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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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superstrate</th>
<th>Article</th>
<th>Numeral</th>
<th>Germanic/Romance source form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>wan</td>
<td>one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tok Pisin</td>
<td>waneela</td>
<td>waneela</td>
<td>one + fellow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dutch</td>
<td>Berbice Dutch</td>
<td>en</td>
<td>één 'one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>en:en</td>
<td>één 'one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td>een</td>
<td>een 'a' één 'one'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td>yon</td>
<td>un 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td>enn</td>
<td>un 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lesser Antillean</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></td>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp./Port.</td>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>un</td>
<td>un 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>São-Tome</td>
<td>üa</td>
<td>üm 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cape-Verdean</td>
<td>ün</td>
<td>üm 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diu Portuguese</td>
<td>üi</td>
<td>üm 'one/a' (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

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><em>di/de</em></td>
<td>def. article</td>
<td><em>the</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>*da&gt;*n)<em>a</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>that</em></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><em>di</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>die ‘that’ (com.sg.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td><em>di</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>die ‘that’ (com.sg.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afrikaans</td>
<td><em>die</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>die ‘that’ (com.sg.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>là ‘there’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritian</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>là ‘there’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean</td>
<td><em>la</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>là ‘there’</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chabacano</td>
<td><em>el</em></td>
<td>def. article</td>
<td><em>el ‘the’ (masc. sg.)</em></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><em>e</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>esse ‘that’ (masc. sg.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saô-Tome</td>
<td><em>se</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>esse ‘that’ (masc. sg.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape-Verdean</td>
<td><em>kel</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td><em>aquele ‘that yonder’ (masc. sg)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>kes</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>aqueles ‘that yonder’ (pl.)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diu Portuguese</td>
<td><em>es</em></td>
<td>adnom. dem.</td>
<td>*esse ‘that’ (masc.sg.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>ik</em></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>aquele ‘that yonder’ (masc. sg.)</em></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 creole 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 Verdcen 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’), (é)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
eyear Sranan deixis was expressed by means of three prenominal forms disi, da and dem,
which functioned as demonstratives and definite markers. While prenominal disi(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 disi 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: it 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 Guadeloupian, Dominican, and Saint-Lucian. Martinican Creole employs the form ta instead of the widespread sa (cf. Gadelii 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)9, 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 Verdean 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

---

9 Specific referenceS are provided here as not all grammatical descriptions of Jamaican Creole and Tok Pisin acknowledge the existence of productive plural inflection in these creoles.
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 adiw* ‘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 3PI pronouns

Many Atlantic Creoles employ a form homophonous to the 3PI pronoun as a nominal plural marker. In most creoles, this form goes back to the strong (emphatic) form of the 3PI 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 3PI 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...*
   
   leave DEF gun PL here
   
   ‘Leave the guns here...’
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 *di* *difman 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 ‘godo 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 *irá* (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] *bó* ‘person’; [-human], [-plural] *vé* ‘thing’; [-human], [+plural] *dí* ‘things’, *ápu* 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 *eni*, 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 bélemáāri kúma ini, imgba 0
Gogo 3SG.M woman love-GEN but 3PL 3PL 3SG.M
bélema-∅-āā.
love-GEN-NEG-NSM
‘Gogo loves his wives 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.\(^\text{10}\) This has given rise to the idea that the use of the 3Pl pronoun as a plural

\(^\text{10}\) 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 homophous with the 3Pl pronoun.

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler et al. 2003: 92)

(i) *Ol* i fíksim 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 nann and Santome (i)ne 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) *iraau gare-na*  
*PL child-3SG*  
‘his children’

(iv) *Na ani i mwaeraha a-daau*  
*DET DEM DET chief POSS-3PL*  
‘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 mí ama ṣe 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>Ebira</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>Fullulde</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>?</td>
<td>Eastern Ijo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negerhollands</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>mainly Kwa (Gbe, Akan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sranan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe), Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaican Creole</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe), Bantu, Benue-Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>mainly Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>mainly Kwa (Gbe)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesser Antillean Creoles</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe), Bantu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santome Creole</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe), Bantu, Benue-Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(and other Gulf of Guinea Creoles)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verdean</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Atlantic, Mande</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papiamentu</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Kwa (Gbe), Bantu, Benue-Congo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palenquero</td>
<td>-</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 \textit{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 \textit{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 \(ás:n lé ‘the crabs’ (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 39) and Gungbe \(távó 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
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., dinding-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 ìl-te-lu ‘they’ (strong) (Rowlands 1969: 55). As these examples demonstrate, the weak form of the 3Pl pronoun ìl(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 lê 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.