoles that nowadays display syntactically independent postnominal markers, these markers derived from syntactically dependent postnominal elements at some point in creole history and/or can be shown to occupy the originally demonstrative reinforcer slot. For instance, with regard to Mauritian Creole, Guillemin (2009: 148) observes: “In early M[auritian] C[reole], the demonstratives çà…là seem to pattern exactly like in French in that the demonstrative precedes the noun, là is postnominal, and, initially là is not used independently of çà”.

The reanalysis of la as a (specific) definite/topic marker, which, according to Guillemin, took place around 1820, lead to its syntactic independence from the demonstrative sa. In modern Mauritian Creole, la still occurs in the sa N la construction, as use of sa requires its presence. The same holds for syntactically independent postnominal elements in other creoles (see chapter 6 for a more extensive discussion).

The role of substrate languages in creole creation can be observed not only in the reinforcement of partially converging superstrate patterns. In the creoles under study, we also find nominal markers with non-European etymology. Interestingly, these markers are subject to similar restructuring processes as superstrate-derived elements.
such as loss of agreement features. Also, they do not always preserve their original function and ordering properties. Among the instances of transfer of the substrate input into creoles, we can also distinguish:

(i) Acquisition of substrate grammatical markers of plurality and (in)definiteness in the function they perform in the substrate.

(ii) Reanalysis of substrate functional and lexical items and structures, whereby they acquire a new function.

(i) can be exemplified by the case of the Chabacano plural marker mango, which is directly adopted from Tagalog and parallels its Tagalog counterpart with regard to its functional and structural properties (see section 6.2.4).

(ii) is represented in the development of the Santome plural marker inen and the Papiamentu plural marker nan from the Edo 3Pl pronoun irã (Maurer 2002) or from the Kimbundu 3Pl ene (Rougé 2004), the development of the Berbice Dutch plural marker -apu from the Eastern Ijo replacive pronoun ápú specified as 3Pl, human, and the development of the Palenquero plural marker ma from the Kikongo/Kimbundu class prefix ma. The pronominal etyma of the Papiamentu, Santome, and Berbice Dutch plural markers are not used in the source languages to mark plurality on nouns. With regard to the Eastern Ijo replacive pronoun ápú, I observe that it may combine with other nominals to form a compound nominal expression with [+human; +plural] reference. Nevertheless, ápú does not belong to the regular means of plural marking in Eastern Ijo.

Kikongo and Kimbundu class prefix ma, which functions as the plural prefix of noun classes V, XI, XIV, XV in Kikongo (Laman 1964) and as the plural prefix of noun classes IV, V, VI, VII, VIII in Kimbundu (Chatelain 1888-89), has a function which rather closely resembles that of a plural marker. It, however, also realizes class specifications of a noun and functions in opposition to the plural prefixes of other noun classes.

In order to establish the triggers for the reanalysis of substrate-derived elements, let us consider the structural properties they have in creoles. As already observed above, the syntax of creole nominal markers that derive from elements that are not used adnominally in the source languages is typically patterned on nominal structures that exist in either the superstrate or the substrate of a creole. I also observe that when a superstrate-derived item develops a new function as a result of substrate influence, it can also acquire the structural properties of the substrate item whose function it is meant to replicate. With regard to substrate-derived nominal markers, the following cases of acquisition of novel structural properties can be identified:

(i) Substrate-derived items acquire new structural properties which replicate the structural properties of functionally similar items in the superstrate.
(ii) Substrate-derived items acquire new structural properties which replicate the structural properties of functionally similar items in other substrates.

(i) is represented by the case of Palenquero ma. Following Moñino (2007), I believe that the structural properties of ma are largely patterned on the morphosyntax of NEs in Spanish. Moñino shows that ma typically appears in positions where in Spanish one would expect the definite articles los/ías or plural inflection of the indefinite article and demonstrative. Another example includes the structural properties of Santome inen and Papiamentu nan. Santome inen occupies the same position as the definite determiner and demonstratives in Portuguese and Papiamentu nan occurs in the position of demonstrative reinforcers.

(ii) is used by Maurer (2002) to account for the development of the structural properties of the plural markers in Santome and Papiamentu. According to Maurer, the reanalysis of the Edo or Kimbundu 3Pl pronoun as a plural marker observed in these creoles represents the result of influence from other Niger-Congo languages in which 3Pl-derived forms are used to mark plurality on the noun. In his study, he invokes Yoruba and Ewegbe as potential sources of the plural marker=3Pl pronoun feature in Palenquero and Santome, as well as of the structural properties of plural markers in Santome and Papiamentu. He argues that the Santome PL-N pattern is based on the PL-N pattern found in Yoruba and that the Palenquero N-PL pattern is based on the N-PL pattern found in Ewegbe. Similarly to what I argued above, I propose to view the development of the structural behavior of Santome inen and Papiamentu nan as a result of the reinforcement of converging patterns of the superstrate and substrate languages.

As a sum up, I observe that both superstrate- and substrate-derived nominal markers can be found in creoles, although the latter are rather uncommon. Superstrate- and substrate-derived nominal markers may either be transferred in the function similar to the one they perform in the source language or develop new functions as a result of the process of grammaticalization or of influence from other contact languages. When a superstrate-derived item is recruited to perform a function that is performed by a similar item in the substrate, the structural properties of the superstrate-derived marker may also be affected by the structural properties of the substrate element that served as a source of the development of its new function. The same holds for substrate-derived plural markers whose structural properties may be developed based on the structural patterns of the superstrate or other substrates. The development of new structural properties is particularly common with elements that are not used adnominally in the source languages. Creole nominal markers that develop from adnominal elements typically preserve (part of) the structural properties of their etyma.

10.2.2 Semantico-pragmatic properties and distribution

While the etymology and the structural properties of creole nominal markers bring out the role of the source languages in the process of creole genesis, particularly that of the
superstrate, their distribution appears to be indicative of the importance of the universal principles of reference marking and discourse organization.

What is identified as function in the previous section only roughly characterizes the semantic and pragmatic content of the nominal markers. As observed in much of the literature on creole NEs, including this study, creole nominal markers identified as (in)definite determiners and plural markers possess a rather different semantic and pragmatic content than their apparent Germanic and Romance counterparts. This becomes obvious if we consider their distribution.

10.2.2.1 Universal principles of reference marking and discourse organization

The distributional properties of creole plural markers and determiners show considerable variation among creoles. Here, I will focus on the tendencies and constraints that are particularly common. As observed in section 10.1, these are: the non-redundancy principle, the referential properties of the NE (animacy, definiteness, and specificity) and the discourse prominence of the NE.

The non-redundancy principle is responsible for:

- the loss of agreement
- the fact that creoles have not developed agreement over time
- the fact that creoles disfavor repeated expression of the same feature

The latter feature is particularly well illustrated in the distribution of creole plural markers. Plural markers in creoles commonly tend to, or even must, be omitted in the following contexts:

- in the presence of plural numerals and quantifiers;
- in the presence of other markers of plurality (in creoles such as Jamaican and Cape Verdean that have several morphological markers of plurality);
- with NEs that are commonly or in a given context likely to refer to pairs or to plural entities.

Certain instances of definite determiner omission in creoles can also be attributed to the non-redundancy principle. The omission of definite determiners in creoles is typical in the following contexts:

- in the presence of definiteness-inducing modifiers such as relative clauses;
- with NEs that refer to unique entities;
- with NEs that refer to firmly established discourse topics.

These examples suggest that the omission of plural markers and definite determiners in creoles may or have to take place whenever discourse context, situational
context or general knowledge suggest that an NE should be interpreted as [+plural] or [+definite, +specific].

Another factor that often controls the distribution of nominal markers in creoles is the referential properties of NEs, which I describe with the notions of animacy, definiteness, and specificity. The role of animacy is illustrated in the following observation:

- Animacy, particularly humanness, plays an important role in the distribution of plural markers in a number of the creoles under study.

The significance of definiteness and specificity in the distribution of creole nominal markers is illustrated in the following observations:

- In many creoles, the use of overt plural markers is restricted to definite NEs. In those creoles where the definiteness constraint does not apply categorically, plural marking usually occurs with all definite and some indefinite NEs. As far as marking of indefinite NEs is concerned, specificity appears to be an important factor that determines whether or not an overt plural marker will be used.
- In most of the creoles under study, the use of indefinite determiners is constrained in terms of specificity. Although contrary to what has been claimed in some literature (e.g., Bickerton 1981) here it was observed that the specificity constraint does not apply categorically, the role of specificity in the distribution of creole indefinite determiners is evident.
- Specificity also plays a role in the distribution of definite determiners. In some of the creoles under study, non-specific definite NEs receive zero marking.

In chapter 4, I distinguish the notions of semantic specificity (defined as the assertion of existence of a particular individual that satisfies the nominal description) and pragmatic specificity (defined as speaker referential intent). The notion of speaker referential intent is the one that appears to be important for the distribution of creole nominal markers. This notion is tightly related to the notion of discourse prominence. In the present study, the following observations are pointed out, with regard to the role of discourse prominence:

- Indefinite determiners that are sensitive to pragmatic specificity typically introduce new discourse topics, that is, NEs that are going to play an important role in the subsequent discourse.
- Old discourse topics also receive a special treatment: while they are always interpreted as [+specific; +definite], such NEs favor the omission of overt definiteness marking. The same holds for uniquely referring NEs, whose
reference might not be prominent in the ongoing discourse but is firmly established in the community use.

- Low discourse prominence is a condition that favors both indefinite and definite determiner omission. In creoles, determiners are far more easily omitted with complements of (locative) prepositions, which typically possess a lower discourse prominence than subjects and objects.

The non-redundancy principle, animacy, definiteness, specificity, and discourse prominence have been repeatedly demonstrated to play an important role in the use of nominal markers not only in creoles, but also in other languages of the world. These factors constrain the variation in the distribution of nominal markers and control the spread in the distribution of nominal markers in the course of the process of grammaticalization (cf. Greenberg 1978; Comrie 1989; Corbett 2000; Givón 1981, 1984; Rijkhoff 2002). This latter observation is interesting in the light of the fact that the majority of nominal markers in creoles have been developed through reanalysis/grammaticalization of superstrate- and substrate-derived lexical or (more semanticized) grammatical items. The sensitivity of these markers to the factors of semantic and pragmatic nature may be interpreted as evidence for their incomplete grammaticalization.

It should, however, be pointed out that not only the distribution of newly created nominal markers, but also the distribution of nominal markers that are directly adopted from the source languages is constrained by factors listed above. For instance, in all the creoles under study that use superstrate-derived inflectional plural markers, these markers are sensitive to animacy. This phenomenon has a logical explanation. According to Comrie (1989), animacy effects on plural marking are cross-linguistically common. Typological studies of plural marking demonstrate that overt plural markers commonly favor animate nouns over inanimate ones. This is attributed to the fact that individuation and number are considered more relevant when the referent is human or animate than with inanimate referents, which may be conceived of as undifferentiated mass.

Summing up, the distribution of creole nominal markers shows sensitivity to the universal principles of reference marking in discourse organization.

10.2.2.2 Substrate influence?

In addition to the fact that they show sensitivity to the universal principles of reference marking and discourse organization (which present evidence in favour of the role of language universals in creole development), creole nominal markers possess distributional properties suggestive of substrate and superstrate influence. Substrate influence has been invoked in the literature to account for the specificity-based behaviour of creole indefinite determiners and for the restriction of definite determiners to discourse-linked NEs (Lefebvre 1998, Aboh 2004c, 2006). As far as indefinite
determiners are concerned, it was observed that the distributional properties of overt indefinite determiners in the creoles under study can in many cases indeed be captured in terms of specificity. However, I question the claim that the restriction of creole indefinite determiners to specificity represents a result of substrate influence. Below, I recapitulate my major counterarguments to this idea:

- Specificity represents a universally prominent constraint on the distribution of indefinite determiners and it has been described for many unrelated languages of the world such as Hebrew, Chinese, Turkish, Russian, and Samoan, to give just a few examples.
- According to Givon (1981, 1984), all indefinite determiners that derive from the numeral ‘one’ have gone through a stage in which they were only used to mark specific definite NEs.
- The research into L1 and L2 acquisition of determiner systems in languages like English shows that both children and adults whose L1 does not have determiners make a common mistake of using the English determiners to mark specificity instead of definiteness (Ionin et al. 2004, 2008; Schaeffer and Mathewson 2005).

With regard to the distribution of definite determiners, it was observed that hardly any of them is restricted in its distribution to the marking of discourse-linked NEs. The deviations from the Germanic/Romance definiteness pattern observed in the behaviour of creole definite determiners can be more straightforwardly shown to represent the heritage of their deictic etyma or to instantiate sensitivity to the universal principles of discourse organization. At the same time, it was observed that Niger-Congo nominal topic markers show properties which in Germanic and Romance languages are associated with demonstratives and that these properties are not restricted to the tracking of discourse topics. Similarly to demonstratives, nominal topic markers may function as attention-focusing devices and convey speaker’s emotional attitude. The converging properties of nominal topic markers and Germanic and Romance demonstratives might have been the reason why demonstratives (and other deictic markers) and not definite articles with their vague semantics were selected to perform the function of NE markers in creoles.

10.2.2.3 Grammaticalization or superstrate influence?

While the majority of the existing claims with regard to the distribution of determiners in creoles focus on the deviations from the Germanic/Romance definiteness-based pattern, in the present study it was observed that in quite a number of creoles indefinite and definite determiners show instances of definiteness-based behavior.

While specificity plays a role in the distribution of indefinite determiners in many of the creoles under study, in none of the creoles does the distribution of the
indefinite determiner fully conform to the specificity-based pattern. The frequency of the indefinite determiner use with non-specific NEs differs across creoles. While in some creoles, the specificity value of an NE nearly always determines whether or not an overt indefinite marker should be used or not, in other creoles, indefinite determiners are less sensitive to the specificity-based constraint and tend to behave like general markers of indefiniteness. The same holds for definite determiners, which in some creoles approximate the Germanic/Romance definiteness-based pattern.

In chapters 8 and 9, I consider grammaticalization and superstrate influence as possible sources of the definiteness-based behaviour of creole determiners. The grammaticalization perspective appears attractive in view of the fact that creole determiners developed anew through reanalysis of demonstratives and numerals. The diachronic analysis of creole determiners does not, however, unanimously support the idea that creole determiners are undergoing a unidirectional development in the direction of grammaticalized definiteness markers. More extensive diachronic research is required to substantiate the claims concerning the role of grammaticalization in the development of the definiteness-based behaviour of creole determiners. In the present study, I focus on the role of superstrate influence as a factor affecting the distributional properties of creole determiners and argue that the prolonged and extensive contact with the superstrate can promote or enhance the development of the definiteness-based determiner use in a creole (see also section 10.2.3).

Summing up, the distributional properties of creole nominal markers are affected by the semantics of their etyma, universal principles of discourse organization and reference marking, grammaticalization, and the influence of languages with which they stayed in contact.

10.2.3 External factors affecting the outcome of creolization

While creole NEs show similarity with regard to such features as lack of agreement, we also observe considerable diversity with regard to structural organization of creole NEs, as well as the distribution of creole nominal markers and bare NEs. In section 10.2, there is a discussion about linguistic factors of universal and individual nature that may affect the development of creoles. In the present section, I emphasize the role of contextual factors such as the characteristics of the contact situation which gave rise to creoles.

In the chapters of the book, it is repeatedly observed that the creoles under study vary with regard to the amount of superstrate-derived features they display and that the amount of superstrate-derived features in a creole typically positively correlates with the amount of contact between the non-European population of the colony and the speakers of the superstrate. This statement is illustrated in the following observations:

- Direct adoption of superstrate-derived nominal markers (i.e. plural inflection and (in)definite determiners) is observed in several of the creoles under study.
These are Tok Pisin, Jamaican Creole, Afrikaans, Chabacano, and Cape Verdean Creole. In most cases, one observes clustering of superstrate-derived features in one creole. For instance, Jamaican Creole, Afrikaans, and Chabacano all exhibit superstrate-derived plural inflectional morphology as well as indefinite and definite determiners that derive from indefinite and definite articles of their superstrates. This is not accidental. These creoles are known to have emerged and developed in an extensive contact with their superstrates.

In some creoles, the distribution of definite and indefinite determiners resembles the Germanic/Romance definiteness-based pattern more than in the others. In these creoles, we find considerably less bare NEs. Based on the comparative analysis of Jamaican Creole and Sranan (section 9.4.2, see also Bobyleva 2011), I claim that differences in the distribution of definite determiners and bare NEs between these two creoles can be related to the different length and intensity of contact with English. A comparison of the distribution of overtly marked and bare definites in Cape Verdean and Santome (Lucchesi 1993) also supports the idea that the length and amount of contact with the superstrate has effects on the development of definiteness marking in creoles.

10.2.4 Creole genesis: summary

The findings of this study suggest that morphophonological and structural properties of creole nominal markers were largely shaped on the basis of the input from superstrate and substrate languages filtered out in accordance with a number of universal and context-specific criteria (e.g., the semantic interpretability of a feature, (partial) convergence between the source languages, the amount and intensity of contact between a creole and its source languages). I therefore believe that the development of the formal properties of creole NEs can be best accommodated and interpreted within the feature pool approach to creole genesis advocated by Mufwene (2000 and other work) and Aboh (2006 and other work). At the same time, I tend to agree with Chaudenson’s point that “in creole languages there are almost no positive transfers of obviously non-European linguistic features” (Chaudenson 2001: 148). Setting the cases of transfer of substrate morphemes aside, the influence of substrate languages on the structure of creole NEs appears to be largely restricted to the reinforcement and (sometimes) modification of the patterns available in the superstrate input.

As far as the discourse-semantic properties of the creole nominal markers are concerned, I argue that much of what we observe in creoles results from the application of the universal principles of reference marking and discourse formation and the universal tendencies of grammaticalization. While this by no means sets creole languages apart as a new typological class, as claimed by Bickerton (1981), McWhorter
(2001) or Bakker et al. 2011, it does show that creoles are more than mixed descendants of their source languages.

10.3 Contribution to the research on nouns and NEs.

By looking at the structure and distribution of creole NEs, the present study contributes to a number of topics within the research on NEs.

10.3.1 Creole data in the light of the DP-hypothesis

In the Introduction to the book I already pointed out that creole data provides a potential challenge to the currently prominent DP-hypothesis (e.g., Abney 1987; Szabolcsi 1987; Longobardi 1994; Chierchia 1998). Assuming that D is a syntactic primitive that assigns reference (i.e. singularizes and individuates the nominal description) and converts nominal predicates into arguments, the wide usage of bare NEs observed in creoles appears problematic. What parameter, if any, allows these languages to use bare nouns in argument positions? Should we, following Longobardi (1994), assume that the DP structure is universal and that creoles are subject to a parameter that allows non-overt D’s so that both determined and bare nouns always project a full DP? Or should we rather adopt the weaker hypothesis that creole languages allow for bare NP structures (Chierchia 1998)?

The existing literature that touches upon the issue of the creole nominal structure presents us with several distinct views. While some researchers (e.g., Stewart 2007) claim that bare NEs with zero determiners in Jamaican Creole are semantically and syntactically equivalent to determined NEs, Bruyn’s (1995, 2007), analysis implies that bare NEs in Sranan possess an impoverished nominal structure.

It is generally assumed that a null element can be postulated if it alternates with an overt morpheme (or morphemes) and if it always expresses a distinct semantic value. Many of the creole languages considered here appear to violate these conditions by using determiners variably and allowing for determined and bare NEs in similar semantico-pragmatic conditions. On the other hand, the variation in the use of determiners is not free. In contrast to determiners and number markers in Germanic and Romance languages, which are only sensitive to definiteness and/or number, creole determiners and number markers are sensitive to a number of interrelated semantic, pragmatic and syntactic factors. In the present study, such factors as the referential properties and discourse prominence of NEs and the non-redundancy principle were shown to constrain the distribution of determined and bare NEs in creoles. This suggests that creole determiners are not optional but have a richer semantic and pragmatic content than their Germanic and Romance counterparts.

What complicates the picture is that the factors listed in the previous paragraph apply variably and do not operate in exactly the same way in all creoles. While some
creoles make an extensive use of overt determiners and plural markers, allowing for bare NEs in a restricted range of contexts, in other creoles overt marking of referentiality and individuation is rather scarce. The variability of determiner use observed within and across creoles makes the creole data problematic for both Longobardi’s and Chierchia’s claims.

According to Longobardi, NEs always project a full DP regardless of whether they occur with an overt determiner or not. If a determinerless NE occurs in an argument position, N is assumed to have raised to the D position (overtly or covertly) or the NE is assumed to comprise a null D + N. The first scenario is applicable to proper names and generics, the second – to determinerless common nouns. In chapter 9, I also used the raising analysis in application to topical NEs to demonstrate that these are different with regard to their underlying structure from non-specific NEs. This analysis undermines Bruyn’s claims with regard to the zero determiner in Sranan, which, according to Bruyn, may occur with non-specific and topical NEs and is therefore ambiguous with regard to specificity. Under the raising analysis, topical NEs do not have a determiner at all. While Longobardi’s analysis helps to distinguish between these two types of definite determiner omission, it cannot accommodate the wide distribution of bare NEs we observe in creoles. Longobardi maintains that determinerless common nouns may only occur in lexically governed positions. Typically, a null D is lexically governed by V. While this observation is true for Romance languages, analyzed by Longobardi, it is violated by many of the creoles studied here.

Creoles also pose problems for Chierchia’s account of the cross-linguistic variation in the use of bare NEs. If we consider Chierchia’s classification of languages in accordance with the Nominal Mapping Parameter, creoles may be grouped together with Slavic and Germanic languages. Such languages do have morphemes, which overtly realize D but allow for bare NEs in certain contexts. Under Chierchia’s analysis, such languages are considered to have both argumental and predicative nouns. The use of determined and bare NEs in such languages is not free but constrained in terms of the Blocking Principle. This principle stipulates that a zero morpheme for a given feature value is blocked whenever the language possesses an overt morpheme which expresses the same feature value. This generalization is problematic for creoles, where elements identified as definite determiners may be omitted in a number of contexts as well as for creoles in which definite referents are normally denoted by means of bare NEs and the use of overt definite markers is only occasional. This problem disappears if we assume that creole nominal markers, which clearly possess a richer semantic and pragmatic content than their apparent Germanic/Romance counterparts, are, in fact, not fully grammaticalized D heads but can be rather regarded as weak deictic markers which are also employed to express the notion of definiteness. This is what I proposed in chapter 9.

If this is the case, creoles should rather be grouped together with languages like Chinese, in which, nouns always denote Kinds and determinerless NEs (structurally represented as bare NPs) freely occur in argument position. This again poses a problem
for Chierchia’s typology. According to Chierchia, languages with argumental NEs are distinguished by having a classifier system and no plural morphology. Most creoles have neither of the two.

This brief discussion shows that creole data clearly poses challenges for the currently prominent views on the structure and interpretation of NEs developed after the introduction of the DP hypothesis.

10.3.2 Creole data and Rijkhoff’s lexico-semantic noun types

The creole data is equally challenging for Rijkhoff’s classification of lexico-semantic noun types. According to Rijkhoff, nouns that are used in languages of the world to refer to spatially discrete entities can be grouped into four lexico-semantic classes based on their inherent specification for the features of individuation and number. These are: singular object nouns, set nouns, sort nouns, and general nouns. Rijkhoff’s classification is based on the analysis of the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs in a sample of typologically different languages.

In chapter 7, I argue that creoles with variable inflectional plural marking pose problems for Rijkhoff’s classification. Based on the distributional and interpretational properties of bare NEs, they fall into the class of set noun languages. The use of inflectional plural marking of the Germanic/Romance type is, however, a property of singular object noun languages, which, according to Rijkhoff’s analysis, should not be compatible with set nouns.

If we want to maintain Rijkhoff’s idea that the differences in the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs are indicative of different lexico-semantic properties of the nouns that head them, then we will be forced to conclude that nouns in creoles with variable plural marking of the Germanic/Romance type have two lexical entries: one with the semantics of a set noun and another with the semantics of a singular object noun. One is activated when a noun occurs in its bare form and the other when it combines with the plural marker -s. Such a rule would obviously go against the principle of economy, which has been repeatedly shown to play an important role in the organization of the language system.

Based on the evidence considered here, I propose that while Rijkhoff’s classification is useful as a typology of the licensing properties of NEs, the idea that the cross-linguistic differences in the morphosyntactic behavior of NEs are indicative of different lexico-semantic properties of the nouns that head them should be reconsidered. With regard to the lexico-semantic properties of nouns, I adhere to Borer’s (2005) universalist view.
10.4 Directions for further research

The scope of the study did not allow me the researcher to treat all the issues raised in the book equally well. Some of the issues touched upon here deserve attention and should therefore be further investigated.

As repeatedly pointed out in the book, the analysis of the development of creole NEs suffers from the scarcity of diachronic data. Diachronic research into the development of creole NEs would considerably substantiate the discussion if the possible sources of the structural and discourse-semantic properties of creole nominal markers.

While the present study digs into the issue of substrate influence more than some of its predecessors, it certainly leaves space for further research. It is sometimes pointed out in the literature that the research of substrate influence is inhibited by the scarcity of information about the behavior of determiners and plural markers in the substrates. However, the body of research in this area has significantly grown in the past couple of years.

A considerable part of the present study was dedicated to the discussion of the categories of definiteness and specificity and their role in the distribution of creole nominal markers. As far as this research topic is concerned, the analysis of creole data could certainly profit from a broader, interdisciplinary perspective. In the chapters devoted to the distributional properties of creole NEs, I claim that creole nominal markers display sensitivity to the universal principles of reference marking and discourse organizations and attempt to draw comparisons between the phenomena observed in creoles and the phenomena observed in other world languages, as well as in cases of L1 and L2 acquisition. A systematic comparison of findings obtained in creole studies, linguistic typology, and studies of L1 and L2 acquisition could significantly substantiate the claims with regard to the nature and semantico-pragmatic content of the categories we identify as definiteness and specificity and allow us to address the issue of their origins in the human language.

These are, in my belief, the major issues that need to be researched in order to complete the picture that has been drawn in the present study. I hope that this book will give the reader more new ideas and inspire further research into the structure and interpretation of NEs in creoles and in other languages of the world.
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Samenvatting (Summary in Dutch)

Dit onderzoek richt zich op de ontwikkeling van de nominale constituent in creoolse talen. Het bevat een analyse van de etymologie, de structurele en de pragmatisch-semantiche eigenschappen van nominale markeerders. Bijzondere nadruk wordt gelegd op het gebruik en de interpretatie van ongemarkeerde naamwoorden – een eigenschap die gezien wordt als typerend voor creoolse talen.


Dit proefschrift is onderverdeeld in drie delen: Deel I Setting the stage, Deel II Analysis, en Deel III Synthesis. Deel I wordt voorafgegaan door een inleidend hoofdstuk (Hoofdstuk 1), waarin de discussie omtreht het ontstaan en de ontwikkeling van creoolse talen en de mogelijke relevantie van de bevindingen met betrekking tot de nominale constituent besproken worden. Daarnaast worden in dit hoofdstuk de achterliggende gedachten, de hypothese en de onderzoeksvragen geformuleerd en worden de methodologie, de theoretische achtergrond en de organisatie van het boek besproken.

Deel I Setting the Stage bestaat uit Hoofdstukken 2, 3 en 4. Hoofdstuk 2 presenteert de linguïstische, historische en socio-demografische factoren die cruciaal zijn voor de ontwikkeling van creoolse talen. Hoofdstuk 3 bespreekt hoe deze factoren in de verschillende theorieën over het ontstaan van creoolse talen worden geïnterpreteerd, en identificeert de belangrijkste ontwikkelingen in de discussie over het ontstaan van creoolse talen. Hoofdstuk 4 presenteert theorieën over de interpretatie en structurele organisatie van de nominale constituent.

De data-analyse wordt gepresenteerd in Deel II Analysis, en is in 5 hoofdstukken onderverdeeld (Hoofdstukken 5-9). Hoofdstuk 5 richt zich op de etymologie van nominale markeerders. Hoofdstuk 6 bespreekt de structurele organisatie van nominale constituenen in creoolse talen, zoals de congruentie, de volgorde en de
onderlinge afhankelijkheid van nominale elementen. Hoofdstukken 7, 8 en 9 richten zich op de semantische en pragmatische eigenschappen van lidwoorden, meervoudsmarkeerders en ongemarkeerde naamwoorden in creoolse talen. Hoofdstuk 7 bespreekt de uitspraak van individualisatie en getal. Hoofdstukken 8 en 9 richten zich op de factoren die bepalend zijn voor de distributie van onbepaalde en bepaalde lidwoorden.

Het proefschrift wordt afgesloten door Deel III Synthesis (Hoofdstuk 10). In Hoofdstuk 10 worden de belangrijkste bevindingen van het onderzoek samengevat. Vervolgens wordt de relevantie van deze bevindingen voor de discussie over het ontstaan van creoolse talen en voor de moderne theorieën van de structurele organisatie van de nominale constituent en de lexicale semantiek van naamwoorden besproken. Als laatste worden in dit hoofdstuk richtlijnen voor verder onderzoek geformuleerd. De belangrijkste observaties van het onderzoek laten zich als volgt samenvatten:

De etymologie en de structurele organisatie van de nominale markeerders bevestigen de rol van Germaanse en Romaanse talen in de ontwikkeling van creoolse talen. Op een aantal uitzonderingen na, worden creoolse nominale markeerders van de lexicale of functionele elementen van het superstratum afgeleid. De structurele patronen van het superstratum worden in de meeste gevallen ook grotendeels behouden.

Echter, er moet ook worden opgemerkt dat de superstratum-input zelden onveranderd in creoolse talen wordt opgenomen. Gevallen van directe adoptie van de Germaanse of Romaanse nominale morfologie zijn schaars, en beperken zich tot creoolse talen die in intensief contact staan met het superstratum. In de meeste gevallen worden de superstratumelementen en -structuren geheranalyseerd, waarbij zij een nieuwe functie en soms ook nieuwe structurele eigenschappen ontwikkelen. Deze heranalyse kan in gang worden gezet door het universele proces van grammaticalisatie, of onder invloed van substratuntalen.

De heranalyse van superstratumelementen die in de brontaal niet adnominaal gebruikt worden gaat gepaard met het ontstaan van nieuwe structuren. Deze baseren zich op de structurele patronen van het superstratum zelf of van het substratum. De invloed van substratuntalen beperkt zich in de meeste gevallen tot consolidatie van patronen die reeds aanwezig zijn in superstratumtalen. Terwijl creoolse talen meer gebruik maken van het postnominale veld dan hun Germaanse en Romaanse superstrata, en de activatie van dit veld duidelijk werd beïnvloed door de patronen aanwezig in het substratum, was het potentieel om dit veld te gebruiken ook al aanwezig in de superstratumtalen.

In enkele creoolse talen treft men ook nominale markeerders die van het substratum afgeleid zijn aan. Het is aangetoond dat deze markeerders dezelfde processen van heranalyse en herstructurering ondergaan.

Terwijl de structurele organisatie van de creoolse nominale constituent grotendeels op patronen van de superstratum- en substratuntalen is gebaseerd, is de distributie van de nominale markeerders gevoelig voor universele principes van referentiemarkering en discoursorganisatie.
Het gebruik van onbepaalde en bepaalde lidwoorden is behalve op bepaaldheid gebaseerd op een aantal andere semantisch-pragmatische categorieën, zoals specificiteit, topicaliteit en de prominentie van de referent in de discourse. Dit laat zien dat lidwoorden in creoolse talen, in tegenstelling tot lidwoorden in Germaanse en Romaanse talen, geen grammaticaliseerde *D-heads* zijn. De distributie van lidwoorden en ongemarkeerde naamwoorden in creoolse talen is echter niet uniform. De rol van de bovengenoemde categorieën is variabel en de ene taal is er gevoeliger voor dan de andere. In een deel van de creoolse talen zien we een ontwikkeling in de richting van het Germaanse/Romaanse lidwoordgebruik, dat gebaseerd is op bepaaldheid. Het variabele gebruik van lidwoorden in creoolse talen wordt niet uitgelegd door hedendaagse theorieën omtrent de structurele organisatie en interpretatie van de nominale constituent (Cinque 1990; Longobardi 1994).

Meervoudsmarkeerders zijn gevoelig voor de referentiële eigenschappen van het naamwoord, zoals bezieldheid, bepaaldheid en specificiteit, en het *non-redundancy* principe. Daarnaast vertonen meervoudsmarkeerders in sommige creoolse talen een aantal bijzondere distributieve eigenschappen. Zo worden ze met massa en collectieve naamwoorden gebruikt, kunnen ze twee of meer naamwoorden markeren als groep en worden ze gebruikt om associatief meervoud uit de drukken. Op basis van de distributie van gemankeerde en ongemankeerde naamwoorden in het meervoud lijken veel creoolse talen in de categorie van ‘set-noun’ talen te vallen (Rijkhoff 2002).

Creoolse talen die naast ongemarkeerde naamwoorden en meervoudsmarkeerders van het hierboven beschreven type ook gebruik maken van meervoudsmarkeering van het Germaanse of Romaanse type zijn bijzonder interessant. Het variabele gebruik van diverse strategieën van meervoudsmarkeering in deze creoolse talen vormt een probleem voor Rijkhoff’s classificatie van de lexicaal-semantische naamwoordcategorieën.
Ekaterina Bobyleva was born on April 5, 1983 in Saint-Petersburg, Russia. In 2000, she finished Saint-Petersburg State University Academic Gymnasium and entered Saint-Petersburg State University where she obtained an MA degree (cum laude) with a major in Dutch Language and Culture and minors in Psycholinguistics and in Spanish Language. Having decided to pursue the career of a researcher, in 2006 Ekaterina entered a Research MA program in Linguistics at the University of Amsterdam. She graduated (cum laude) in 2007. In the same year, she got a PhD position at the University of Amsterdam. She is currently a teacher at the departments of Slavic Languages and Cultures and English Language and Culture at the University of Amsterdam.