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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 *een kaas/*kaz-en
       1SG want 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-*en
       1SG have three dog-PL
       ‘I have three dogs.’

---

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/*queso/*quesos*.  
    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 perro-*(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 morposyntax. 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, Fon. 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 Fon 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. \textit{Wata} de aal uova di tiebl ina im afis. \\
\quad water COP.LOC all over DEF table in 3SG office \\
\quad ‘There is water all over the table in his office.’

b. Myeri laik \textit{papaw}. \\
\quad Mary like papaw \\
\quad ‘Mary like papaw/papaws.’

c. \textit{Buk} de aal uova di tiebl ina im afis. \\
\quad book COP.LOC all over DEF table in 3SG office \\
\quad ‘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) \textit{Duwan buk} de pan di tiebl ina im afis. \\
\quad DEF/IND book COP.LOC on DEF table in 3SG office \\
\quad a. ‘The book is on the table in his office.’ \\
\quad 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 \textit{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 \textit{mongoose} gone wid yuh chicken. \\
\quad mama it look like mongoose gone with 2SG chicken \\
\quad ‘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. 18 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 mumuim* 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=ij fri, firki, risi, 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 melke mete s:igrit if 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 chéché 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 to beb-e so leyt.
    3SG IMPF.NPST drink-INF only milk
    ‘He only drinks milk.’

b. elz vidi faz-e kaz si d-elz jut t-iń dįjer.
    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 dėt 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 wapela man i dai em etpela de-s i sti ng
   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 baha 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’
b. Is bed I tek– could-en move fe day-s.  
   FOC bed 1SG take could-NEG move for day-PL  
   ‘I stayed in bed, could not move for days.’

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 CIP, 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 lexicosemantic 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 â oso, dan den suma aksi pe then time ISG come PREP home then DEF.PL person ask where m oposo.

1SG come-from

‘Then when I came home then the people asked where I came from.’

Cape Verdean (Baptista 2002: 103)

(205) Em i 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)\(^{19}\), 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:

\(^{19}\) 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 mânê nà-salô, timoun-yo mânê nà-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 funxônariu 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 sono bê-bê knopo…
    DEF.PL 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 dexti 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

---

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 bôbô* *den* *kr* go *den* *tri* *bag* *den* *na* mi *pikinden.*

DEF boy PL carry go DEF.PL three bag PL PREP 1SG childPL

‘The boys carried the three bags to my children.’
Some boy dem dey pon de corner.

‘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 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 planty 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 feiftik 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 kase dizuisan zasyêt…

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) Some boh boh den bin kam ask fi 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 (Lefebvre and Brousseau 2002: 39)

\[(219) \textit{àsòn lè} \]

- CRAB PL
- a. ‘the crabs’
- b. ‘some crabs’

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, \textit{un}, \textit{ma} and \textit{un ma}. The marker \textit{un} which bears the features [-definite, -plural] was considered to perform the function of an indefinite determiner. The marker \textit{ma} was analyzed as a plural definite determiner, and \textit{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 \textit{ma} and that \textit{ma} (alone) may also occur with indefinite plural and generic NEs. Based on these observations he reconsidered the interpretative properties of bare NEs, arguing that they are unspecified for number. According to Schwegler, as well as Moñino (2007), the use of \textit{ma} and \textit{un ma} is contextually dependent. They function to add optional information and to eliminate possible ambiguity. This tendency in the distribution on \textit{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.
bolivar 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”.
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 nā ten muyt famil, *doyz irmā, subriŋ, mi fil i* 1SG NEG have much family two 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-ː so o lahan-ː tigrō met *fi tok-* tiger wife die-PFV so 3SG leave-PFV tiger with 3POSS child *apu.*

PL

‘Tiger’s wife died, so she left Tiger and his children.’

b. …*ken-ap* jen=da̱ 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.
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).

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 pikenini mipela i no save Tok Pisin.*
   
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PL</th>
<th>child</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>NEG</th>
<th>know</th>
<th>Tok Pisin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>‘Our children don’t know Tok Pisin.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   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?’
(ii) variable with (semantically) specific indefinite NEs; 


(233) a. Kachó-nan a keda grita henter nochi.  
   Dog-PL IPFV stay shout entire night  
   ‘Dogs kept barking all night.’

b. Mi a kumpra kas.  
   1SG PST buy house  
   ‘I bought a house/houses.’

(iii) does not occur with non-specific indefinite NEs and generics.

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmitt 2007: 123)

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

b. Muhé ta compañera di homber.  
   Women COP companion of man  
   ‘Women are companions of men.’

With regard to the distribution of 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 nan cannot co-occur with plural numerals and quantifiers in indefinite NEs, they point out that the distribution of 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 *buki-nan/buki riba mesa.  
   1SGPRS see book-PL/book on table  
   ‘I see books on the table.’

21 The role of pragmatic specificity on the use of 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 backgrounding (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.’
b. **Bann butej la ranpli.**
   PL bottle PL full
   ‘The bottles are full.’

NEs marked by *bann* alone may have a definite as well as an indefinite interpretation:

Mauritian Creole (Alleesaib 2005)

(239) **Bann zelev inn reini dan lakur 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 (Alleesaib 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).
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.’
We done sweep up di yard, wash di plate...
‘We finished sweeping the yard and washing the plates…’

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. Furthermore, 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 (Sisten 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 Mühlhäusler 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).
Palenquero (Friedemann and Patiño 1983: 209)

(249) Entonse suto á kojé un ma konejo. Ese ma konejo lo k so 1PL PST catch IND PL bunny. DEM PL bunny it REL suto kojé suto a yeba=lo p=ayá p=andi enkaggao. Entonse 1PL catch 1PL PL bring=it for=there for=where chief so enkaggao seba ndá suto konéjo ku jusio nu. chief NEG give 1PL bunny with justice NEG ‘So we caught some bunnies. We took these bunnies to the chief. The chief did not give us the bunnies justly.’

Chabacano (McKaughan 1954: 209)

(250) Kwando maduro ya mana saging di kabáw ya abla ele kon when ripen now PL banana of turtle PST say 3SG OBL komachíng para di-ila dos ya el saging… monkey for OBL-3PL two already DEF banana ‘When the turtle’s bananas ripened, he said to the monkey that the bananas were for the two of them…’

The tendency illustrated in examples (249) and (250) appears to be the least common tendency associated with the non-redundancy principle.

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?
    FOC why 3SG have PREP handle DEF people PL so
    ‘Why does he have to treat the people like that?’

Papiamentu (Kester and Schmitt 2007: 115)

(252) Despues ku hende-nan a keha nan a drecha e película.
    after REL people-PL PST complain 3PL PST fix DEF film
    ‘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 PL people PROG do well already to put 1PL water here
    ‘…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
    PL flour PM short
    ‘a shortage of flour’

Krio Pichi (Yakpo 2009: 65)

(255) dan smɔl smɔl wàtá dɛn
    DEM small small water PL
    ‘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!
alleluiia 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*
\[\text{Waga PL PM come}\]
‘Waga and his people came’

Mauritian Creoles (Alleesaib 2005)

(263) *Mo inn truv bann Zidane jer.*
\[\text{1SG COMPL see PL Zidane yesterday}\]
‘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…*
\[\text{mama PL NEG have NEG whole heap PREP money}\]
‘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.*
\[\text{1SG.POSS wife PL IPFV keep up but 1SG.NOM NEG go}\]
‘My wife and the rest [of my family] still go [to church] but I don’t go.’

Principe (an offshoot of Santome) (Maurer 2009: 33)

(266) *Ine pêzêdêntê xiga ontxi.*
\[\text{DEF.PL president arrive yesterday}\]
‘The president and his escort arrived yesterday.’
Tok Pisin (Mühlhäusler 1981:43)

(267) *pater ol*

priest PL

‘the priest and his flock’

Mauritian Creoles (Alleesaib 2005)

(268) *Mo inn truv bann Moka jer.*

1SG COMPL see PL Moka yesterday

‘I saw the group (e.g., our friends) from Moka 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 groupforming 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)

    DEF three boy PL kill 3PL father
    ‘The three boys killed their father.’

    b. *Chiï bwaï* kil dem faada.
    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*...
    tell 2 confederate-PL PL.
    ‘Tell your confederates…’

Tok Pisin (Mühlhäuser et al. 2003: 198)

(271) …*mi salim ol buk-s*…
    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 Verdian 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 etymology 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 Verdian 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) *Dòndá lè ná wá kpɔ̀n 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) *àwōn Táiwò*
   PL Taiwo
   ‘Taiwo and his family/schoolmates/friends’

Mandianka (Rowlands 1959: 38)

(275) *Báakári-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) \textit{Ry} \begin{tabular}{lll} Paoly \\ DET.PL & Paul \\ \end{tabular} ‘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 \textit{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) \textit{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 (Mufwene1998: 73)

(278) \textit{Felicia an’ them} done gone. \\
\begin{tabular}{lll} Felicia & and & 3PL COMPL gone \\ \end{tabular} ‘Felicia and her company are already gone.’

And, as I already pointed out in chapter 5, associative plural marking by means of \textit{and them} is also found in Trinidadian Creole:
Trinidadian Creole (my data)

(279) I talk-ed to my daughter an’ dem.

\[ \begin{array}{l}
1SG.SUBJ \text{ talk-PST to 1SG.POSS daughter and 3PL} \\
\text{‘I talked to my daughter and the others [the part of the family that lives in the same household].’} 
\end{array} \]

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 superstrate 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.