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To mum, dad, Matteo and Filippo.
And to all the people who think that the difference between a language and a dialect has something to do with linguistics considerations, whereas it is only a matter of political and economical power. Don't be ashamed of speaking the idiom that best reflects your inner self.
“Pa obliyé, tout biten ka évoliyé. [...] Avan lang fwansé té tin Laten. Laten, kon manmanpoul kouvé zé a-y é éklò : Pangnòl, Italyen, Fwansé, Pòwtigè... Lè yo vin manman, yo fè pittt osi : fwansé fè kréyòl, Pòwtigè fè Brézilyen, Pangnòl fè Papamient... Pa obliyé on tîpoul sé on poul ki pitt é poulòsdonk kréyòl kon fwansé sè on lang.”

[Moïse, 2005]
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Abstract
(English)

The present work provides an overview of the main structures of Guadaloupean Creole and constitutes an improvement over former works on the subject (cf. Bibliography), many of which grouped Guadeloupean, Martinican, and other varieties of Caribbean French-based creoles under the label of Lesser Antillean Creole (LAC). This classification was done without taking into consideration the fact that these varieties are not 100% intelligible today, although their common origins are undeniable. In contrast to most of the existing scholarship, this dissertation tries to point out what is peculiarly Guadeloupean, not only from a syntactic but also from a morphological point of view. The organization of the work is the following: in Part 1, I first explain the (widely debated) question of the genesis of Creole languages then give an overview of the main Creole languages spoken worldwide, and finally present Guadeloupe and Guadeloupean Creole; in Part 2, I describe some phonological and morphological phenomena of Guadeloupean Creole; in Part 3, I describe the morphosyntax of the extended-VP and the sentence, with special attention to unmarked and marked word-orders, to argument structure and thematic relations, and to the TMA system; finally, in Part 4, I analyze the extended-NP in depth, with special attention to the determiner system and to pronouns, adjectives, and relative clauses. Comparisons to the morphosyntax of other French creoles of the Caribbean and Bourbonnais areas are carried out systematically. At the end of the dissertation, five corpora of original examples are provided: relative clauses, distribution of adjectives, occurrences of bare-stem Vs, direct interrogative clauses, and dislocations (Appendices 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, respectively).
Il presente lavoro fornisce una visione d'insieme sulle principali strutture del Creolo della Guadalupa e costituisce un miglioramento rispetto ad alcuni lavori precedenti sullo stesso soggetto che raggruppavano i creoli di Guadalupa, Martinica ed di altre ex colonie francesi di area caraibica sotto l'etichetta generale di Lesser Antillean Creole (LAC, “Creolo delle Piccole Antille”) (cf. Bibliografia). Tale classificazione veniva attuata senza tenere in considerazione il fatto che, nonostante la loro origine comune sia innegabile, oggi le suddette varietà non sono sempre mutualmente intellegibili. Diversamente, lo scopo di questo lavoro è quello di descrivere nel modo più accurato possibile le caratteristiche morfosintattiche del solo Creolo della Guadalupa. L'organizzazione dei vari capitoli è la seguente: nella prima parte (Part 1) viene discussa brevemente la spinosa questione della genesi delle lingue creole, vengono presentati e localizzati i principali creoli parlati nel mondo e viene fatta un'introduzione alla Guadalupa e alla sua lingua; nella seconda parte (Part 2) vengono presi in analisi alcuni interessanti fenomeni fonologici e morfologici del Creolo della Guadalupa; nella terza parte (Part 3) viene descritta la frase, con enfasi particolare sulla questione dell'ordine non marcato e di quelli marcati, sulla struttura argomentale del verbo, le relazioni tematiche e il VP-esteso con il cosiddetto sistema TMA (Tempo – Modo – Aspetto); infine, nella quarta parte (Part 4) viene descritta la morfosintassi delle Espressioni Nominali, con particolare attenzione per il sistema dei determinanti, i pronomi, gli aggettivi e le frasi relative. Vengono inoltre fatti alcuni confronti sistematici con la morfosintassi di altri creoli a base francese parlati non solo nell'area caraibica ma anche in alcune isole dell'Oceano Indiano. In appendice è possibile trovare 5 corpora di esempi originali: frasi relative (Appendix 1), distribuzione degli aggettivi (Appendix 2), occorrenze di verbi nella loro forma base (Appendix 3), interrogative dirette (Appendix 4) e dislocazioni (Appendix 5).
Symbols

(*X) The insertion of X is agrammatical

(D/I)O (Direct/Indirect) Object

(O/C)FR (Old/Contemporary) French

(S-V) Staudacher-Valliamée (2011)

(TP) Tiprens-la (book)

[ ] Phonetic transcription

[±x] X is a binary feature

{X}{Y} X and Y are in complementary distribution

*(X) The omission of X is agrammatical

*X X (and the sentence in which it appears) is agrammatical

→ Ostention

1/2/3pp 1st, 2nd, 3rd person plural

1/2/3ps 1st, 2nd, 3rd person singular

A Adjective

ACC Accusative

Adv(s) Adverb(s)

AgrSP Subject Agreement Phrase

ANT Anterior action or state

AspP Aspect Phrase

Aux Auxiliary

BA Bachelors

Ben Benzo (2005)

C Complementizer

CLD Clitic Left Dislocation

COP_{int} Copula (interrogative form)

COP_{past} Copula (past form)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COP&lt;sub&gt;pres&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Copula (present form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>Complementizer Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D(et)</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam</td>
<td>Damoiseau (2012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dam2</td>
<td>Damoiseau (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAR</td>
<td>Double Access Reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>Dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF</td>
<td>Definiteness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEF&lt;sub&gt;2&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Resumptive definiteness marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deg</td>
<td>Degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>Determiner Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ec</td>
<td>Empty category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL</td>
<td>Expletive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC(s)</td>
<td>French-based Creole(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FocP</td>
<td>Focus Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR&lt;sub&gt;sub&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>French sub-standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GC</td>
<td>Guadaloupean Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td>Genitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GuyC</td>
<td>Guyanese Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-M</td>
<td>Hazaël-Massieux (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAB</td>
<td>Habitual action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HC</td>
<td>Haitian Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I(nfl)</td>
<td>Inflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPER</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inf</td>
<td>Infinitival form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT</td>
<td>Interrogation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>Indirect Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IP</td>
<td>Inflection Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRR</td>
<td>Irrealis (action or state)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT</td>
<td>Italian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITER</td>
<td>Iterated action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAC</td>
<td>Lesser Antillean Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LB(H)</td>
<td>Language Bioprogram (Hypothesis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MauC</td>
<td>Mauritian Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MC</td>
<td>Martinican Creole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ModP</td>
<td>Modal Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moï</td>
<td>Moïse 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoodP</td>
<td>Mood Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MovP</td>
<td>Movement Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(s)</td>
<td>Noun(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE(s)</td>
<td>Nominal Expression(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>Negation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NegP</td>
<td>Negation Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLP</td>
<td>Natural Language Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>Nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP(s)</td>
<td>Noun Phrase(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Num</td>
<td>Numeral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Phonetically-null element</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEN</td>
<td>Open (action or state)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø_that</td>
<td>Null complementizer of RCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;B</td>
<td>Pinalie&amp;Bernabé (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td>Poullet&amp;Telchid 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLUR</td>
<td>Plural marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSS</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PROGR  Progressive
PROX  Proximity
PUCT  Punctual
RC(s)  Relative Clause(s)
ReuC  Reunionais Creole
S  Subject
SG  Singular
SP  Spanish
Spec  Specifier
t  Trace
TMA  Tense Mood Aspect
TopP  Topic Phrase
TP  Tense Phrase
V(s)  Verb(s)
Ve  Verb (eventive)
VP  Verb Phrase
Vs  V (stative)
w.r.t  With respect to
X < y  X originated from y
x(N/V)  X is a Noun/a Verb
X[+INT]  X bears interrogative features
Xd  X is a deficitary pronoun
xs  X is a strong pronoun
θ  Argumental
Introduction

The aim of this work is to describe the main morphosyntactic properties of Guadeloupean Creole. The description is carried out in a comparative way and the main languages taken into account are English, French and some other French-based creoles of the Caribbean and Bourbonnais areas. The work is divided in 10 Chapters grouped in 4 Parts. The 5 Appendixes provide each a corpus of original examples of: relative clauses, nominal expressions containing at least one adjective, occurrences of verbs in their base-stem form, direct interrogative sentences and dislocations.

Part 1 is an introduction to Creole languages and Guadeloupean Creole. Chapter 1 explores the widely-debated question of Creole genesis and provides an overview of the main Creole languages spoken worldwide. These are divided into groups according to the colonial language on which their lexicon is based, and then further divided into sub-classes on the basis of their geographical distribution. Chapter 2 describes the geography and history of the islands of Guadeloupe and the development of Guadeloupean Creole. It also provides some basic evidence on the independence of this Creole from French. Part 2 explores some interesting phonological and morphological phenomena displayed by this language. Chapter 3 deals with the adaptation of loanwords to the phonology of Guadeloupean creole, which includes phenomena of phonetic reduction, deletion and insertion. Also the presence of a great number of French unanalysed chunks in the grammar of this creole is discussed. Chapter 4 is an overview of the lexical morphology of the language (with special attention to derivation and composition) and a demonstration that only the functional morphology of this language is “poor”, whereas word-formation processes are quite complex. Part 3 describes the sentence of Guadeloupean creole, from the Verb Phrase (VP) up to the Complementizer Phrase (CP). Chapter 5 deals with the VP: it describes the verbal morphology of this language and classifies the different Vs on the basis of argument selection and theta-role assignment. A number of auxiliary-like and restructuring Vs are also taken into account. Chapter 6 describes the IP-layer of Guadeloupean creole and reviews the
so-called TMA (Tense-Mood-Aspect) system making a distinction between eventive and stative Vs. Chapter 7 is a discussion of the unmarked and marked word-orders of Guadeloupean creole based on the assumption that all marked orders must be justified by the checking of some discourse feature. Part 4 describes the Nominal Expressions of this language. Chapter 8 is an overview of the morphosyntax of the determiners of Guadeloupean creole, which are systematically compared to the determiners of other French-based creoles. Chapter 9 describes the personal, possessive, demonstrative, interrogative and indefinite pronouns and their position in the clause. It also classifies personal pronouns in strong and weak on the basis of their structural deficiency, which turns out to be a good way to account for the different behaviours of the various forms. Chapter 10 analyses the morphosyntax of the relative clauses and points out a number of interesting phenomena due either to current/recent contact with French or to simplification. Finally, the corpora in the Appendixes are meant to be used for further research. The corpus provided in Appendix 3 is preceded by a brief description of the morphosyntax of the adjectives, which are derived from French and show the same patterns of their French counterparts.

This grammatical description has been based partly on fieldwork and partly on reference to previous works. In particular, my main references were Moïse (2005) and Poullet&Telchid (2010). I also collected a corpus of data from the Creole translation of the book Le Petit Prince (Ti prens-la, Caraïbeditions (2010)). I further enlarged it by means of numerous interviews with native speakers who were asked to give grammaticality judgements and were requested to do some translation tasks.

Notice that some of the information found in the grammar books I consulted was not considered correct by my informants. When this happened, I tried to understand the reasons why it was so, and in most cases I decided to modify the data in the direction indicated by the native speakers’ intuitions. These discrepancies might be due to four facts:
– the language described by grammarians and the language actually used in everyday communication could be different;
– due to lack of systematic encoding, Creole languages might evolve so fast that grammatical descriptions are late compared to them;
– a distinction should be possibly made between different varieties of Guadeloupean Creole (for example, taking into account geographical and social variations, and distinguishing oral and written forms);
– different varieties of French-based creoles have been blindly grouped under the common label of Lesser Antillean Creole, which is rather useful for broad comparative descriptions but constitutes a problem when it comes to a precise description of a single variety.

For these reasons, and with the help of my trustworthy informants, I corrected the data found in the traditional grammar on GC, so that every phenomenon I describe here can be considered “authentically” Guadeloupean. Of course, many of them are shared with other Creole languages of the Antillean area, but in my work no characteristics peculiar to other varieties will be attributed to GC. I will also show that some biases against Creole languages and Guadeloupean Creole are due to over-generalizations and can be corrected by means of a deeper analysis of the data. Finally, I will show how some aspects of this language are changing in the direction of French, which is and has always been the official language of this department, and therefore the model to look up to. Consequently, it is not surprising that it should have influenced Guadeloupean, which has the same status of a dialect and thus no social prestige.

All of my informants are young men in their late twenties and thirties born in Guadeloupe and brought up by native Creole-speaking parents. For some of them, Guadeloupean Creole is their first language, the one to which they have been exposed since birth and of which they have a full native competence. For the others, it is a language they have always heard in their environment but in which they have
not been addressed to by their parents. They learnt it later at school or in the street from their peers, so that nowadays their knowledge of Guadeloupean Creole is complete but their intuitions on the grammar of the language are not always trustworthy: for them, Creole is in fact a second rather than a native language. Despite this, I decided to keep all of them as informants: as the translation tasks were very easy, I decided to submit them to everyone, whereas the judgements of grammaticality were asked only to the genuine native speakers. Also, as all of them also speak French as a native or a second language, I tried to avoid the possibility that their translations be influenced by the original French sentences by choosing to submit also some translation tasks in English to the informants who had full proficiency in this language. This double-checking operation was done to evaluate whether the Creole translations were genuine or if they had been unconsciously influenced by French.

Here is the description of my four main informants, their profiles are those that follow. Fabien Matius-Hatchi is a 38-year-old man grown up in the Parisian region. His father came from Guadeloupe. He has been surrounded by Creole-speaking people since his early childhood. However, he started speaking and writing GC only when he was 20. He is a native speaker of French who can use English and is at his ease with other varieties of French-based creoles as well. He went to college and he obtained the equivalent of a current MA. Thierry Malo is a 38-year-old man born and grown up in Southern Guadeloupe (Bouillante). He speaks Creole since his early childhood and has always been exposed to it. He also speaks French (as a second language) and English (as a foreign language). He is a writer and a singer, and has a BA in Computer Science and Engineering and an MA in Management. Djibril Néré

---

1 This decision made by the parents of several Guadeloupean people of the last generation(s) seems to be due to reasons of social prestige. I will not analyse this subject more in depth, which would require a real sociological survey, but just present the readers a very interesting consideration made by one of our informants. According to R. Lacreole in fact (and some of my speakers agree with him), this choice was mainly due to the fact that some kind of stigma towards Creole speakers was and is still at work in Guadeloupe. As he said, «Our parents perfectly knew that, if we [Black people of previous French colonies, ndr] wanted to have the same possibilities the [real, ndr] French had, we needed to speak French better than the French themselves did. This is why they avoided us access to our language: they did not want us to sound Creole».

2 Fantasy name. I gave to all of my informants the choice between being cited with their true name or with an invented one. This informant chose to keep his identity private. called Djibril Néré.
is a 26-year-old man born and grown up in Guadeloupe, more precisely in the town of Pointe-à-Pitre. He has been surrounded by speakers of Creole since his birth, and has always spoken Creole with his family. He also speaks French (as a second language) and English (as a foreign language). Emmanuel Peroumalnaïk is a 28-year-old man born in Southern France (Toulouse) and grown up in Guadeloupe with his Creole-speaking parents. He speaks GC from his primary school years, French (as a mother language), English (as a foreign language), and he knows some bribes of Spanish. He has a Masters in Computer Science. All of his family comes from Guadeloupe and he has a Masters.

All of the examples I used in this work were checked by at least one of my informants but, of course, every misusage of the evidence is my fault entirely.
Chapter 1
On Creole languages

This chapter consists of an introduction to the characteristics that differentiate pidgins from creole languages (1.1), a discussion of the different theories on Creole genesis (1.2), and an overview of the main Creole languages spoken all over the world (1.3). Special attention will be paid to French-based Creole languages (1.4), with the exception of Guadeloupean Creole, which will be described in depth in chapter 2.

1.1 Pidgins and Creole languages

A creole is a stable, full-fledged natural language developed in a situation of linguistic emergency from the mixing of parent languages, very often in a colonial environment (Hymes (1971), Todd (1990), Hall (1966)). In fact, many Creole languages originated during the European colonial period as a consequence of the linguistic contact between the European languages spoken by the colonizers, the native languages originally spoken in the conquered territories and the different African dialects spoken by the traded slaves (Moise (2005), Bernabé (2003)). This period lasted from the 1500s to the mid-1900s and brought to the establishment of colonies in Asia, Africa, and in North, Central and South America.

During this period, the dominant language to be looked up to was that of the conquerors, whereas all other idioms were minor useless languages, as workers and
slaves had so different linguistic backgrounds that it was impossible for them to communicate with each other (Hymes (1791) and Holm (1988)). The lack of a common means of communication was a strategy used by slavers to prevent any rebellion. Very soon however, the contact between all of these languages, the presence of a common code whose words could be learned and used for everyday communication, and the desire to communicate gave birth to so-called *pidgins* (Hymes (1971) and Holm (1988), among others). These are broken idioms with no stable grammar (and no native speakers) used for every-day basic communication by people lacking a common linguistic code. Later on, when the first generation of children was born and raised in these pidgin-speaking environments, these emergency idioms became Creole languages (among others, Hall (1966), Hymes (1971) and Holm (1988)). In fact, a Creole language basically differs from a *pidgin* in that it has been *nativized* by the children of pidgin-speaking parents as their primary language (Sankoff&Laberge (1972)). The result of this process of nativization is that a Creole language has features of natural idioms that are normally missing from pidgins (Hymes (1971)).

The capacity of creating a brand-new language when exposed to an insufficient (both in quality and in quantity) linguistic input is the basis of the *poverty of the stimulus hypothesis* (see Jackendoff (1983), Pullum&Scholz (2002)). One of the components of the generative approach to language since Chomsky (1980)'s *generative grammar* postulates the existence of an inborn mechanisms for language learning peculiar to the human race. According to Chomsky, this mental faculty, called the *Universal Grammar* (henceforth, UG), is composed of universally-valid grammatical characteristics (*Principles*) and binary choices (*Parameters*) which would be fixed as a consequence of the exposure to a given language. We can thus imagine that, in the absence of a sufficient linguistic input, UG would be able to set *default parameters* and the child would be given the possibility to develop a linguistic code despite its incomplete exposure to any language. This phenomenon, along with many others, could be at the basis of the genesis of Creole languages (see section 1.2).
A very interesting fact concerning Creole languages is that their vocabulary consists of so-called **cognates**, though there are often clear phonetic and semantic shifts, from the parent languages. Consequently, it is common to classify Creole languages on the basis of the language from which they inherited most of their lexicon. For example, when Guadeloupean Creole (henceforth, GC) came to life, the language of the colonizer was French. The words of French origin in GC, though they clearly underwent a series of phonetic changes in the passage to their Creole form, are still widely recognizable (Bernabé (2003), Moïse (2005), Poullet&Telchid (2010)). For this reason, GC is considered a **French-based creole**. Another interesting fact is that the grammar of a creole language often has original features and may differ substantially from those of the parent languages, that in the case of GC are mostly 18th-century French and a number of West African languages and dialects (Bernabé (2003), Moïse (2005)). In the majority of cases then, the vocabulary of a Creole language comes from the **dominant group** (that is, the language of the colonizer) and the grammar from the **subordinate group** (that of the slaves). Also, Creole languages are sometimes said to share more similarities with each other than with the idioms from which they are genetically derived (Bickerton (1983)), whereas other scholars state that such peculiarly Creole features are not possible to single out and do not agree with so-called **Creole exceptionalism** (DeGraff (2003)). Notice that today a dispute over the extent to which it is possible to apply the terms **substrate** and **superstrate** to the genesis and description of creole languages exists (Mufwene (1993)), and these emerging languages are sometimes said to derive from multiple idioms without any one of them being imposed as a replacement for the others (Singler (1988) and (1996)).

In GC, most words clearly derived from French (with some English, Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, Indian and African loanwords), whereas the majority of both nominal and verbal functional elements show a behaviour and a phonetic form that do not resemble their French counterparts. I will systematically point out these facts throughout my work, trying to make predictions on the origins of the various functional elements of Guadaloupean Creole.
1.2 On Creole genesis

Many a theory on Creole genesis has been formulated over the years. The subject is very interesting because, as pointed out earlier (1.1), it implies the acquisition of language in very peculiar conditions. The two most important theories on the matter are the monogenetic theory and the polygenetic one (1.2.1). The former, no longer actively investigated today, is clearly invalidated by what I stated in the previous section. It denies the possibility of acquiring a language absent from the input and postulates the existence of a unique proto-creole spoken all over the world from which all Creoles would have derived. Differently, the latter includes many theories that postulate a different origin for each Creole, thus denying the possibility of a common source. These theories are more recent and include, among many others, the generativist view on language acquisition, which I embrace. However, even if the subject of Creole genesis is still a widely-debated one, there are some points on which (virtually) all scholars agree. I will briefly discuss them in 1.2.2.

1.2.1 From monogenesis to polygenesis

According to the monogenetic theory of pidgin and Creole genesis, all of these languages would have derived from a single linguistic variety, a sort of Mediterranean lingua franca. The existence of this idiom, commonly considered to be a West African variety of Portuguese Pidgin, was first postulated by Schuchardt towards the end of the 19th century and then re-formulated by Taylor (1974) and by Thompson (1961). At the beginning, this theory was believed to be valid because it justified the massive presence of Portuguese words in most Creoles and the striking grammatical similarities that they shared. For example, it has been observed that a large number of Creole languages (many of which apparently completely unrelated and spoken in very distant areas) share exactly the same TMA (Tense-Mood-Aspect) system, which is rather difficult to be accounted for without imagining an original common linguistic source. Moreover, Bickerton (1983) argued that Creole languages show more structural similarities with each other than with the languages on which
they are based. However, this theory failed in explaining a number of facts. Let us observe its applications to the TMA system that is peculiar to Creoles.

1.2.1.1 What the TMA systems teach us

The TMA particles appear in a fixed order which seems to be consistent in all creole languages, that is, *tense > mood > aspect*. In passing, notice that this order seems to be universally common to all idioms, not only in Creoles (Cinque (1999)). As far as Creole languages are concerned though, these peculiar TMA preverbal morphemes are present in Guadaloupean Creole (see Part 3 of this work), but also in all French-based Creoles and in many other Creole languages spoken in very distant and historically-unrelated places. In fact, as Pieter Muysken (1980) correctly pointed out, we find that

Creole languages, which are only partially related to each other historically, and spoken in places widely distant from each other such as the Caribbean, the Gulf of Guinea, the Indian Ocean, South East Asia, and the South Pacific, [have] pre-verbal particle systems that resemble each other closely.

But how come that all Creole languages resemble each other so closely? Muysken explains that these particles do not generally occur as main verbs in the languages cited\(^1\), although some of them may be historically derived (albeit very indirectly) from verbs or auxiliary verbs in the European languages which have provided the vocabulary for the Creole languages.

He goes on saying that these particles “indicate tense, mood, and aspect, and in some languages also negation and predicate”, pointing out that “their similarity was noted quite early by creolists, not so much a phonological similarity but a functional

\(^1\) Namely: Haitian, Sranan, Crioulo, Seychellois, Tok Pisin, Negerhollands, Papamientu, and Sao Tomense.
similarity”. These similarities are quite fascinating, and many an author has tried to give an explanation to this striking fact. Taylor (1960) and Thompson (1961) noted two important peculiarities of these particles:

- each Creole language tends to have three of them: a past tense marker, a potential mood marker, and a durative aspect marker;
- when more than one particle accompany the V, their order is always the same: tense, mood\textsuperscript{2}, aspect, and main V; and the combinations of these particles are interpreted in fixed and rather complex ways.

Muysken (1980) also speaks about Voorhoeve's (1973) study of the three particles in a large number of Creole languages, in which he gives “an impression of the remarkable uniformity existing in this respect among Creole languages of widely different areas and of widely different lexical origins”. Voorhoeve, but also Taylor and Thompson, tried to justify these similarities by postulating the existence of a language from which all Creoles would have derived. What they did, was to appeal to the existence of a Portuguese-based trading and slaving \textit{pidgin} in many parts of the world during the 16th and 17th centuries. In their opinion, this Portuguese-based \textit{lingua franca} would have possessed the same tense/mood/aspect system of the modern Creole languages, which would be derived from it through so-called \textit{relexification}, a process of massive substitution of the vocabulary that takes place despite the survival of all basic grammatical structures.

However, Muysken explains that this theory, called the \textit{historical theory}, cannot be correct for three reasons:

\textsuperscript{2} The order TMA may appear bizarre to those who know Cinque's (to appear) article on the “Tense, Aspect, Mood morpheme order and the Mirror Principle”, in which the author states that “the preverbal order of (free or bound) mood, tense, and aspect morphemes appears to be, across languages, Mood > Tense > Aspect”. The contradiction is only apparent because, as Cinque himself states, “the term ‘mood’ is used in the literature to refer to different grammatical notions, corresponding to functional heads differently ordered with respect to Tense”: in his work, he refers to “\textit{speech act} mood, which traditionally ranges over such values as declarative, interrogative, imperative, etc., and which is unquestionably higher than Tense”. Differently, we refer to the opposition between the \textit{reals} and the \textit{irreals} features.
some Creole languages, despite lacking any connection to the putative Portuguese pidgin, present the same TMA particles;

it is unlikely that a trading pidgin might have had the complex TMA system that most Creole languages present nowadays;

it is not clear why creoles would have inherited this complex preverbal-particle system in its entirety but no other basic aspects of the grammar, in which Creole languages massively differ.

In this work, I will show that the peculiar grammar of Guadaloupean Creole sets it apart not only from the major Romance languages but also the different dialects spoken all over Europe. For this reason, it is possible to imagine that the verbal system of GC might be either peculiar to all Creole languages or derived from a specific (West) African language (or even more than one). The latter option seems more promising. In fact, the mixed origins of African slaves and the great number of languages spoken in Africa make it difficult to find a unique linguistic origin for all creole languages.

In a dissertation on the Haitian TMA system (1996), Lefebve points out that “it is often assumed that creolization involves a break in transmission”. This idea is very interesting, as it gives us the chance to imagine a role of the UG in the formation of Creole languages. In order to explain this, Lefebve cites Thomason & Kaufman (1991), who had previously presented this theory and claimed that creole languages “did not arise through any sort of direct transmission”. Lefebve also talks about Bickerton (1984) who, in his outline of the Language Bioprogram Hypothesis (LBH), makes three claims:

- “the innovative aspects of creole grammars are inventions on the part of the first generation of children who have a pidgin as their linguistic input, rather than features transmitted from preexisting languages”;
- “such inventions show a degree of similarity, across wide variations in linguistic background, that is too great to be attributed to chance”;
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the most cogent explanation of this similarity is that it derives from the structure of a species-specific program for language, genetically coded and expressed, in ways still largely misterious, in the structures and modes of operation of the human brain”.

Let us observe the following table, taken from Bickerton (1984), in which he shows the similarities between the TMA systems of 6 different creole languages, namely Saramaccan (spoken by about 24,000 people in Suriname (Dutch Guyana) and 2,000 in French Guyana\(^3\)), Sranan (spoken as a lingua franca by 300,000 people in Suriname\(^4\)), Haitian creole, Guyanese creole, Hawaiian creole and Lesser Antilles creole (which also includes GC):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>±A ±I ±N(^a)</th>
<th>Saramaccan</th>
<th>Sranan</th>
<th>Haitian C</th>
<th>Guyanese C</th>
<th>Hawaiian C</th>
<th>Lesser Antilles C(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-A -I -N</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-A -I +N</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>ap</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>stei</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-A +I -N</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>av</td>
<td>sa/go</td>
<td>go</td>
<td>ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-A +I +N</td>
<td>o-ta</td>
<td>sa-e</td>
<td>av-ap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>go stei(^b)</td>
<td>ke ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+A -I -N</td>
<td>bi</td>
<td>ben</td>
<td>te</td>
<td>bin</td>
<td>bin/wen</td>
<td>te</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+A -I +N</td>
<td>bi-ta</td>
<td>ben-e</td>
<td>t'ap</td>
<td>bina</td>
<td>bin stei(^b)</td>
<td>te ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+A +I -N</td>
<td>bi-o</td>
<td>ben-se</td>
<td>t'av</td>
<td>bin sa/go</td>
<td>(wuda)(^c)</td>
<td>te ke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+A +I +N</td>
<td>bi-o-ta</td>
<td>ben-sa-e</td>
<td>t'av-ap</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>te ke ka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)A = anterior tense; I = irrealis modality; N = nonpunctual aspect; \(^b\)Forms that are now extremely rare. \(^c\)A form borrowed from English, not part of the original creole system.

Lefebve (1996), explains that

Bickerton presents the tense, mood, and aspect system of creole languages as evidence supporting the LBH. He claims that creoles show a great deal of similarity in the way they encode tense, mood,

\(^3\) Source: Saramaccan language - Wikipedia [Visited 07 September 2012]
\(^4\) Source: Sranan Tongo - Wikipedia [Visited 07 September 2012]
\(^5\) I do not agree with this label. Nevertheless, in this case I find it useful to put all Creole languages of the Antilles together, as their TMA systems are, if not perfectly identical, extremely similar.
and aspect: (a) in these languages, tense, mood, and aspect are encoded by preverbal markers; (b) the inventory of these markers, as well as their semantics, is very similar in all creoles; and (c) the combinations of these markers have meanings that are consistent across all the more radical creoles.

What Bickerton proposes in his LBH is that there is a species-specific inborn device called the *Language Bioprogram*. The LB is an acquisitional tool that would be activated (and provide a system of tense, mood and aspect) when the linguistic input is too poor for the child to create a TMA system, such as in the situations of linguistic emergency in which Creole languages were born. According to this author, the activation of the LB constitutes a break in the grammar, which in the presence of a reduced input cannot be normally transmitted. Thus, this human in-built device is a way to account for the postulated similarities between the TMA systems of a large number of Creole languages.

These similarities seem to suggest that the TMA systems of all creole languages could be the realization of an option offered by Universal Grammar. If it was so, and if the child was able to build a grammar even when lacking a sufficient linguistic input, a large part of Creole grammar could constitute a *default* option that is activated when no option can be chosen on the basis of the mere input. If it was so, creole grammar would be a mirror of the basic options of the UG, plausibly of the options that are the easiest to acquire and/or activate because of their low-rate of *computational complexity*.

What all of these facts and observations show is that, no matter which author is right, the monogenetic theory cannot be considered valid. As seen before, the monogenetic theory in fact fails to explain a number of syntactic phenomena of Creole grammars, making it necessary to formulate other hypotheses on Creole genesis. For this reason, other theories have been formulated over the years. As pointed out by Hazaël-Massieux (2011), the polygenetic theories postulate the existence of a specialised linguistic source for each Creole language or group of related Creoles. She says that
“the big differences between Creole languages make it compelling to postulate multiple sources for each of them”\(^6\). For this reason, today “we try to show that, for French-based Creoles, two different linguistic varieties of Creole would be the bases of Caribbean Creoles on one hand and of the Creoles spoken in the Indian Ocean on the other hand”. Moreover, as she explains, “even if the origin of Creoles and their genesis are still massively debated […], and the question of the importance of African influences is still open, all scholars seem to agree on a number of points”, which I will discuss in the next section.

1.2.2 What scholars agree on

Hazaël-Massieux (2011) explains that still today only four facts about French-based Creole languages are believed to be true by all scholars. As it would not be useful for this work, I will not indulge on all the various (polygenetic) theories on Creole genesis that have been formulated in the last decades, and just introduce the universally-valid facts about the genesis of French-creoles. In fact, these will constitute the basis of our investigation of the grammar of Guadeloupean Creole as well.

First, Comhaire-Sylvain (1936) was wrong when he declared that Creole languages are “African languages with a French lexicon”\(^7\). Hazaël-Massieux explains that today the scholars who study the origins of French-based creoles tend to show both the importance of the regional varieties of oral French spoken by the slavers and that of their re-interpretations and re-structurations, which the slaves made under the influence of their native languages. The results of this processes are a number of Creole languages whose grammatical features are neither exclusively French-based nor peculiarly African. Second, all similarities between French creoles can be accounted for by postulating a common French origin, as the Western French dialects spoken by the slavers and the French free workers have clearly influenced the

---

\(^6\) All quotes from Hazaël-Massieux (2011) are my translations. The fault of any possible misinterpretation and misusage is entirely mine.

\(^7\) In fact, Hazaël-Massieux explains that he considered Ewe as the main linguistic source of Haitian Creole.
genesis of these Creoles. In the same way, most differences between varieties are explained by looking at the origins of the slaves: in fact, almost all of those who were traded to the Caribbean area came from Western Africa, whereas the slaves of the Indian Ocean regions tended to come from Eastern Africa and Madagascar. These differences are found mainly in the lexicon, as all words referring to African realities were missing from the lexicon of French and tended to be referred to by means of their original African names, which varied depending on the linguistic background of the slaves. Third, all French creoles are (and were) spoken in situations of diglossia 8 (or linguistic continuum), which means that in most cases their social status is similar (with the exception of the countries where a Creole has official status): in fact, they exist along with more prestigious varieties and are only used in oral, informal communication. Finally, even if most French-based Creoles are not in danger of extinction, some of them are slowly disappearing because of the super-power of French, whose strength is due to its political, economic and social importance. Moreover, in the three overseas French departments (Martinique, Guadeloupe and Réunion island) the youngest generations tend not to speak Creole, or to modify it in the direction of French. Throughout this work, we will see that this phenomenon is at work in Guadeloupean Creole as well, whose grammar slightly varies depending on the age and the social origin of the people who speak it.

However, before moving on to the description of Guadeloupean Creole, I offer a brief overview of the main Creole languages spoken worldwide.

1.3 Creole languages in the world

Creole languages are spoken virtually all over the world, more specifically in geographical areas that were afflicted by colonization. As pointed out in 1.1, they are divided into families depending on the colonial language they are partially based on. Unsurprisingly, most creoles are based on European languages, such as English,

---

8 Situation in which two languages with different social status are spoken. Usually, one language is the “high variety” and the other the “low variety”, and their prestige is so different that their use is contextual-bound. In such cases, any misusage of one of the two codes leads to a communicational problem.
Spanish, French, Portuguese, Dutch and German; but there are also creoles bases on Arabic, Malay and Ngbandi (see 1.3.4).

The next sections are based on information found in a number of linguistic books and atlas which I collected and re-organised. I also visited numerous Internet Sites. The number of Creole languages spoken all over the world being so large, and the number of their speakers so difficult to determine, the list might not be exhaustive and contain a few mistakes. Of course, the fault of any misinformation is entirely mine.

1.3.1 English-based Creoles

Most English-based creoles originated in British colonies in the period that followed the great military and trade expansion of Britain in the 17th, 18th and 19th centuries. For descriptive and linguistic reasons, I will divide them into Atlantic ECs, Asian ECs and Pacific ECs.

Atlantic English Creoles can be divided into Western Caribbean, Eastern Caribbean and West African creoles. Western Caribbean Atlantic English Creoles are spoken in some Western Caribbean Islands, Central America, Northern Mexico and in the Southern regions of North America. Jamaican Patois is spoken by 2.582.000 people in Jamaica, where it is the dominant language. Spoken along with English and Jamaican English (a dialect), today it is gaining in prestige. Cayman Islands English is spoken in the Cayman Islands (where it was introduced with the migration of plantation workers) and is a dialect of Jamaican Patois. Jamaican Patois was introduced in Central America as well, where today many dialects of it are spoken: Bocas del Toro Creole, Colon Creole and Rio Abajo Creole in Panama; and Limonese Creole in Costa Rica. Other English-based Creole languages are spoken in Central America: Belizean Creole (spoken in Belize as a lingua franca by the majority of the population (Johnson, 2003)), Miskito Coastal Creole (spoken by less

9 Source: Ethnologue – Languages of Jamaica. [Visited 8 February 2013]
10 Source: Ethnologue – Jamaican Creole English. [Visited 8 February 2013]
than 30,000 speakers\textsuperscript{11}) and \textit{Rama Cay Creole} (approximately 900 speakers\textsuperscript{12}) in Nicaragua, and \textit{Bay Islands Creole} (spoken in Honduras by 22,500 native speakers\textsuperscript{13}). Finally, as for Mexico and North America, \textit{Afro-Seminole Creole} is spoken in many communities scattered in Northern Mexico, Texas and Oklahoma, and \textit{Gullah} is spoken in the Sea Islands and in the adjacent North American coasts of South Carolina, Georgia and Florida.

Differently, \textit{Eastern Caribbean English Creoles} are spoken in the Eastern Islands of the Caribbean Sea. \textit{Bahamian Creole} is spoken in the Bahamas and in the Turks and Caicos Islands by about 400,000 people\textsuperscript{14}, and in the latter also different varieties of \textit{Turks and Caicos Islands Creole} are found. In the Dominican Republic, more precisely in the Samana Peninsula, \textit{Samana English} is spoken by 8,000 people\textsuperscript{15}. The speakers of this Creole language are mostly the descendants of US black slaves (called the Samana Americans) who settled there in 1824. As for the Lesser Antilles, many Creole languages are spoken in those islands: \textit{Virgin Islands Creole} and \textit{Saint

\textsuperscript{11} Source: \texttt{Miskito Coast Creole – Wikipedia}. [Visited 8 February 2013]
\textsuperscript{12} Source: \texttt{Rama Cay Creole – Wikipedia}. [Visited 8 February 2013]
\textsuperscript{13} Source: \texttt{English – Ethnologue}. [Visited 8 February 2013]
\textsuperscript{14} Source: \texttt{Bahamian Creole – Wikipedia}. [Visited 8 February 2013]
\textsuperscript{15} Source: \texttt{English – Ethnologue}. [Visited 8 February 2013]
Martin Creole English in the Virgin Islands and in the former Netherlands Antilles (where it is also known as Netherlands Antilles Creole English); Crucian in Saint Croix; Leeward Caribbean Creole English (or Leeward Islands Creole) in the Commonwealth Islands, which are situated between the Virgin Islands and Guadeloupe; Saint Kitts Creole in Saint Kitts and Nevis; Montserrat Creole in Montserrat; Antigua Creole in Antigua and Barbuda; Anguillian Creole in Anguilla; Bajan in the Barbado; Vincentian Creole in Saint Vincent and the Grenadines; Grenadian Creole in Grenada; Tobagonian Creole in Tobago; and Trinidadian Creole in Trinidad.

South Eastern Caribbean English Creoles are spoken in the South-American regions of Guyana, Colombia and Suriname. Guyanese Creole is spoken throughout the Co-operative Republic of Guyana and is divided into many dialects. The total number of
speakers is about 700,000. Saint Andrés-Providencia Creole is a dialect of Jamaican Patois spoken by 15,000 people in Columbia, where it was introduced with the migration of plantation workers. The situation in the Republic of Suriname is more complex, as many creole languages are spoken in the area. In fact, Sranan Congo is the vernacular language spoken by the majority of the population (approximately 300,000 speakers), along with many dialects introduced by escaped African slaves: Aluku (spoken by 5,000 speakers), Ndyuka (25,000 to 30,000 speakers), Paramaccan (less than 1,000 speakers), Kwinti (less than 200 speakers) and Mataway. Ndyuka excepted, all of these Creole dialects are in serious danger of extinction.

West African English Creoles are spoken on the Western countries of Africa. Krio, spoken in Sierra Leone by 490,000 speakers, is very similar to Nigerian Pidgin and mutually intelligible with Jamaican Patois. Present in Gambia as well, it is spoken by

---

16 Source: [Guyanese Creole – Wikipedia](#). [Visited 8 February 2013]
17 Source: [Ethnologue – Islander Creole English](#). [Visited 8 February 2013]
18 Source: [Sranan Tongo – Wikipedia](#). [Visited 8 February 2013].
19 Source: [Ethnologue – Aukan](#). [Visited 8 February 2013]
20 Source: [Ndyuka language – Wikipedia](#). [Visited 8 February 2013]
21 Source: [Paramaccan people – Wikipedia](#). [Visited 8 February 2013]
22 Source: [Ethnologue – Kwinti](#). [Visited 8 February 2013]
23 Source: [Ethnologue – Krio](#). [Visited 10 February 2013]
so-called Aku people, whose descendants came from Sierra Leone. *Nigerian Pidgin* is spoken as a lingua franca across Nigeria (30.000.000 speakers), and tends to be considered a pidgin instead of a Creole language because only few speakers use it as a native language. *Kamtok*, or Cameroonian Pidgin English, is spoken as a first language by 5% of the people of Cameroon. It is divided into two dialects, Grafi and Limbe-Krio. *Liberian Pidgin English* (or Kreyol) is spoken in Liberia. It is said not to be the native language of anyone, and to be spoken as a second language by 1.500.000 speakers. Finally, an English is spoken in Spanish Guinea as well: *Fernando Poo Creole* (5.000 speakers). It was initially used for trade reasons by Krio descendants coming from Sierra Leone.

Asian English Creoles originated in South East Asia. They are called *Manglish* and *Singlish* and are spoken respectively in Malaysia and Singapore (see map 5). They both developed from British English and originally constituted a single language, as Malaysia and Singapore were a single political entity, old Malaya. Later, the vocabulary was influenced by American English and other languages spoken in the
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area as well, and the original language gradually split after 1948, when the Malayan Union was dissolved and replaced by the Federation of Malaya. Today, they can be considered two varieties of the same Creole language.

Map 5: Asian English Creoles

Pacific English Creoles developed in Katherine and Queensland, two northern regions of Australia, and in a number of Pacific Islands. Roper River Creole, also known as Australian Creole, is spoken in Northern Australia, more precisely in the Katherine area. With its 10,000 speakers, it is the major non-English language spoken by Aboriginal Australians. Torres Strait Creole is spoken by 25,000 people on several Torres Strait Islands, in the Australian region of Queensland (Shnukal (1988)). Hawaiian Pidgin (today called also Hawaii Creole English) is a language spoken in the Hawaiian Islands by 600,000 people. It was at first a pidgin, that is, a lingua franca used for everyday communication during the early European colonization, and had already been nativized by Hawaiian children by the 1920s. Other English-based creoles are Bislama (one of the official languages of Vanuatu), Pijin (spoken in the Solomon Islands and closely related to Tok Pisin), and Tok Pisin. The last is very important today, as it is spoken throughout Papua New Guinea.
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as a first language by 50,000 people and as a second language by 2,000,000. Unsurprisingly, it is the most widely spoken official language of the country.

1.3.2 Spanish-based Creoles

If compared to the number of English-based Creoles that developed in the areas afflicted by the British commercial and political super-power, that of Spanish Creoles is almost irrelevant. Only two genuine Spanish Creoles are Chavacano and Palenquero, spoken respectively in the Philippines and in Colombia. Differently, Dominican Spanish and Caribbean Spanish are to be considered creolized languages, and there are many Creoles spoken around the world that are based on languages other than Spanish but have been massively influenced by it.

Chavacano (also known as Chabacano) is a Spanish-based Creole languages spoken by 293,000 native speakers in the Philippines. It is divided into six varieties whose names derive from those of the localities where they are spoken: Zamboangueño, Castellano Abakay, Ternateño, Caviteño, Cotabateño and Ermitaño. Each of them is
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influenced by different substratum languages. Chavacano dates back of more than 400 years, which makes it the oldest Creole languages still spoken. It is the only language spoken in the Philippines that does not belong to the family of Austronesian languages (Steinkrüger (2006)). The other genuine Spanish-based Creole language, *Palenquero* (or Palenque), is spoken as a native language by a very small group of people (about 500) in South America, more precisely in Colombia. The ethnic group to which it is associated consists of not more than 3,000 people, and only a very few speakers aged less than 25 years can speak it. These two facts make it a language in serious danger of extinction. This language shows interesting influences of Kongo (the language of the Democratic Republic of Congo).

Some other languages show a clear influence of Spanish, even though they cannot be considered true Spanish Creoles. For example, *Dominican Spanish* and *Caribbean Spanish* show some features of creolization, which are probably due to the influence

of West-African languages spoken in the area as a consequence of the colonial period. The former is spoken in the Dominican Republic and by all the Dominicans scattered around the world (Dominican diaspora), whereas the latter is found in a number of Caribbean Islands (Cuba, Puerto Rico, Dominican Republic) and in Central and South America (Panama, Venezuela and the eastern coast of Colombia). More than real Creole languages, these languages can be considered dialects of Spanish with lexical and syntactic Creole influences.

Moreover, some Creole languages whose lexical basis is not Spanish have undergone a clear lexical and syntactic Spanish influence over the years. This happened mainly in the countries that were conquered by both Britain and Spain. The most important cases are: Annobonese (a Portuguese-based Creole spoken in Equatorial Guinea in the islands of Bioko and Ano Bom) (1.3.3); Nigerian Pidgin (a Creole language based on English and spoken throughout Nigeria) (1.3.1); Papamiento (spoken in the Lesser Antilles by about 360,000 people, it was originally Portuguese-based but converges more and more in the direction of Spanish because of the contact with the surrounding Spanish-speaking countries) (1.3.3); Pichinglis (an English Creole spoken in Equatorial Guinea) (1.3.1); Haitian Creole (French-based, heavily influenced in its vocabulary by its hispanophone neighbours) (1.4.1); and Saint Andrés-Providencia Creole (spoken in Colombia by the natives) (1.3.1).

1.3.3 Portuguese-based Creoles

Portuguese-based Creoles developed in the areas where Portugal played an important political, economical and social role between the 15th and the 16th century. They are spoken in West Africa, South America, India and Sri Lanka, and in the Pacific Ocean (map 8). Portuguese-based Creoles have been massively studied in the past because they were thought to be at the origin of all Creole languages (monogenetic theory of Creole genesis), which has turned out to be a false belief (1.2.1). Unfortunately, at least four Portuguese Creoles originally spoken in Southeast Asia became extinct in
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the 19th and 20th centuries: Mardijiker (spoken in Jakarta by the homonym people and extinct in the 19th century³⁸); Papia Tugu (spoken in Tugu, Indonesia, and extinct in 1978); Portegis (spoken in Indonesia until around 1950); and Bidau Portuguese (spoken in East Timor until the 1960s).

As a consequence of the extinction of Mardijiker, Papia Tugu, Portegis and Bidau Portuguese, only a Portuguese Creole is still spoken in Southeast Asia. The language in question is Kristang (also known as Cristao, “the language of Christians”), which is spoken in the Malacca area of Malaysia and in Singapore by about 1000 people³⁹. The language is also spoken by the Kristang immigrants and descendants in Britain, and by a number of migrated retired people in Australia (Perth). Another Portuguese Creole is spoken in the coasts of the Pacific Ocean, more precisely in Macau and, with a less extent, in the town of Hong Kong. It is called Macanese (or Patua) and in 2009 it has been classified by UNESCO as critically endangered language, as the number of its speakers was believed to be smaller than 50 in the year 2000. It is in fact spoken as a first language by only a few Macanese old women⁴⁰.

Differently, many Portuguese-based Creoles have survived and are still spoken in West Africa. Moreover, two of them are so important that they became one of the official languages of the countries where they are spoken: Cape Verdan Creole in Cape Verde and Kriol (or Guinea-Bissau Creole), which is the lingua franca of Guinea-Bissau. The former is spoken as a first or second language by about 954,000 people⁴¹, whereas the latter by 483,400 people⁴². Other Creole languages based on Portuguese and spoken more to the South are: Angolar (5,000 native speakers⁴³) and Forro (about 69,900 speakers⁴⁴) in São Tomé Island; the Annobonese language (about 2,500 native speakers⁴⁵, very similar to Forro) in the islands Annobon and
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Bioko, which are part of Equatorial Guinea; and *Principe*nsen*se* (almost extinct, spoken by less than 200 speakers, many of whom are old women\(^{46}\)) in the island of Principe.

In central America, two other important Creole languages are spoken: *Papamien*to and *Saramaccan*. The first one is spoken in the so-called ABC-islands (Aruba, Bonaire, Curàçao: Lesser Antilles) by more than 300,000 native speakers\(^{47}\), whereas the second one is spoken in Suriname by about 26,000 people\(^{48}\). Sometimes, the structural and lexical similarities existing between Spanish and Portuguese tend to make it difficult to determine whether a Creole language is Spanish-based or Portuguese-based, so the precise origins of many Central- and South-American Creoles are still uncertain. Moreover, there is an interesting debate on the origins of Saramaccan, as in the linguistic literature this language is classified as both as an English-based Creole with a massive number of Portuguese words, and as a Portuguese-based Creole that has undergone a process of *relexification* in the direction of English.

Finally, a very little number of speakers of Portuguese-based Creoles still exists in Sri Lanka and in India. In fact, there would be only 5,000 native speakers of at least one of the 6 varieties of Indian Portuguese creoles still existing. *Sri Lankan Portuguese Creole* is spoken in Sri Lanka and has less than 30 speakers\(^{49}\); *Diu Portuguese Creole* is spoken in Diu (India) by around 180 people\(^{50}\); the *Kasti* language of the village of Korlai (India) has about 750 speakers\(^{51}\). *Daman Portuguese Creole*, with its 4000 native speakers (see note 47), is the most important Portuguese-based Creole left in the Indian territory. It is spoken in Dama, India. Sadly though, *Cannanore Portuguese Creole* is almost extinct (it is said to be spoken by only 5 people), and the last speaker of *Cochin Portuguese Creole* died in 2010.

\(^{46}\) Source: *Ethnologue – Principense*. [Visited 11 February 2013]
\(^{47}\) Source: *Papamien*to – Wikipedia. [Visited 11 February 2013]
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1.3.4 Other Creole languages

Among the main Creole languages spoken around the world and derived from European languages, we also list German-based Creoles and Dutch-based ones. Also other Creoles are found, which are based on extra-European idioms: Arabic-based, Malay-based and Ngbandi-based Creoles.

The only German-based Creole still alive is so-called Unserdeutsch (“Our German”). It is spoken by about 100 native speakers in Papua New Guinea and 10 in Great Britain. It is, for this reason, seriously endangered. Similarly, all Dutch-based Creoles are today extinct or spoken by less than 10 speakers (and thus almost dead). Berbice and Skepi were spoken in Guyana and became extinct respectively in 2005 and by 1998. Negerhollands, once spoken in the US Virgin Islands, died out in 1987. No data exists for the number of speakers of Petjo, which is considered to
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be critically in danger of extinction, and *Javindo*\(^{57}\) has been extinct since the 20\(^{th}\) century. They were both spoken in Indonesia. *Ceylon Dutch*, spoken in Sri Lanka since when the country became a Dutch colony, seems not to be spoken anymore\(^{58}\). All of the three American Dutch-based Creoles are now extinct: *Mohawk Dutch* and *Albany Dutch* (spoken in New York), as well as *Negro Dutch* (spoken in New Jersey)\(^{59}\).

Among the Creole languages based on non-European idioms we list Arabic-based, Malay-based and Ngbandi-based Creoles. *Arabic-based Creoles* are spoken in Kenya and Uganda (*Nubi*, about 25.000 speakers\(^{60}\)), Southern Sudan (*Juba Arabic*, about 20.000 native speakers\(^{61}\)), and Chad (*Babalia Creole Arabic*, less than 4000 speakers\(^{62}\)). *Malay-based Creoles* are spoken in Malaysia and Indonesia. Each counts less than 200.000 speakers, and many of them are almost extinct. In these regions, also a number of pidgins used for trade reasons are still spoken\(^{63}\). Finally, the only *Ngbandi-based Creole*, whose Creole status is however uncertain, is *Sango*. This idiom is spoken in the Central African Republic, Chad, and the Democratic Republic of Congo, counts about 404.000 native speakers\(^{64}\) and 1.600.000 people who speak it as a second language\(^{65}\).

### 1.4 French-based Creole languages

French-based Creoles can be divided into 2 main groups, depending on the area where they are spoken. Of course, mutual intelligibility is not impossible between speakers of different varieties of French Creoles belonging to the same area, whereas it is often difficult for speakers coming from different areas to understand each other. The two main families of French Creoles are: *Caribbean FCs* (1.4.1) and
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Other minor Creoles are spoken in the Pacific Ocean and in Asia: *Tayo* in New Caledonia (less than 2000 speakers (Ehrhart (1993)), and *Tay Boi* in Vietnam (less than 1000 speakers).

Moreover, two French Creoles were spoken in Africa in the past, but they are now extinct: *Little Moorish* in North Africa (Jocelyne (2008)), and *Petit Nègre* in West Africa (above all in Cote d'Ivoire).

In the next sections, I will briefly describe the major French Creoles and give an overview on the minor ones. The distinction between *major* and *minor* Creoles is based on the number of their speakers and does not imply any qualitative judgement.

### 1.4.1 Carribean French Creoles

The French-based Creoles of the Caribbean area are commonly divided into two

---

groups on the basis of their *progressive aspect marker*. The first group is that of Haitian and Louisiana Creole, which mark the progressive aspect by means of the morpheme *ape* (also *ap* and *pe*), derived from the French word *après* (Wittmann (1995)). Differently, the morpheme *ka* characterizes the following Creoles: all the varieties of *Lesser Antillean Creoles* (LAC), *Grenadian Creole French*, *Guyanese*, *Karipuna* and *Lanc-Patuà*.

As for the minor varieties of Caribbean French Creoles, let us remember that *Louisiana Creole* is spoken in Louisiana by 70.000 native speakers67, whereas *Karipunà* and *Lanc-Patua* are spoken in Amapà (Brazil) by about 1.710 people68.

### 1.4.1.1 Haitian Creole

*Haitian Creole* (or *Kréyòl Ayisyen*) is the official language of Haiti, along with French (Valdman (2011)). The *Republic of Haiti* is a country of the Caribbean area, located in the Great Antillean archipelago. It constitutes the smaller portion of the island of *Hispaniola*, whose other part is the Spanish-speaking *Dominican Republic*. Haiti is a unique country from a historical and ethno-linguistic point of view. Allegedly, it was the first nation of Latin America and the Caribbean to become independent, and the first Republic in the world led by Black people. It was also the second Republic proclaimed in the Americas, which happened in 1804 after a ten-year revolution of the slaves. Haiti is the most populous of the main French-speaking independent American nations. Along with Canada, it is the only American nation whose official language is French. In fact, all the other French-speaking areas of the Americas are French overseas departments. This is the case for example of Guadeloupe, Martinique and Réunion island.

Haitian Creole is spoken by about 6.960.000 people in Haiti and in a large number of Haitian-speaking communities of immigrants scattered in the Americas (7.701.640 in
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all countries). In 1987, it has been recognized as the official language (along with French), mainly thanks to the efforts of the Haitian writer Félix Morisseau-Leroy. Before that recognition, and since the Haitian independence of 1804, French had been the unique literary language of the country. The situation has started to change in the 1980s, when many professors, writers and activists started to write in Haitian Creole. Nowadays, many newspapers, radio and television programs, are written and produced in Haitian Creole.

This Creole language, massively based on 18th-century French, also shows some West African features, as well as the influence of languages such as Arawak and Taíno (two Caribbean and Central-American native languages), English, Arabic, Portuguese and Spanish (Lefebve (1985)). As pointed out before, it is one of the only two French creoles of the Caribbean area to have the *progressive aspect* marker *ape* (the other being Louisiana Creole). Today, it is the largest French-based creole, and the most widely-spoken Creole in the world.

1.4.1.2 Lesser Antillean Creole(s)

Under the broad label of *Lesser Antillean Creole*, many a variety is included: Guadeloupean Creole, Dominican Creole, Martinican Creole, Saint Lucian Creole and Grenada Creole. All of these varieties are (virtually) mutually intelligible and are characterized by the presence of the *progressive aspect* marker *ka*. The common label is justified by the common linguistic source of these Creoles, an original Antillean Creole that split into many varieties (Hazaël-Massieux (2011)). For this reason, even though the label LAC is not wrong, it is better to call each variety with its peculiar name, as they all show lexical and grammatical peculiarities. The two main varieties of LAC, very similar to each other, are *Guadaloupean* and *Martinican* Creoles. As the former will be the object of this whole work, I will just give some information on the latter.
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*Martinican Creole* is a Creole language spoken in *Martinique*, a French overseas department whose official language is French. Like Guadeloupe, it is part of the French Republic and of the Eurozone. It is located in the Eastern Caribbean sea (south-east to Guadeloupe) and its prefecture is Fort-de-France. This variety of LAC is very similar to Guadeloupean Creole and, despite being widely spoken by most inhabitants of the island (about 418,000 people\(^{71}\)), it has no official recognition. It is French-based and shows many West African features, as well as a number of peculiarly creole ones. It has undergone massive Spanish and English influences over the years, in particular lexical ones.

As for the minor varieties of LAC instead, *Grenadian Creole* is spoken in Grenada by less than 90,000 native speakers\(^{72}\), whereas *Saint Lucian* (or Dominican Creole) is one of the languages of Santa Lucia and Dominica and is spoken by around 356,000 people\(^{73}\).

### 1.4.1.3 Guyanese

Guyanese is spoken in *French Guiana* (officially Guyane), an overseas region of France located on the North-Atlantic coast of South America. Predictably, the official language of French Guiana is French. Along with Guyanese Creole, a number of other local languages are found: six *Amerindian languages* (indigenous idioms of the Americas), four *Maroon dialects* (languages of the slaves who escaped from the West Indies and the Americas and formed independent settlements), as well as *Hmong Njua* (a dialect of the family of Miao languages). Also some other language are spoken in French Guiana, like for example: Portuguese, Hakka (a variety of Chinese), Haitian Creole, Spanish, Dutch and English.

Guyanese Creole is not only spoken in French Guiana but also in *Suriname* and in the English-speaking *Co-operative Republic of Guyana*. The number of native
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speakers is about 150,000. It derives from French and shows, like other Caribbean French-based Creoles, West African, Portuguese, Spanish and English influences. Even if it is commonly listed among Caribbean French Creoles, its grammar and lexicon are different from those of the varieties spoken in the Lesser Antilles, so much so that intercomprehension between Guyanese-speaking people and LAC-speaking ones is not always assured. However, as LACs do, this language marks the progressive aspect by means of the preverbal morpheme *ka*. As happens in Guadeloupe and Martinique, despite its unofficial status, today this French Creole is taught in schools, where in certain special contexts it is also used as a *vehicular language* in class.

Guyanese Creole must not be confused with *Guyanese English Creole*, an English-based Creole spoken mainly in English Guyana (1.3.1).

### 1.4.2 Bourbonnais Creoles

Bourbonnais Creoles are spoken in the Western part of the Indian Ocean. They are all characterized by the presence of the progressive aspect marker *ape* (Wittmann 74). Source: [French Guyanese Creole – Wikipedia](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Guyanese_creole). [Visited 15 February 2013]
1.4.2.1 Mauritian Creole

Mauritian Creole is spoken in the Republic of Mauritius, a nation composed of a main island (Mauritius) and 3 lesser islands (Rodrigues, Agaléga and Saint Brandon) located in the Western part of the Indian Ocean. More precisely, Mauritius is 2000 kilometres off the south-eastern coast of Africa. Mauritian people belong to several ethnicities and most of them are multilingual. In fact, on the territory English, French, Mauritian Creole and a number of Asian languages are spoken, none of which is mentioned in the Mauritian constitution as being the official idiom of the country. In fact, English, French and Mauritian Creole are only recognized as vernacular languages. However, English is recognized by people as the official language, French as the lingua franca of the nation and Mauritian Creole as the domestic idiom. For this reason, Mauritian Creole is more of an oral language than of a written one: it is possible to find some literature written in this French-based Creole, but Mauritians usually do not read in Creole (Carpooran (2011)).

Mauritian Creole (whose original name is Kréol morisyen) is based on French and shows clear lexical loans from African languages (mainly Malgache), English and the Asian languages spoken in the country (Carpooran (2011)). It is at least understood by virtually everyone in Mauritius, and its native speakers are about 1.200.000 (Carpooran (2011)). Syntactically, it is closely related to the other Bourbonnais French Creoles, above all Seychellois Creole and Chagossian Creole. Differently, Mauritian Creole and Réunion Creole are as distant from one another as they are from other non-Bourbonnais French-based Creoles (Baker&Corne (1982)). However, it does share with all other Bourbonnais Creoles (and with Haitian and
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Louisiana Creoles as well) the presence of the progressive aspect marker *ape*.

Finally, remember that in Rodríguez (a semi-autonomous island part of the Republic of Mauritius) a dialect of Mauritian Creole called *Rodriguan Creole* is spoken. The number of its speakers must be about 37,000 or slightly less, as almost everyone in Rodríguez speaks Creole and the population of the island is estimated to be of about 37,992 people79.

### 1.4.2.2 Réunion Creole

The *Réunion Island* is the native land of Réunion Creole. It is a French island located east of Madagascar, in the Indian Ocean. As Guadeloupe and Martinique, it is an overseas department of France, thus part of the French Republic and of the Eurozone. Its only official language is French, even though Réunion Creole is spoken by the vast majority of the population. According to Staudacher-Valliamee (2010) in fact, this Creole is the native language of more than 90% of the whole population, which is estimated to be of 743,000 people. Moreover, French and Reunion Creole are not the only languages found on the island, as also a number of indigenous Indian, Chinese and Arabic varieties are spoken by certain religious or ethnic communities.

*Réunion Creole* (or Kréol Réyoné) is, like all other Bourbonnais Creoles, a language that marks progressive aspectuality by means of the preverbal morpheme *ape*. However, as pointed out by Baker&Corne (1982), it is as distant from the grammar of other Bourbonnais Creoles as it is from that of Caribbean French-based Creoles. It is spoken by 555,000 people in the Réunion and by more than 600,000 people if we take into account the number of Réunionnais-speaking immigrants as well80. It derived mainly from French and clearly shows the influence of other languages spoken in the territory in its lexical entries. Among others, Chaudenson (1974) lists:
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Malagasy, Hindi, Portuguese, Gujurati (an Indo-Aryan language) and Tamil (a Dravidian language native to India). As the language of education is French, Réunion Creole is rarely written and maintains its original status of oral language. However, since 2001, it is taught in schools as a *regional language*, and also bilingual French/Creole education is allowed\(^{81}\).

**1.4.2.3 Seychellois Creole**

The *Republic of Seychelles* is the archipelago composed of 115 islands where Seychellois Creole is spoken. It is located in the Indian Ocean, northeast of the island of Madagascar. The official languages are English, French and Seychellois Creole. This makes the Seychelles, along with Haiti, one of the few countries recognizing a Creole as their official language.

*Seychellois Creole* (whose Creole name is Sesèlwa) is a French-based Creole language of the *ape* group which has undergone a number of English, African and Indian influences. It is spoken by about 72,700 people\(^{82}\) and, since the independence of Seychelles from the United Kingdom power in 1976, scholars have tried to develop and codify it, trying to give it a fixed written form as well\(^{83}\). For this purpose, the Seychellois Creole Institute has been created. It is reported to show relatively minor structural differences if compared to Mauritian Creole, and to present a low rate of intelligibility with Réunion Creole (see note 14). A dialect of Seychellois, called *Chabossian Creole*, is reportedly spoken in Chagos Islands by about 3,000 people.
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81 Source: [Kreol dann Lekol](http://www.kreol-ekol.com/). [Visited 6 February 2013]
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Chapter 2
On Guadeloupe and Guadaloupean Creole

This chapter constitutes a brief introduction to Guadaloupean Creole, both from a geographic and historic point of view and from a linguistic perspective. Section 2.1 is dedicated to the geography of the islands where Guadaloupean Creole is spoken and to some notes on the population of these territories. Section 2.2 retraces the history of the islands of Guadeloupe, from their discovery to present days. Finally, in 2.3 I will briefly introduce Guadeloupean Creole, trying to demonstrate its linguistic independence from French.

2.1 Geography of the islands of Guadeloupe

_Gwadloup_ (or _Gwada_, Creole name for Guadeloupe) is a Caribbean archipelago located in the Leeward Islands, which are part of the Lesser Antilles. It belongs to the so-called _French West Indies_. It is an overseas region of France, consisting of a single overseas department whose departmental code is 971. As all other overseas departments, Guadeloupe is also an integral part of the French Republic and, as a consequence, of the European Union and the Eurozone too. Its prefecture and capital is the town of _Basse-Terre_. Besides proper _Guadeloupe_, which is divided into _Basse-Terre_ and _Grand-Terre_, this French department also includes the smaller islands of _Marie-Galante_, _La Désirade_, and the _Îles des Saintes_ (“Islands of the Saints”).

Guadeloupe has a land area of 1.628 kilometres square and a population of 403.355 (2010 census). It is located 6.200 kilometres away from metropolitan France, 600 to the North of South America, 700 to the East of the Dominican Republic and 2.300 to the South-east of the United States (see map 9). Marie-Galante, La Désirade and the Saintes are dependencies of Guadeloupe. The first one is located at the South of
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85 Estimates from the CIA World Factbook, july 2006. Notice that these estimates also include Saint-Martin and Saint-Barthélemy; and disagree with official INSEE estimates.
86 Source: [Région Guadeloupe (Site officiel) – Les dépendances](http://www.guadeloupe.fr). [Visited 19/02/2013]
Guadeloupe and at the north of Dominica, and has a population of 12,009 people (2006 census) and a land area of 158 kilometres square. The second one is located about 8 kilometres to the East of Grande-Terre, and groups a population of 1,595 inhabitants (2006 census) in 20.64 kilometres square. The last ones, the Îles des Saintes, constitute a small archipelago and are located at the South of Basse-Terre, west of Marie-Galante and north of Dominica. They are composed of 2 main inhabited islands (Terre-de-Haut and Terre-de-Bas), and of 7 other uninhabited ones.

The total area of the 9 islands is of 12.8 kilometres square, and the number of inhabitants of the two main islands is 3,418 (2008 census).

87 Source: Marie-Galante – Wikipedia. [Visited 19/02/2013]
88 Source: La Désirade – Wikipedia. [Visited 19/02/2013]
89 Source: Îles des Saintes – Wikipedia. Visited 19/02/2013]
2.1.1 Guadeloupean people

The population of Guadeloupe is very variegated. According to Moïse (2005), Guadeloupe is a “multicoloured island” that can be considered a “cultural mosaic”. Although any statistics about the ethnic origins of the population is forbidden in France, it is possible to make some observations on the ethnicity of Guadeloupean inhabitants. In fact, most of them (say, about 70% of the population) are Black or mixed-race people, whereas a smaller part of the population are of Indo-caribbean, European, or Middle-eastern origins. Moreover, in the last few decades also some Asian people started to move to Guadeloupe, thus making the population of its islands even more mixed.

Despite the massive number of young people who move to metropolitan France or to the United States every year, Guadeloupe is one of the youngest French departments. Guadeloupean people are reported\(^{90}\) to speak 1 to 4 languages, depending on their geographical and social origins: French (most inhabitants, except very old people), Guadeloupean Creole (most inhabitants, younger generations partly excluded\(^{91}\)), English, and Haitian Creole. English is spoken in Guadeloupe both as a consequence of the British colonization and because of its social, economic and political power. Generally, the variety of English that Guadeloupean people look up to is American English, not only because of the super-power of the United States and of their geographic closeness to Guadeloupe, but also because of the evergreen cold conflicts between French and English people. Differently, Haitian Creole was introduced by Haitian migrants. In fact, migrations to Guadeloupe by French Caribbean people are quite common because it is one of the wealthiest island of the Caribbean sea.

2.2 History of Guadeloupe

Many an author has tried to outline the history of Guadeloupe. This section is based mainly on Oruno (1921), a very old yet quite interesting account on the historical
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90 Source: Ethnologue – Languages of Guadeloupe. [Visited 19/02/2013]
91 Cf. Introduction.
evolution of the region from 1492 up to the end of the 19th century; the history of slavery in Martinique and Guadeloupe of Belenus (1988); the recent description of the history of Lesser Antilles and Guyane by Adélaïde-Merlande (1994); Moreau (1992)'s overview of the history of the Lesser Antilles from their discovery to the 17th century; and Cocks (2010).

The first occupants of the Guadeloupean region were Native Americans who came from the Guyana Shield. They were a pacific tribe of fishermen, called the Arawaks, who lived in the region up to the 9th century. Virtually all of the men of this tribe were exterminated by the Kalinagos, a people of cannibal warriors who came from other Caribbean islands. However, they did not kill the Arawak women, with whom they had mixed-race children who probably spoke both the Arawak and the Kalinagos idioms. These people called Guadeloupe Karukera (“the island of the gumtree”), and lived there until the beginning of the 15th century when the Europeans (who re-baptised the island Calau, “the island with beautiful waters”) landed on the territory.

European people arrived in Guadeloupe with Christopher Columbus in November 1493, during his second American expedition. After the Virgin Mary, venerated in the Spanish town of Guadalupe (Extremadura), he gave the island the name of Santa María de Guadalupe. Allegedly, the Europeans did not start to settle down in the territories before 1635, and they were responsible of the genocide of all Native Americans and of the introduction in the region of African people, whom they traded and used as slaves (see Moïse (2005)). These colonizers were French and, consequently, both Guadeloupe and Martinique became possession of the king of France Louis XIV. However, also the Brits conquered Guadeloupe, which became English from 1759 to 1763 and then for a short time in 1794. The second time in fact, the general Victor Hugues manages to chase them thanks to the help of the slaves, whom he had promised to set free. Consequently, he abolishes slavery on 7th July 1794. Sadly though, Bonaparte reintroduced it on 16th July 1802. In the following years and before the ultimate French conquest in November 1815, Guadeloupe
becomes British again, and then Swedish. Slavery is finally abolished for good in 1848 under the Second Empire, and Guadeloupe (along with Martinique) loses its colonial status and becomes an overseas French department on 19th March 1946.

African slaves were introduced in Guadeloupe starting from 1660, whereas Indian workers arrived there only after the abolition of slavery in 1848, and up to 1889. In the same period, more precisely from 1857 to 1861, a large number of Kongos, very strong African men, were hired to revive the sugar production. After World War I, also some Syrian and Lebanese merchants settled down in the area, whereas after the horrors of WW2, in which many French soldiers coming from the colonies died, some Dominicans arrived in Guadeloupe in order to work in the fields. The same happened to Haitian workers, but this only after 1980. Among all of these people, let us not forget the presence in Guadeloupe of those who were originally referred to as Creoles\textsuperscript{92}, that is, the white descendants of former slavers and high-class Europeans. For all of these reasons, and also thanks to all the European and Asian people who moved to Guadeloupe in more recent years, today the population of this French overseas department is extremely variegated from an ethnic and cultural point of view. It is in this complex cultural and linguistic situation than Guadeloupean Creole developed, which is the offspring of the mixing of French and a number of West African languages (very likely, èwè (Sylvain-Comhaire (1936)) and other varieties of the kwa family\textsuperscript{93} (Lefebve (1998)), and of later influences of all the languages spoken in the territory in more recent years.

2.3 On Guadaloupean Creole

The next sections will be dedicated to an overview on the main characteristics of Guadaloupean Creole, above all on those who differentiate it from its parent

\textsuperscript{92} This is the original employ of the word Creole. Notice that today, everybody and everything that comes from the Islands is referred to as Creole, animals, objects and food included (for further details on the subject, see Poullet&Telchid (2004)). Then, the traditional distinction between Creole and Black people does not exist anymore, and anyone coming from the French Caribbean islands is considered a Creole, regardless of any ethnic consideration.

\textsuperscript{93} See Ethnologue – Kwa [Visited 28 May 2013] for further details on this family of languages scattered mainly in Western Africa.
language, French. I will show that these differences lie on its syntactic features, as most functional elements of Guadeloupean Creole do not have French origins or, despite having derived from French, underwent a specification in their use (2.3.2). These observations will give me the possibility to explain why Guadeloupean Creole is linguistically independent from French (2.3.2). Also a problem in the denomination of this Creole, and more specifically in the distinction between different varieties of French Antillean Creole, will be dealt with (2.3.1).

2.3.1 A denomination problem

Before starting the description of the morphosyntax of Guadeloupean Creole, a precision is in order. Guadaloupean Creole is also known as Lesser Antillean Creole (henceforth, LAC) and is said to be spoken on the whole by 850,000 speakers\(^{94}\). The fact is that the label LAC is too broad and includes many varieties of a single original French-based Creole language which does not exist anymore. In fact, all of these languages clearly show a common origin, and ancient texts demonstrate the existence of an original Antillean Creole which is no more spoken or written anywhere (Hazaël-Massieux (2011)). What happened is that over the years this language underwent a series of diatopic and diachronic changes and ended up splitting into a number of different linguistic varieties. This phenomenon is part of the normal evolution process that every language undergoes, and is justified not only by the passing of time but also by the fact that the language was spoken in a number of islands that were different both from a geographical, historic and social point of view and from a linguistic one.

For this reason, Martinican, Santois, Guyanese, Haitian, Dominican, St Lucian, and Guadaloupean Creoles are nowadays different languages (or different varieties of the same language) and in my opinion should not be grouped under the simplistic label of LAC. They are in fact so different, both from a grammatical and a lexical point of view, that mutual intelligibility between different varieties is not always assured.

\(^{94}\) Source: Ethnologue – Languages of Guadeloupe. [Visited 19/02/2013]
Hazaël-Massieux (2011) explains that the degree of mutual comprehension between speakers of different varieties of Caribbean French Creole varies mainly depending on their education and age. In fact, even if the youngest generations of Martinican and Guadeloupean people find it rather easy to communicate with each other, it would be almost impossible to do so for older people who do not share a common code, be it French or a Creole with mixed Guadeloupean and Martinican features. To be more precise then, we should say that proper Guadeloupean Creole is spoken and/or understood only by 350,000 people.

2.3.2 Lexical vs functional elements

Although French-based Creoles derived most of their lexicon from French, their syntax shows a number of features that betray different origins, be they West African or peculiarly Creole. Let us observe the following extract taken from Tiprens-la (2010), the translation of Saint-Exupéry's book Le petit Prince:

**Adan liv-la, yo té ka di konsa: “Sé sèpan boa-la ka valé jibyé a-yo toutannantyé, sans krazé-y. Aprèsa, yo pa fouti déplasé é yo ka dòmi pannan sé si mwa-la manjé-la ka pwan pou désann an fal a-yo la.**

“In the book, they said: “Boa snakes swallow their prey entirely, without chewing it. Afterwards, they cannot move, so they sleep during the six months of their digestion.” [my translation]

The *underlined* lexical words are clearly of French origin: GC *adan* < FR *dans* (EN “inside”); *liv* < *livre* (“book”); *di* < *dire* (“to say”); *konsa* < comme ça (“like this”, “this way”); *sèpan* < *serpent* (“snake”); *boa* < *boa*; *valé* < *avaler* (“to swallow”); *toutannantyé* < tout en entier (“completely”, “entirely”); *sans* < sans (“without”); *krazé* < écraser (“to smash”, here in the sense of “to chew”); *aprésa* < après ça (“after that”); *fouti* < *foutre* (“to do”, popular French); *déplasé* < se déplacer (“to

95 Source: *Ethnologue – Languages of Guadeloupe*. [Visited 19/02/2013]
move”); dòmi < dormir (“to sleep”); pannan < pendant (“during”); si < six (“six”); mwa < mois (“months”); manjé < manger (“food”, deverbal); pwan < prendre (“to take”); pou < pour (“to”); désann < descendre (“to go down”). Differently, jibyé (“prey”) and fal (“intestine”) are probably derived from languages other than French.

The interesting fact is that the functional elements in **bold** clearly distinguish GC from French: -la is a postnominal definiteness marker; té carries the feature [+ANTERIOR]; ka means [+OPEN]96; sé is a prenominal plurality marker; a-yo is a postnominal possessive adjective; the final la marks the end of a definite relative clause. In such cases, French would respectively use: a prenominal definite article; a verbal suffix both for the feature [+ANTERIOR] and for the [+OPEN] one; a plural morpheme -s (or -x); a prenominal possessive adjective; and no element at all in the case of the definite relative clause.

The only two functional elements derived from French are those I put in *italics*: y < lui (“him”) and pa < pas (“not”). Although, in such context the position of the GC pronoun y is rigidly postverbal, whereas that of French lui is always preverbal (see Part 4 of this work). Similarly, pa is preverbal in GC (and constitutes the only negation of this language), whereas pas is rigidly postverbal in French (and constitutes a split negation along with ne, which in contemporary oral French can be omitted) (see Part 3). Notice that also the preverbal marker té may have derived from the French PP été (“been”), but the two elements have different usages (see Part 3). Similarly, as pointed out in Part 4, also -la is likely to derive from the French reinforced demonstrative construction ce+N+la (ce chat-là “this cat”). I will systematically discuss all the features that distinguish the morphosyntax of Guadeloupean Creole from that of French (and of other European languages and French-based creoles) throughout this work.

96 Giorgi Alessandra (personal communication) suggested me to avoid the classification of these cases as [±PUNCTUAL] because that would make ka the only TMA marker associated to a negative feature (see Part 3).
2.3.3 On the independence of the language from French

As seen in the previous section, a quick look at Guadeloupean Creole clearly proves that it is linguistically independent from French, as all similarities only operate at a very superficial level. This re-opens the question of the origins of this language. As I said before, Creoles are commonly thought to take their lexicon from the dominant language and their grammar from the sub-languages originally spoken by the slaves. Thus, GC should have taken (the majority of) its words from French and its core grammar from a number of West African languages.

As for the lexicon, it seems to me that this hypothesis is undoubtedly true, which I demonstrated by discussing the passage taken from the Creole version of *Le Petit Prince*. However, I am not entirely sure about the truthfulness of this prediction when it comes to the origins of the grammar. In fact, it has been demonstrated (see Taylor (1960), Thompson (1961), Muysken (1980), and Voorhoeve (1973) for further explanations) that some elements of GC, for example its TMA (Tense Mood Aspect) system, are shared by a consistent number of Creole languages, no matter whether they are French-based or not (for a more detailed discussion of the subject, see chapter 1). For this very reason, and because of the computational simplicity of these languages (poor morphology, very little instances of syntactic movement etc.), I think that something more interesting than a simple influence of the underlying languages must have been at work when GC (and Creoles in general) came to life.

The similarities that are found in most Creole languages (and that I will discuss throughout this work) make me think that probably, in the absence of a sufficient and coherent linguistic input (like the one the children of pidgin-speaking people are exposed to), Universal Grammar could be unable to set any parameter, and would then activate some default options. It would be interesting to investigate whether Creole grammars really constitute a series of such default options activated in situations of linguistic emergency by the UG. It would also be interesting to try to
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97 From both a quantitative and a qualitative point of view.
demonstrate if all the divergences found in their grammars can be explained as a (mainly late) influence of European and/or African languages, or as instances of grammatical features for which the linguistic input was sufficiently clear (maybe because the languages in the input belonged to the same linguistic family), making it possible to set the parameter correctly.

No matter where this language comes from or whether in surface it resembles to its parent languages, if observed from a syntactic point of view Guadeloupean Creole clearly shows its independence from French, which I will systematically point out in the following sections. This makes GC, as all other French-based Creoles I mention in this work, a real independent language and not an instance of broken French.
PART 2: PHONOLOGICAL
AND MORPHOLOGICAL PHENOMENA

Chapter 3
The phonology of Guadeloupean Creole

This chapter is an overview of the main phonological processes that took place in the passage from French to Guadeloupean Creole. Predictably, these processes are still at work when new words are borrowed from languages whose phonology is different from that of this Creole. I will show that, on the whole, most of these phenomena of phonetic loss or insertion can be accounted for by postulating a tendency towards a simplification of the syllabic structure (3.1). I will also discuss some instances of French collocations that were misanalysed by the pidgin-speaking population and thus treated and borrowed as unanalysed chunks (3.2). Notice that the actual phonology of present-day Guadeloupean Creole, which has already been described by many an author (Bernabé (2003), Moïse (2005), Hazaël-Massieux (2011), among others), will not be taken into account here.

3.1 From French to Creole phonology

On the whole, from a purely lexical point of view, the process that gave birth to Guadeloupean Creole constituted an adaptation of French words to the phonological rules of the new language. The speakers of the pidgin generation came mainly from West Africa and spoke one or more African dialects. Predictably, the ways in which they reproduced the French words heard in their new linguistic environment were highly influenced by the phonology of their native language(s). In the two sections that follow, we will see which phonological processes were presumably at work
when the new language started to develop, and how people (unconsciously) modified French words and made them Creole-like. Namely, as we will see, both processes of phonological loss (3.1.1) and of phonological insertion (3.1.2) occurred, which can be explained as phenomena of syllabic simplification. Also, we will see that these processes of adaptation of the phonology and simplification of the syllabic structure still take place today when a word is borrowed from French or other languages, which is a universal tendency of all natural idioms.

3.1.1 Phonological loss

*Phonological reduction* and *deletion* are phenomena that commonly affect oral languages and oral communication in general. It is thus not surprising that they should have affected the variety of French spoken by non-native speakers in Guadeloupe and in other former French colonies. Three processes of phonological loss occurred: the loss of one or more sounds from the beginning of a word, especially the loss of an unstressed vowel (4a-g); the loss of one or more (weak vowel) sounds from the end of a word (5a-g); the loss of a word-internal phoneme (6a-f). In the examples that follow, I compare a number of Guadeloupean Creole words with their French counterparts. For the phonological changes that affected French words to be more clearly visible, each word is followed by its IPA transcription:

(4a) FR *apporter* [apɔʁte] > GC *pòtè* [pote]  
“To bring”
(4b) FR *arrêter* [aʁete] > GC *rété* [rete]  
“To stop (in GC “to live somewhere”)”
(4c) FR *arriver* [arɪve] > GC *rivè* [rive]  
“To arrive”

98 Notice that all of the IPA transcriptions used in this work are very broad, as their function is not that of describing the phonology of GC in detail but rather of helping the reader in the process of making comparisons between GC words and their original French counterparts. Differently, very narrow and precise transcriptions would be less immediate to interpret, and thus less useful for my purposes.
(4d) FR *avaler* [avale] > GC *valé* [vale]
   “To swallow”
(4e) FR *écouter* [ekute] > GC *kouté* [kute]
   “To listen to”
(4f) FR *essayer* [eseje] > GC *séyé* [seje]
   “To try”
(4g) FR *essuyer* [esɥije] > GC *swiyé* [suje]
   “To dry”

(5a) FR *à travers* [atravʁ] > GC *atravè* [travè]
   “Through”
(5b) FR *dentiste* [dãtist] > GC *dantis* [dâtis]
   “Dentist”
(5c) FR *descendre* [desãdʁ] > GC *désann* [desan]
   “To take down”
(5d) FR *communiste* [komynist] > GC *kominis* [kominis]
   “Communist”
(5e) FR *masque* [mask] > GC *mas* [mas]
   “Mask”
(5f) FR *table* [tabl] > GC *tab* [tab]
   “Table”
(5g) FR *travailler* [travaje] > GC *travay* [travaj]
   “To work”

(6a) FR *accepter* [aʁsepte] > GC *asepté* [asepte]
   “To accept”
(6b) FR *batterie* [batri] > GC *batri* [batri]
   “Battery”
(6c) FR *carte* [kart] > GC *kat* [kat]
   “Card”
(6d) FR dormir [dɔʁmîr] / GC dòmi [dɔmi]
    “To sleep”
(6e) FR marcher [maʁʃe] / GC maché [maʃe]
    “To walk”
(6f) FR parler [paʁle] / GC palè [pale]
    “To talk”

Of course, these processes, which have been at work throughout the history of GC, still operate when new words are borrowed from other languages, as they need or tend to be adapted to the phonology of the receiving language. For example, this is clearly visible in (5d), as the word kominis (“communist”) is definitely a recent loan.

3.1.2 Phonological insertion

As it was the case with phonological deletion, also phonological insertion can operate both word-internally and word-initially. **Prosthesis** consists in the addiction of a sound (7a-d) or syllable (8a-e) at the beginning of a word and is a process that does not affect the meaning or structure of the word (differently for example from prefixation, which changes the meaning of the word to which the grammatical morpheme is attached). **Epenthesis** instead is the addiction of one or more consonantal (9a) or vocalic (9b) sounds in a word-internal position:

(7a) FR statue [statty] > GC estati [estati]
    “Statue”
(7b) FR oreilles [ɔʁɛj] > GC zorèy [zorɛj]
    “Ears”
(7c) FR yeux [jø] > GC zyé [zje]
    “Eyes”
(7d) FR amour [amur] > GC lanmou [lāmu]
    “Love”
(8a) FR (de l’) eau [o] > GC dlo [dlo]
   “Water”
(8b) FR (du) riz [ri] > GC diri [diri]
   “Rice”
(8c) FR (la) lune [lyn] > GC laïn [laïn]
   “Moon”
(8d) FR (la) nuit [nqi] > GC lannuit [laniq]
   “Night”
(8e) FR (ma) sœur [sœ] > GC masè [mase]
   “Sister (nun)”

(9a) FR arrêter [arete] > GC arésté [arestë]
   “To stop”
(9b) FR océan [oseâ] > GC loséyan [losejân]
   “Ocean”

Notice that the phenomenon of e-insertion in (7a-b) is common to many languages, such as Spanish (cf. español, espadrillas, estrella etc.), and constitutes a way to maintain extrasyllabic /s/, that is, an /s/ sound preceding a consonant of lower sonority (such as /t/, /p/ and /k/). Moreover, the insertion of l-, z- and di/dl- derives from a process of agglutination of the definite article in an onset (l’océan, “the ocean”, became loséyan, “ocean”) or of the plural morpheme [z] produced in the French prosodic phenomenon of liaison and a noun with vocalic onset (le[z]_oreilles, “the ears”, gave [z]orèy, “ear”); similarly, insertion of /dl/ derives from the incorporation of the partitive article (de l’eau, “some water”, became dlo, “water”). The same process applies to words like masè, which is the result of the phonetic combination of the French noun sœur (“sister”) with the first person singular possessive ma (“my”). As explained in depth in Part 4 of this work, it is important to understand that the original definite, possessive and partitive connotations originally carried by the French determiners have completely been lost in Ns like those in (7a-d) and (8a-e). In fact, as correctly poited out by Stranquist
(2003) and Moïse (2005) (among many others), their distribution with respect to determiners is exactly the same as in all other Ns.

Finally, notice that the phenomenon of <s> insertion in the middle of words is probably more of a conservative feature than a real phenomenon of insertion. In fact, French words like arrêter [aʀete] (“to stop”) and île [il] (“island”) lost the /s/ sound during the 17th century: at that time in fact, this consonant was no longer pronounced, even if in writing it disappeared gradually and did not become systematic until the 19th century. Thus, before this change took place, these words looked and sounded like arester [aʀeste] and isle [izl]. In French, this loss is nowadays remembered in writing by means of the so-called accent du souvenir (“the accent of memory”, that is, the circumflex accent), which indicates the position that the fallen <s> used to occupy. Notice that also in the English correspondent word island the /s/ is no longer heard ([ailand]), but it is still present in writing. The loss seems to have taken place in the same period for both French and English, and the presence of the /s/ sound in these words in French-based and English-based creoles suggests that they might have been borrowed when the /s/ was still pronounced by native speakers.

On the whole, most of the examples seen in this section and in section 3.1.1 seem to be phenomena of simplification of the original syllabic structure of French words. In fact, the syllable of Guadeloupean Creole is mostly of the types CV and VC: as a consequence, the trend at work seems to be that of cutting off the coda of CVC syllables and adding an extra vowel to CCV ones. As a generalization, it is possible to say that in GC the foot must always be iambic (that is, an unstressed syllable followed by a stressed one) and that the weak syllable needs to have an overt onset. Also, notice that most Guadeloupean Creole words are reduced of one syllable if compared to their French counterparts. These phenomena should be considered instances of simplification rather than a process of creolization of French words, as they quite common in many natural languages.
3.2 Borrowed unanalysed chunks

As stated in the previous section and discussed in detail in Part 4 of this work, Guadeloupean Creole and other French-based creoles have a number of lexicalised DET+N chunks in their lexicon (for a good descriptive account on the subject, see Strandquist (2003)). As far as GC is concerned, these lexicalised chunks are mostly derived from the French sequences definite article + N (10a), partitive article + N (31b), and possessive determiner + N (10c):

(10a) Lalin > FR la lune
    “Moon”
(10b) Diri > FR du riz
    “Rice”
(10c) Masè > FR ma sœur
    “Nun”

Along with these widely-known cases of mis-analyses, the lexicon of GC groups many other examples of French phrases of different natures that were borrowed as unanalysed chunks by pidgin-speaking people, and then lexicalised in the passage to GC (11a-h, among many others). Notice that (11a-c) seem to be instances of syllabic simplification similar to those discussed in 3.1.1 and 3.1.2:

(11a) Dabò [dabɔ] > FR d'abord [dabɔʁ]
    “Firstly”
(11b) Oswa [oswa] > FR au soir [ɔswaʁ]
    “Evening”
(11c) Ovwa [ovwa] > FR au revoir [əʁvwa]
    “Goodbye”
(11d) Annfāngas [anfangas] > FR enfant de garce [ãfãdɔʁs] (Moï)
    “Son of a bitch”
(11c) *A talè* [atalɛ] > FR *à toute à l’heure* [atutalɔʁ]

“See you later”

(11f) *Souplè* [suplɛ] > FR *s’il vous plait* [silvuplɛ]

“Please”

(11g) *Enpè* [ɛnpe] > FR *Un peu* [œ̃pø]

“A lot”

(11h) *Bondyè* [bondje] > FR *bon Dieu* [bɔ̃djø]

“God”

The list of such occurrences is quite long, and I will not take into consideration all of the examples of unanalysed French chunks in GC here. Nonetheless, notice that it is possible to say that they have been mis-interpreted and lexicalised because they cannot be broken into different, smaller parts any longer. For example, (11a) was originally composed of the P *de* (“of”) and the N *abord* (“approach”), and then it has become a unique chunk in the passage to GC, as in this language it would be impossible to make a further decomposition into morphemes. Similarly, (11d) is the consequence of the misinterpretation of a N+P+N sequence, and is clearly lexicalized in GC, as in this language *annfan* does not mean “child” and *gas* does not mean “prostitute”. (11c) is the result of the mis-interpretation of a DET+N structure and cannot be broken into any smaller part in GC, exactly as happens in (11g), which has even changed its meaning from the original “a bit” to “a lot”. (11e) is the reduction of an original long French expression, of which it has kept the meaning but not the morphology: in fact, its semantics is not longer compositional but obscure. The same is true for (11f). The word in (11d), as the one in (11c), comes from a complex DET+N sequence, and the resulting GC unique chunk has kept the semantics of the original French N but the value of the French DET has completely been lost. Finally, (11h) comes from the mis-intepretation of the sequence *bon Dieu* (“Sweet Lord”), and is only used to refer to God today, without any intrinsic qualitative judgement.
Chapter 4
The morphology of Guadeloupean Creole

Creole languages have always been claimed to have very little morphology, if any at all. For example, among many others, Thomason (2011) claims that most pidgins and creoles “either lack morphology entirely or have very limited morphological resources compared with those of the lexifier and other input languages”, and Seuren&Bekker (1986) state that morphology is “essentially alien to creole languages”. However, as Plag (2004) explains “most recently, there is a growing body of literature on pidgin and creole morphology in which these traditional views are seriously challenged”. He also adds that

A serious review of the literature on creoles also refutes the claim that there is little or no morphology in these languages. Many creoles have inflectional morphology in their nominal, verbal or adjectival systems. […] With regard to lexical morphology, creoles exhibits conversion, affixation, reduplication and compounding as very common processes.

This statement is partially true if applied to GC. In order to analyse its morphology correctly, it is however important to make a distinction between inflectional and derivational affixes, or better, to take word-formation processes (which are the subject of this chapter) apart from verbal, adjectival and nominal inflection. In fact, whereas lexical morphology is quite rich and transparent, in that the origins of the words are quite easy to understand, functional morphology is poor and very often non-visible.

In Part 4, the nominal inflection will be described as being very poor, with no functional affixes indicating number or gender, except for a very limited number of cases that mark the distinction between feminine and masculine referents by means of compounds of the type fimèl-N (“female-N”) or mal-N (“male-N”) (1a), or by
means of the non-productive suffixes -ez/-in/-èn (1b-c):

(1a) *On mal-bèf / On fimèl-bef*

A male-bull / A female-bull
“A bull / A cow”

(1b) *On vandè / on vandez*

“A salesman / a saleswoman”

(1c) *On Ayisyèn / on Ayisyin*

“A Haitian (man / woman)”

In all other cases though, gender remains either uncertain and is either interpreted from the context, or it is intrinsic to the lexical entry. Number is instead signalled by overt or covert determiners combined with the plural-marker (henceforth, PLUR-marker) (see Part 4). Case is never visible, not even on personal pronouns, which have different forms for each person, and a deficient and a strong realization each (see Part 4).

Similarly, adjectives do not bear any gender, number or Case distinctions. These are to be retrieved from the context, except for a very limited number of cases that have the [+FEMININE] suffixes -èz/-is (Poullet&Telchid, 2010) (see Part 4), as in the examples (2a-b):

(2a) *Ni fanm èskandalèz ou ka tann palè è ri*  

Have woman scandalous you PROGR/HAB hear speak and laugh
“There are scandalous women (that) you can hear speak and laugh”

(2b) *On fanm sélibatrîs*

“An unmarried woman”

Also verbs have very little inflectional morphology, which is discussed in detail *Part 3*. In fact, the only overt functional morphemes belonging to the IP-layer of this languages are *té* (indicating an action or state that took place before a given event
present in the linguistic context) (3a), ké (whose intrinsic feature is [+IRREALIS], and thus has future meaning when used alone) (3b), and ka (associated to an andative/open\(^9\) or habitual meaning) (3c):

(3a) *Sé timoun a-y-la pa té la, yotout té sòti!*  
PLUR child of-she-DEF NEG ANT there, they.all ANT left  
“Her children weren't there, they had all left!”

(3b) *Chakmoun ké vin èvè mizik a-yo*  
Everyone IRR come with music of-they  
“Everyone will bring their own music”

(3c) *Tonton Alèsann ka bwè anni wonm*  
Uncle Alexander PROGR/HAB drink only rhum  
“Uncle Alexander only drinks rhum”

Of course, these morphemes can be combined in a rigidly fixed order to convey different, complex meanings, which I explain in *Part 3*. In the same section I propose that each of them is the positive realization of a binary feature, thus claiming that they must have a phonetically-null counterpart. Nonetheless, if compared to languages like French or Italian, it is clear that GC has a rather poor verbal morphology with respect to tense, aspect and mood. Moreover, verbs do not agree for person, gender or number of the subject or object.

The following sections will therefore not focus on functional morphology (which is discussed throughout Part 3 and 4 of this work), but rather on *lexical morphology*. Both the productive word-formation processes and those that are not at work any longer but contributed to the development of this language will be taken into consideration. The description is organised as follows: after a brief introduction on word-formation processes in general, all of the morphological processes of word-

---

\(^9\) The term *open* was suggested to me by Alessandra Giorgi, who claimed that such a definition could account for the distinctions in the use of *ka* with *Vs* indicating actions and *Vs* indicating states better than the terms *progressive* and *andative*. I discuss this issue more in detail in *Part 3* of this work.
formation are discussed in 4.1. More briefly, figures of speech and loanwords are investigated in 4.2 and 4.3.

4.1 Word-formation processes

In this section, I will show that the reasons why languages such as GC are said to be morphologically poor is that very often only their functional morphology is taken into account. In fact, if we analyse their lexical morphology, we discover that they are much richer than we expected. As far as morphology is concerned, a generalization can be made saying that in this respect GC is more similar to English than to French, as both languages have very little functional morphemes but a rather great number of lexical affixes and other word-formation processes at their disposal.

Morphological processes of word-formation combine two or more free lexical elements or bound functional and derivational morphemes to form new words. They can be divided in two classes on the basis of the nature of the combined elements: we speak of derivation when we combine an already existing free word with a bound element to create a new word (4.1.1), and of compounding when the new word is the result of the combination of two unbound elements (4.1.2). We will see that, in the process of derivation, free stems are combined with bound affixes with different properties that are described in a detailed way in the following sections; and that compounds can be of different types (endocentric, exocentric, or dvandva) depending on the presence or absence of a head in their structure.

4.1.1 Derivation

Derivation is the process of forming a new word starting from an existing lexical stem and combining it with bound inflectional or derivational morphemes. The phenomenon is called affixation and the elements that the speakers use to form new words are called affixes: these can be overt or non overt morphemes and, according to whether they are placed at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of the word,
they are classified as *prefixes, infixes or suffixes*. Infixes are not used in GC, whereas prefixes and suffixes are common. As said in the introduction of this chapter though, GC has no functional affixes, but only derivational ones, for which reason only lexical morphology will be dealt with in this section.

### 4.1.1.1 Prefixation

*Prefixation* is a morphological process that consists in adding an affix, called a *prefix*, before the first sound of an already existing word. The meaning of the newly-formed word is often different from that of the original free stem, and so may be the syntactic category. We can represent this as in (4a-b):

(4a) \[
\text{[ prefix \[ X_1 \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_] > [X_2 \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_] (semantic change / no categorial shift) }
\]

(4b) \[
\text{[ prefix \[ X_1 \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_] > [Y \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_ \_] (semantic change + categorial shift) }
\]

The productive prefixes of GC are the following ones (16a-h); in passing, notice that the meaning of the derived word always changes, whereas there is no change in syntactic category.

- the prefix *an-*, added to Vs, forms new Vs and add to the original ones the meaning of “inside, in depth” (5a);

\[
(5a) \text{[an-[[N chouk]-é]^100]] > [V anchouké]}
\]

- the prefix *dé-* combines with Vs to form new Vs. Its meaning can be “opposite of...”, as in (5b-c) (notice that in this case it has two different allomorphs), or of “badly” (5d):

\[
(5b) \text{[de-[V respecté]] > [V dérespecté]}
\]

- the prefix *an-* can be at work in the same word. Here, the N *chouk* combines with the -é to form the V *chouké*, which in turn combines with the prefix *an-* to form the V *anchouké*.

100 Prefixation and suffixation can be at work in the same word. Here, the N *chouk* combines with the -é to form the V *chouké*, which in turn combines with the prefix *an-* to form the V *anchouké*.
(5c) [déz-[v apwann]] > [v dézapwann]
De+learn
“To unlearn”
(5d) [de-[v palê]] > [v dépalê]
De+talk
“To contradict oneself/to talk nonsense”

− **en-** can be added to As to form As with opposite meaning (5e-f):

(5e) [en-[λ konprènab]] > [λ enkomprènab]
En+comprehensible
“Incomprehensible”
(5f) [en-[λ pridan]] > [λ enpridan]
En+prudent
“Imprudent”

− **wou-** is a very productive prefix added to Vs to form new Vs (5e-f). It conveys repetitive meaning:

(5g) [wou-[v vini]] > [v wouvini]
Wou+come
“To come again”
(5h) [wou-[v rantré]] > [v wourantré] (P&T)
Wou+Enter
“Re-enter”

### 4.1.1.2 Suffixation

As we will see in *Part 3* and *4* of this work, no Case suffixes exist in GC, number and gender suffixes are added to Ns and As only in a very little number of non-productive examples, and the verbal inflection has the form of three different pre-verbal morphemes: for these reasons, it is safe to state that GC does not have any functional suffix. Differently, lexical suffixes do exist, and they behave as shown in (6a-b):
The main peculiarities of lexical suffixation are that lexical suffixes constitute a relatively open class (as we can imagine that in the future new suffixes of this kind could appear) and are very productive; also, they can change the class of the word with which they combine, but they can also form a semantically distinct word within the same syntactic category. The main suffixes of GC are those listed in (7a-i):

- denominal Vs are formed using the suffixes -é and -té. Notice that -té seems to be particularly productive (Poullet&Telchid, 2010) (7a-b);

\[(7a) [[N,makrèl]-é] > [V,makrélé]\]

Tactless+é

“To be tactless”

\[(7b) [[N,soulié]-té] \rightarrow [V,souliété]\]

Shoe+té

“To wear nice shoes”

- denominal adjectives are formed by adding the suffix -ab (very similar to French and English -able) to Ns (7c);

\[(7c) [[N,fet]-ab] > [A,fétab]\]

Party+ab

“That can be celebrated”

- deverbal adjectives are formed by adding -an to Vs (7d);

\[(7d) [[V,konprann]-an] > [A,konprènan]\]

Understand+an

“Sympathetic/understanding”

- deverbal Ns are formed with the suffix -(é)zon and -an (7e-g);

\[(7e) [[V,konprann]-ézon] > [N,konprinézon]\]

Understand+ézon

“Comprehension”
(7f) $[[_v soulé]-zon] > [N soulézon]$

To make drunk+zon

“Intoxication”

(7g) $[[_v travay]-an] > [N travayan]$

Work+an

“A worker”

- adverbs are formed by adding the suffix -man (equivalent of French -ment) (7h) to As;

(7h) $[[A mal]-man] > [Adv malman]$

Bad-man

“Badly”

- Ns can be created by adding the suffix -ad to other Ns (7i).

(7i) $[[N jiwomon]-ad] > [N jiwomonnad]$

Giromon+ad

“A giromon-based dish”

GC also displays *backward derivation*, that is, the process of forming new words by eliminating suffixes from already-existing words. Thus, it behaves in the exact opposite way of suffixation. In first two examples that follow, for instance, the French origin of the starting word is undeniable, and at the same time it is clear that the word derived by inverse derivation does not exist in French. Notice that this process does not change the syntactic category of the original word in all cases (cf 8a-b with 8c):

(8a) $[[_v chap]-é] > [N chap]$

(To) run away

“A run away”

(8b) $[[_v blés]-é] > [N bles]$

(To) wound

“A wound”
Finally, notice that also zero derivation (a change in category and meaning driven by a phonetically null suffix) is possible in GC (9a-b). Notice that it is both possible to create deverbal nouns (9a) and denominal Verbs (9b):

9a) \([V \text{ manjé }] \Omega_{\text{suffix}} \) > \([N \text{ manjé }]\)

“Eat(N)”

9b) \([V \text{ travaj }] \Omega_{\text{suffix}} \) > \([V \text{ travaj }]\)

“To work”

As a matter of fact, the above analyses were driven by the corresponding French words: whereas the V *manger* (“to eat”) is very common, its nominal counterpart *le manger* (“the food”) is virtually never used; and similarly the GC verb *travaj* (“to work”) is likely to have been derived by zero-suffixation from the GC noun *travaj* (“work/job”), not from the French V *travailler* (“to work”).

### 4.1.2 Compounding

Compounding differs from derivation (4.1.1) in that it combines two or more free lexical items, whereas derived words are composed of a lexical stem and a functional or grammatical bound morpheme. Compound words can be divided into three main groups: endocentric (with one of the two parts being the head), exocentric (with no overt head) and dvandva (with two covertly co-ordinated heads) compounds. Notice that in my corpus no instances of dvandva compounds (that is, compounds with two equally-important heads) are found. This type of compounding process is not attested in the linguistic literature on GC either.
4.1.2.1 Endocentric compounds

The main characteristic of endocentric compounds lies in the fact that they have a lexical *head* that gives most of the meaning to the whole compound. In detail, a compound of the type \([X][X+Y]\) can be explained as the head of the compound being modified by the modifier \(Y\) that narrows its meaning (thus, \(X+Y\) denotes a special type of \(X\)). In the following representation, \(X2\) is the resulting compound (10a-b):

\[
\begin{align*}
(10a) \quad & [[X_1 \_ \_ \_ ][Y \_ \_ \_ ]] > [X_2 \_ \_ \_ ] \\
(10b) \quad & [[X_1 \text{HEAD }][Y \text{modifier}]] > [X_2 \text{compound}]
\end{align*}
\]

For example, in English a “backache” is nothing but an “ache on the back”, and thus a subpart of the class “ache”. Differently from what happens in English and parallel to what happens in French, in GC the head is always the leftmost element of the compound word. This is not surprising, if we consider that GC is a VO and NGen language (in fact, we say *chyen a Jean*, “dog of John”, but not *Jean chyen*). The most common type of compounds are Ns formed by N+N compounding (11a-d):

\[
\begin{align*}
(11a) \quad & [[\text{smal}][\text{ren}]] > [\text{smalren}] \\
& \text{Pain+kidney} \\
& \text{“Backache”} \\
(11b) \quad & [[\text{mèt}][\text{lékol}]] > [\text{Mét-lékol}] \\
& \text{Master+school} \\
& \text{“School teacher”} \\
(11c) \quad & [[\text{gato}][\text{patat}]] > [\text{Gato-patat}] \\
& \text{Pie+potato} \\
& \text{“Sweet potato pie”} \\
(11d) \quad & [[\text{kout}][\text{zyé}]] > [\text{Koutzyé}] \\
& \text{Blink+eye} \\
& \text{“Eye blink”}
\end{align*}
\]
Interestingly, also Vs can be endocentric compounds. Such Vs of GC express a special subclass of the modified V; they are semantically transparent and can be either V+N (12a) or A+N compounds (12b):

\[(12a) \text{[} [\text{bat}] + [\text{men}] \text{]} > [\text{batmen}]\]

Clap+hand

“Clap one's hands”

\[(12b) \text{[} [\text{lévé}] + [\text{acho}] \text{]} > [\text{lévécho}]\]

Raise/turn+hot

“Get angry”

Again, notice that the head of these verbal compounds is the leftmost element, as *batmen* is a type of clapping and *lévécho* the process of the raising of anger. Notice that the possibility of having compound Vs is a feature quite common to Australian Aboriginal languages, which only have very little genuine Vs, and a massive Ns of Vs created as V+N compounds (Pensalfini (1992)).

### 4.1.2.2 Exocentric compounds

The second type of compound words is that of *exocentric compounds* (also referred to as bahuviri compounds), which very often are *obscure* as far as meaning is concerned. In fact, they are lexemes whose semantics do not equal the sum of the meanings of the compounding words, as they seem to lack a head. As a consequence, we postulate that they are a sub-class of a phonetically null head: thus, in such cases the whole compound is a modifier and the head is null. As GC only allows post-modification, they are likely to have the structure in (13a-b), where the modified null head appears to the left of the compound:

\[(13a) [\emptyset_{\text{head}} [\text{[x1 ___ ]+[x2 ___ ]}]] > [\text{v ___ }]\]

\[(13b) [\emptyset_{\text{head}} [\text{[x1 modifier]+[x2 modifier]}]] > [\text{v compound }]\]
Notice that all the examples of exocentric compounds present in my corpus are Ns. Various combinations are possible: A+N (14a), V+N (14b-c), P+V (14d), but also N+N (14e). For each example, a morphological analysis is provided:

(14a) [Ø_head [[A bon]+[N vivan]]] > [N Bon-vivan]
    Ø(Good+living)
    “Pleasure-seeker”
(14b) [Ø_head [[V pozo]+[N tet]]] > [N Poztet]
    Ø(Put.down+head)
    “Nap”
(14c) [[V kach]+[N téte]] > [N Kachtété]
    Hide+breasts
    “Bra”
(14d) [Ø_head [[P san]+[V palé]]] > [N Sanpalé] (Moï)
    Ø(Without-speak)
    “Mute person”
(14e) [Ø_head [[N chouval]+[N bwa]]] > [N Chouval-bwa]
    Ø(Horse+wood)
    “Carousel”

Clearly, the semantics of all of the previous examples betrays the presence of an unrealized head. In fact, a bon-vivan is neither “good” nor “living”, but a person who seeks pleasure in his or her life (in this example and in those that follow, I underline the head); a pozet is neither the action of “putting down” nor a “head”, but rather a moment in which you can lie down and rest your head (“a nap”); a sanpalé is neither the P “without” nor the faculty of “speaking”, but a mute person, someone who cannot speak; finally, a chouval-bwa is neither a “horse” nor “wood”, but rather a carousel with wooden horses.

Also, notice that some compounds display a strange behaviour, as they are not genuinely endocentric or exocentric and they rather have a metaphorical
interpretation (15a-c):

(15a) \[ [\text{Agran}][\text{N}\text{Grek}]] > [\text{NGrangrek}] \\
     \text{$\emptyset$ (Big+Greek)} \\
     “Expert or wise person”

(15b) \[ \text{\emptyset head} [\text{Vbrizé}][\text{Nfè}] ] > [\text{NBrizfè}] \\
     \text{$\emptyset$ (Break+iron)} \\
     “Child who breaks everything”

(15c) \[ [\text{Nbe}][\text{Awouj}] ] > [\text{NBe-wouj}] \\
     \text{$\emptyset$ (Butter+red)} \\
     “Red seasoning”

A grangrek is neither “big” nor “Greek”, but a wise person: it seems more of a fixed expression than of a genuine compound; a brizfè is neither the act of “breaking” nor the element “iron”, but a messy child who could break anything, iron included; the bè-wouj is neither a type of “butter” nor the A “red”, but a red seasoning with the same consistency as butter.

4.2 Figures of speech

Figures of speech are rhetorical means through which it is possible to convey specific meanings in highly figurative ways. Their interpretations are strictly related to the cultural background, and so is their creation. For this reason their semantics is not compositional and must be listened in the lexicon.

An onomatopoeia, for example, is a word which imitates or suggests the source of the sound associated with the entity it describes. As it is the case in all languages, many onomatopoeic words can be found in GC (16a-k):

(16a) Vountak \hspace{1cm} (Moï) \\
     “Umbrella”
(16b) *Vonvon*  
“Bumblebee”  
(Moi)  

(16c) *Gógó*  
“Species of birds”  

(16d) *Gligli*  
“Cry of a little hawk”  

(16e) *Kokiyoko*  
“The cry of a cock”  

(16f) *Tjoup*  
“The sound produced by a kiss”  

(16g) *Blogodo / bidim*  
“A noisy and brutal fall”  

(16h) *Blip*  
“The noise of a fall or of a whip”  

(16i) *Djouboum*  
“A dive”  

(16j) *Wélélé*  
“Uproar”  

(16k) *Chacha*  
“Music instrument”  
(Moi)  

Allegedly, (16a) stands for the sound produced by old umbrellas while they are being opened (Moïse, 2005); (16b) is the sound that bumblebee's wings produce while they move (Moïse, 2005); (16c-e) all stand for the cry of specific birds (notice, en passant that the cry of cocks is one of the most controversial animal sounds: among many other realizations, French people perceive it as *cocorico*, Italians as *chicchirichi*, English-speaking people as *cock-a-doodle-doo* etc.); (16f) is the sound of a peck on the lips, with some connotations of “wetness” in it conveyed by the sound [ʧ]; the two Ns in (16g) as well as the one in (16h) reminds of the sound of a (perhaps harmful) big fall; (16i) reproduces the sound of dives, or better, the sound produced by the body while entering/slashing in the water; (16j) refers to a condition of noisy
and excited confusion, and reminds of the noise of people chatting loudly and screaming to each other for no reason; and the N of (16k) comes from the sound that such wooden music instrument produces, as the massive number of dry seeds contained in it resound while it is being shaken. Notice that all of these examples are words that do not reproduce worldwide-accepted sounds made by their referents, but rather, in terms of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis (Hoijer (1954)), the way in which people from Guadeloupe perceive those very sounds as a consequence of adapting them to their *prism of language*. More precisely, people reproduce non linguistic sounds on the basis of the phonemes of which they dispose, which explains why onomatopoeic words massively differ from one language to another.

Other ways of conveying meanings in everyday language are *metaphors* and *metonymies*. They both involve a substitution of one term for another but, whereas in metaphor the substitution is based on some specific similarity, in metonymy it is based on some understood association. More in detail, a *metaphor* uses an image, story or tangible thing to represent a less tangible entity or some intangible quality or idea. Specific interpretations are never given explicitly in metaphors. (17a-f) are instances of very commonly used metaphors of GC:

(17a) *I sé on kok-djenm/on rina/on mal-mouton*

He/she COPpres a fighting cock/a fox/a bad ram

“He/she is hard-fighting/shrewd/a moron”

(17b) *A pa on nomn, sé on zongnon !*

EXPL NEG a man, COPpres an onion

“It isn't a man, it's a wussy”

(17c) *Ou two krab*

You too much crab

“You're not brave”

(17d) *Sé moun-la pété dézod*

PLUR person-DET explode mess

“People have started fighting”
(17e) An vlé on pété-pié
I want an explode-feet
“I want a glass of rhum”

(17f) Sé on manjé-kochon
COP.prep a food (for) pigs
“It's a mess/a trick”

In a broader sense, also metonymy can be considered a type of metaphor. We can define it as a figure of speech in which a thing or concept is not called by its own name, but by the name of something intimately associated to it. As shown in the following examples that follow, many types of relation between the referent and the N are possible: for instance, a concrete element can be called using the name of an abstract one (18a), the whole can indicate a part of the referent (18b), or name of the container can be used to refer to the content (18c):

(18a) Ni lalwa ka vini
Have law PROGR come
“Here come the police”

(18b) Gwadloup té an dey
Martinique ANT in mourning
“People from Guadeloupe were in mourning”

(18c) An vlé bwe on vè
I want drink a glass
“I want to drink a glass [of rum, wine, etc.]”

4.3 Loanwords

Loanwords are words borrowed from one language and incorporated into another. As I already pointed out here and in Part 1, most words of GC are adaptations of French words to its phonological rules. Nonetheless, many words also came from other languages present in the linguistic context in which this language developed, for
example from African (19a–d) and Caribbean languages (20a–c), or from Indoeuropean languages such as English (21a–f), Dutch (22a–b), Spanish (23a–d) and Tamil and other Indian languages (24a–c):

(19a) *Gombo*

“Fruit” (from Kimbundu)

(19b) *Banza*

“Music instrument” (from Kimbundu)

(19c) *Kenbwa*

“A spell”

(19d) *Bonda*

“Butt” (from Kikongo and Bambara)

(20a) *Kasav*

“Manioc pancake”

(20b) *Ajoupa*

“Shack”

(20c) *Kwi*

“Half a calabash”

(21a) *Vanmpaya*

“Prostitute” (from English “vampire”)

(21b) *Manawa*

“Prostitute” (from “man of war”)

(21c) *Boskaf*

“Combat boots” (from “box-calf”, the black shoe cream used to polish them)

(21d) *Foulbak*

“Full”

---

101 An official language of India. Source: Ethnologue - Tamil. [Visited on 17/03/2013]
102 A language of Anglola. Source: Ethnologue - Kimbundu. [Visited on 17/03/2013]
103 A language of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Source: Ethnologue - Kongo. [Visited on 17/03/2013]
104 A language of Mali. Source: Ethnologue - Bamanankan. [Visited on 17/03/2013]
(21e) Sinobol (Moï)
“Ice-cream with fruit topping” (from “snowball”)

(21f) Ponch (Moï)
“Punch [=the drink]”

(22a) Blaf
“Fish-based Creole dish”
(22b) Zen
“Fish-hook”

(23a) Madras
“Paisley head-handkerchief”
(23b) Kabêch (Moï)
“Head”
(23c) Tini (Moï)
“To have”
(23d) Matadô (Moï)
“Woman wearing the traditional Creole costume”

(24a) Moltani (Moï)
“Spicy soup”
(24b) Massalé
“Indian seasoning”
(24c) Nanni-nannan
“A long time ago”

Notice that the process of borrowing words is quite common to all living languages, as linguistic and human contacts are always related to the appearance of new referents in the linguistic environment of the both parts. So for example, when GC came to life French lacked all the words needed to describe both originally-African and originally-Guadeloupean referents (let us not forget that many slaves were traded
from West Africa to Guadeloupe in the 19th century), and for this reason a massive number of words was introduced in the vocabulary of newly-born GC, but also in that of French people living in those territories. The same can be said for all words of Spanish origin, as many slaves came from Spanish-speaking Caribbean countries. Differently, the borrowing of most English words can be explained as a late consequence of the English and American super-power from an economical, political and social point of view.

Moreover, notice that some word that were borrowed from French reflect an older linguistic stage, like for example the V hapé, which comes from French japper (“to bark”, which nowadays is way less used than its modern counterpart aboyer. Also, notice that, as Moïse (2005) correctly points out, a number of GC Ns have been borrowed not from Standard French but rather from vieux Normand (“Old Norman”). This is quite predictable, as many French emigrants came from the Norman area. Nowadays, these Norman words are still used with the original pronunciation and semantics in GC (25a-d):

(25a) Chigna (Moï)
    “Whimperer”

(25b) Balyé (Moï)
    “Broom”

(25c) Lèch (Moï)
    “Shard”

(25d) Makayé (Moï)
    “To graw”
PART 3: THE SENTENCE OF GUADELOUPEAN CREOLE

The verb system of GC is very interesting, and it shows some peculiarities that are common to all Creole languages. First, its morphological poverty is striking, as it has only 3 overt preverbal markers of Tense, Mood and Aspect at its disposal. Of course though, as pointed out in Part 2 of the present work, the morphology of Creole languages that I label as “poor” is the functional one, as the language is instead rather rich from the point of view of its lexical morphology. Second, the particles belonging to the Tense-Mood-Aspect system (henceforth, TMA) of GC are shared with many other Creole languages (Bickerton 1984, among others), if not in their phonological realization at least in the features that they are associated to, in this order and in their rigidly pre-verbal position. This is very interesting at many levels and raises a number of questions about the genesis of Creole languages which are discussed in 6.2. Third, the marked and unmarked word-orders are shared with many Indo-European languages and, as a consequence of both its origins and its oral nature, GC shows a great number of ways of focussig or topicalizing the most salient elements. Finally, the Vs of GC seem to have originated directly from French, which explains why they are similar to their French counterparts as regards their argument structure and theta-role assignment.

This Part constitutes an overview of the verb system of GC, with some considerations on the structure of its (marked and unmarked) sentences, and with special attention to the IP-layer and its functional elements. The Part is organised as follows: chapter 5 constitutes a detailed description of the VP of GC: the verbal morphology of this language is discussed in (5.1), then a distinction between lexical and functional Vs is made (5.2 and 5.3), with special attention to their argument structure, and notes on special auxiliary-like Vs that always select bare-stem Vs as their complements (5.3.3); chapter 6 deals with the IP-layer and the morphemes belonging to the TMA system, which I postulate to be binary and having a negative
counterpart each, and the different realizations of the negation; chapter 7 deals with word-order, and makes a distinction between unmarked order and marked orders, with special attention to the movements that take place in interrogative clauses (7.3.1) and to all cases of dislocations and focalizations (7.3.2).

Chapter 5
The Verb Phrase

The Verb Phrase (henceforth, VP) is a syntactic unit composed of a main V (the head of the phrase) plus all the arguments selected by it. Thus, its structure depends on the type of V. In this chapter, I will distinguish between lexical and functional Vs. The former will be divided on the basis of the number of arguments they select, and the latter on the basis of their semantics. Also, restructuring Vs will be classified depending on the type of sentence that they select as an internal argument.

5.1 Verbal morphology

Most GC verbs derive from French. Some of them closely look like the infinitive or past participle of French verbs of the 1st class (that is, those ending in -er) (1a-b), some sound like Old French words (1c), some others do not seem to have French origins (1d-e):

(1a) Kouté [ku'te] < FR écouter / écouté [eku'te]
    “To listen”
(1b) Chanté [ʃan'te] < FR chanter / chanté [ʃa'te]
    “To sing”
(1c) Hapé [(h)a'pe] < OFR japper [ʒa'pe] (cf. aboyer)
    “To bark”
“To live”

(1e) Goumé ≠ FR lutter
“To fight”

There are also a number of Vs that have a French-like form but have undergone a semantic shift, like for example montré (similar to French montrer, “to show”, but meaning “to teach”). One might wonder why, and many an explanation of this special behaviour can be given. First, French has many infinitive constructions, and many Vs have the same infinitive-like phonological form ending in /e/ not only for the past participle but also in the 1/3PS and 3PP indicative “imparfait”, for which reason the /(t)e/ suffix might have been predominant in the linguistic input to which the pidgin-speaking population and the first Creole-speaking people were exposed. For this reasons, the Vs of constructions such as Marie veut chanter [ʃã'te], Marie a chanté [ʃã'te] and Marie chantait [ʃã'tɛ] might have been interpreted as bare-stem Vs (infinitives), and the second and third uses might explain why in GC the bare-stem form of eventive Vs has a [+PAST] interpretation today. Probably in fact, at the beginning most French past verbs were mis-interpreted as chunks and considered non-tensed forms. Second, it is not unlikely that the slaves might have been addressed to using a simplified language by the slavers, that is, in a form of “foreign talk” with mostly infinitive Vs (Lipski (2001)). This could account for the use of bare-stem Vs even more than the third hypothesis. In this respect, McWhorter (2005) explains that the “overgeneralization of the infinitive is a diagnostic of pidginization” and suggests that “there was indeed a break in the transmission if French” behind the birth of Creoles. Finally, it is not unlikely that GC might have inherited not only a massive number of French words but also the lexical morphology of this language (see Part 2), which would explain why also most non French-derived Vs have French-like lexical suffixes.

Moreover, along with these formal similarities, in many cases GC verbs also share their argumental structure with their French correspondents, and this probably
because of semantic reasons. In fact, the number of arguments a V selects and the
theta-roles it assigns to each of its arguments depend on its semantics, that is, on the
number and type of participants involved in the action or state that it expresses.
Bernabé (1983) explains that GC verbs can take one, two or three arguments. Thus,
they can be intransitive, transitive, or ditransitive verbs. I will show that along with
these lexical verbs (5.2) a number of functional verbs (5.3) and of verbs with reduced
argument structure exist (5.3.3), as well as verbs that belong to more than one
category, and verbs that optionally require the presence of an expletive S. Also
clausal arguments and adjuncts will be discussed (5.2.2).

5.2 Lexical verbs

Lexical verbs, also called full verbs, are verbs belonging to an open class that
typically express action or state. In this, they are different from auxiliary verbs,
which express grammatical (or functional) meaning. Sentences are generally headed
by a lexical verb expressing content, the only exception being copular Vs, which just
link the S to a property expressed by an adjective or noun. Here the term lexical is
used to refer to content words in general, as distinct from functional words.

5.2.1 Arguments and thematic structure

Each functional verb selects a fixed number of arguments and, according to Thematic
theory (Jackendoff (1990)), each argument is assigned one and only one theta-role.
Verbs are divided into classes on the basis of the number of arguments that they
select, and each class of verbs is further divided into subclasses according to the
theta-roles assigned to each argument. Also, some verbs might be associated to more
than one argument structure, in which case we postulate the existence of two
different homophonous verbs with different argument structures, not of one single
verb optionally requiring a different number of arguments.
5.2.1.1 Transitive Vs

Transitive Vs are verbs that select two direct arguments: an external and an internal one (the S and the DO, respectively). They are subdivided into further subclasses on the basis of the theta-roles assigned to their arguments. In fact, the S can be an AGENT (when the action expressed by the V is made intentionally, that is, by a willing being) (2a-b), a CAUSE (when there is no volition) (2c), an INSTRUMENT (when the action is performed by some unwilling inanimate instrument requiring the presence of an animated being actually moving or using it) (2d), an EXPERIENCER (when it experiences a mental or psychological state) (2e), GOAL (of a movement) (2f), ORIGIN (of a movement or action) (2g), PLACE (when it indicates a location) (2h), or POSSESSOR (when it owns something) (2i):

(2a) Jean kyouyé twa kochon
AGENT
Jean kill three pig
“Jean killed three pigs”

(2b) Jean bo Mari
AGENT
Jean kiss Mary
“Jean kissed Mary”

(2c) Vann-la ka bougé sè pyébwala
CAUSE
Wind-DEF PROGR move PLUR tree-DEF
“The wind is moving the trees”

(2d) Kouteau-lasa ka koupé byen
INSTRUMENT
Knife-DEM HAB cut well
“This knife cuts well”

(2e) Mari pè dlo
EXPERIENCER
Mary fear water
“Mary fears the water”
(2f) *An risivwè onlo kat postal*  
**GOAL**  
I receive a lot card postal  
“I got a lot of postal cards”

(2g) *Manman voyé onlo kourié yé*  
**ORIGIN**  
Mother send a lot letter yesterday  
“Mother sent a lot of letters yesterday”

(2h) *Bwèt-lasa ni 200 kat*  
**PLACE**  
Box-DEM have 200 card  
“This box contains 200 cards”

(2i) *Fabyen ni on bèl loto*  
**POSSESSOR**  
Fabian have a nice car  
“Fabian has a nice car”

Differently, the DO can be either a PATIENT (when it is radically affected by the action or state expressed by the V) (3a), a THEME (when the action changes it in some way, but without changing it in a radical way) (3b), or FACTITIVE (when it comes to life as a result of the action expressed by the V) (3c):

(3a) *Yè, Jean kyoyé fanm a-y*  
**PATIENT**  
Yesterday, Jean kill woman of-he  
“Yesterday, Jean killed his wife”

(3b) *Sé Jean ki kriyé tonton Fabyen yé, pa Mari*  
**THEME**  
COP prez Jean that call uncle Fabian yesterday, NEG Mary  
“Jean called uncle Fabian yesterday, not Mary”

(3c) *Mari fè on bèl bonbon*  
**FACTITIVE**  
Mary do a nice cake  
“Mary baked a nice cake”
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Also, note that GC has a number of transitive Vs that have reflexive meaning. In such cases, either the S personal pronoun is repeated after the V as a complement (which is rather strange for a prenominal form, as we would expect it to be free in its governing category) (4a-c), or the reflexive interpretation is assured by the presence of the complement kò a-X (“body of-X”), where X is a pronoun coindexed with the S (4d-f):

(4a) É i mété-y ka gadé-y
   And he, start-he, PROGR look it
   “And he started looking at it”

(4b) An moman-lasa yo ka mét-yo ka kriyé
   In moment-DEM they, PROGR put-they, PROGR cry
   “At that moment, they started crying [=they put themselves crying]”

(4c) Fo pa sé timoun-la montré-yo two rèd avè sé granmoun-la
   Must NEG PLUR child-DEF, show-they, too hard with PLUR adult-DEF
   “The children shouldn't be too hard on adults”

(4d) I ké ay nenpòt kikoté, é i ké pèd kò a-y
   He IRR go no.matter where, and he, IRR lose body of-he,
   “He's going to wander and get lost”

(4e) Sa rèd woumèt kò a-w ka désinè
   This hard re-put body of-you PROGR draw
   “It's hard to start drawing again”

(4f) Apré nou fin lavé-kò an-nou lèmaten
   After we stop wash-body of-we morning
   “Just after we're done washing our body in the morning”

5.2.1.2 Ditransitive Vs

Ditransitive Vs are a subclass of transitives which select three arguments. Most ditransitive Vs have two possible realizations of the arguments: while the external argument is always direct, the two internal arguments can either be both direct
objects or one direct object and one indirect object. Nonetheless, the construction with two objects, also called double object construction, is not allowed by all ditransitive verbs. The commonest order of the internal arguments is THEME-BENEFACTIVE, and in this case two of the arguments are direct (AGENT and THEME) and one is introduced by the P ba (the BENEFACTIVE) (5a-b):

(5a) *Fabyen achté on bèl wob ba Mari*

   AGENT      THEME     BENEFACTIVE

   Fabian buy a nice dress to Mary
   “Fabian bought a nice dress to Mary”

(5b) *Fabyen payé on bwason ba Mari*

   AGENT      THEME     BENEFACTIVE

   Fabian pay a drink to Mary
   “I paid[=bought] a drink to Mary”

Vs like payé (“to pay”) also allow for a double object construction (DOC) in which the order of the thematic roles is BENEFACTIVE-THEME (6a), whereas other Vs like achté (“to buy”) only allow the DOC only if the first DO is not interpreted as a BENEFACTIVE but rather as SOURCE (6b):

(6a) *Fabyen payé Mari on bwason*

   AGENT      BENEFACTIVE      THEME

   I pay Mary a drink
   “I paid[=bought] Mary a drink”

(6b) *Fabyen achté Mari on bèl wob*

   AGENT      *BENEFACTIVE / SOURCE     THEME

   Fabian buy Mary a nice dress
   “Fabian bought a nice dress from Mary”

Actually, the DOC seems to be more used than the construction with the indirect object. Michaelis&Haspelmath (2003) explain that this behaviour is quite constant among different creoles, which led Bruyn&alii (1999) to postulate the possibility that DOCs might be the unmarked option offered by the UG, and therefore the one that
surfaces during Creole acquisition. Actually in fact, even though in my corpus both constructions were found, the DOC was far more present, not only when the GOAL was a NE (7a), but also when it was a pronoun and the THEME was a NE (7b-c) or a phrasal constituent (7d). Actually, with a phrasal BENEFICIARY the presence of a THEME realized as an indirect object is excluded (7d'):

(7a) An montré sé granmoun-la mèt-travay an-mwen
AGENT            GOAL                  THEME
I show PLUR adult-DEF masterpiece of-me
“I showed the adults my masterpiece”

(7b) Sé timoun-la an ka mandé-zòt tanprisouplé a-zòt
AGENT           GOAL               THEME
PLUR child-DEF I PROGR ask-you pardon of-you
“Children, I ask you your pardon”

(7c) Sé granmoun-la ban-mwen on konsèv
AGENT              BENEFICIARY      THEME
PLUR adult-DEF give-me a advice
“The adults gave me a piece of advice”

(7d) An mandé-yo si désen an-mwen té ka fè-yo pè
AGENT           GOAL                               THEME
I ask-them if drawing of-me ANT PROGR do-they fear
“I asked them if my drawing scared them”

(7d') *An mandé si désen an-mwen té ka fè-yo pè ba-zòt
AGENT            THEME                                      GOAL-phrasal
I ask if drawing of-me ANT PROGR do-they fear to-they
“I asked if my drawing scared them to them”

5.2.1.3 Intransitive Vs

Intransitive verbs select ONLY one argument, the S, which can of course be assigned different theta-roles on the basis of the semantics of the verb. In fact, it can be an AGENT (8a), a PATIENT (8b), a THEME (especially in the case of weather expressions) (8c), or EXPERIENCER (8d):
(8a) *Fabyen* ka chanté
   AGENT
   Fabian PROGR sing
   “Fabian is singing”

(8b) *Mami* ka mò lè nou rivé
   PATIENT
   Grandma PROGR die when we arrive
   “Grandma was dying when we arrived”

(8c) *Lapli* ka tonbé
   THEME
   Rain PROGR fall
   “The rain is falling”

(8d) *Mari* pléré onto lè Jean pati
   EXPERIENCER
   Mary cry a.lot when Jean leave
   “Mary cried a lot when Jean left”

Also, in a restricted number of cases, intransitive Vs can have a prepositional internal argument, thus behaving more like transitives than like pure intransitives (9a-b):

(9a) *An palé ba Mari yè*
   I speak to Mary yesterday
   “I spoke to Mary yesterday”

(9b) *Jean manti ba-mwen*
   Jean lie to-me
   “Jean lied to me”

Moreover, notice that some Vs that have the same semantics and phonological forms of their French unaccusative counterparts could be considered unaccusative verbs too (even though no test for unaccusativity exists for this language yet). They indicate a changement in state (10a) or a movement (10b). Their unique argument is likely to be generated in an internal position and to be assigned either the theta-role of PATIENT (of the action) or of THEME (of the movement):
Finally, notice that some verbs can have both an intransitive (11a-c) and a transitive realization (11a'-c'), as in the examples that follow. In passing, notice that in some cases the interpretation slightly changes: for example, as happens in English, the V *bouvè* (“to drink”), means “drinking alcohol” or “being an alcoholic” in its intransitive form, whereas it does not have this connotation when used as a transitive V. The same is true for the V *manjé* (“to eat”), whose intransitive structure is linked to the meaning of “having a full meal”.

(11a) *Jean manjé onlo yè*

Jean eat a.lot yesterday
“Jean ate a.lot yesterday”

(11a′) *Jean ka manjé on ponm*

Jean PROGR eat an apple
“Jean is eating an apple”

(11b) *Jean té ka bwè onlo lè i jenn*

Jean ANT PROGR drink a.lot when he young
“Jean used to drink a lot when he was young”

(11b′) *Jean ka bwè dlo ou achté*

Jean PROGR drink water you buy
“Jean is drinking the water you bought”

(11c) *Sé Jean ki kryié yè*

COP pres Jean that call yesterday
“It's Jean that called yesterday”
(11c′) Jean kryié Mari yè oswa
Jean call Mary yesterday evening
“Jean called Mary yesterday evening”

5.2.2 Clausal complements

In the previous sections, only nominal arguments and adjuncts were taken into consideration, that is, NEs (12a) and pronouns (12b):

(12a) Jean vwè Mari (yè)
Jean see Mary yesterday
“Jean saw Mary yesterday”
(12b) Li kryié-yo (matin-lasa)
She call-they morning-DEM
“She called them this morning”

Along with these nominal forms, it is possible to find phrasal complements (that is, full clauses acting as complements), which will be dealt with in this section. Clausal arguments are constituents selected by the main V whose nature is not that of a NE but of a finite or non-finite clause. They can be either subjects (13a) or objects (13b). The examples (13a′) and (13b′) show the nominal counterparts of the clausal complements in (13a-b):

(13a) [CP That you would attend the party] seemed obvious to me
(13a′) [DP Your attendance] seemed obvious to me
(13b) Martina said [CP that you would attend the party]
(13b′) Martina said [DP that]

As for GC, Delumeau (2006) explains that, as happens for relative clauses (see Part 4), “subordinate complements are not introduced by any […] subordination marker [my translation]”. He makes a comparison between French and GC and says that “in
French, they are introduced by *que* and the Creole counterpart of this complementizer does not exist [my translation]”. Delumeau cites the French examples quoted in (14a’-c’) and their GC counterparts in (14a-c):

(14a) *Elle voudrait que je lui parle*
    She would that I to-her speak
(14a’) *I té ké vlé an palé ba-y*
    She ANT IRR want Ø I speak to-her
    “She would like me to speak to her”
(14b) *Jean savait qu’il allait mourir*
    Jean knew that he went die
(14b’) *Jan té sav i té kay mò*
    Jean ANT know Ø he ANT PROGR.go die
    “Jean knew that he was going to die”
(14c) *Penses-tu qu’il viendra demain ?*
    Think-you that he will.come tomorrow ?
(14c’) *Ou ka pansé i ké vin dèmen ?*
    You PROGR think Ø he IRR come tomorrow ?
    “Do you think (that) he is going to come tomorrow?”

Delumeau also explains that subject phrasal arguments are impossible in GC. He lists the French examples in (15a-b) and says that the most usual way to convey the same meaning in GC is using a NE, as in the French clauses in (16a-b) and in their GC correspondents in (16a’-b’):

(15a) *Qu’il soit aussi fatigué m’inquiète beaucoup*
    That he is.SUBJ so tired me’worries a lot
    “That he should be so tired worries me a lot”
(15b) *Qu’il roule aussi vite constitue un danger pour les autres*
    That he drives so fast represents a danger for the others
    “That he should drive so fast is dangerous for other people”
(16a) *Sa fatigue m'inquiète beaucoup*
His fatigue me'worries a.lot

(16a') *Fatig a-y ka enkyété-mwen onlo*
Fatigue of-he PROGR worries-me a.lot
“His being tired worries me a lot”

(16b) *La vitesse a laquelle il roule met les autres en danger*
The speed at which he drives put the others in danges

(16b') *Vitès i ka fè danjérè pou lézòt*
Speed he HAB do dangerous for other
“His driving so fast is dangerous for the other”

Also **clausal adjuncts** are possible. They are constituents whose function is that of adding some information (about time, place, manner etc.) to the clause in which they appear. In fact, they are not directly selected by the main V. Again, their nature is not that of a *NE* but rather of a finite or non-finite clause. The examples in (17a'-c') are instances of phrasal adjuncts of time, place and manner, respectively. They are preceded by a nominal counterpart (17a-c):

(17a) *An pléré onlo yè*
I cry a.lot yesterday
“I cried a lot yesterday”

(17a') *An pléré onlo lè méyè zanmi an-mwen pati*
I cry a.lot when best friend of-me leave
“I cried a lot when my best friend left”

(17b) *Mari kontré Jean si mawché*
Mari meet Jean on market
“Mary met Jean at the market”

(17b') *Mari vwè Jean ola ou kontré-y yè*
Mary see Jean where you meet-she yesterday
“Mary saw Jean where you met her yesterday”
(17c) *Mari enmè Fabyen kon on fwè*
Mary love Fabian as a brother
“Mary loves Fabian like a brother”

(17c′) *Mari enmè Fabyen kon moun enmé on fwè*
Mary love Fabian as person love a brother
“Mary loves Fabian as one loves one's brother”

Notice that throughout this section I did not make any prediction on the nature of these complements: this was due to the lack of any overt complementizer introducing the phrasal complements, which makes it difficult to say whether they are CPs or IPs. For this reason, I prefer to remain agnostic on their nature. Nonetheless, as phrasal adjuncts are always introduced by a wh-element (cf. 17a'-c'), I believe it is quite safe to state that they are very likely to be CPs.

### 5.3 Functional Vs

Differently from lexical verbs, functional verbs are not associated to lexical meaning. In fact, they convey *functional* information and are not associated to any argument or thematic structure. In the following sections, I will describe the morphosyntax of the copula (5.3.1), and that of the V *ni* (“to have”), which is used not only to express possession but also in existential constructions (5.3.2). Finally, in (5.3.3) I will discuss the distribution of bare-stem Vs in this language, which will lead to a distinction between modal and restructuring verbs.

#### 5.3.1 The copula

The copula of GC behaves in a very peculiar way, not only in distributive terms, but also as far as morphology is concerned. Quite surprisingly in fact, it is the only V of this language that changes its form according to the Tense and the illocutionary type of sentence in which it appears.
As far as distribution is concerned, notice that when the predicate of the subject is an adjective, the copula is not present in the phonetic string (18a-b). Differently, with a nominal predicate, the [+PRES] copula is sé for all persons (18c-d) (Gadelii (2007)). Even though in cases like (18a-b) the copula seems to be omitted, I postulate that it is present in the structure: I will demonstrate that this prediction is correct when I describe how this V behaves in the past/future tenses, in which the verbal morphology appears in the phonetic string despite the absence of a phonetically-realized form of the V. Also, notice that when the copula is realized the negation pa precedes it, for which reason I postulate that it must precede the phonetically-null copula in the linear order as well:

(18a) *Ou [ap anpenn]*
    You ØCOP sad
    “You are sad”
(18b) *An pa [ap malad]*
    I NEG ØCOP ill
    “I am not ill”
(18c) *Madanm-la sé [dp on machann]*
    Woman-DEF COPpres a merchant
    “The/this woman is a merchant”
(18d) *I pa sé [dp on bèl fanm]*
    She NEG COPpres a beautiful woman
    “She is not a beautiful woman”

Predictably, the copula behaves exactly as stative Vs. So, it does not require the presence of *ka* (see 6.3.2 for further explanations) to be interpreted as present, even though it is possible to employ these Vs with the morpheme *ka* in the construction usually referred to as *present of circumstance* (19a-b), that is, with temporal complements. In chapter 6, I will show that this possibility is found with stative verbs as well (which usually do not accept to be constructed with *ka*):
(19a) I ka lèd lè i ka lèvé
    She ITER ØCOP ugly when she ITER wake up
    “She's ugly when she wakes up”
(19b) Fanm ka bèl lè yo dousinè zanfan a-yo
    Woman ITER ØCOP beautiful when they cuddle child of-they
    “Women are beautiful when they cuddle their children”

The parallel between the copula and other stative Vs is valid also with the marker té, as its presence does not lead to a past-before-past interpretation but just to a past one (20a-b). The negation is pa and predictably precedes té (20c-d). In this case, the copula is covert both with adjectival predicates and with nominal ones. As already pointed out, the presence of the copula in the structure is acknowledged by use of the verbal markers, which appear even when the copula is not realized in the phonetic string, as in the examples that follow:

(20a) Ou té [4p tris]
    You ANT ØCOP sad
    “You were sad”
(20b) Ou té [DP on mèt-lékòl]
    You ANT ØCOP a teacher
    “You were a teacher”
(20c) Yo pa té [4p kontan]
    They NEG ANT ØCOP happy
    “They weren’t happy”
(20d) I pa té [DP on mèt-lékòl]
    She NEG ANT ØCOP teacher
    “She wasn’t a teacher”

Nevertheless, the past-before-past reading seems possible (but not necessary), as my informants agreed on the correctness of the following examples (20e-f):
(20e) *Fabwis té* [Ap kontan] (avan li aprann sa)

Fabrice ANT ØCOP happy (before he know this)

“Fabrice was happy (before he got to know this)”

(20f) *Fabwis té* [Ap on pwofèsè] (avan li vin rèktè)

Fabrice ANT ØCOP a professor (before he become dean)

“Fabrice was/had been a professor (before he became dean)”

Interestingly, in past cleft sentences the copula has the form *sétè* [se'te], which closely looks like its French counterpart *c'était* [se'tɛ] (“it/this was”) (21a-b):

(21a) *Sétè* on astrononm tirk, an 1909 [...]

*COP*<sub>past</sub> an astronomer turk in 1909

“That was a Turk astronomer, in 1909 [that..]”

(21b) *Kou-lasa ankò sétè gras a mouton-la*

Time-DEM again *COP*<sub>past</sub> thanks to mutton-DEF

“This time again, it was thanks to the mutton [that...]”

Of course, the null copula can be combined with any other TMA marker in order to convey different meanings. For example, in (22a-b) the morpheme *ké* conveys futurity, whereas in (28c-d) the combination of the morphemes *té* *ké* forces the hypothetical reading:

(22a) *Fabwis ké* [Ap kontan]

Fabrice IRR ØCOP<sub>COP</sub> happy

“Fabrice will be happy”

(22b) *Fabwis ké* [Ap pwofèsè]

Fabrice IRR ØCOP professor

“Fabrice will be a professor”

(22c) *Fabwis té ké* [Ap kontan] (si ou té la)

Fabrice ANT IRR ØCOP happy (if you ANT Ø here)

“Fabrice would be happy (if you were here)”
(22d) *Fabwis té ké [dp pwofèsè] (si i pa té chwazi ondòt travay)  
   Fabrice ANT IRR Ø_COP professor (if he NEG ANT choose another job)  
   “Fabrice would be a professor if he hadn't chosen another job”

Notice that té ka is used in temporal adjuncts as ka in (19a-b), but it has a past interpretation (23e-f):

(23e) I té ka [ap lèd] lè i ka lévé  
   She ANT ITER Ø_COP ugly when she ITER wake up  
   “She was ugly after waking up”

(23f) Fanm-la té ka bèl lè yo dousiné zanfan a-yo  
   Woman-DEF ANT ITER Ø_COP beautiful when they cuddle child of-they  
   “The/those women were beautiful when they cuddling their children”

Predictably, no combination of TMA markers containing ka is judged as fully grammatical when combined with the null copula (24a-d), unless we insert a temporal specification (24a'-c'):

(24a) ??Fabyen ka kontan\textsuperscript{105}  
   ?? Fabian PROGR Ø_COP happy  
   “??Fabian is being happy”

(24b) ??Fabyen té ka kontan  
   ??Fabien ANT PROGR Ø_COP happy  
   “??Fabien was being happy”

(24c) ??Fabyen ké ka kontan  
   ??Fabien IRR PROGR Ø_COP happy  
   “??Fabian will be being happy”

(24d) *Fabyen té ké ka kontan  
   *Fabian ANT IRR PROGR Ø_COP happy  
   “*Fabian would be being happy”

\textsuperscript{105} My informants class sentences (24a-c) as “correct but incomplete”. In fact, these sentences are ungrammatical if pronounced in isolation.
(24a') *Fabyen ka kontan lè ou abiyé konsa*
   Fabian PROGR $\theta_{\text{COP}}$ happy when you dress like this
   “Fabian is happy when you are dressed like this”

(24b') *Fabyen té ka kontan lè ou té abiyé konsa*
   Fabian ANT PROGR $\theta_{\text{COP}}$ happy when you ANT dress like this
   “Fabian was happy when you dressed like that”

(24c') *Fabyen ké ka kontan lè ou ké abiyé konsa*\(^{106}\)
   Fabian IRR PROGR $\theta_{\text{COP}}$ happy when you IRR dress like this
   “Fabian will be happy when you dress like this”

(24d) *Fabyen té ké ka kontan lè Mari pati si i pa enné-y*
   Fabian ANT IRR PROGR $\theta_{\text{COP}}$ happy when Mary leave if he NEG love-she
   “Fabian would be happy when Mary leaves if he wasn't in love with her”

Finally, notice that the copula can even assume another form, *yé*, when the sentence in which it is contained is interrogative, as in (25a-b). Moreover, as Poullet&Telchid (2010) correctly pointed out, *yé* is the realization of the copula not only in interrogative clauses but also in fixed expressions like (25c-d):

(25a) *Kilè i yé ?*
   What time it COP\(_{\text{INT}}\)
   “What time is it?”

(25b) *Kimoun ou yé ?*
   Who you COP\(_{\text{INT}}\)
   “Who are you?”

(25c) *Jan an yé an yé*
   Gender I COP\(_{\text{INT}}\) I COP\(_{\text{INT}}\)
   “I am who I am”

(25d) *Sé konsa yo yé*  \(^{(TP)}\)
   COP\(_{\text{pres}}\) like.this they COP\(_{\text{INT}}\)
   “This is what they are”

\(^{106}\) This progressive future construction is believed not to be very common in everyday Creole.
To summarize then, the copula of GC predictably behaves like all other *stative verbs* (see 6.3.2 for further details). Interestingly though, it is the only irregular V of this language. In fact, it has 3 possible realizations depending on the features it is associated to: sé when it is [+PRES], sété in [-PRES] sentences and yè in [+INT] clauses. This is quite unsurprising though, as most languages have a rich paradigm for the copula, also those that show very little verbal morphology.

In passing, notice also that in GC the V “to be” is never used as an auxiliary (as for example in the French construction *elle est allée au cinéma* (“she's gone to the movies”)), because the language does not have composed tenses.

### 5.3.2 Ni (“to have”)

The V *(ti)ni* (“to have”) can be both a lexical and a functional V. In its lexical realization, it is a transitive V that selects as its external argument a POSSESSOR (the S) and a THEME as its internal argument (the DO) (26a-b). The theta-role of POSSESSOR is a subclass of the LOCATION, as the THEME is “located” on or very close to the possessor:

(26a) *Fabien ni on bel loto*  
POSSESSOR | THEME  
--- | ---  
Fabian have a nice car  
“Fabian has a nice car”

(26b) *Mari ni kat zanfan*  
POSSESSOR | THEME  
--- | ---  
Mary have four child  
“Mary has four children”

However, the V *ni* can also be used as a functional V, for example in such fixed expressions where English would use a construction of the type *be+A* (“be thirsty”) (27a-d). These constructions might be a French loan, as this language uses constructions of the type *avoir+N* (“have+N”) as well (27a'-d'). Also, notice that *ni*
can be preceded by all TMA markers, *ka* excluded (because it is a stative V (6.3.2)):

(27a) *Ini* [\_NP\text{fen}]  
She have hunger  

(27a') *Elle a faim*  
She has hunger  
“*She's hungry*”

(27b) *Mwen té ni* [\_NP\text{swef}]  
I ANT have thirst  

(27b') *J'avais soif*  
I have\text{past} thirst  
“*I was thirsty*”

(27c) *Ou ké ni* [\_NP\text{cho}]  
You IRR have hot  

(27c') *Tu auras chaud*  
You have\text{future} hot  
“*You'll be hot*”

(27d) *Ou té ké ni* [\_NP\text{fwèt}]  
You ANT IRR have cold  
“*You'd be cold*”

(27d') *Tu aurais froid*  
You have\text{conditional} cold  
“*You'd be cold*”

Moreover, *ni* is also employed in existential constructions. Notice that, as explained in Part 4, the behaviour of the expletive *i* is not consistent, as it may (28a-b) or may not appear (28c-d) in the string:

(28a) *I ni* twa zanfan ka joué adan kou-la  
EXPL have three child PROGR play in garden-DEF  
“*There are three children playing in the garden*”
(28b) *I ni chouval ka kouri an pak-la*

EXPL have horse PROGR run in parc-DEF
“There are some horses running in the parc”

(28c) *An touttan, té toujou tini, asi planèt a Tiprens-la, flè òwdìnè*  

In all time, ANT always have, on planet of Little.prince-DEF, flower orderly
“At all time, there had always been orderly flowers on the Little Prince's planet”

(28d) *Poukisa pa tini, adan liv-lasa, dòt granmanman désen [...]?

Why NEG have, in book-DEM, other huge drawing
“Why aren't there other huge drawings in this book?”

However, as I explain in Part 4, in the absence of the expletive the construction is always interpreted as existential, whereas when the expletive is phonetically realized it might also be mis-interpreted as a 3PS referential pronoun and have might be considered a lexical V (28a'-b') selecting a POSSESSOR and a THEME:

(28a') *I ni twa zanfan ka joué adan kou-la*

She have three child PROGR play in garden-DEF
“She has three children (who are) playing in the garden”

(28b') *I ni chouval ka kouri an pak-la*

She have horse PROGR run in parc-DEF
“She has some horses (that are) running in the parc”

According to my informants, the existential construction with the French-like expletive is more recent and is typical of so-called *kréyòl francisé*.

In passing, notice also that in GC the V (*ti*)ni is never used as an auxiliary (as for example in the French construction *elle a mangé plein de bonbons* (“she's eaten many candies”)), because this language does not have composed tenses.
5.3.3 Bare-stem Vs

Guadeloupean Creole is a language that allows for the use of a massive amount of bare-stem Vs in its sentences and clauses (cf. Appendix 3). The choice of using the term bare-stem form to refer to these verbal occurrences is driven by the desire of not taking position on their very nature, as their origins and morphological properties (absence of specialized infinitival morphology, over-generalization of their use to cases in which many other languages would use a finite form etc.) make it difficult to state whether they are genuine infinitives or not.

As stated in all of the linguistic literature on this language, when stative Vs appear in their base form they are associated to a [+PRES] meaning (29a), whereas eventive Vs take a [+PAST] interpretation (29b). All of these occurrences will be dealt with in sections 6.3 and 6.4:

(29a) *Mari enné zanfan a-y*
    Mary love\textsubscript{stative} child of-she
    “Mary lover her children”
(29b) *Mary joué èvè zanfan a-y*
    Mary play\textsubscript{eventive} with child of-she
    “Mary played with her children”

The base-stem form of the V is also used in imperative clauses (30a), with the only exception of the 1PP, in which the base-stem V is always preceded by the imperative particle *annou* (30b):

(30a) *An di-y : “Tonton, arèsté bwe wonm si ou sè on nomn !”*  
    I say-him : Uncle, stop drink rhum if you COP\textsubscript{pres} a man
    “I told him : “Uncle, stop drinking rhum if you're a real man!”
As shown in the examples above, no P or complementizer introduces the clausal complements of Ns and As, whereas the same constructions in French (but also in English and in Italian) would have a P (31a' and c'):
Predictably then, also in V+V constructions (described in 5.3.3.1) the complement Vs appear in their base-stem form and are not introduced by any P. Moreover, in the following sections I will describe the behaviour of special monoclausal V+V constructions and of modal and restructuring Vs, all of which take a base-stem V not introduced by any element as their complement.

5.3.3.1 Constructions of the type V+V

Not taking into consideration the case of modal verbs, which will be dealt with in the following sections, GC shows many examples of V+V sequences which are likely to be monoclausal constructions. In fact, the first V of such constructions closely resembles to those classified as semi-lexical motion verbs by Cardinaletti&Giusti (2000). The most widely used V of this type is ay (“to go) (32a-b), which also adds the interpretation of immediate future (as in French je vais aller au supermarché (“I'm off to the supermarket”) to the action when preceded by the aspectual marker ka (32c-d). Also vini (“to come”) can give raise to such monoclausal constructions (33a-b), as well as viré (“to come back”) (33c) and kouri (“to run”) (33d):

(32a) Kanmarad an-mwen ay fe chimen a-y épi mouton a-y (TP)
    Friend of-me fo make track of-he with mutton of-he
    “My friend made his way with his mutton”

(32b) Sé pli gran la pwofité ou pa la pou yo ay drivé (P&T)
    PLUR more big DEF take.advantage.of you NEG there for they go roam
    “The bigger ones have taken advantage of your absence to hang around”
(32c) *An kay* wouvè lenj adan savann

I PROGR.go hang linen in garden
“*I'm going to hang the linen in the garden*”

(32d) *Sé tifi-la té kay bengné an rivyé-la*

PLUR girl-DEF PROGR.go swim in river-DEF
“The girls were going to swim in the river”

(33a) *An vin atann-yo*

I come wait-them
“I came to wait for them”

(33b) *E sé konsa an vin konnèt Tiprens-la*

And COP pres like.this I come know Little.prince-DEF
“And that's how I got to know the Little Prince”

(33c) *Astrononm-la viré fê montray a-y an 1920*

Astronomer-DEF come.back do exposition of-he in 1920
“The astronomer came back to do his exposition in 1920”

(33d) *I kouri gadé*

She run look
“She ran to see what was happening”

Other Vs that take a bare-stem V as their complement are *aré(s)té* (“to stop”) (34a), *komansé* (“to start”) (34b), *éiséyé* (“to try”) (34c), *apwann* (“to learn”) (34d), *mété* (“to put oneself/to start willingly”) (34e), and *fin* (“finish”) (34f). These verbs, despite not being motion verbs, are likely to be semi-lexical Vs too: in fact, in the constructions to which they give raise, their meaning is in composition with the meaning of the selected V:

(34a) *Mé vitman tipyébwa-la arété tijé*

But soon little.plant-DEF stop grow
“But very soon the little plant stopped growing”

107 Notice that kay is the contraction of the sequence *ka*+*ay*. 
(34b) *An té présé konmansé démonté motè an-mwen*  
I ANT in.a.hurry start disassemble engine of-me  
“I was in a hurry to start disassembling my engine”

(34c) *An kay éseyé [...]*  
I PROGR.go try make two portrait PROGR resemble-he more  
“I will try to paint two more faithful portraits of him”

(34d) *É an apwann fè avyon volé*  
And I learn make plane flight  
“And I learnt how to make planes flight”

(34e) *Adan onsèl kou i mété pléré-gwodlo atè*  
In only.one time he put cry-tear to.the.ground  
“And all of a sudden, he started crying”

(34f) *Apré nou fin lavé-kò an-nou lématen*  
After we finish wash-body of.us morning  
“And after we finish washing ourselves in the morning”

Also some stative Vs are Vs that select a V in its base-stem form as their complement, such for example *ennmé* (“to love”) (34g) and *pisimyé* (“to prefer”) (34h):

(34g) *I pa ennmé dansé*  
She NEG love dance  
“She doesn't love dancing”

(34h) *Yo ka pisimyé ay bòdlannè lè tan-la two fiwè*  
They HAB prefer go seaside when weather-DEF too cold  
“The prefer going to the seaside when it's a bit too cold”

Finally, notice that in some cases transitive and intransitive Vs do not select a mere V as their complement, but rather a whole phrasal argument containing a base-stem V, as in (35a-d):
(35a) Pa mandé-yo manjé dòt biten ki pen (P&T)
    NEG ask-them eat other thing than bread
    “Don't ask them to eat other things than bread”

(35b) Epi penga mandé-yo rann-vou pon sèvis (P&T)
    And useless ask-them do-you any service
    “And it's useless to ask them to do you a service”

(35c) É on jou i konsévè-mwen pwan tout ti tan an-mwen (TP)
    An one day he suggest-me take all little time of-me
    “And one day he suggested I should take all my own sweet time”

(35d) An désidé pa rété bouch fèmé ankò (TP)
    I decide NEG stay mouth shut still
    “And I decided non to keep my mouth shut any longer”

Of course, other Vs can take a phrasal internal argument (cf. Appendix 3), but only in a restricted number of cases the V of the selected argument is in its base-form.

5.3.3.2 Modal Vs

Modal verbs are a subclass of auxiliary verbs used to indicate different modalities, such as ability, likelihood, obligation and permission. The main function of a modal auxiliary verb is that of giving more information about the modality of the main verb that it selects as its complement, in terms of a semantic scale ranging from possibility to necessity. We distinguish between two main different modalities:

- the epistemic modality, which is concerned with the theoretical possibility of the proposition of being true or false (in a scale that ranges from likelihood to certainty);
- the deontic modality, which is concerned with the possibility and/or necessity to act freely (ranging from permission to duty).

108 Notice that penga is likely to be an unanalyzed chunk coming from the French sequence pas le cas.
In GC, most modal Vs express a deontic modality, which is not surprising given that very often epistemic usages of modals tend to develop from deontic ones (Bybee&alii (1994)). The main deontic modal verbs of GC are: bizwen (expressing necessity) (36a), fo (expressing obligation) (36b)\textsuperscript{109}, ba (which in this use expresses permission of knowing) (36c), pé (expressing possibility) (36d), lésé (expressing permission) (36e), and vlé (expressing desire of accomplishing or obtaining something) (36f):

(36a) Flè-la ou enmé la pa bizwen pè ayen...
    Flower-DEF you love DEF2 NEG need fear nothing
    “The flower you love doesn't need to fear anything...”

(36b) On bon rézon fo-zòt pwan an konsidérasyon
    A good reason must-you(PL) take in consideration
    “A good reason you must take into consideration”

(36c) È si an ba-zòt konnèt liméwo a-y [...]
    And if I give-you know number of-it
    “And if I allow you to know its number [...]”

(36d) A pa toutmoun i pé di yo té ni on zanmi
    EXPL NEG everybody that can say they ANT have a friend
    “Not everyone can affirm they have a friend”

(36e) Si sè on plan [...] a wòz, ou pé lésé-y iji kon i vlé
    If COP pres a plant [...] of rose, you can let-it grow as it wish
    “If it's a plant of roses, you can let it grow as it pleases”

(36f) Rènéliz é Fanélya vlé ay bengné
    Rènéliz and Fanélya want go bath(V)
    “Rènéliz and Fanélya want to go swimming”

As for epistemic modal verbs of GC, the most common are: pé (expressing capacity or possibility) (37a-b), rivé and fouti (expressing a one-stand hability) (37c-d):

\textsuperscript{109} Notice that this is the only modal V also selecting finite phrasal complements. This possibility is very likely to be due to the French origins of this V (which comes from French falloir) and is explained more in depth in Appendix 3.
Of course, some of these Vs can also be used as lexical Vs, as shown in (38a-c):

(38a) *An vlé on mouton i kā yā pé viv lontan* (TP)
I want a mutton that PROGR.go can live long
“I want a mutton which can live long”

(38b) *An bizwen on mouton* (TP)
I need a mutton
“I need a mutton”

(38c) *Lè yo rivé bò rivyè-la, pa té ni ponmoun* (P&T)
When they arrive riverside-DEF, NEG ANT have anyone
“When they got to the riverside, no one was around”

### 5.3.3.3 Restructuring Vs

Restructuring verbs owe their name to the fact that they change the structure of main clauses. Most restructuring Vs of GC are causatives: they modify the structure of the clause that they select by adding an argument, to which they assign the theta-role of CAUSE. Also, the external argument of the lower V might be assigned a different
theta-role as a consequence of the idea of lack of volition expressed by the causative V. The main causative Vs of GC are fôsé (“to compell”) (39a'), opozé (“to prevent”) (39b'), fè (“to have”) (39c'); their CAUSE-free counterparts are given in (39a-c):

(39a) *Pep a-y pôtê lenj éwopéven*  
**AGENT**                      **THEME**  
People of-he wear clothes european  
“His people wore European clothes”

(39a') *On diktatè tirk fôsé pêp a-y pôtê lenj éwopéven*  
**CAUSE**                    **PATIENT**                    **THEME**  
A dictator turk force people of-he wear clothes european  
“A Turk dictator had his people wear [only] European clothes”

(39b) *Qu té ka dansé*  
**AGENT**  
You ANT PROGR dance  
“You were dancing”

(39b') *Men sa pa ka opozé-w dansé*  
**CAUSE**                    **AGENT**  
But this NEG HAB prevent-you dance  
“But this doesn't prevent you from dancing!”

(39c) *An pêd lanvi kontinyé fè sa an enmé*  
**EXPERIENCER**                             **THEME**  
I lose will continue do that I love  
“I lost the desire to go on doing what I loved”

(39c') *Sé granmoun-la té fè-mwen pêd lanvi kontinyé*  
**CAUSE**                    **EXPERIENCER**                             **THEME**  
PLUR adult-DEF ANT make-me lose desire go.on  
“The adults had me lose the desire to go on [doing so]”

Also, notice that the CAUSE can be arbitrary and non-expressed (40a-a'):

(40a) *Sa ka rantré an kabèch a timoun bôkaz*  
**THEME**  
This PROGR enter in head of child home  
“Our children remember this”
(40a') Pou (now/moun) byen fe sa rantré an kabèch a timoun bòkaz

(CAUSE) THEME

For (we/one) well make this enter in head of child home

“To make our children to remember this well”

Also, notice that some epistemic modal Vs behave like raising verbs. In fact, they trigger the raising of the S of the lower V to the Spec of their IP, as shown in the examples below (41a-b):

(41a) Après sa, [IP yo pa fouti [IP ___ déplasé]]

↑ ___________________

After this, they NEG manage move

“After, they can’t move”

(41b) [IP I pa té pé [IP ___ jambé rivye-la]], i té malad

↑_____________

He NEG ANT can jump river-DEF, he ANT sick

“He couldn’t jump over the river, he was sick”
Chapter 6
The IP-layer

This chapter is an overview of the elements belonging to the IP-layer of GC. The verbal morphology of this language has only 3 overt TMA (Tense – Mood – Aspect) markers plus a Negation with different allomorphic realizations. These elements combine with each other in very rigid orders to convey different meanings and, because of semantic reasons, they cannot combine with all types of Vs. Predictably in fact, stative Vs (which are inherently [+OPEN]) are not compatible with Aspectual markers. I will also show that these overt morphemes are likely to be binary and have phonetically-null counterparts conveying the opposite meanings.

6.1 Strength of INFL

As already pointed out, differently from what happens in the major romance languages, in which the verb unites to specialized postverbal bound morphemes (suffixes) carrying the so-called Inflection (1a-c), Guadaloupean creole verb stems are morphologically invariable and do not unite to any post-verbal morpheme. As shown in (1d), for example, all of the present indicative forms (of stative verbs) coincide with the bare-stem verb. Notice that, in what concerns the expression of the pronominal subject GC is more similar to Spanish, French and English than to Italian. In fact, the latter requires the omission of the pronominal S in the unmarked case, whereas in Spanish, French, English and GC its expression is compulsory (1a-d). Thus we can state that, whereas Italian is a pro-drop language, GC is non pro-drop\textsuperscript{110}:

\begin{align*}
(1a) \ (lo) \ am-o / (tu) \ am-i / (egli) \ am-a \ Maria & \quad (IT, \ Inf: \ amare) \\
(i) \ love-1ps / (you) \ love-2ps / (he) \ love-3ps
\end{align*}

\textsuperscript{110} The only exception is that of expletives, which can be both overt or non realized (see Part 4). As far as expletives are concerned, in fact, we can say that GC is surprisingly a pro-drop language.
Due to the functional poverty of GC, we can imagine that its verbal Inflection (as well as that of the nominal functional layers) is not strong enough to attract the verb (or the N) and unite with it, so that we do not expect V-to-I (nor N-to-D) movement to be possible. In morphologically poor languages like this one, the relationship between the Inflection and the verb can be of two different types, at least for what concerns the semantically-heavy lexical verb: we can imagine that, as the Inflection is not strong enough to attract the V, either it lowers onto the V (as it does in English) or there is no movement at all. Differently, morphologically rich languages have an Inflection whose strength is sufficient for the lexical V to move from its original position and raise towards it.

6.1.1 The position of frequency Advs

A way to understand how the Inflection behaves in a language consists in observing the position of the verb with respect to a frequency adverb. Let us consider the

---

111 Notice that in French this opposition is conserved only in writing, as final consonants are not pronounced anymore (a progressive process that began in the 13th century and was over around the 17th century). For this reason, the three verbal forms in (1c) differ from the infinitival one 'aimer', pronounced [e'me], but are pronounced exactly in the same way, that is, ['ɛm].

112 Notice that even English, which is known for its morphological poverty, conserves some reliquies of an ancient AGR. The 3rd person singular -s is in fact an overt realization of AgrS (whereas -ed and -ing are the heads of the TP). No such realization of the head of the AgrSP can be found in GC.

113 I use this term in order to distinguish between lexical Vs (that select arguments and are semantically rich) and functional Vs like, for example, the copula (that do not select any argument and do not add any information to the clause in which they appear). The verbal inflection of some languages, like for example English, is not strong enough to attract the lexical verb but is sufficiently strong to make the copula and auxiliaries raise in its direction.

114 I keep this very basic explanation because in this work I do not want to take position on any theoretical matter. Of course, there could also be checking without any movement instance.
following sentences (2a-b and 2a'-b'), in which I postulate the existence of a simplified structure of the type \([IP [VP V]]\). Not to complicate the representations, I do not represent any AdvP, and insert the frequency adverb in [Spec;VP] and the S directly under [Spec;IP]. The arrows show the movement of the V or the Inflection, and the starting position of the moved element is indicated by means of a \(t\) (trace):

(2a) \([IP \text{ The girl } [i \ t ] [VP \text{ always } [V \text{ cri-es}]]]\)  (EN)

(2a') \([IP \text{ The girl } [i \text{ is }] [VP \text{ always } [V \ t ] [AP \text{ sad}]]]\)  (EN)

(2b) \([IP \text{ La fille } [i \text{ pleur-e} ] [VP \text{ toujours } [V \ t ]]]]\)  (FR)

(2b') \([IP \text{ La fille } [i \text{ est }] [VP \text{ toujours } [V \ t ] [AP \text{ triste}]]]\)  (FR)

Allegedly, the difference between English and French lies in the fact that the English Inflection is not strong enough to attract the lexical V, so that it is compelled to lower onto V (2a). Differently, the French Infl is strong and successfully attracts the lexical Vs under \(I^\o\) (2b). For this reason, in English the frequency Adv precedes the lexical V (2a), whereas in French the Adv follows the finite V (2b). (2a') and (2b') show that in both English and French the copula, being light from a semantic point of view (as the Aux), is able to raise towards \(I^\o\). For this reason, both \textit{always} and \textit{toujours} follow the finite copula.

As far as GC is concerned, notice that the distribution of \textit{toujou} (“always”) is very interesting (3a-d) and (4a-c):

(3a) \textit{Tifi-la toujou ka pléré}  
Girl-DEF always HAB cry  
“The girl always cries”

(3b) *\textit{Toujou tifi-la ka pléré}  
*Always girl-DEF HAB cry

(3c) *\textit{Tifi-la ka pléré toujou}  
*Girl-DEF HAB cry always
(3d) ?Tifi-la ka toujou pléré
   ? Girl-DEF HAB always cry

(4a) Tifi-la toujou tris
   Girl-DEF always sad
   “The girl is always sad”

(4b) Tifi-la té toujou tris
   Girl-DEF ANT always sad
   “The girl was always sad”

(4c) Tifi-la toujou té tris
   Girl-DEF always ANT sad
   “The girl has always been sad”

In CG, information about tense, modality and aspect is conveyed by (overt or covert) specialized preverbal morphemes which, constituting a very small closed class of invariable elements, might be too weak to make the lexical verb raise towards them. These morphemes are said to always directly precede the verb stem and, when there are two or three of them in the same sentence, they should not be separated by any sort of element (Bernabé (2003) and Poullet&Telchid (2010), among others).

Nevertheless, as can be seen in (5a), my informants admitted the possibility of separating ka and the lexical V by means of the frequency Adv toujou. What they say is that the construction sounded slightly non-standard, but was grammatical. Moreover, with an adverbial element like yenki (“only”), the separation is judged absolutely possible (5b), whereas sentences containing souvantfwa (“often”) appear grammatical only when this Adv is placed at the beginning of the clause, as in (5c):

(5a) ?Tifi-la ka toujou pléré
   Girl-DEF HAB always cry
   “The girl always cries”
(5b) *Tifi-la ka *yenki *pléré*
   Girl-DEF HAB only cry
   “The girl only cries”

(5c) *Souvantiwa tifi-la ka pléré*
   Often girl-DEF HAB cry
   “The girl often cries”

The situation is thus quite complex, because the behaviour of frequency adverbs is not consistent. As I said before, the morphological poverty of GC suggests that there should be either lowering of the Inflection onto the V, or no movement at all. In the first case, only the order *Adv + ka + V* would be possible (6a), whereas the second option would only admit a separation of *ka* and the V (if we admit the correctness of a structure where the Advs are placed somewhere between the IP and the VP) (6b):

(6a) $[\text{IP} \quad \text{Tifi-la} \quad [\text{I} \quad \text{t}] \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{toujou} \quad [\text{V} \quad \text{ka pléré}]])$

(6b) $[\text{IP} \quad \text{Tifi-la} \quad [\text{I} \quad \text{ka}] \quad [\text{VP} \quad \text{toujou} \quad [\text{V} \quad \text{pléré}]])$

The other option is that the above orders might be a consequence of the position in the structure of the different tense, mood and aspect markers and of different types of Advs, as in the *Universal Hierarchy of clausal functional projections* proposed by Cinque (1999). According to him, Advs are placed at different structural levels: finding out which places they occupy in GC and where the TMA morphemes are placed in the structure might be the only way to justify the different orders shown above.

6.2 The order of the TMA particles

As explained in Part 1, the TMA particles of GC appear in a fixed order which seems to be consistent in all creole languages, that is, *tense > mood > aspect*. This peculiar order is known as TMA and is present not only in GC but also in all French-based creoles and other creole languages spoken in distant and unrelated places (Muysken (1980), among others). These particles indicate tense, mood, and aspect, (but in some
languages also negation and predicate) and their functional similarity was noted quite early by creolists. Taylor (1960) and Thompson (1961) noticed that every Creole language tends to have three particles: a past tense marker, a potential mood marker, and a durative aspect marker. Also, the same authors explain that, when more than one TMA particle appear in the IP-layer, their order is always the same: tense, mood\textsuperscript{115}, aspect, and main V. Then, the combinations of these particles are interpreted in fixed and rather complex ways. Voorhoeve (1973) observes the morphosyntax of the three particles in a large number of Creoles and shows the strikingly uniformity that exist in this respect among Creole languages spoken in very different areas and having widely different lexical origins.

Voorhoeve, but also Taylor and Thompson, tried to justify these similarities by postulating the existence of a language from which all Creoles would have derived. What they did was to appeal to the existence of a Portuguese-based trading and slaving *pidgin* in many parts of the world during the 16\textsuperscript{th} and 17\textsuperscript{th} centuries. In their opinion, this Portuguese-based *lingua franca* would have possessed the same tense/mood/aspect system of the modern Creole languages, which would have derived from it through so-called *relexification*, a process of massive substitution of the vocabulary that takes place despite the maintaining of all basic grammatical structures. However, Muysken explains that this theory, called the *historical theory*, is not correct because some Creole languages lack any connection to such Portuguese pidgin but still have the same TMA particles; also, he states that it is unlikely that a trading pidgin might have had the complex TMA system shown by Creole languages nowadays; and creoles are unlikely to have inherited this complex preverbal-particle system in its entirety but no other basic aspects of the grammar, in which they differ substantially.

\textsuperscript{115} The order TMA may appear bizarre to those who know Cinque's (to appear) article on the “Tense, Aspect, Mood morpheme order and the Mirror Principle”, in which the author states that “the preverbal order of (free or bound) mood, tense, and aspect morphemes appears to be, across languages, Mood > Tense > Aspect”. The contradiction is only apparent because, as Cinque himself states, “the term ‘mood’ is used in the literature to refer to different grammatical notions, corresponding to functional heads differently ordered with respect to Tense”: in his work, he refers to “speech act mood, which traditionally ranges over such values as declarative, interrogative, imperative, etc., and which is unquestionably higher than Tense”. Differently, we refer to the opposition between the *reals* and the *irreals* features.
Lefebve (1996) explains that creolization is often assumed to involve a break in transmission. For example, Thomason & Kaufman (1991) claim that creole languages “did not arise through any sort of direct transmission”, and Bickerton (1984) explains that the innovations of Creole grammars are not features transmitted from languages present in the linguistic environment but rather inventions of the first generation of children of pidgin-speaking parents. Also, according to him, the degree of similarity among the different varieties is so great that it cannot be attributed to chance. As a consequence, Bickerton (1984) proposes that there must be a species-specific inborn device for language acquisition that he calls the Language Bioprogram (henceforth, LB). The LB is an acquisitional tool that would be activated (and provide a system of tense, mood and aspect) when the linguistic input is too poor for the child to create a TMA system, such as in the situations of linguistic emergency in which Creole languages generated. He explains that the activation of the LB constitutes a break in the grammar, which in the presence of a reduced input cannot be normally transmitted. Thus, this human in-built device is a way to account for the similarities between the TMA systems of a large number of Creole languages.

Actually, in Chomskyan's (1980) terms, these similarities seem to suggest that the TMA systems of all creole languages could be the realization of an option offered by Universal Grammar (henceforth, UG), even though there might have been more than this at work when these languages developed. In fact, the UG might have activated a number of last-resort operations in such peculiar processes of linguistic acquisition, but the influence that the linguistic substratum had in the activation of some options rather than others is undeniable. Also, if the child was able to build a grammar even when missing a quantitatively and qualitatively sufficient linguistic input, a large part of Creole grammars could constitute a number of default options (Parameters, in generative terms) that are activated when no option can be chosen on the basis of the mere input. Maybe these default options are the easiest to acquire and/or activate because of their low-rate of computational complexity. If this prediction was correct, then the syntactic differences between Creole languages could be accounted for as:
– a setting of a non-default parameter due to the influence of the substratum: peculiar linguistics backgrounds might have blocked the setting of certain parameters, or hence they helped the setting when an option was predominant in the languages spoken by the pidgin-speaking population (African people coming from the same region might have spoken different languages of the same family so maybe certain Parameters were more predominant than others in the input);
– an influence of the superstratum language, as the first Creole-speaking generation was often bilingual, and differently from their parents they would learn the language of the colonizer as well;
– a later development of the Creole language itself.

To summarize, the similarities between Creole languages are likely to be due to the setting of certain default options offered by UG which are at the child's disposal even when the linguistic input to which they are exposed is not sufficient, although not completely absent. Nonetheless, the influence of the substratum in the setting of the parameters seems to be undeniable, as otherwise it would be impossible to account for the differences found in the grammars of different Creole languages.

6.3 Overt TMA morphemes

The IP-layer of Guadeloupean Creole is characterized by the presence of a number of overt morphemes of Tense, Mood, Aspect and Negation. Nonetheless, as it is possible to postulate the existence of a phonetically-null series of morphemes (which I call covert morphemes) as well, I will first present the properties and distribution of the overt morphemes, and then explain why each TMA morpheme must be associated to a phonetically null counterpart (3.4).

6.3.1 The morpheme ka

Ka is an inflectional morpheme that is placed right before the lexical V and indicates that the state or action expressed by the V is open, in the sense that it has started at
some point but it is still on-going. The traditional literature (among others, Poullet&Telchid (2010) and Bernabé (2003)) distinguishes between 3 different types of ka, conveying slightly different meanings but being phonologically and distributionally identical. In the following sections, I will show that ka is an aspectual morpheme, and that for semantic reasons it cannot be employed with all types of verbs.

6.3.1.1 Present progressive (ka₁)

The morpheme ka indicates that the action expressed by the lexical V is still going on at the time of speaking or likely to take place again, that is, it is unaccomplished (52a-b) or iterated (52c-d):

(52a) Machann-la ka vann bannann
     Merchant-DEF PROGR/HAB sell banana
     “The merchant is selling/sells bananas”

(52b) Sé timoun-la ka jwé adan savann-la
     PLUR child-DEF PROGR/HAB play inside park-DEF
     “The/these children are playing/play in the park”

(52c) I ka chanté dépi bonmaten
     She ITER sing since morning
     “She's been singing since this morning”

(52d) Tou lé dé minit i ka manjé on sik
     Every the two minute she ITER eat a candy
     “She eats a candy every two minutes”

In the literature (for example, in Bernabé (2003)), it is often referred to as ka₁, in order to distinguish it from the two other (semantically slightly different) ka, which will be dealt with in the next two sections. In the present work, such a distinction will

\[\text{\textsuperscript{116}}\] Both the progressive and the habitual interpretations are possible. According to one of my informants, in the absence of a precise indication “all expressions are context-bound” and “clearly depend on the intonation, on gestures and shared information”.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{117}}\] The iterated meaning is lost if the time specification is cut out.
be neglected, as *ka* is likely to be a single morpheme associated to only one functional projection, and its different meanings are likely to be conveyed by the linguistic context. This is demonstrated by the fact that it is not possible to find more than one *ka* in the same clause, that is, an habitual unaccomplished/iterated action will never be expressed by means of a *ka + ka + V*.

In the negative form, the morpheme *pa* is preposed to the sequence *ka+V* (53c-d):

(53c) *Mesyé-la pa ka konpwann sa ou vlé*

Man-DEF NEG PROGR understand what you want

“The/this man cannot understand what you want”

(53d) *Madanm-la pa ka tann sa ou ka di*

Woman-DEF NEG PROGR hear what you say

“The/this woman cannot hear what you say”

Notice that, whereas the NEG morpheme *pa* clearly derives from the French negation *pas*, the same is not true for *ka*, which does not seem to be linked to any French functional element. In this latter case, the origin of the element should probably be looked for in the lexicon of a West African language.

### 6.3.1.2 Habits and general truths (*ka*)

The preverbal morpheme *ka* is used also when the action expressed by the V constitutes a habit (54a-b) or expresses a general truth (154c-d):

(54a) *I ka travay tè*

She HAB work land

“She cultivates”

(54b) *I kay si mawché chak mewkrèdi*

She HAB go on market each Wednesday

“She goes to the market every Wednesday”
(54c) *Latè ka touné*
Earth HAB turn
“The Earth turns”

(54d) *Sé timoun-la (toujou) ka fè onlo dézòd*
PLUR child-DEF (always) HAB do a lot noise
“The/these children are being/are always very noisy”

### 6.3.1.3 Temporal complements (*ka*)

The third type of *ka* is the one that appears in sentences modified by a temporal adjunct, like (55a-b):

(55a) *Lè ka fè cho, nou ka bengné*
When HABIT make hot, we HABIT bath
“When it is hot, we bath [in the sea]”

(55b) *Yo ka pisimyé ay bòdlamè lè tan-la two fwé*
They HABIT prefer go seaside when weather-DEF too chilly
“They prefer going to the seaside when the weather is chilly”

Notice that (55b) introduces a crucial question, that is, the distinction between *eventive* and *stative* verbs, which is discussed in depth in the next section. Allegedly, *pisimyé* (“to prefer”) is a verb that does not require the presence of *ka* for the state it expresses to be perceived as located in the present by the listener (55b’). Notice also that *enné* (“to love”) behaves exactly in the same way:

(55b’)*An enné wonm, mé an pisimyé bwè dlo*
I love rhum, but I prefer drink water
“I love rhum, but I prefer drinking water”

I postulate that they are not accompanied by any aspectual morpheme, as stative verbs are intrinsically associated to a [+OPEN] meaning.
6.3.2 The distinction between eventive and stative verbs

Poullet&Telchid (2010) list a number of verbs whose interpretation is [-PUNC] in the absence of any marker (whereas all other Vs are [+PUNC] in such cases): enmé (“to love”), hay (“to hate”), vlé (“to want”), pé (“can/be able to”), konnèt/sav (“to know”), and ni (“to have”). Van de Vate (2011) introduces a fundamental distinction between eventive and stative verbs, basing her discussion mostly on Bickerton's (1975) work. According to her,

unmarked verbs are interpreted as expressing a non-anterior, punctual and realis eventuality. For the interpretation of the unmarked verb form, the stative vs. eventive distinction is very important. The former are interpreted as expressing non-past, while the latter express past and refer to a 'single action that happened at a moment in the past that may or may not be specified but should not predicate any action simultaneously under discussion' (Bickerton, 1975, 28).

To understand this statement, let us compare the behaviour of two stative verbs (56a-b) to that of two eventive ones (56c-d) in the absence of verbal morphology:

(56a) Fabyen enmé fanm a-y
    Fabian love woman of-he
    “Fabian loves his wife”
(56b) Fabien vlé dansé èvè-w
    Fabian want dance with-you
    “Fabian wants to dance with you”
(56c) Emmayel dansé èvè Mari
    Emmanuel dance with Mary
    “Emmanuel danced with Mary”
(56d) Katrin kriyé Jilian
    Catherine call Julian
    “Catherine called Julian”
As the examples show, stative verbs are interpreted as present when they are not preceded by any overt functional morpheme, whereas in the same conditions eventive verbs are interpreted as anterior with respect to the time of the utterance. A similar distinction is found when the verb is accompanied by the Tense morpheme té (see 3.3.3 for further details). Van de Ven explains that

with regard to the functional category of Tense, Bickerton argues that creole languages have a relative tense system which implies that not the time of utterance is taken as an anchor time but rather some contextually relevant time (which might be the time of utterance). In combination with stative verbs, [+anterior] results in a simple past interpretation, while in combination with eventive verbs [+anterior] gives rise to a past-before-past interpretation.

This aspect will be discussed more in detail in the next section. En passant, as Alessandra Giorgi suggested to me, notice that it is better to say that ka is an aspectual marker carrying the [+OPEN] feature rather than a [-ACCOMPLISHED] one, and this for two reasons:

- if we used the [±ACCOMPLISHED] feature, ka would be the only TMA marker characterized negatively (see the following sections);
- the feature [+OPEN] is inherently present in stative Vs, which easily accounts for the different behaviour of these Vs with respect to eventive ones.

### 6.3.3 The morpheme té

Van de Ven's statement quoted above can be understood observing the behaviour of stative (57a-b) and eventive verbs (57c-d) when combined with the Tense marker té:

\[(57a) \textit{Fabyen té enmé fanm a-y} \]

Fabian ANT love woman of-he

“Fabian loved his wife”
(57b) *Fabyen té vlé dansé èvè-w*

Fabian ANT want dance with you

“Fabyan wanted to dance with you”

(57c) *Emmanyel té dansé èvè Mari (avant fam a-y rivé)*

Emmanuel ANT dance with Mary (before wife of-he arrive)

“Emmanuel had danced with Mary (before his wife arrived)”

(57d) *Katrin té kryé Jilyen (avant y pati)*

Catherine ANT call Julian (before he leave)

“Catherine had called Julien (before he left)

As shown in the examples, the morpheme té conveys a past idea when it is combined with a stative verb (that is, the idea is past with respect to the time of speaking), whereas it conveys a past-before-past idea when it appears with an eventive verb (that is, its meaning is past with respect to a defined past moment). Similarly, its absence from the phonetic string means [-ANTERIOR] when the V is stative and [+ANTERIOR] when it is eventive, which will be discussed more in detail in 3.4.1.

As happens with aspectual *ka*, the negation for this Tense morpheme is *pa* and always precedes it, as in (58a-b):

(58a) *Fabyen pa té enné fam a-y*

Fabian NEG ANT love woman of-he

“Fabian didn't love his wife”

(58b) *Emmanyel pa té dansé èvè Mari (avant fam a-y rivé)*

Emmanuel NEG ANT dance with Mary (before that) woman of-he arrive

“Emmanuel hadn’t danced with Mary (before his wife arrived)”

The last overt TMA morpheme of GC is the one that conveys the idea of *futurity*, which is discussed in the next section.
6.3.4 The morpheme ké

The morpheme ké is considered a Mood and not a Tense marker because it can appear in the structure along with té, in conditional structures of the type té ké V that will be discussed in 4.3.2.3. As a matter of fact, we do not expect two functional markers of the same type to be able to qualify a verb simultaneously, as we postulate that they must occupy the same position in the structure. Thus, ké is believed to carry the feature [+IRREALIS] rather than the [+FUTURE] one. Differently from what happens with té, this marker has exactly the same meaning both with stative (59a-b) and eventive (59c-d) verbs, which is explained by the possibility of both [+OPEN] and [-OPEN] Vs of being associated to a futurity interpretation:

(59a) (Adan 50 ans), an ké enmé-w toujou
  (In 50 years) I IRR love-you always
  “(In 50 years) I will still love you”
(59b) (Lè egzamen an-mwen ké fini), an ké vlé repozé kò a-mwen
  (When final of-me IRR over), I IRR want rest body of-me
  “When the finals are over, I will want to take a rest”
(59c) (Prochen grann vakans-la), an ké ay bennyé an rivyè
  (Next summer-DEF), I IRR go bath in river
  “(Next summer), I will bath in the river”
(59d) (Sanmdi pro Chen) an ké ay fè konmisyon an sipèwmawché-la
  (Saturday next ) I IRR go do shopping in supermarket-DEF
  (Next Saturday), I will go shopping at the supermarket”

As confirmed by my informants, the bracketed future expressions are not necessary for the interpretation of the event or state expressed by the V as being likely to take place in a moment that is future with respect to the utterance time. Predictably then, a sentence containing a present (60a) or past (60b) temporal expression and the sequence ke + V cannot be grammatical:
(60a) *An ké ay si mawchè alè-la
    *I IRR go on market now
    “*I will go to the market now”

(60b) *Yé, an ké ay fè commision an-mwen
    *Yesterday, I IRR go do shopping of-me
    “*Yesterday, I will go shopping”

The present expression is accepted only if it refers to a precise lapse of time that has already started and is still going on, as in (60c-d):

(60c) Jodila, an ké ay vvè Mari
    Today I IRR go see Mary
    “Today, I’ll visit Mary”

(60d) Bonmaten-la an ké kryé Emmanyel
    Early morning-DEF I IRR call Emmanuel
    “I’ll call Emmanuel this morning”

The negation of ké is different from that of ka and té, as it is realized as pé (61a-c):

(61a) An pé ké ay bod-lanmè èvè Julien
    I NEG IRR go seaside with Julien
    “I won’t go to the seaside with Julien”

(61b) An pé ké pé soti èvè-w dimen
    I NEG IRR can go out with-you tomorrow
    “I won’t be able to go out with you tomorrow”

(61c) Lanmou an-nou pé ké fini
    Love of-we NEG IRR end
    “Our love is not going to end”

Nonetheless, I do not think that each TMA marker can have a specialized negation. In fact, pé is more likely to be an allophonic realisation of pa that has undergone a
process of regressive assimilation. For this reason, all negations are marked with the same tag NEG throughout the present work.

6.4 Covert TMA morphemes

In the present chapter I postulate that, as the absence of a functional morpheme from the phonetic string always conveys a peculiar meaning, each morpheme discussed in the last chapter must have a phonetically-null counterpart carrying the same feature specified negatively instead of positively. So, if the overt morpheme carries a [+x] feature, its phonetically null counterpart will obligatorily carry the correspondent [-x] feature.

As explained, ka is specified for the feature [+OPEN], té is [+ANTERIOR], and ké is [+IRREALIS]. Thus, if we postulate that each positive feature belongs to a binary system and has always a contrary counterpart, all GC verb must always be specified for the features [±OPEN], [±ANTERIOR] and [±IRREALIS]. Thus, there must be a covert [-OPEN] aspect marker, a covert [-ANTERIOR] tense marker, and a covert marker associated to the [-IRREALIS] feature.

6.4.1 Past non-overt marker

In GC, the past interpretation is said to be conveyed by a “past non-overt marker” (Bernabé (2003) and Poullet&Telchid (2010), among others), or rather by an Aspectual marker present in the structure but absent from the phonetic string. This is true when the V is of the eventive type. Actually such an interpretation is unlikely to be given by the Tense covert marker alone, but rather by a combination of covert TMA markers that will be discussed in (3.4.4). For the moment, let us just postulate that this zero marker is the covert counterpart of ka, that is, a marker associated with the [-OPEN] feature. Let us observe some examples of affirmative (62a-b) and negative pa+V (62c-d) sentences containing this covert marker, which is represented in the gloss by means of the symbol Ø:
(62a) Madann-la konpwann sytiasion a-w
Woman-DEF Ø understand situation of-you
“The woman understood your situation”

(62b) Fabyen ja bwè kafè a-y
Fabian already Ø drink coffee
“Fabian has already had his coffee”

(62c) Sé tifi-la pa répond
PLUR girl-DEF Ø NEG answer
“The girls didn't answer”

(62d) Maman-w pa paré zéfé a-w yè
Mother-you NEG Ø prepare stuff of-you yesterday
“Your mother didn't prepare your stuff yesterday”

As for stative verbs, their interpretation in the absence of any overt marker in the phonetic string is interpreted as [+OPEN]. Poullet&Telchid (2010) say that a way to give them a [+PUNCTUAL] (in my terms, [-OPEN]) interpretation (but not a past-before-past one, which is conveyed by té) is to combine them with the verbs vin (“to come”) and touvé (“to find”)118. As they say, these verbs can be used “alone or combined” [my translation] (63a-d):

(63a) An anmé/ni/sav
I love/have/know
“I love/have/know”

(63b) An vin sav
I come know
“I got to know”

(63c) An touvé-mwen sav
I find-me know
“I happened to know”

118 Notice that these are the semi-lexical Vs discussed in 2.1.3.1. Actually, Poullet&Telchid (2010) classify them as “modal verbs”. 
In the following sections, I will show that a way to prove the presence of covert morphemes in the TMA system of GC consists in observing the possible combinations of overt morphemes and of the meanings they assume when combined.

### 6.4.2 Possible combinations of the morphemes

In this chapter I will show how the morphemes combine with each other and I will try to demonstrate the presence in the preverbal TMA sequences of phonetically-null morphemes. I will do so by observing the semantics of the various sequences.

#### 6.4.2.1 Té ka

The combination of the pre-verbal morphemes té ka conveys the idea of an unaccomplished past event (64a-d), as an English past progressive or habitual past. Of course, as stative Vs are inherently [+OPEN], the sequence té ka is not possible with such Vs.

(64a) *Ou té ka bengné an rivyé-la*

You ANT PROGR bath in river-DEF

“You were bathing in the river”

(64b) *Asi mòn-la té ni dêtwa tigason té ka jwé sèvolan*

On hill-DEF ANT have some child PAST PROGR play kite

“On the hill, there were some children playing with kites”

(64c) *Vôlè-la té ka volé lajan*

Tief-DET ANT HABIT/PROGR rob money

“The thief used to steal/was stealing some money”
(64d) Yo té kay si mawché
   They ANT PROGR-go on market
   “They were going to the market”

Predictably, the negative sequence is pa té ka, as in (65a-b):

(65a) I pa té ka palé évè Fabyen lè ou rivé
   She NEG PAST PROGR talk with Fabian when you Ø arrive
   “She wasn't talking with Fabian when you arrived”

(65b) Ou pa té ka dansé évè Katrin lè papa a-y rivé
   You NEG PAST PROGR dance with Catherine when dad of-she Ø arrive
   “You weren't dancing with Caterina when her dad arrived”

6.4.2.2 Ké ka

The sequence ké ka gives the interpretation of a progressive future activity or event. As it was the case with té ka, also the sequence ké ka is not compatible with stative Vs. Predictably, the negative particle used for this sequence is pé, as pa undergoes a process of regressive assimilation triggered by the presence of ké. The following examples are instances of affirmative (66a-b) and negative (66c-d) uses of the ké ka sentence:

(66a) Lè ou ké rivé, an ké ka dansé épi Emmanyèl
   When you IRR arrive, I IRR PROGR dance with Emmanuel
   “When you arrive, I will be dancing with Emmanuel”

(66b) Prochain mwa-la, an ké ka bennyé an rivyé
   Next month-DEF, I IRR PROGR bath in river
   “Next month, I will be bathing in the river”

(66c) A dizè, an pé ké ka dòmi
   At ten, I NEG IRR PROGR sleep
   “At ten, I won’t be sleeping”
(66d) *A nèvè, an pé ké ka dansé épi-w*

At nine, I NEG IRREALIS PROGR dance with-you

“At nine, I won’t be dancing with you”

### 6.4.2.3 Té Ké

As already pointed out, this peculiar sequence of morphemes shows that the morpheme *ké* cannot be considered a Tense marker but rather a Mood marker. In fact, if *té* and *ké* were both Tense markers, they would belong to the same category and thus would compete for the same position in the structure. As a result, they would be mutually exclusive, which is not the case in GC.

Thus, *ké* means [+IRREALIS], that is, future because plausible to happen but not part of the real world yet. In combination with *té*, which means [+ANTERIOR], what we obtain is a *conditional*. Consequently, this sequence often appears in hypothetical clauses, like those in (67a-b), but also in isolation (when the condition is not expressed), as in (67c). The negation is formed with a preposed *pa*, as in (67d-e):

(67a) *Si mari an-mwen té ka kité-mwen, an té ké ay viv adan ondot pays*

If husband of-me ANT PROGR left-me, I ANT IRR go live in other country

“If my husband left me, I’d move to another country”

(67b) *Si an té ni assé lagent, an té ké pati viv en Guadeloupe*

If I ANT have enough money, I ANT IRR leave live in Guadeloupe

“If I had enough money, I’d move to Guadeloupe”

(67c) *An té ké enmé manjé on bon manjé kréyòl*

I ANT IRR love eat a good eat creole

“I would love eating some good Creole food”

(67d) *Si y té invitè-mwen adan fèt a-y, an pa té ké ay*

If she ANT invite-me in party of-she, I NEG ANT IRR go

“If she had invited me to her party, I wouldn’t have gone“
(67e) Si y té bo-mwen, an pa té ké kontan
If he ANT kiss-me, I NEG ANT IRR happy
“If he had kissed me, I wouldn’t have been happy”

Notice that this sequence can be used also with stative verbs, as both té and ké are compatible with these verbs (67f-g):

(67f) Si y té pli janti, an té ké enmé-y
If he ANT more nice, I ANT IRR love-he
“If he was nicer, I’d love him”

(67g) An té ké pisimyé pa mangé adan gato-lasa
I ANT IRR prefer NEG eat in cake-this
“I’d prefer not to eat this cake”

6.4.2.4 Té ké ka

The sequence té ké ka conveys an additional meaning to the sequence discussed in the precious section: the action or event is in fact interpreted as [+OPEN], that is, unaccomplished or still going on at the time in which the hypothetical condition would/could have taken place. This can be observed in the sentences that follow (68a-d). Notice that the negation used here is again pa (68c-d):

(68a) Si y té vin adan fèt-la, nou té ké ka dansé ensemb
If she ANT come in party-DEF, we ANT IRR PROGR dance together
“If she had come to the party, we would be dancing together”

(68b) Si té ka fè cho, nou té ké ka nagé adan lanmè
If ANT PROGR do hot, we ANT IRR PROGR swim in sea
“If it was hot, we would be swimming in the sea”

(68c) Si ou té enmé mwen, ou pa té ké ka pini-mwen kon sa
If you ANT love me, you NEG ANT IRR PROGR scold-me like this
“If you loved me, you wouldn’t be scolding me like this”
(68d) An pa té ké ka chanté kon sa si té ni moun

I NEG ANT PROGR sing like this if ANT have person

“I wouldn’t be singing like this if there was someone around”

Because of the presence of ka, the sequence is not compatible with stative verbs.

6.4.4 Binary overt/covert TMA morphemes

If we observe the semantics of the various morphemes and of their combinations, we understand that there must be a number of covert morphemes in the structure. For instance, let us take the sequence té ké ka into analysis. It is composed of three TMA preverbal markers whose meaning is [+ANTERIOR; +IRREALIS; +OPEN] and it is the longest possible sequence of verbal functional markers. The order of its elements is unchangeable, and it conveys the idea of a hypothetical event or action that could be taking place if a certain condition (expressed or not) is satisfied. Let us postulate that all Vs are always specified by a sequence of three TMA markers: a quick look at the various sequences will demonstrate that this prediction is correct.

Té ka indicates a progressive or habitual past action/event and clearly carries the [+ANTERIOR] and [+OPEN] features. Clearly, in such cases the action or event indicated by the V is also [-IRREALIS], so I postulate the presence of a zero morpheme carrying the [-IRREALIS] feature between té and ka. As a consequence, in a hypothetical MoodP, Mood° would be occupied either by ké, carrying the [+IRREALIS] feature, or by a zero morpheme of the type [-IRREALIS], as in (69a):

(69a) [MoodP [Mood ké [+IRREALIS] /Ø[-IRREALIS] ] [VP]]

Similarly, ké ka must be preceded by a covert Tense marker. This is demonstrated by the fact that the sequence makes the event or action expressed by the verb not only [+IRREALIS; +OPEN] but also [-ANTERIOR]. Thus, it is possible to postulate the existence of two Tense markers: té, carrying the feature [+ANTERIOR], and a zero
morpheme associated with the opposite feature [-ANTERIOR]. They are likely to occupy the head of a TP, as in (69b):

$(69b) \left[ TP \left[ T \text{té}_{[-\text{ANTERIOR}] / \text{Ø}_{[-\text{ANTERIOR}]} \right] \left[ VP \right] \right]$

Also, té ké is a sequence carrying the [+ANTERIOR; +IRREALIS] features. As its meaning is also [-OPEN], there must be a zero morpheme inserted under Asp° associated with this feature. Notice that AspP is likely not to be projected when the V is stative, and that because of the semantics of the V itself. If these predictions were correct, AspP would look as in (69c):

$(69c) \left[ AspP \left[ Asp \text{ka}_{[-\text{PUNCTUAL}] / \text{Ø}_{[+\text{PUNCTUAL}]} \right] \left[ VP \right] \right]$

As a consequence, the combinations of morphemes described in the previous sections must be slightly different from what I said above. In fact, the covert morphemes must not be forgotten, as the absence of the overt morphemes is meaningful. It is possible to postulate that they are present in the structure and just not realized in the phonetic string.

Consequently, the actual combinations of morphemes of GC must be: ØØØVe (70a) and ØØVe (70a'); TéØVe (70b) and TéOVVe (70b'); ØkéOVVe (70c) and ØkéVVe (70c'); ØØkaVe (70d-d'); téØkaVe (70e-e'); té kéØVe (70f); ØkékaVe (70g-g'); tékékaVe (70h-h'):

(70a) *Mari kryé Pyè*

Mary Ø{[-ANT]} Ø{[-IRR]} Ø{[-OPEN]} call Pierre

“Mary called Pierre”

(70a') *Mari enmé Pyè*

Mary Ø{[-ANT]} Ø{[-IRR]} love Pierre

“Mary loves Pierre”
(70b) *Mari té **bo** Pyè
   Mary ANT 0[IRR] 0[OPEN] kiss Pierre
   Mary had kissed Pierre
(70b') *Mari té **pisimyé** Pyè
   Mary ANT 0[IRR] prefer Pierre
   “Mary preferred Pierre”
(70c) *Mari ké **kryé** Pyè
   Mari 0[ANT] IRR 0[OPEN] call Pierre
   “Mary will call/love Pierre”
(70c') *Mari té **enmé** Pyè
   Mary 0[ANT] IRR love Pierre
   “Mary loves Pierre”
(70d) *Mari ka **kryé** Pyè
   Mary 0[ANT] 0[IRR] OPEN call Pierre
   “Mary is calling/calls Pierre”
(70d') *Mari ka **enmé** Pyè
   *Mary 0[ANT] 0[IRR] OPEN love Pierre
   *Mary is loving/loves Pierre”
(70e) *Mari té ka **kryé** Pyè
   Mary ANT 0[IRR] OPEN call Pierre
   “Mary was calling/used to call Pierre”
(70e) *Mari té ka **pisimyé** Pyè
   *Mary ANT 0[IRR] OPEN prefer Pierre
   “*Mary was preferring/used to prefer Pierre”
(70f) *Mari té ké **kryé/enmé** Pyè
   Mary ANT IRR (0[OPEN])\(^{119}\) call/love Pyè
   “Mary would call/love Pierre”
(70g) *Mari ké ka **kryé** Pyè
   Mary 0[ANT] IRR OPEN call Pierre
   “Mary will be calling Pierre”

\(^{119}\) I put this element into round brackets because AspP is not projected with stative verbs.
(70g') *Mari ké ka pisimyé Pyè

*Mary Ø[ANT] IRR OPEN prefer Pierre

"*Mary will be preferring Pierre

(70h) Mari té ké ka kryé Pyè

Mary ANT IRR OPEN call Pierre

"*Mary would be calling Pierre”

(70h') *Mari té ké ka pisimyé Pyè

*Mary ANT IRR OPEN prefer Pierre

*Mary would be preferring Pierre

To summarize, the following table groups all the TMA morphemes that can accompany an *eventive verb, and all their possible combinations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[±ANTERIOR]</th>
<th>[±IRREALIS]</th>
<th>[±OPEN]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø + Ø + Ø + Ve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té + Ø + Ø + Ve</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø + ké + Ø + Ve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø + Ø + ka + Ve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té + ké + Ø + Ve</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té + Ø + ka + Ve</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø + ké + ka + Ve</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té + ke + ka + Ve</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As stative Vs are intrinsically different from eventive Vs because they are naturally associated with the [+OPEN] feature, only the Tense features [±ANTERIOR] and the Mood features [±IRREALIS] are included in the table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[±ANTERIOR]</th>
<th>[±IRREALIS]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø + Ø + Vs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té + Ø + Vs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø + ké + Vs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Té + ké + Vs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 7
Word order

The term *word order* refers to the order of the syntactic constituents of a given language, and word order typology studies how different languages can employ different orders to convey the same meanings, as well as the correlations between orders found in different syntactic sub-domains. In fact, the study of word order focuses on the *constituent order* of clauses, but also on the order of modifiers of the NE and the order of adverbials. In this section though, only the first type of order will be taken into account, that is, the relative order of S, V and (direct and indirect) O in the different types of clauses.

Some languages have rather restrictive word orders, as they rely on the relative order of the constituents to convey most grammatical information. Differently, others languages (mostly those that convey grammatical information through some specialized inflection) allow a more flexible order, which can be modified in order to encode pragmatic information such as focus and topic. In many languages, for instance, changes in word order occur due to topicalization, to focus or in questions. Nonetheless, most languages show an unmarked word order which is used more frequently than the others (Comrie (1981)), *marked* word orders being used to emphasize a given element in the sentence or to indicate modality and illocutionary force.

7.1 The unmarked word order

Guadeloupean Creole is an SVO language, like modern English and French. That is, in the unmarked case the subject is preverbal, whereas the object immediately follows the verb. Being rigidly SVO is very common a feature for languages that, like GC, do not seem to have any Case-system. As a consequence, the same NE can be a S when it precedes the V, or a complement when it follows it, as the
grammatical function of an element varies according to the position it occupies in the sentence. For instance, in the following couples of examples (1a-b and 2a-b) it is clear that the S of (a), has exactly the same form as the DO or the IO of (b):

(1a) *On sèpan boa ka valé on bèt féròs*
    A snake boa PROGR swallow a beast wild
    “A boa is eating a wild beast”
(1b) *On bèt féròs ka valé on sèpan boa*
    A beast wild PROGR swallow a snake boa
    “A wild beast is eating a boa”
(2a) *Timoun-la ba on liv ban-mwen*
    Boy-DEF buy a book to-me
    “The boy bought me a book”
(2b) *An achté on liv ba timoun-la*
    I buy a book to child-DEF
    “I bought a book to the boy”

The same happens with pronouns, which do not bare any Case distinction and simply have two forms whose distribution depends on their internal structure: strong forms can occupy all positions, whereas the distribution of deficient forms is restricted (for a more detailed description, see Part 3 of this work and Cardinaletti&Starke (1994)). As a consequence, in the unmarked order both strong and deficient pronouns can function as S, DO or IO.

The order SVO is predominant in GC and constitutes the unmarked order, that is, the order in which the constituents appear in main declarative clauses with no special intonation nor peculiar informative structure. Nonetheless, different orders can be found when the sentence has a special illocutionary force or when the speaker wants to stress on one or more elements. These are called *marked orders* and will be dealt with in the following section.
7.2 Marked word orders

Differently from the unmarked word order, marked orders involve some extra instance of movement and, as movement is computationally costly, they must always be justified by presence of additional information or feature with respect to their unmarked counterpart. For this reason, we can postulate that if an unmarked sentence $A$ has a marked counterpart $B$, then $B$ must equal to $A+x$, where $x$ stays for any given complementary information not conveyed by $A$ alone.

In GC, the main marked orders are found in direct interrogative sentences, in which the questioned element moves upwards in the structure to verify the [+INT] feature, and in dislocations, which move an element in an unusual position in order to make it more prominent with respect to the others.

7.2.1 Interrogative sentences

Interrogative clauses differ from their declarative counterparts in that the questioned element is not found in its canonical position\textsuperscript{120} but rather in a higher position, very often the first position available in the sentence. This movement is justified by the need to get the interrogative interpretation, which is obtained by mere raising of the interrogative element to the Spec of the higher projection of the CP-layer\textsuperscript{121}, which I will call [Spec;CP]. This projection is associated with an [+INT] feature that the questioned element must check in order to get the interrogative interpretation. No in-situ interrogatives seem to be possible in GC, as the raising is compulsory for the sentence to be correctly interpreted.

In the following examples, I show how different elements are inserted under [Spec;CP] to give an interrogative interpretation to the whole sentence. (3a-d) and (4a-d) are wh-interrogatives, the only difference between the two groups being that

\textsuperscript{120} The canonical positions are: [Spec;IP] for the S, [VP;Compl] for the DO and VP-adjoined positions for the IO and adjuncts.

\textsuperscript{121} In passing, notice that SAI does not occur in GC, as when the INFL is visible it does not raise towards C, thus staying to the right of the S.
in the former the questioned element is a pronoun, whereas in the latter it is a *pronoun + N* string. In both groups, in (a) the questioned element is the DO, in (b) the IO and in (c) an adjunct; the movement from the base position to the CP is represented by means of an arrow:

(3a) \[ \text{[} CP \text{Kibiten [IP Fabien achté } \underline{\text{ba Mari yé}] \text{]} } \]

What Fabian buy to Mary yesterday

“What did Fabian buy Mary yesterday?”

(3b) \[ \text{[} CP \text{Ba}^{122} \text{kimoun [IP Fabien achté bonbon-lasa } \underline{\text{yé}] } \text{]} \]

To who Fabian buy cake-DEM yesterday

“To whom did Fabian buy this cake yesterday?”

(3c) \[ \text{[} CP \text{Kitan [IP Fabien achté bonbon-lasa ba Mari } \underline{\text{]] } \text{]} } \]

When Fabian buy cake-DEM to Mary

“When did Fabian buy Mary this cake?”

(4a) \[ \text{[} CP \text{Kilès pwofésè [IP ou konnèt } \underline{\text{]] ] } \text{]} } \]

Which professor you know

“Which professor do you know?”

(4b) \[ \text{[} CP \text{Ba kilès pwofésè}^{123} [IP ou di sa } \underline{\text{]] ] } \text{]} } \]

To which professor you say this

“To which professor did you say that?”

(4c) \[ \text{[} CP \text{Ki koté [IP ou vvè pwofésè-lasa } \underline{\text{]] ] } \text{]} } \]

Which place see professor-DEM

“Where did you see that professor?”

Notice that, similarly, the same movement might take place when the questioned element is the S, even though in such cases the linear order of the interrogative clause does not change from that of the correspondent declarative clause (5a-b):

---

122 In passing, notice that the P must raise, as pied-piping is not allowed.
123 Again, notice that pied-piping of the P would not be possible.

156
In *yes/no questions* (henceforth, Y/N) there is no raising of any element towards [Spec;CP] and the interrogative element *ès* is used to guarantee the interrogative interpretation (6a-b). This element is likely to originate from a mis-analysis of French *est-ce que* [ɛskə], with which it shares distribution and interpretation:

(6a) \( \text{[CP } \text{Es} \text{ [IP } \text{ou pé dansé}] \text{]} \)?

INT you can dance

“The do you know how to dance?”

(6b) \( \text{[CP } \text{Es} \text{ [IP } \text{ou konpwann sa i di la}] \text{]} \)?

INT you understand that she say DEF

“Can you understand what she's saying?”

Y/N questions can also lack the interrogative element *ès* (6c-d). In such cases, the interrogative clause can be both genuine and rhetoric. The interrogative interpretation is conveyed by the intonation:

(6c) \( \text{[CP } \text{Ø} \text{ [IP } \text{ou pé dansé}] \text{]} \)?

ØINT you can dance

“The do you know how to dance?”

(6d) \( \text{[CP } \text{Ø} \text{ [IP } \text{ou konpwann sa i di la}] \text{]} \)?

ØINT you understand that she say DEF

“Can you understand what she's saying?”

124 I use the broad label IP because the theoretical description of the Guadeloupean Creole is not the aim of the present work, for which reason I prefer not to take position on the nature of the topmost projection of the IP-layer, and just call it IP.
The same marked order is found also in indirect \textit{wh}-interrogative clauses\textsuperscript{125} (7a-d):

(7a) \textit{An té ké enmé sav [\textit{CP kimoun [\textit{IP }fè sa]}}]  
I ANT IRR love know who do this  
“I’d love to know who did this”

(7b) \textit{An té ké enmé sav [\textit{CP kimoun [\textit{IP }vwè yè]]}}  
I ANT IRR love know who you see yesterday  
“I’d love to know who you saw yesterday”

(7c) \textit{An té ké enmé sav [\textit{CP ba kimoun [\textit{IP }achté braslé onlo-lasa ___]]}}  
I ANT IRR love know to who you buy bracelet golden-DEM  
“I’d love to know to whom you bought this golden bracelet”

(7d) \textit{An té ké enmé sav [\textit{CP ola [\textit{IP }ka rété ___]]}}  
I ANT IRR love know where you HAB live  
“I’d love to know where you live”

In Y/N indirect questions the order of the elements is unmarked and the interrogative interpretation is assured by the presence of the complementizer \textit{si} (“if”) (8a-b):

(8a) \textit{An té ké enmé sav [\textit{CP si [\textit{IP }ou ka rété Lafwans]]}}  
I ANT IRR love know if you HAB live France  
“I’d love to know if you live in France”

(8b) \textit{Ou obliyé di-mwen [\textit{CP si [\textit{IP }Mari mayé]]}}  
You forget tell-me if Mary married  
“You forgot to tell me if Mary is married”

To summarize, the unmarked order SVO is not present in direct and indirect \textit{wh}-questions, with the exception of S questions, as their first element is always the questioned string. Differently, Y/N direct and indirect questions are unmarked, as the only differences between them and their declarative counterpart are the intonation

\textsuperscript{125}Again, I postulate that there might be a movement of the questioned element also in S interrogative clauses, even though the movement is not visible in the linear order.
and the presence of the interrogative elements *es* and *si*, respectively.

### 7.2.2 Dislocations

In dislocations a constituent that is an argument or an adjunct of the clause is placed outside the clause boundaries. The dislocated element is often separated by a pause from the rest of the sentence, and it can be co-indexed with a *resumptive pronoun* placed inside the actual clause (in which case we speak of *clitic dislocation*). Three types of dislocation are possible in GC: right dislocation (henceforth, RD), in which the constituent is postposed, left dislocation (LD), in which it is preposed, and asides (phrases placed in the middle of a sentence, often resumptive).

LD is like clefting, as it is used to emphasize or define a topic. It is a very useful tool in languages that, like GC, do not have passive constructions. In fact, when GC speakers want to focus a peculiar element of the sentence, they dislocate it to the leftmost part of the sentence and replace it in the original clause by means of a resumptive (clitic) pronoun. Of course, both the S and the O of a V can be dislocated. Actually, in GC a mere LD (also referred to as *anacoluthon*) is only possible when the topicalized element is the S. This phenomenon is probably due to the morphological poverty of this language, which would make it difficult to retrieve the antecedent of moved elements other than the S. In fact, the reference of the S is likely to be understood thanks the linear order, which would not be possible in all other cases. As a consequence, only Clitic Left Dislocation (henceforth, CLD) is used in those cases. Following Rizzi (1997)'s proposal, I postulate the presence of a TopP (Topic Projection) whose head Top° hosts such topicalized elements. The following examples are CLDs of the S (9a'-c') and of the O (10a'-c'). The unmarked counterparts are in (9/10a-c):

(9a) [\textit{IP} Mari enmé Fabyen]  
I love Fabian  
“Mary loves Fabian”
(9a') \[\text{\texttt{\textit{TopP} Mari}}, [\text{i \textit{enmé Fabyen}]}\]
Mary, she love Fabian
“Mary, she loves Fabian”

(9b) \[\text{\texttt{\textit{Fabyen ka karésé chat-la}}}\]
Fabian PROGR stroke cat-DEF
“Fabian is stroking the cat”

(9b') \[\text{\texttt{\textit{TopP Fabyen}}, [\text{i \textit{ka karésé chat-la}]}\]
Fabian, he PROGR stroke cat-DEF
“Fabian, he’s stroking the cat”

(9c) \[\text{\texttt{\textit{On éléfan ka pwan onlo plas toubôlman}}}\]
An elephant HAB keep a.lot place extremely
“An elephant needs a lot of space”

(9c') \[\text{\texttt{\textit{TopP On éléfan}}, [\text{\textit{sa ka pwan onlo plas toubôlman}]}]}\] (TP)
An elephant this HAB keep a.lot place extremely
“An elephant, that needs a lot of space”

(10a) \[\text{\texttt{\textit{i \textit{enmé Fabyen}}}]}\]
“I love Fabian”

(10a') \[\text{\texttt{\textit{TopP Fabyen}}, [\text{\textit{\textit{an enmé-y}}]}]}\]
Fabian, I love-him
“Fabian, I love him”

(10b) \[\text{\texttt{\textit{i \textit{Fabyen ka karésé chyen-la}}}]}\]
Fabian PROGR stroke dog-DEF
“Fabian is stroking the dog”

(10b') \[\text{\texttt{\textit{TopP Chyen-la}}, [\text{\textit{i \textit{Fabyen ka karésé-y}]}]}\]
Dog-DEF, Fabian PROGR stroke-it
“The dog, Fabian is stroking it”

126 The topicalized element and the resumptive pronoun must be co-referent, otherwise the Topic is interpreted as a vocative.
As shown in the examples above, all instances of CLD are characterized by their marked order. As far as leftward movement of core elements to a position outside the clause is concerned, CLD is not the only option. In fact, GC has also clefting at its disposal. A cleft sentence is a complex structure (or sentence) composed of a main and a dependent clause. Allegedly, these constructions put a particular constituent into focus, and are thus often accompanied by a special intonation. In GC, they have the structure in (11a), where sé is the present form of the copula, X the focused element and the rest a subordinate clause introduced by the complementizer ki (when the focused element is the S, otherwise there is no overt complementizer, as in relative clauses) and containing a V in its base form. Notice that, differently form what happens in English and French, no expletive precedes the copula (11b). This might be due to the fact that sé originated from the French complex structure “neuter demonstrative ce + tensed copula est” (see Part 4 for further details). Note that it is also possible to dislocate the focused element to the right and then start the sentence with sé (11c):

(11a) Sè X ki V_{Stem Form} ...
(11b) *I sé X ki V_{Stem Form} ...
(11c) Xs, sé X_{PRONOUN} ki ...

The examples in (12a'-c') are instances of GC cleft sentences. The focused elements often indicate a contrast, and the contrasted element can be overt or covert. Differently, the negative cleft sentence is constructed with the element a (which is likely to be an expletive and only appears in negative clefts), no copula, the focused
element and then the rest of the clause (13a'-b'). In negative constructions no use of
resumptive pronouns is made. Each example is preceded by its unmarked counterpart
(12a-c and 13a-b):

(12a) *An fè sa*
   I do this
   “I did this”

(12a') *Sé mwen ki fè sa (pa Mari)*
   COP<sub>pres</sub> me that do this (NEG Mary)
   “It's me that did this (not Mary)”

(12b) *Mari kryié Fabyen*
   Mary call Fabian
   “Mary called Fabian”

(12b') *Mari<sup>127</sup>, sé li ki kryié Fabyen (pa mwen)*
   Mary, COP<sub>pres</sub> she<sub>s</sub> that call Fabian (NEG me)
   “Mary, it's her that called Fabian (not me)”

(12c) *An vwè Mari*
   I see Mary
   “I saw Mary”

(12c') *Mari, sé li an vwè (pa Fabyen)*
   Mari, COP<sub>pres</sub> she<sub>s</sub> I see (NEG Fabian)
   “Mary, it's her I saw (not Fabian)”

(13a) *Mari pa fè sa*
   Mary NEG do this
   “Mary didn't do this”

(13a') *A pa Mari ki fè sa (sè Fabyen)*
   EXPL NEG Mary that do this (COP<sub>pres</sub> Fabian)
   “It isn't Mary that did this (it's Fabian)”

---

<sup>127</sup> Again, the dislocated element and the resumptive pronoun must be co-indexed, otherwise the extra-clausal element would be a vocative.
Finally, notice that the focused element can also appear in the middle of the clause (14a), or to its right (14b). We speak of an aside and of RD, respectively:

(14a) \[ \text{Yo pé vin, /sé tig-la, /}^{28} \text{avè grif a-yo !} \]  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>Yo pé vin, /sé tig-la, /avè grif a-yo !</th>
<th>(TP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They can come PLUR tiger-DEF with claw of-they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They can come, the tigers, with their claws!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(14b) \[ \text{É sa ka izé sé timoun-la, } \text{ba-yo lèsplikasyon toulongalé konsa} \]  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>é sa ka izé sé timoun-la, ba-yo lèsplikasyon toulongalé konsa</th>
<th>(TP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And this HAB exhaust PLUR child-DEF give-them explanation all.the.time like.this</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“And it is exhausting for the kids to always have to explain them everything like that”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, in all types of dislocation the movement is justified by a shift in meaning with respect to their unmarked counterparts: in fact, they put an element in the position of Topic or Focus. This happens in wh-questions as well, where the mouvement takes place for the sentence to get its interrogative interpretation. Thus, unmarked orders are not in contrastive but in complementary distribution with their unmarked counterparts.

128 The slashes indicate that the dislocated element does not belong to the sentence.
This Part provides an overview of the morphosyntax of the Nominal Expressions (henceforth, NEs) of Guadeloupean Creole. The organisation is the following: chapter 8 opens with a description of the corpus used for this work, then I discuss the nominal morphology of GC (8.1) and of a very limited number of Ns that display gender agreement. In section 8.2 I describe the determiner system of this Creole language: the indefinite article (8.1.1), all instances in which no determiner seems to be used (8.1.2), the definite article (8.1.3) and the morphosyntax of a small number of French-derived Ns that incorporated the original article, possessives (8.1.4) and the possessive construction, and demonstratives (8.1.5). In chapter 9 I describe the morphosyntax of pronouns in detail, firstly of personal pronouns (which I divide into two classes according to their structural deficiency, following Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)) (9.1), but also possessive (9.2), demonstrative (9.3), interrogative (9.4) and indefinite (9.5) pronouns. Finally, chapter 10 deals with relative clauses (henceforth, RCs), which I systematically divide into restrictives and appositives RCs and classify depending on their antecedent: subject RC (10.1.1) direct object RCs (10.1.2) and indirect object RCs (10.1.3). The chapter ends with a discussion on the use of wh-like elements (10.1.4) and a description of free relative clauses (10.2), which had never been investigated in the linguistic literature on GC so far. Systematic comparisons to the morphosyntax of other French-based creoles will be made throughout this Part.

129 In this work I systematically adopt the term NE, as suggested by Giusti (2009). In fact, following a suggestion by Mila Dimitrova-Vulehanova, in her paper she proposes to “use nominal expression (or NE) to refer to the whole nominal constituent when we want to remain agnostic as regards the very nature of the topmost projection”. In the next sections, I will show how the morphosyntax of the determiners of GC is different from that of most European languages: for this reason, I prefer to remain agnostic as for the very nature of the nominal functional projections of GC.
Chapter 8
Nouns and determiners

This chapter investigates the morphosyntax of the determiners of GC. As for the corpus used here, notice that this chapter is a revision and expansion of previous works of mine (Bonan (2011) and (2012)), where I tried to provide a first descriptive and generative account of the NEs of GC. For these works, I studied the morphology and syntax of all the NEs of the book Tiprens-la. As a whole, I found 2298 of them. The total number of Ns used in the book was 2661 (that is, more than the NEs), which is not surprising as many NEs contain more than a single noun. More precisely, my corpus contained 294 complex NEs: 224 composed of two Ns (1a-c), 37 of three Ns (2a-c), 9 of four Ns (3a-c), 1 of six and 1 of seven nouns. I do not include the longest examples here because their glosses would be too complex:

(1a) *On bèl kaz an brik woz*
    A beautiful house of brick pink
    “A beautiful house with pink bricks”
(1b) *On délégasyon boutèy vid*
    A delegation bottle empty
    “A delegation of empty bottles”
(1c) *Sé flè-la i ni pikan-la*
    PLUR flower-DEF that have thorn DEF₂
    “The flowers that have thorns”

(2a) *Dousé a solèy ka désann an lanmè*
    Sweetness of sun Ø that PROGR set in sea
    “The beauty of the sun that sets behind the sea”
    “The beauty of the sun setting behind the sea”

130 Throughout this work, I will be distinguishing between DEF₁, the actual definiteness marker, and DEF₂, the resumptive definiteness marker. Not to complicate the glosses though, I will be calling the resumptive one DEF₂ and the real DEF-marker simply DEF (without the subscript number).
(2b) *On Misyélèwa ba linivè limenm adan tout grandè a-y*

A King of universe itself in all greatness of-he

“A King of the very universe in all his greatness”

(2c) *On pousé doulè an jenti an-mwen*

A shoot pain on joint of-me

“A shooting pain\(^{131}\) at my knee joint”

(3a) *On timoun \(^i\) pèd chimen an mitan dézè-la*

A child that lose way in middle desert-DEF\(_2\)

“A child that loses his way in the middle of the desert”

(3b) *On grenn kèk moun té menné dèpi kek koté ponmoun pa té konnèt ola*

A seed Ø some person ANT bring from some place Ø\(_{\text{that}}\) nobody NEG ANT know where

“A seed someone had brought from some completely unknown place”

(3c) *Lenbé a désant a solèy an lanmè a-y-la i té raté la*

Sorrow of setting of sun in sea of-him-DEF Ø\(_{\text{that}}\) he ANT miss DEF\(_2\)

“The sorrow of the sun setting behind the sea he had missed”

The examples taken from *Tiprens-la* were successively validated by my informants, who also helped me in the process of listing all the ungrammatical orders and combinations (which of course I could not find in the book) and the orders that, despite being grammatical, were not used by the translators of the book. For this reason, many examples of the present chapter were not taken from the book *Tiprens-la* but rather found in some other book I consulted (see *Bibliography*), suggested to me by my informants, or extracted from Poullet&Telchid (2010).

---

131 Literally: “a shoot of pain”.

132 Notice that \(i\) can be both the 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) person singular personal pronoun (i) or the reduced form of the relative complementizer \(ki\) (ii):

(i) *I rivé yé oswè*

“He arrived yesterday night”

(ii) *Gason \(k\)i rivé yé oswè sé kouzen an-mwen*

“The boy that arrived yesterday night is my cousin”

See chapters 9 and 10 for further details.
8.1 Nominal morphology

The noun (henceforth, N) is the lexical head of the NE. It can have several grammatical functions: it can be a subject (S), an object (direct or indirect, respectively DO and IO) or an adjunct. In GC, nouns are morphologically invariant both in gender and number, except for some rare (and non-productive) exceptions. They do not bear any (overt) mark signalling their grammatical function either: in fact, GC seems to have no Case-system. As GC is an SVO language, in the unmarked case the subject is preverbal, whereas the direct object (henceforth, DO) directly follows the verb. The same NE can thus be a subject (S) when it precedes the V, or a direct object when it follows it (see Part 3 for further details) (4a-b):

(4a) On sèpan boa ka valé on bèt féròs

   S                     DO

A snake boa PROGR swallow a beast wild

“A boa is eating a wild beast”

(4b) On bèt féròs ka valé on sèpan boa

   S                     DO

A beast wild PROGR swallow a snake boa

“A wild beast is eating a boa”

This phenomenon is quite predictable, as it is to be found in (virtually) all Romance languages and dialects, in English and in other French-based Creoles as well, none of which has a (phonetically-realized) Case-system. Differently though, whereas languages like English show traces of an old Case-system on personal pronouns (5a-b), GC do not. In fact, GC has two forms for each pronoun whose distribution does not depend on Case-assignment but rather on their internal structure: strong pronouns are maximal projections and can occupy any position in the sentence, whereas the distribution of deficient pronouns is limited. As a consequence, in the unmarked order strong and weak pronouns are in free variation in S and O positions (5c):

(5a) He loves her

   S₁NOM   DO₁ACC

(ENG)
(5b) *She* *loves* *him* *(ENG)*

(5c) *Li/i* *enmé* *li/i* *(S)*

3PS₃/3PSₜ love 3PS₃/3PSₜ

“She loves him”

Nouns are generally not inflected for gender and never inflected for number or Case, which are always understood from the context. Nonetheless, in a limited number of cases, gender information can depend on the choice between a (feminine or masculine) member of a lexical pair, as in (6a-c):

(6a) *On nomn* / *on fanm*

“A man / a woman”

(6b) *On gason* / *on fi*

“A boy / a girl”

(6c) *On timoun* / *on tifi*

“A boy / a girl”

Also, when it is important to know the gender of the referent, gender information can be conveyed by preposing the gender-specified terms¹³³ *mal/fimèl* (“male/female”, from FR mâle/femelle) to the N, as in (7a-d), in a sort of compound word:

(7a) *On mal-bèf*

A male-bull

“A bull”

(7b) *On fimèl-bèf*

A female-bull

“A cow”

¹³³ In the online course on GC (Bibliography), they are said to be “gender-specified prefixes”, which I do not agree with because *mal* and *fimèl* can appear in isolation. Moïse (2005) and Cérol (2011) are in some way right and Ns like *fimèl-bèf* should be considered instances of compounding, not of derivation. However, differently from them, I think that *fimèl* and *mal* are Ns and not As.
Moïse (2005) and Cérol (2011) explain that the use of these functional elements (that they call “adjectives”) might be an African loan, as the same phenomenon is present in Kikongo (or Koongo), one of the languages spoken in the Democratic Republic of the Congo\textsuperscript{134}. When such Ns appear in their \textit{bare-stem form} gender information is unclear (7e-f):

(7e) \textit{On chyen}

“A (male/female) dog”

Moreover, today a quite productive tendency is at work, namely that of marking a distinction between masculine and feminine nouns by adding the terminations \textit{-ez/\-in/-\-'en} to the latter, as in the examples in (8a-f). This could be an influence of French, which in the diglottic\textsuperscript{136} Guadeloupean linguistic panorama has always been the \textit{high} language, that is, the one to look up to:

(8a) \textit{On vandè / on vandez}

“A salesman / a saleswoman”

(8b) \textit{On makoumè / on makoumez}

“A gay / a lesbian”

\textsuperscript{134} Source: Ethnologue – Koongo. [Visited 16 February 2013].

\textsuperscript{135} However, one of my informants made me notice that the translation of “bull” is always \textit{mal-bèf}.

\textsuperscript{136} The term \textit{diglossia} refers to a situation in which two dialects of the same language or closely-related idioms are used by a single language community, one of which is considered the \textit{high code} and the other the \textit{low code}. The distinction between high and low is based on \textit{prestige} considerations, which gives the two idioms a complementary distribution in terms of use (formal and informal, respectively).
(8c) *On sòsié* / *on sòsiez*

   A wizard/a witch

(8d) *On milannè* / *on milannez*

   “A gossip (man / woman)”

(8e) *On vòlè* / *on vòlez*

   “A thief (man / woman)”

(8f) *On lapen* / *on lapin*

   “A (male / female) rabbit”

The same distinction can be found in some nationality nouns, as the examples (9a-b) show:

(9a) *On Ayisyèn* / *on Ayisyin*

   “A Haitian (man / woman)”

(9b) *On Seselwa* / *on Seselwez*

   “A man / woman from the Seychelles”

The number of these examples is limited, even though I observed a certain tendency in nowadays spoken and written Guadeloupean Creole to form feminine forms by adding specialised inflectional morphemes to the nouns (without whom they are interpreted as masculine), above all to newly-formed ones. DeGraff (2001) called these phenomena “preudo-French” hypercorrections, and said that their use is part of the decreolization process that Haitian Creole (henceforth HC), as well as CG and other Creole languages, are undergoing. This phenomenon is certainly due to the influence of French that, being the official language of Guadeloupe, is a socially and politically strong idiom which tends to be looked up to as a model. People from Guadeloupe call the variety of their language that is closer to French créole francisé, that is, a varieté of Creole that has undergone a process of lexical and syntactic francization. This variety is mostly spoken by the last generation of creolophones, above all by those who have not been raised in Guadeloupe, or whose parents decided not to use Creole at home for social reasons.
8.2 Determiners

In the following sections, I will outline a description of the morphosyntax of the determiners of GC (with special attention to how they combine with each other), and try to understand their origins. Moreover, systematic comparisons with a number of European languages and other French-based creoles will be made. Also, section 8.2.3.1 introduces a Creole-specific feature of GC (and of all other French-based creoles), that is, the presence in its lexicon of French-derived Ns which in the passage from French to GC incorporated the original French article. I will show that, as correctly pointed out by Strandquist (2003), in such Ns the incorporated element has completely lost its original functional features.

8.2.1 The indefinite article

The indefinite article is a functional element belonging to the DP-layer that introduces a (yet) unidentified entity in the universe of discourse. In GC, the singular indefinite article is not inflected for gender: in fact, the only available form is *on*. Moreover, it is often said (Moïse (2005), Hazaël-Massieux (2011)) not to have a plural counterpart: actually, it is better to state that this functional element has no phonetically-realized plural form, but rather a null or zero variant (*Ø*), which is not present in the phonetic string but is syntactically active. The only exception to this general rule applies when the plural nominal head is a predicate, that is, when it follows the copula: in such cases, the pre-nominal French-like plural indefinite article *dé* is used with both feminine and masculine Ns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>On + N</th>
<th>Ø + N</th>
<th>dé + predicate (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The examples that follow contain instances of singular (10a-g) and plural (11a-e) indefinite articles. Notice that the indefinite plural article is realized as *dé* when the N
is a predicate (11f-g), even though Germain (1976) says the use of dé in French-based Creoles is always “optional [my translation]”. Nonetheless, notice that some variation can be found in the use of plural indefinite articles, which I discuss later.

(10a) **On granmoun**

“An adult”

(10b) **On kisa ? On chanpinyon !**

A who? A mushroom

“A what? A mushroom!”

(10c) **Si on moun enmè on flè…**

If a person love a flower

“If a person loves a flower…”

(10d) **Sizyèm planèt-la sêté on planèt di fwa pli gran**

Sixth planet-DEF COP_{past} a planet ten time more big

“The sixth planet was a ten times bigger one”

(10e) **An sé on jéograph**

I be a geographer

“I'm a geographer”

(10f) **Sé granmoun-la ban-mwen on konsèy**

PLUR adult-DEF give-me a piece of advice

“The adults gave me a piece of advice”

(10g) **Mwen atann on bon moman**

I wait a good moment

“I waited for a while”

(11a) **Fanm rivé**

Ø woman arrive

“Some women arrived”

(11b) **Timoun manjé sé koko an-nou-la**

Ø child eat PLUR coconut of-us-DEF

“Some children ate our coconuts”
(11c) *Tifi vini bennyé ko a-yo an rivié évé nou*

Ø girl come bath body of-they in river with us

“All some girls went swimming in the river with us”

(11d) *An vlé manjé chanpyinion!*

I want eat Ø mushroom

“All I want to eat (some) mushrooms!”

(11e) *Timoun anba laku-la* (H-M)

Child down garden-DEF

“All some children are in the garden”

(11f) *Sé misyé-la sé (dé137) pwofésè*

PLUR man-DEF COPpres art.PL professor

“These men are professors”

(11g) *Sé tifi-la sé (dé) kouzin an-mwen*

PLUR girl-DEF COPpres art.PL cousin of-me

“All these girls are my cousins”

This optionality might be due to the fact that the use of *dé* is quite new in GC, which is confirmed by the fact that the expression of this determiner is only accepted by my younger informants. Three other combinations are possible: *on* + sé N-la (12a), *on* + sé N-lasa (12b) and *on* + *N* + possessive (12c):

(12a) *On sé lezot-la* (TP)

A PLUR other-DEF

“One of the others”

(12b) *On sé lezot-lasa* (TP)

A PLUR other-DEM

“One of these others”

137 Notice that, in such cases and in the absence of a clear context, *dé* could also mean “two”, as the two elements are perfectly homophonous. Thus, the meaning of the sentences in (22e-f) can be ambiguous between the two interpretations: “I saw some/two men” and “I bought some/two bananas”. My informants explained that, in order to avoid any possible misinterpretation, they tend not to use *dé* but rather the null determiner.
(12c) **On sijé an-mwen**

A subject of-me

“One of my subjects”

As for other French-based creoles, Pinalie&Bernabé (1999) explain that Martinican uses the unique form *an* for singular referents (13a-b), a *null form* (that they call a *forme vide*, “empty form”) for plurals (13c-d), and the French-like form *dé* “after certain verbs”\(^{138}\) [my translation]”(13e) and certain expressions (13f):

(13a) **Té ni an fwa..**

ANT have a time

“There was a time [=Once upon a time]”

(13b) **An jou ké vini**

A day IRR come

“A day will come”

(13c) **Ni péyi san lenpo**

Have Ø country without Ø tax

“There exist countries with no taxes”

(13d) **Yo vann liv**

They sell Ø book

“They sell books”

(13e) **Ni dé péyi ki ka pran fè**

Have some country that HAB take belief

“There are some suffering countries”

(13f) **Mi dé boug kouyon !**

Here some person idiot

“Here's some idiots!”

Damoiseau (2005) and Damoiseau (2012) confirm these data and state that Guyanese and Haitian too have a prenominal invariable form to express indefinite singularity,

\(^{138}\) According to their examples, the verbs in question seem to be mostly the copula and *to have* in its possessive use.
roun/oun (14a-b) and yon/on (24c-d) respectively. As for indefinite plurality, he explains that also Guyanese and Haitian have a null article (14e-f). Also Hazaël-Massieux (2011) confirms these data.

(14a) *I gen (r)oun loto divan laport-la* (Dam)(GuyC)  
EXPL have a car in.front door-DEF  
“There is a car in front of the door”

(14b) *(R)oun bel tifi* (Dam)(GuyC)  
“A beautiful girl”

(14c) *Gen (y)on machin devan pòt la* (Dam)(HC)  
Have a car in.front door DEF  
“There is a car in front of the door”

(14d) *(Y)on gran garson* (Dam)(HC)  
“A big boy”

(14e) *Sa madanm-an ka vandé mang* (Dam)(GuyC)  
DEM woman-DEF HAB sell Ø mango  
“This woman sells mangoes”

(14f) *Madanm sa a ap vann mango* (Dam)(HC)  
Woman DEM DEF HAB sell Ø mango  
“This woman sells mangoes”

Differently, according to Police-Michel&alii (2012) Mauritian Creole has an overt article used for both singular and plural indefinite referents, *enn*. As happens for other French-based Creoles, there exist no gender-specialized forms. The difference between singular (15a-b) and plural (15c-d) lies in the fact that plural Ns are determined by the prenominal PLUR-marker *bann* (15c-d):

(15a) *Enn misie* (P-M&a)(MauC)  
“A man”

(15b) *Enn madam* (P-M&a)(MauC)  
“A woman”
Staudacher-Valliamée (2011) says that Réunionnais Creole as well has a unique overt indefinite article for both genders\(^{139}\) (16a): *in* (also *inn* or *inm*) and a null determiner used to convey indefinite plurality (16b):

(16a) *Son famiy la vann in terin*  
His/her family PUNCT sell one estate  
“His/her family sold an estate”

(16b) *Son famiy la vann terin*  
His/her family PUNCT sell Ø estate  
“His/her family sold some estates”

### 8.2.1.1 Use of *yon(n)*

A further precision is in order. Instead of *on*, in GC the form *yon(n)* can be used when the speaker wants to focus on a NE. It is important to underline that the two forms *on* and *yon(n)* are absolutely *not* equivalent. The second form is definitely less used than the first one, and namely when we want to give a peculiar characterization to a NE, in order to distinguish its referent among a precise group of other referents of the same type. Thus, *on gwo chyen* is just “a big dog”, no matter which one, whereas *yon(n) gwo chyen* is a dog of a given group of dogs sharing the peculiar feature expressed by the Adj (17a). Similarly, *yon(n) bèl loto* is not just “a beautiful car”, but a car belonging to a peculiar group of beautiful cars (17b). Notice that (17c-d) are examples of *yon(n)* in its pronominal use:

\(^{139}\) Notice that she only gives examples containing the N *terin.*
(17a) *Nou vwè yon gwo chyen!* (Ben)
We see one big dog
“We saw one of these/those big dogs”

(17b) *Misyé ni on bel loto, an vlé yon loto aussi*
Mister has a beautiful car, I want a car as well
“The man has a beautiful car, I want one car like that too”

(17c) *An woufè, ba-y, yonn adan sé dé onsèl désen-la an té sa fè la* (TP)
I again.do, to-him, one inside PLUR two only drawing-DEF I ANT know do DEF
“I did again, for him, one of the two only subjects I could draw”

(17d) *Lè an té ka jwenn èvè yonn adan-yo i té ka sanm sa i té ka vwè klè* (TP)
When I ANT HAB meet with one inside-they that ANT HAB seem that he ANT HAB see clear
“When I would meet one of them that seemed to be reasonable”

This peculiar article is similar to Martinican *yan(n)* (Pinalie&Bernabé (1999) and Bernabé (2003)), which can be used both as an article (18a) and a pronoun (18b). I could not find any description of articles similar to *yon(n)/yan(n)* in the works on other Creoles that I consulted.

(18a) *Man fouté’y yan koutjòk!* (P&B)(MC)
I give’he a punch
“I gave him a punch [=I punched him]”

(18b) *Man ba’y yann* (P&B)(MC)
I give’he a
“I gave him one [=a very violent punch]”

### 8.2.1.2 Unexpected uses of *dé*

Notice that my informants consider it possible (but optional) to use *dé* with the same meaning of “some” also with S and DO indefinite expressions, which is not predicted
by the traditional grammars of GC (see, among others, Bernabé (2003) and Moïse (2005)). As a consequence, (11a-c) can also look as (19a-c), and it is possible to find indefinite DOs as those in (20a-b):

(19a) Dé fanm rivé
(19b) Dé timoun manjé sé koko an-nou la
(19c) Dé tīfi vini bennyé ko a-yo an rivié évé nou

(20a) An vwè dé misyé an bodlanmè
      I see some man in seaside
      “I saw some men at the seaside”
(20b) An acheté dé bannann si mawché-la
      I buy some banana on market-DEF
      “I bought some bananas at the market”

My youngest informant actually considers the presence of dé compulsory in such cases, which suggests that this phenomenon could be part of the most recent evolutions of GC. In fact, older speakers tend not to use dé in order to avoid any possible misinterpretation. The massive use of this element among the youngest could be due to the influence of French (and to a misinterpretation of the numeral dé as a plural indefinite French-like article), but also to a natural evolutionary process and the consequent exploitation of an option offered by the UG. It is in fact possible that the use of the overt article should make it easier to compute the meaning of the NE.

8.2.2 The definiteness marker

The Guadeloupean Creole definite article is commonly referred to as the definiteness marker. It has the form of a postnominal invariable -la, and it is said to be enclitic on

140 Notice that in all of these cases it is perfectly possible to interpret dé as the numeral “two”, as the two elements are perfectly homophounous. My informants explained that, in order to avoid any possible misinterpretation, they tend not to use dé but rather the null determiner.
the N it actualizes (see Bernabé (2003)\textsuperscript{141}, among others). However, the analysis of very complex NEs shows that this functional element does not directly follow the N, but rather the whole nominal expression in which it appears. Thus, the DEF-marker attaches to the N only in case of bare Ns (21a), whereas when the NE is a complex one it attaches to a postnominal adjective (21b), the post-nominal possessive (21c), to a nominal modifier (21d) or to the definite relative clause\textsuperscript{142} (21e). This means that this element is actually enclitic on the \textit{whole nominal expression}, not simply on the N (21b'-e'):

(21a) \textit{An montré /sé granmoun-la/ mèt-travay an-mwen}  
\hspace{1cm} I show PLUR adult-DEF art-work of-me  
\hspace{1cm} “I showed my masterpiece to the adults”  

(21b) \textit{[Nomn gwadloupéyen-la] sé tonton an-mwen}  
\hspace{1cm} Man guadaloupean-DEF COP \textsubscript{pres} uncle of-me  
\hspace{1cm} “The Guadeloupean man is my uncle”  

(21c) \textit{[Tiboug an-mwen-la] pa tê ka samm-mwen sa i tê pêd chimen}  
\hspace{1cm} Boy of-me-DEF NEG ANT HAB seem-me that he ANT lose track  
\hspace{1cm} “This little boy of mine didn't look lost to me”  

(21d) \textit{Mi [pòtré-kraché a désen-la]}  
\hspace{1cm} Here's sketch of drawin-DEF  
\hspace{1cm} “Here's the drawing's sketch”  

(21e) \textit{[Mouton-la ou vlé la\textsuperscript{143}] andidan a-y}  
\hspace{1cm} Mutton-DEF you want DEF \textsubscript{2} inside of-it  
\hspace{1cm} “The mutton you desire is inside it [=the box]”  

(21b') \textit{*Nomn-la gwadloupéyen sé tonton an-mwen}  
(21c') \textit{*Tiboug-la an-mwen}  
(21d') \textit{*Pòtré-kraché-la a désen}  

\textsuperscript{141} He says “the definite article always follows the N it refers to [my translation]”.  
\textsuperscript{142} In case of definite relative clauses, the final DEF-marker is actually a resumptive one, as the NE that heads the relative clause is already definite and somehow “closed” by a first DEF-marker. See chapter 5 for more details on the subject.  
\textsuperscript{143} This is a special case of doubling common in definite relative clauses (see chapter 11).
The definiteness marker is only used when the referent of the NE is *definite*, and it cannot be combined with indefinite elements, as shown in (22a-b):

(22a) *On nomn-la sé tonton an-mwen
    *A man-DEF COP_pres uncle of-me
    “*The a man is my uncle”

(22b) *An konnèt dé tifi zanti-la
    *I know some girl nice-DEF
    “*I know the some nice girls”

As stated by Benzo (2005) and Poullet&Telchid (2010) (among others), this functional element is very likely to have derived from the French reinforced demonstrative construction of the type *ce(t)/cette/ces N-là* (23a-d):

(23a) *Cet homme-là*  
    “This/that very man”  

(23b) *Cette femme-là*  
    “This/that very woman”  

(23c) *Ces gentilhommes-là*  
    “These/those gentlemen”  

(23d) *Ces dames-là*  
    “These/those women”

If is was so, then GC would have only adopted the second part of this complex demonstrative form and not the original demonstrative part. This hypothesis is very likely to be right, as the definiteness marker *-la* has so strong a *deictic value*\(^\text{144}\) that,

\(^{144}\) Notice that in GC the element *-la* only accompanies nominal expressions whose referent is very strongly defined. This is the same in French but, whereas in GC the *-la* can indicate both (definite) proximity and distance, in this language it is supposed to indicate only distance (a). In fact, for the expression of proximity, *-ci* should be used, as in (b):

(a) *Cet homme-la*  
    “That man”
in virtually all cases, it can be translated into English by means of a demonstrative.

The origins of the DEF-marker are very important for us to keep in mind because, as a consequence of them, this element is used only when the referent of the NE is a strongly definite one. Thus, the choice between the use of a definite article or a demonstrative (24a-b) when we translate a GC nominal expression into English depends on the linguistic context and on stylistic choices. Consequently, both interpretations are available:

(24a) *Fanm-la sè manman-mwen*

Woman-DEF COP_pers mother-me

“The/this woman is my mother”

(24b) *Misyé-la sè plibon zanmi an-mwen*

Man-DEF COP_pers best friend of-me

“The/this man is my best friend”

Similarly to what happens with the English definite article, the definiteness marker has the same morphological form for both feminine and masculine referents. Its main characteristic is that it is enclitic on the last element of the NE. Thus, at least in this respect, the definiteness marker of GC differs from the English singular definite article, which is strictly prenominal. This phenomenon is signalled in writing by means of a dash, as shown in all the examples of this section.

The proclitic definite article *lé* [le] can also be preposed to a noun in a number of cases: when English would require a structure of the type *each/every + singular N* (25a-b) or to indicate the repetition of a given action or state. This element is likely to have derived from the French plural definite article *les* [le], and is very common in Martinican (see Pinalie&Bernabé (1999) and Zribi-Hertz&Loic (to appear).

(b) *Cet homme-ci*

“This man”

Nonetheless, notice that today’s French -*la* can be used to indicate both proximity and distance, as you can see in (c):

(c) *Cet homme-la*

“This/that man”
In GC there is no specialized form conveying the [+PLUR, +DEF] plural meaning. When the idea expressed is either general or abstract, it is possible to postulate the existence of a prenominal zero element, which carries the features [+PLUR, -DEF]. When the referent is a definite one, in order for the N to be interpreted as plural the functional element sé must appear before the “noun-la” combination. Throughout my paper, I will call this element the plural marker. The resulting structure can be represented as PLUR noun-DEF. It is important to understand that sé must not be considered as an article but rather as a functional preposed particle bearing a [+PLUR] feature, and that its presence in the structure renders the phrase in which it is contained agrammatical if the DEF-marker -la is not realized, as shown in (26a-b):

(26a) Sé kaz-la bèl
     PLUR house-DEF beautiful
     “The/theses houses are beautiful”
(26b) *Sé kaz bèl
     *PLUR house beautiful

The situation is summarized in the following table. The only form for the DEF-marker in GC is -la: the allomorphs -lan, -a and -an (Pinalie&Bernabé (1999), among others) are peculiar to Martinican Creole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singuler</th>
<th>NE-la</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Sé NE-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lé NE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In the corpus I used for Bonan (2012)\textsuperscript{145}, I found only four possible combinations of the DEF-marker and other functional elements, namely:

- $N$-$la$\textsuperscript{146} (see above);
- $Sé$ $N$-$la$\textsuperscript{147} (see above);
- $N$ possessive-$la$\textsuperscript{148} (27a);
- $Sé$ $N$ possessive-$la$\textsuperscript{149} (27b).

The following sentences contain examples of complex NEs in which the DEF-marker appears of the types $N$ possessive-$la$ and $sé$ $N$ possessive-$la$:

(27a) $Kach$-$né$ $anlo$ $a$-$y$-$la$  
Scarft golden of-he-DEF
“His golden scarf”

(27b) $Sé$ $zorèy$ $a$-$y$-$la$  
PLUR ear of-he-DEF
“His ears”

All other combinations and orders between -$la$ and any other functional element seem to be impossible, and other possible combinations of determiners will be discussed in the following sections.

As for other French-based creoles, the situation is quite interesting. In fact, Martinican and Haitian use a postnominal DEF-marker very similar to that of GC, excluded the fact that it has 4 allomorphic variants (Bernabé (2003), Pinalie&Bernabé (1999), Damoiseau (2012) and Hazaël-Massieux (2011) among many others): -$la$ (used after oral consonantal sounds) (28a); -$lan$/$-nan$ (after nasal consonants) (28b-b'); -$a$ (after oral vowels) (28c); and -$an$ (after nasal vowels) (28d):

\textsuperscript{145} 744 total occurrences of the DEF-marker .
\textsuperscript{146} 532 occurrences.
\textsuperscript{147} 185 occurrences.
\textsuperscript{148} 19 occurrences.
\textsuperscript{149} 8 occurrences.
Similarly, Guyanese has two allomorphic forms of DEF-marker, one for nasal endings (be they consonants or vowels) (29a) and one for oral endings (29b). These forms are -an and -a respectively (Damoiseau (2012)):

(29a) **Tablo(-)a**

Painting-DEF / Table-DEF

“The painting / The table”

(29b) **Pon(-)an**

Bridge-DEF / Person-DEF

“The bridge / The person”

Mauritian creole speakers have at their disposal a postnominal DEF-marker in the unique form -la (30a-b) (Police-Michel&Mali (2012)). Very differently though, Reunionnais creole has a prenominal definite article lë, which has different

---

150 In this case, Martinican requires the use of the dash in writing, whereas Haitian does not.
151 In this case, Martinican requires the use of the dash in writing, whereas Haitian does not.
allomorphic realizations depending on the structure of the NE\textsuperscript{152} (30c-d) and disappears when the N is French-derived and has the original French article agglutinated in its structure (54e) (Staudacher-Valliamée (2011)):

(30a) Lakaz-\textit{la} \hspace{1cm} (P-M&a)(MauC)
House-DEF
“The house”

(30b) Santé-\textit{la} \hspace{1cm} (P-M&a)(MauC)
Health-DEF
“The health”

(30c) \textit{Lë loto / lë fyì} \hspace{1cm} (S-V)(ReuC)
“The car / The girl”

(30d) \textit{La ser / la sab} \hspace{1cm} (S-V)(ReuC)
“The sister / The sand”

(30e) \textit{Labou}\textsuperscript{153} \hspace{1cm} (S-V)(ReuC)
“The mud”

cf. \textit{*Lë labou}

As for the ways of expressing \textit{plurality} in such contexts, many differences are found in the grammars of French creoles. Martinican behaves exactly as GC, as it preposes the PLUR-marker \textit{sé} to the \textit{N-(l)a(n)} string (31a), whereas Guyanese and Haitian express plurality by preposing the 6PP personal pronoun to the N (31b-c) (Damoiseau (2012)). Differently, Mauritian and Réunionnais use the prenominal PLUR-marker \textit{bann} (31d-e) (Police-Michel&alII (2012), Staudacher-Valliamée (2011)). Actually, in ReuC \textit{bann} alone, without the definite singular article \textit{lë}, thus suggesting that it might be the actual plural definite article, not just a PLUR-marker:

(31a) \textit{Sé moun-lan} \hspace{1cm} (Dam)(MC)
PLUR person-DEF
“The(se) people”

\textsuperscript{152} She does not give any further explanation on the matter.
\textsuperscript{153} This N comes from French \textit{la boue}, “the mud”.
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8.2.2.1 French-derived Ns with agglutinated article

Some Creole Ns are the result of a process of *agglutination* between an ancient French N and its determiner that took place in the passage from the original French form to the Creole one. Grant (1995) explains that the agglutinated element is an “indissoluble and indivisible prefix, […] a part or the whole of a French article, be it definite, indefinite, or partitive [my translation]”. In GC the determiners that underwent this change were *definite articles* or *partitive* ones. It is for example the case of nouns like the following ones:

- GC *dlo* [dlo] (FR *de l’eau* [dəlo], “some water”);
- GC *diri* [diri] (FR *du riz* [dyri], “some rice”);
- GC *diven* [divɛn] (FR *du vin* [dyvɛ], “some wine”);
- GC *lékol* [lekɔl] (FR *l’école* [lekɔl], “the school”);
- GC *légliz* [legliz] (FR *l’église* [legliz], “the church”);
- GC *lari* [lari] (FR *la rue* [lary], “the road”).
Notice that two different types of agglutination are possible in GC: syllabic (as for example with di/du and la) and consonantal monosyllabic (as with l- and d-). Despite the peculiar derivation of such Ns, it is important to observe that the original value of the determiner that they host in their morphology has been completely lost in the passage from French to GC, and this because they have been lexicalized. In fact, such French-derived Ns behave exactly as bare nominal heads. Thus, as a consequence of the process of lexicalization that they underwent, they behave as all other Ns and, in order to be correctly inserted in the universe of discourse, they must be actualized by means of one of the following functional elements:

- a definiteness marker (32a-b);
- an indefinite article (32c);
- a partitive covert article (32d);
- a possessive adjective (32e);
- a demonstrative (32f-g).

The following examples show how the agglutinated article of a French-derived N like dlo (“water”) does not affect the behaviour of the very N, nor its meaning when combined with a Creole determiner:

(32a) Dlo-la
Water-DEF
“The/this water”

(32b) Sé dlo-la
PLUR water-DEF
“The/these waters”

(32c) On dlo
A water
“A (kind of) water”

(32d) Dlo
“(Some) waters”
(32e) *Dlo an-mwen*
Water of-me
“My water”

(32f) *Dlo-lasa*
Water-DEM
“This water”

(32g) *Sé dlo-lasa*
PLUR water-DEM
“These waters”

Notice that these French-derived Ns can be both *uncountable* (as *dlo*) and *countable* (as *légliz*, “the church”). In both cases, they behave exactly in the same way and are actualised by means of the same determiners, as shown in (32a’-g’):

(32a’) *Légliz-la*
Church-DEF
“The/this church”

(32b’) *Sé légliz-la*
PLUR church-DEF
“The/these churches”

(32c’) *On légliz*
“A church”

(32d’) *Légliz*
Ø church
“(Some) churches”

(32e’) *Légliz an-mwen*
Church of-me
“My church”

(32f’) *Légliz-lasa*
Church-DEM
“This church”
Strandquist (2003), in her dissertation about article incorporation in Mauritian Creole, explains that “of all the French creoles, Mauritian Creole has the most article incorporation, with at least five times more nouns with article incorporation”. She says that, has happened also in the passage from French to GC, not all Ns underwent this agglutination process, nor did all types of articles. What she demonstrates in her thesis is that the article incorporation process “can be at least partly explained by influence from Bantu languages” (which are spoken in East Africa, and thus influenced Mauritian Creole more than other French Creoles). In fact, as she explains,

[…] incorporated articles are modelled on noun class prefixes from Bantu languages, and that Bantu vowel harmony affects which nouns receive incorporated articles and which articles are incorporated. Articles whose vowels are consistent with Bantu vowel harmony are more likely to be incorporated than those that are not.

In fact, “an article was more likely to become incorporated if its vowel was in harmony with the noun it preceded”: if not, either there was no incorporation at all, or the vowel underwent a number of changes that made it to harmonize. She also argues that “when Bantu speakers in Mauritius were exposed to French, a process of transfer occurred, whereby French articles were interpreted as noun class prefixes”, which also Baker (1984) states. Predictably, for this reason “no Bantu-derived words

---

154 Article incorporation is the term she uses to refer to the phenomenon that I describe in this section, which she explains as “a phenomenon […] where a French article becomes fused with a noun in the creole language”.

155 See Strandquist (2003) for the original Bantu examples, which I do not include in this work because they would not be useful for my purposes. Moreover, my limited knowledge of African languages does not allow me to make any predictions on the subject, for which reason I base this last discussion only on what Strandquist says. Of course, any misuse possible misuse is entirely mine.
appear with an incorporated French article”, because “any Bantu noun would have
been adopted into Creole with its nominal classifier intact”. All of these explanations
can easily be applied to GC as well, whose first (pidgin) speakers found themselves
in a situation of linguistic emergency and learnt many French words present in the
linguistic input in a wrong way, thus modifying their forms in the direction of the
phonology of their native languages.

Thus, the massive presence of Bantu-speaking slaves in Mauritius can account for
the huge number of French-derived words with agglutinated article present in the
lexicon of Mauritian creole. Similarly, the moderate number of such Ns in Creole
languages as GC, as well as all other Creoles belonging to the same geographic area,
would be due to the fact that the slaves imported to those areas came mainly from
West Africa. Also, it is important to notice that in such territories many agglutination
processes took place either to avoid homophony (Strandquist (2003)) or because of
the principle of *frequency of collocation*: in fact, Baker (1984) states that if a N is
commonly found in association with a peculiar article, that article is more likely to be
incorporated by the N than other articles. Finally, Réunionnais Creole, despite the
huge number of Bantu-speaking people present in the territories where it is spoken,
only has 12 Ns of this type (Strandquist (2003)) because it is not a genuine Creole
but rather a *semi-creole*\(^{156}\) (Holm (1989)).

8.2.3 The null/zero article

In my corpus, I found a large amount\(^ {157}\) of bare Ns. As the absence of a determiner
before the N is always associated to a peculiar meaning, I postulate the existence of a
number of *null* or *zero determiners* in GC. Thus, because of the functional features
that they carry, these elements would be present and active in the structure, and just
not realized in the phonetic string. Differently, in all other cases the expression of an

\(^{156}\) The *semi-creole status* of Réunionnais is due to the fact that, in the territories where it is spoken,
second-language speakers of French were in constant contact with native speakers of French, so
the circumstances that would have favoured creolization (see Part 1) actually never existed in
Réunion Island (Holm (1989)).

\(^{157}\) For the redaction of Bonan (2012), for example, I analysed the whole book *Tiprens-la* and found
434 instances of bare Ns.
Overt determiner is compulsory, as shown throughout this chapter.

The null article appears where French would use an indefinite plural article (as shown in (8.2.1) or a partitive article (a determiner indicating an imprecise quantity of a given entity, that is, a part of an uncountable whole) (33a-d):

(33a) *Mwen pa manjè diri*

I NEG eat Ø rice

“I didn't eat any rice”

(33b) *Ou pa buvè dlo*

You NEG drink Ø water

“You didn't drink any water”

(33c) *An pa té manjè bonbon*

I NEG ANT eat Ø cake

“I hadn't eaten any cake”

(33d) *An pa bwé ronm*

I NEG drink Ø rum

“I didn't drink any rum”

It also appears in fixed expressions (34a-c), with vocatives (35a-b) and with generic nouns (36a-b):

(34a) *Ni fen*

Have Ø hunger

“Be hungry”

(34b) *Pran pè*

Take Ø fear

“Get scared”

(34c) *Vin zanmi*

Come Ø friend

“Become friends”
(34c) *Vin zanmi*
   Come Ø friend
   “Become friends”

(35a) *Zanfan ! Annou alè si mawchè !*
   Child ! IMP$_{2pp}$ go on market !
   “Children ! Let's go to the market!”

(35b) *Tiprens ! Ou sitelman bo !*
   Little prince ! You so beautiful !
   “Little Prince! You are so beautiful!”

(36a) *Chyen bèl*
   Dog beautiful
   “Dogs are beautiful”

(36b) *Zanfant bruyan*
   Child noisy
   “Children are noisy”

Notice that the examples in (36a-b) are ambiguous: in fact, they show the difficulty in determining whether GC uses *generic plurals* or *generic singulars*. In fact, as neither the indefinite null article nor the copula or the adjective undergo gender and number (visible) agreement, it is difficult to understand whether the examples in (36a-b) are singular or plural. To study this issue I tried to elicit some sentences containing a singular indefinite (37a) or a plural indefinite predicate (37b):

(37a) *Chyen sè on bèl zanimo*
   Dog COP$_{pres}$ a beautiful animal
   “The dog is a beautiful animal”

(37b) *Chyen sè bèl zanimo*
   Dog COP$_{pres}$ Ø beautiful animal
   “Dogs are beautiful animals”
Thus, the important thing to notice is that the generic interpretation is possible both in the plural and in the singular form, and that in both cases it is associated to a null article ($\emptyset$). In Italian and French, generic plurality is conveyed by means of the plural definite article ($I/le$ and $les$ respectively) (38a-b), and generic singularity by means of the singular definite article ($il/la$ and $le/la$) (38c-d). Differently, the same values are associated to a zero article ($\emptyset$) and the singular definite article in English ($the$) (38e-f). For what concerns English and Italian, I borrow Giusti's (2007) examples, whereas the French ones are mine:

(38a) *I bambini italiani vanno a scuola a 6 anni*

\( \text{The}_{m\text{PL}} \text{ children } \text{italian}_{m\text{PL}} \text{ go}_{3\text{pp}} \text{ to school at 6 years} \)

(38b) *Les enfants italiens sont scolarisés à 6 ans*

\( \text{The}_{PL} \text{ children } \text{italian}_{PL} \text{ are scholarized}_{m\text{PL}} \text{ at 6 years} \)

(38c) *Il bambino italiano è viziato da un'educazione troppo permissiva*

\( \text{The}_{mSG} \text{ child } \text{italian}_{mSG} \text{ is spoiled}_{mSG} \text{ by an'}upbringing too permissive}_{SG} \)

(38d) *L'enfant italien est gâté par l'éducation trop indulgente*

\( \text{The}'\text{child } \text{italian}_{mSG} \text{ is spoiled}_{mSG} \text{ by the'upbringing too permissive}_{SG} \)

(38e) *Italian children go to school at 6*

(38f) *The Italian child is spoiled by an excessively permissive up-bringing*

Finally, notice that the NE does not have any overt determiner when it contains a proper name either (39a-d). In these cases though, it would certainly be more correct to state that there must not be any determiner in the structure, as the N is inherently definite.

(39a) *Tiprens\textsuperscript{158} (tê enmé woz a-y)*

\( \text{Little prince ANT love rose of-he} \)

\( \text{“The Little prince (loved his rose)"} \)

\textsuperscript{158} Notice that in this case also the form with the DEF-marker is possible, as in (a):

(a) *Tiprens-la*

\( \text{Littleprince-DEF} \)

\( \text{“The little Prince”} \)
(39b) **Lostrali** *(sé on bel péyi)*  
Australia *(COP.pres a nice country)*  
“Australia *(is a nice country)*”

(39c) **Latè** *(sé planèt ola nou ka viv)*  
Earth *(COP.pres planet where we HAB live)*  
“The Earth *(is the planet where we live)*”

(39d) **Marie** *(sé on bèl fam)*  
Marie *(COP.pres a beautiful woman)*  
“Marie is a beautiful woman”

As for French creoles of the Caribbean area, Hazaël-Massieux (2011) argues that the null determiner is used with generic nouns also in Haitian (40a) and Martinican (40b), Damoiseau (2012) confirms it and observes this same use in Guyanese as well (40c):

(40a) **Pentad sé bèt ki malen** *(H-M)(HaiC)*  
Ø guinea.fowl COP.pres animal that smart  
“The guinea fowl is a smart animal”

“Guinea fowls are smart animals”

(40b) **Chouval ka rété an létchiri, milèt en savann** *(H-M)(MC)*  
Ø horse HAB live in stable, Ø mule in field  
“The horse lives in the stable, the mule in the fields”

“Horses live in the stable, mules in the fields”

(40c) **Wara pa ka fè maripa** *(Dam)(GuyC)*  
Ø wara NEG HAB do Ø maripa

“The awara tree don't give maripas”

“As for the creoles of the Bourbonnais group, Police-Michel&alii (2012) do not mention the use of any null determiner in Mauritian Creole, whereas Staudacher-

---

159 *Wara* and *maripa* are two different types of palm trees.
Valliamée (2011) says that Reunionnais Creole has null determiners both for singular and plural [generic] Ns [that is, Ns whose referent is universally clear\(^{160}\)], as in (41a-b):

(41a) *Kari la\(^{161}\) pa bon\(^{162}\)* (S-V)(ReuC)

“Kari isn't good”

(41b) *Longani la fini* (S-V)(ReuC)

“The season of longanes is over”

### 8.2.4 Possessives

Differently from French, whose possessives *always* precede the noun, Guadeloupean Creole is a language with *postnominal possessives*. They are constructed with the preposition *a(n)* in all persons, thus resembling the possessives of the strong series that exist in French (*à moi / à toi / à elle / à nous / à vous / à elles*).

We distinguish between six different forms. They vary on the basis of the possessor's grammatical person, but they do not bear any gender distinction (neither for the possessor nor for the possessed entity):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sp</td>
<td>An-mwen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sp</td>
<td>A-w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sp</td>
<td>A-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>An-nou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>A-zôt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>A-yo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following examples (42a-f) contain 6 instances of possessive determiners, one per person:

---

160 In fact, there also exist two definite articles for singular (*lë*) and plural (*bann*) definite Ns.
161 Notice that this element resembles the DEF-marker of GC, but has a different function: it is in fact a verbal marker associated to PUNCTUAL meaning.
162 I do not include the glosses of these examples because they are not given in the original work.
(57a) *Konsékaman an ka rèktifyé lonnmaj an-mwen*  
Consequently I PROGR change dedication of-me  
“Consequently, I change my dedication”

(57b) *Sygarèt a-w ka dérajé-mwen*  
Cigarette of-you PROGR bother-me  
“Your cigarette is bothering me”

(57c) *Non a-y sétè Fabyèn*  
Name of-him COP<sub>past</sub> Fabian  
“His name was Fabian”

(57d) *Travay liméwo 1 an-nou té bèl*  
Drawing number 1 of-we-DEF ANT beautiful  
“Our drawing number 1 was beautiful”

(57e) *Zanmi a-zòt rina-la pati*  
Friend of-you<sub>pl</sub> fox-DEF left  
“Your friend the fox has left”

(57f) *An pa konpwann répons a-yo*  
I NEG understand answer of-they  
“I didn't understand their answer”

Assimilation processes are possible when the qualified N ends with <a> or <an>. In such cases, the P “a(n)” can completely disappear in the phonetic string or be assimilated by the preceding N. With the Ns *papa* (“dad”) and *manman* (“mum”), the deletion of the P is systematic, as we can see in (58a-b) (Moïse (2005), Bernabé (2003)):

(58a) *An enmé manman-mwen*  
I love mother-me  
“I love my mother”

(58b) *Misyè-lasa sé papa(n)-mwen*  
Man-DEM COP<sub>pres</sub> father(of)-me  
“That man is my father”
This type of determiner does not exclude the presence of a demonstrative (59a), or a DEF-marker (59b) or of an indefinite article (59c) in the NE in which they appear:

(59a) *Vyé kaz a-w-lasa bèl toubolman*

Old house of-you-DEM beautiful extremely

“This old house of yours is extremely beautiful”

(59b) *Timoun a-y-la zanti*

Child of-him/her-DEF nice

“His/her child is nice”

(59c) *On tifi an-mwen ka rété Lafwans*

A daughter of-me HAB live France

“A daughter of mine lives in France”

The lack of the PLUR-marker sé makes the interpretation of number uncertain, as such information is carried neither by the N nor by the possessive (60a). The insertion of the PLUR-marker makes the number of the referent clear, as in (60b):

(60a) *Tifi an-mwen ka rété Lafwans*

Daughter of-me HAB live France

“My daughter(s) live(s) in France”

(60b) *Sé tifi an-mwen ka rété Lafwans*

PLUR daughter of-me HAB live France

“My daughters live in France”

With the DEF marker (60c) or the demonstrative (60d), the omission of sé is never possible when the referent is plural:

(60c) *Sé nomn-la ou ka vve la sé tonton an-mwen*

PLUR man-DEF you PROGR see DEF₂ COPₚₑᵣ uncle of-me

“The men you see are my uncles”

Cf. *Nomn-la*, “the man”
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(60d) **Sé timoun-lasa ou pa konnèt sé zanfan a Fabyen**

PLUR child-DEM you NEG know COP_{pres} child of Fabian

“These children you don't know are Fabian's”

Cf. **Timoun-lasa**, “the child”

Four other combinations of nominal elements in the NEs containing a possessive seem to be possible, namely:

- **N possessive-DEM** (61a);
- **PLUR N possessive-DEM** (61b);
- **??PLUR N DEM-possessive** (61c);
- **On N possessive** (61d).

(61a) **Zanmi an-mwen-lasa ka rété Lafwans**

Friend of-me-DEM HAB live France

“This friend of mine lives in France”

(61b) **Sé zanmi a-y-lasa zanti**

PLUR friend OF-he-DEM nice

“These friends of his are nice”

(61c) **??I rakonté-mwen zidé étranj lasa-a-y**

??He tell-me idea strange DEM-of-he

“??He told me this strange idea of his”

(61d) **On zanmi an-mwen ka rété Lafwans**

A friend of-me HAB live France

“A friend of mine / one of my friends lives in France”

Notice that the order in (61c), despite being discussed in the linguistic literature (see, among others, the online course of GC and Bernabé (2003)), is not accepted by my informants.
As for other Creoles, Martinican has a possessive similar to that of GC (that is, the postposition of a personal pronoun to the N), except for the fact that it is constructed without the preposition *an* (62a) (Pinalie & Bernabé (1999), Damoiseau (2012)). The plural form is obtained by preposing to the N the PLUR-marker *sé* (62b), or the null article (62c). It can of course be constructed with the DEF-marker too (62b and d) when the referent is specific (Damoiseau (2012)):

(62a) *Lang an pèp, sé nanm li*  
Language one people, COP<sub>pres</sub> soul he  
“The language of a people is its soul”

(62b) *Tout sé vyé liv ou a*  
All PLUR old book you DEF  
“All of your old books”

(62c) *Zanmi yo*  
Ø friend they  
“Our friends”

(62d) *Ti péyi nou an*  
Little country us DEF  
“Our little country”

The possessives of Haitian Creole are very similar to those of Martinican with singular referents, but different with plural ones. Haitian possessives are in fact postnominal complement pronouns whose interpretation is ambiguous between plural and singular if the N is indefinite and has a null determiner (63a) or singular if the N is definite and followed by the DEF-marker (63b). The main difference lies in the fact that the definite plural is signalled by a postnominal and PLUR-marker, *yo*, whose original function is that of 3pp personal pronoun (63c). This plural element follows not only the N but the possessive as well. It is deleted with the 3pp possessive (63d): thus, the construction N + POSS<sub>3pp</sub> is always ambiguous in meaning, as it can be both singular and plural (63e) (Damoiseau 2005):

(63a) *Mi lann li yo*  
I my book DEF  
“My book”

(63b) *Mi lann li ou*  
I my book you DEF  
“My book”

(63c) *Mi lann li yo ou*  
I my book you DEF DEF  
“My book”

(63d) *Wi lann li*  
We my book DEF  
“Our books”

(63e) *Mi lann li yo ou an*  
I my book DEF DEF PLUR  
“My books”

199
Interestingly, the 2PP uses the 1PP pronoun to form the possessive, so that the interpretation of *nou* is ambiguous (63f) (Damoiseau (2005)):

(63f) *Liv nou* (Dam2)(HC)

“*Our book(s)/yourPL book(s)”*

Guyanese Creole completely differs from the other French creoles of the Caribbean group because it has “possessive determiners” that are “preposed to the determined N” (Damoiseau (2012)). With singular referents, these elements can either appear alone (64a) or with the DEF-marker (to indicate more specificity) (64b). With plural referents, the postnominal PLUR-marker *ya* appears (64c) (Damoiseau (2012)). In the absence of other determiners the interpretation of *POSS + N* as indefinite plural is not excluded (64d):

(64a) *Mo liv* (Dam)(GuyC)

“My book”
As for the French creoles of the Indian Ocean, Police-Michel & al (2012) say that Mauritian, like Guyanese, has specialized prenominal possessive determiners used alone with singular referents (65a) and in combination with the PLUR-marker *bann* with plurals. Notice that *bann* appears between the possessive and the N (65b). Moreover, Staudacher-Valliamée (2011) explains that the situation is exactly the same in Réunionnais (66a-b):

(65a) **Mo lakaz**

“My house”

(65b) **Mo bann lakaz**

My PLUR house

“My houses”

(66a) **Son famyi**

“His/her family”

(66b) **Son bann famyi**

His/her PLUR family

“His/her families”

The following table summarizes the basic system of possessives of Caribbean and Bourbonnais French-based creoles (exceptions to the rule and very complex...
combinations of functional elements are left out):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>GC</th>
<th>MC</th>
<th>HC</th>
<th>GuyC</th>
<th>MauC</th>
<th>ReuC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Singular referent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ps</td>
<td>N an-mwen la</td>
<td>N mwen /la/163</td>
<td>N mwen</td>
<td>Mo N</td>
<td>Mo N</td>
<td>Mon N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N mwen</td>
<td></td>
<td>N mwen /la/164</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ps</td>
<td>N a-w la</td>
<td>N ou /la/</td>
<td>N ou</td>
<td>To N</td>
<td>To N</td>
<td>Out N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N ou /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ps</td>
<td>N a-y la</td>
<td>N li /la/</td>
<td>N li</td>
<td>So N</td>
<td>So N</td>
<td>Son N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N li /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>N an-nou la</td>
<td>N nou /la/</td>
<td>N nou</td>
<td>Nou N</td>
<td>Nou N</td>
<td>Nout N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N nou /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>N a-zôt la</td>
<td>N zot /la/</td>
<td>N zot</td>
<td>Zot N</td>
<td>Zot N</td>
<td>Out N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N zot /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>N a-yo la</td>
<td>N yo /la/</td>
<td>N yo</td>
<td>Yé N</td>
<td>Yé N</td>
<td>Zo(t) N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N yo /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plural referent</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1ps</td>
<td>Sé N an-mwen la</td>
<td>Sé N mwen /la/</td>
<td>N mwen</td>
<td>Mo N</td>
<td>Mo N</td>
<td>Mon bann N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N an-mwen</td>
<td></td>
<td>N mwen /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N mwen yo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ps</td>
<td>Sé N a-w la</td>
<td>Sé N ou /la/</td>
<td>N ou</td>
<td>To N</td>
<td>To N</td>
<td>Out bann N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N a-w</td>
<td></td>
<td>N ou /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N ou yo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ps</td>
<td>Sé N a-y la</td>
<td>Sé N li /la/</td>
<td>N li</td>
<td>So N</td>
<td>So N</td>
<td>Son bann N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N a-y</td>
<td></td>
<td>N li /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N li yo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>Sé N an-nou la</td>
<td>Sé N nou /la/</td>
<td>N nou</td>
<td>Nou N</td>
<td>Nou N</td>
<td>Nout bann N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N an-nou</td>
<td></td>
<td>N nou /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N nou /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>Sé N a-vou la</td>
<td>Sé N zot /la/</td>
<td>N zot</td>
<td>Zot N</td>
<td>Zot N</td>
<td>Out bann N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N a-vou</td>
<td></td>
<td>N zot /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N zot /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>Sé N a-yo la</td>
<td>Sé N yo /la/</td>
<td>N yo</td>
<td>Yé N</td>
<td>Yé N</td>
<td>Zo(t) bann N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N a-yo</td>
<td></td>
<td>N yo /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N yo /la/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

163 One of the 4 allomorphic realization of -la present in the grammar of Martinican.
164 One of the 4 allomorphic realization of -la present in the grammar of Haitian.
165 One of the 2 allomorphic realization of -la present in the grammar of Guyanese.
8.2.4.1 The possessive construction

The possessive construction (or *genitive construction*) is often described in an erroneous way in the linguistic literature, maybe because many scholars come from Martinica (see Bernabé (2003) and the online course of GC, among others) and describe a structure that is present in their variety of LAC but unacceptable in GC. In fact, the possessive structure is said to be formed by a mere *juxtaposition* of two Ns: the *possessed* and the *possessor* (in this precise order). Thus, the Saxon genitive if the English possessive construction “Fabian's uncle” should be translated as in (67a), where the first element is the determined N and the second one the determinant:

(67a) *Tonton Fabien*

Uncle (of) Fabian

“Fabian's uncle”

However, all of my informants interpret such a NE as “Uncle Fabian”. In such constructions, there is thus no possessive reading in GC. For my informants, the presence of the preposition *a* between the two elements of the possessive construction is compulsory for the structure to be interpreted as a genitive one, as confirmed by all of the examples found in my corpus (67b-l) and correctly pointed out by Damoiseau (2012):

(67b) *Tonton a Fabyen enmé fanm a-y*

Uncle of Fabian love woman of-he

“Fabian's uncle loves his wife”

(67c) *Loto a papa-la sété ta tonton Aleksan*

Car of dad-DEF COPpast that.of uncle Alexander

“Dad's car used to be uncle Alexander's ”

(67d) *Istwà a vandé-la étranj toubólman*

Story of merchant-DEF bizarre extremely

“The merchant's story is very strange”
(67e) *Mwen enmé son a van-la*
I love sound of wind-DEF
“*I love the sound of the wind*”

(67f) *[...] davwa an meté liv-lasa an lonnè a on granmoun*
For I put book-DEM to honour of an adult
“For I dedicated this book to an adult”

(67g) *Mi pòtré-kraché a désen-la*
Here sketch of drawing-DEF
“*Here's a sketch of the drawing*”

(67h) *[...] sa fè-mwen graté tèt an-mwen onlo asi tribilasyon a lajeng*
This make-me scratch head of-me a-lot over problem of jungle
“This had me think a lot about the problems of the jungle”

(67i) *Alò an désiné andidan vant a sèpan boa-la*
So I draw inside belly of snake boa-DEF
“So I drew (something) inside the boa's belly”

(67l) *[...] lidé a on bèl chimen i té ké ka atann-mwen adan lapenti*
Idea of a nice path that ANT IRR PROGR wait-me inside painting
“The idea of a nice carrier I could have had in drawing”

This construction is possible also in non-standard, popular French. In fact, the standard possessive construction uses the P *de* (68a) but in non-standard varieties the use of the P *a* is quite common, as in (68b):

(68a) *La voiture de papa*  
The car of dad

(68b) *La voiture à papa*  
The car to dad

Damoiseau (2012) says that the situation in Martinican, Guyanese and Haitian is different from that of GC, as these languages do not need the insertion of any particle for the genitive interpretation to be possible (69a-b):
8.2.5 The demonstrative

The Guadeloupean Creole demonstrative does not undergo any gender or number variation. It does not vary along the proximity/distance feature either. The only available form is in fact used by itself for singular Ns and accompanied by the prenominal PLUR-marker sé when the determined N is plural. Similarly to what happens with the DEF-marker and with possessives, this determiner immediately follows the bare noun it qualifies, and unite to it in writing by means of a dash. Differently, when the NE in which it appears is complex, the demonstrative follows the whole NE. In fact, as pointed out above, the order demonstrative > possessive is attested in the linguistic literature on GC but not accepted by my informants, who only seem to accept the order possessive > demonstrative. This peculiar postnominal position resembles to that of the postnominal Spanish demonstratives described by Brugè (2002) (70a-b):

(70a) *El libro este/ese/aquel*
   The book this/that/that
   “This/that book”

(70b) *Los libros estos/esos/aquello*
   The books these/those those
   “These/those books”

The form of the demonstrative of GC suggests that this element might have originated as a result of the union of the French neutral demonstrative pronoun ça and the DEF-marker -la, which is also confirmed by the impossibility of combining the DEF-marker and a demonstrative. In fact, my informants consider such
constructions (71a-b) as redundant and thus agrammatical:

(71a) *Fanm-lasa-la bèl
    *Woman-DEM-DEF beautiful
    “*The this woman is beautiful”
(71b) *Fanm-la-lasa bèl
    *Woman-DEF-DEM beautiful
    “*This the woman is beautiful”

It follows that the actual demonstrative might be *sa*: if it was so, the element would have lost its pronominal value in the passage from French to GC, thus becoming a determiner. Then, its peculiarity is that it must always appear with the DEF-marker, which directly precedes it in the phonetic string and forms a single phonetic unit with it. Thus, the form of the singular demonstrative is -lasa (or better, [[-la] + [sa]]), and corresponds to the English demonstratives *this* and *that*. It carries a [±PROX] feature which indicates, according to the linguistic context, either the proximity or the distance of the qualified entity from the speaker and the listener. The same pattern is found with plural Ns, for which the [+PLUR] feature is carried along by the prenominal PLUR-marker *sé*.

The table that follows summarises what I said up to now, and the sentences in (72a-d) and (72e-h) contain examples of singular and plural demonstratives respectively:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Singular</th>
<th>NE-lasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Sé NE-lasa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(72a) *Granmoun-lasa sé plibon zanmi an ni asi latè* (TP)
    Adult-DEM is best friend I have in Earth
    “This adult is the best friend I have”
(72b) *Sé yenki an moman-lasa yo ka kwè yo konnèt-li* (TP)
    COP only at moment-DEM they HAB believe they know-he
    “And it's only at that moment that they believe to know him”
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The possible combinations of functional elements in the NEs in which a demonstrative is contained are the following\textsuperscript{166}:

\begin{itemize}
  \item $N$-$DEM$\textsuperscript{167} (see 72a-d);
  \item $PLUR$ $N$-$DEM$\textsuperscript{168} (see 72e-h);
  \item $N$ possessive-$DEM$\textsuperscript{169} (73a);
  \item $PLUR$ $N$ possessive-$DEM$\textsuperscript{170} (73b).
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{166} For Bonan (2012) I found 96 occurrences of demonstratives, many of which were combined with other determiners.

\textsuperscript{167} 85 occurrences.

\textsuperscript{168} 10 occurrences.

\textsuperscript{169} Only 1 example of this order.

\textsuperscript{170} Combination not present in my corpus but perfectly grammatical.
The following NEs are instances of *N possessive-DEM* and *PLUR N possessive-DEM* orders:

(73a) *Zidé étranj a-y-lasa*  
Idea strange of-he-DEM  
“This strange idea of his”

(73b) *Sé zidé étranj a-y-lasa*  
PLUR idea strange of-he-DEM  
“These strange ideas of his”

Finally, three combinations and orders are impossible, which is quite interesting for our work. First of all, as already pointed out in (2.6), the order *demonstrative > possessive* is not accepted by my informants: this seems to suggest that in this language the demonstrative is always *enclitic on the whole NE* (74a). Second, the fact that the demonstrative cannot be preceded (74b) nor followed (74c) by the DEF-marker *-la* (because otherwise the structure is perceived as *redundant*) tells us two important facts:

− as already mentioned, it is likely that the real demonstrative is *-sa*, whereas *-lasa* is but the combination of the DEF-marker and the demonstrative (which cannot appear in the alone in the structure (74d));
− in the maximally-modified NE, it is the demonstrative *-sa* that is enclitic on the whole nominal expression, not the DEF-marker.

(74a) ??*Sé zidé-lasa an-mwen étranj*  
??PLUR idea-DEM of-me strange  
“These ideas of mine are strange”

(74b) *Chyen-lasa-la bèl*  
*Dog-DEM-DEF beautiful  
“This the dog is beautiful”
In Martinican Creole, the situation is very similar to that of GC: there is a unique form of postnominal demonstrative, -tala, used for both feminine and masculine Ns (75a-b); and the plural form is constructed by preposing the PLUR-marker sé to the whole NE (75c) (see, among others, Pinalie&Bernabé (1999), Hazaël-Massieux (2011) and Damoiseau (2012)):

(75a) \textit{Fanm-tala} \hspace{1cm} (P&B)(MC)
Woman-DEM
“This/that woman”

(75b) \textit{Boug-tala} \hspace{1cm} (P&B)(MC)
Guy-DEM
“This/that guy”

(75c) \textit{Sé moun-tala} \hspace{1cm} (P&B)(MC)
PLUR man-DEM
“These/those men”

Damoiseau (2012) explains that in Guyanese the situation is different, as the demonstrative element sa is placed before the NE, which is followed by the DEF-marker (76a). The plural form is formed by placing the PLUR market yé between the N and the DEF-marker: the union between yé and an gives the form -yan (76b):

(76a) \textit{Sa moun-an} \hspace{1cm} (Dam)(GuyC)
DEM person-DEF
“This/that person”
In Haitian Creole, the singular demonstrative form consists in the postposition of the demonstrative *sa* and of the DEF-marker to the N (in this order) (77a). The plural form is identical, but the DEF-marker is substituted by the PLUR-marker *yo* (that directly follows the demonstrative *sa*) (77b) (Damoiseau (2012) and (2005)):

\[(77a) \text{*Moun sa a* (Dam)(HC)} \]

Person DEM DEF

“This/that person”

\[(77b) \text{*Moun sa yo* (Dam)(HC)} \]

Person DEM PLUR

“These/those people”

As for Bourbonnais creoles, Mauritian uses the prenominal demonstrative *sa* combined with the postnominal DEF-marker *la* for singular referents (78a), and adds the PLUR-marker *bann* between the DEM and the N for plural referents (78b) (Police-Michel&alii (2012)). Differently, Reunionnais has two possible forms: *N-là* (79a), and *Sè N-là”171 (79b). As happens in Mauritian, the plural form is formed by inserting the prenominal PLUR-marker *bann* (79c-d) (Staudacher-Valliamée (2011)). Notice that the postnominal -là is not a DEF-marker but an actual demonstrative.

\[(78a) \text{*Sa lakaz-la* (P-M&a)(MauC)} \]

DEM house-DEF

“This/that house”

\[(78b) \text{*Sa bann lakaz-la* (P-M&a)(MauC)} \]

DEM PLUR house-DEF

“These/those houses”

171 Notice that this construction resembles to the French reinforced demonstrative form *ce N-là*. 
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(79a) *Lë pri poisson-là fê pêr aou*

   The price fish-DEM make fear to.you
   “The price of this fish scares you”

(79b) *Kouvertür sê’172 marmit-là*

   Cover DEM₂ pan-DEM
   “The cover of this pan”

(79c) *Bann liv-là*

   PLUR book-DEM
   “These books”

(79d) *Së bann marmay-là*

   DEM₂ PLUR child-DEM
   “These children”

---

172 I call this element DEM₂ in order to distinguish it from the postnominal demonstrative -là, that I named DEM.
Chapter 9

Pronouns

Pronouns can be either definite, indefinite or interrogative. In the following chapters, I describe the morphosyntax of the main pronominal forms of GC: 9.1 is dedicated to personal pronouns as referential subjects (9.1.1), expletive subjects (9.1.2) and referential objects (9.1.3). Section 9.1.4 provides a classification of the personal pronouns of GC based on their structural deficiency (Cardinaletti & Starke (1999)). In 9.2 I discuss the morphosyntax of possessive pronouns, which nowadays appears to be rather different from that described in the traditional literature on GC (Bernabé (1983), Germain (1976), among others). The classical demonstrative pronouns are described in 9.3, along with a special neuter demonstrative that only appears in cleft sentences. Finally, 9.4 and 9.5 constitute an overview of interrogative and indefinite pronouns, respectively.

9.1 Personal pronouns

Guadeloupean Creole always requires the subject personal pronoun of finite clauses to be realized in the phonological string (1a-b).

(1a) *(An) sé on jën tifié
    *(I) COP₉₀₁ a young girl
    “*(I) am a young girl”
(1b) *(Ou) té vini yé
    *(You) ANT come yesterday
    “*(You) came yesterday”

It thus behaves like English and French. This is expected given the weakness of its inflectional morphology. The French origin can also have played a part in setting this parameter when GC originated. The only exception to this general rule is found in
the absence of the expletive pronoun *i* in cases in which French would use *il* and English *it/there*. This issue is investigated more in detail in section 9.1.2.

### 9.1.1 Subject pronouns

As GC is an SVO language, in the unmarked case subject pronouns precede the V, whereas object pronouns follow it.

As in English and French, GC has a different personal pronoun for every grammatical person, that is, three singular forms and three plural ones. Differently from what happens in English and similarly to French, in GC a morphological distinction between the singular and the plural second person pronouns exists. GC personal pronouns are described as divided into two different series, namely a *strong* and a *weak* one (Moïse (2005), Bernabé (1983), among others):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sp</td>
<td>Mwen</td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sp</td>
<td>Vou</td>
<td>Ou, -w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sp</td>
<td>Li</td>
<td>I, -y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>Nou</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>Zòt</td>
<td>Zò, zo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>Yo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let us observe some instances of so-called weak (2a-f) and strong (3a-f) pronouns. Notice that 1PP and 3PP use the strong form where 1-3PS and 2PP would use the weak one (2-3d and 2-3f), and this because the weak form seems to be missing. This issue is discussed more in detail in 9.1.4, where some observations based on the concept of *structural deficiency* (Cardinaletti&Starke (1999)) are carried out.

(2a) *An ni pwoblèm avè on flè*  
I have problem with a flower  
“I have some troubles with a flower”
(2b) *Ou ni sè zètwal-la?* (TP)
You have PLUR star-DEF?
“Do you own the stars?”

(2c) *I ëlè-la : Adye!* (TP)
He tell flower-DEF : Goodbye!
“He told the flower: Goodbye!”

(2d) *Nou manjè enpi fwi*
We eat lot fruit
“We ate a lot of fruits”

(2e) *Poukisa zo ka vann sa?* (TP)
Why you HAB sell this?
“Why do you sell this?”

(2f) *Yo kriyé gran-manman-yo*
They call grand-mother-them
“They called their grand mother”

(3a) *Mwen an pa té ka di ayen* (TP)
Me I NEG ANT PROGR say nothing
“Me, I kept silent”

(3b) *Vou, ou ka vini* (TP)
You, you PROGR come
“YOU are coming”

(3c) *Li, i buvè dlo an-mwen* (TP)
Him, he drink water of-me
“Him, he drank my water”

(3d) *Nou, nou tousèl tousèl an-nou*
We we alone alone at-us
“We, we are really alone”

(3e) *Zòt, zo enmè planèt-lasa*
You(PL), you(PL) love planet-DEM
“It's you that love this planet”
(3f) *Yo, yo téléfonné manman-yo*
They they call mother-them
“Them, they called their mother”

Notice that *ou*, the 2nd person singular pronoun is also used as a courtesy pronoun. It has thus the same value of English *you* and French *vous*. The 3rd person plural pronoun *yo* may also have a general arbitrary interpretation, like that of the English pronoun *one/you* and French *on* (Moïse (2005)). In such cases, it means “people in general”. Also the forms *moun* and *ou* are associated to this type of interpretation (4b-c), even though they are less commonly used. My informants tend to avoid the use of *ou*, as they say that its meaning can be confusing, exactly as happens with English *you* (4c):

(4a) *Isidan yo pa ka di moun bêtiz*  
Here you/one not say person nonsenses  
“We must respect people in here”

(4b) *Moun pa ka ba manman-yo kou*  
One NEG HAB give mother-them stroke  
“One shouldn't beat their mother”

(4c) *Ou pa ka di moun bêtiz*  
You NEG HAB say person nonsenses  
*We* must respect people in here”  
*You* must respect people in here”

9.1.2 Expletive pronouns

As already pointed out in the previous section, the 3PS pronoun *i* can also be used as an expletive pronoun, that is, a pronoun that is not assigned a theta-role, whose only function is that of overtly filling the subject position. Usually, non-pro-drop languages require expletive pronouns to always be *overtly expressed* in the phonetic string; but this is not the case in GC. In fact, in some cases the expression of the
overt expletive seems to be optional in this language. The situation is further complicated by the fact that not all Vs that require the presence of an expletive in other non-pro-drop languages have the same argument structure in GC, but also by the fact that often the same V can be associated to different structures.

For example, it is possible to say that in French and English expletive pronouns (il in French and it/there in English) are used with weather Vs (5a-b), time expressions (5c-d), and existential constructions (5e-f). Moreover, it also appears in English cleft sentences (5g) and with the French V falloir (“to be necessary”) (5h):

(5a) *It is raining*  
(5b) *Il pleut*  
It rains  
(5c) *It's 5 o'clock*  
(5d) *Il est 5 heures*  
It is 5 hours  
(5e) *There are some kids in the garden*  
(5f) *Il y a des enfants dans le jardin*  
It there is some kids in the garden  
(5g) *It's Mary that baked this cake*  
(5h) *Il faut que tu ailles au marché*  
It must that you go.SUBJ to.the marked  
“You must go to the market”

In GC, the expletive pronoun can appear in the following cases:

– with the V fò, very similar to its French counterpart falloir (“to be necessary”) (6a-b);  
– in existential constructions (6c-d);  
– and in time expressions (6e-f).
(6a) *I fo ou pati oswa-la*  
It must you leave evening-DEF  
“You must leave tonight”

(6b) *I fo mwen té resté a kaz épi timoun an-mwen*  
It must me ANT stay at home with child of-me  
“I had to stay at home with my children”

(6c) *I ni on chouval ka kouri adan pak-la*  
It have a horse PROGR run in garden-DEF  
“There's a horse running in the garden”

(6d) *I té ni twa timoun adan pak-la*  
It ANT have three child in parc-DEF  
“There were three children in the garden”

(6e) *I senkè oswa*  
It five evenig  
“It's 5 p.m.”

(6f) *I ja ta*  
It already late  
“It's late”

Nonetheless, my informants believe that the overt expression of the expletive pronoun in existential constructions belongs to the grammar of what they call créole francisé, and is not accepted by older native speakers of GC. In fact, they explain that the presence of *i* constitutes a problem in that the expletive pronoun might be confused with a genuine 3PS pronoun and be interpreted as in (6c'-d'):

(6c') *I ni on chouval ka kouri adan pak-la*  
She/he have a horse PROGR run in garden-DEF  
“She/he has a horse (that is) running in the garden”

(6d') *I té ni twa timoun adan pak-la*  
She/he ANT have three child in parc-DEF  
“She/he had three children in the garden”
Expletive *i* is optional with the V fo\(^{173}\) and in existential constructions (7a-b and 7c-d, respectively) but it is obligatory in time expressions (7e-f):

(7a) *(I) fo ou pati oswa-la*

(It) must you leave evening-DEF

“You must leave tonight”

(7b) *(I) fo mwen té resté a kaz épi timoun an-mwen*

(It) must me ANT stay at home with child of-me

“I had to stay at home with my children”

(7c) *(I) ni on chouval ka kouri adan pak-la*

(It) have a horse PROGR run in garden-DEF

“There's a horse running in the garden”

(7d) *(I) té ni twa timoun adan pak-la*

(It) ANT have three child in parc-DEF

“There were three children in the garden”

(7e) * *(I) senkè oswa*

*(It) five evenig

“It's 5 p.m.”

(7f) * *(I) ja ta*

*(It) already late

“It's late”

Differently from French and English, GC weather Vs do not take an expletive pronoun (as, for example, in ENG *It is raining* / FR *Il pleut*), but rather take the weather phenomenon as their subject and THEME (8a-b):

(8a) *Lapli ka tonté*

\[ THEME \]

Rain PROGR fall

“The rain is falling”

---

173 Notice that the presence of the expletive in (7a-d) is judged by older people as “créole francisé”.

---
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Moreover, the Vs indicating physical or environmental states are never construed with the expletive pronoun (9a-b). Similarly, the copula \( \text{sé} \) (present form) or \( \text{sété} \) (past form) placed at the beginning of the cleft sentence is never preceded by any overt expletive pronoun (10a-b), whereas the same construction would require the presence of \( \text{it} \) in English (\( \text{It's me} \)) and of the demonstrative \( \text{ce} \) in French (\( \text{C'est moi la femme qui a appelé hier} \)).

(9a) (\( \text{*I} \)) \( \text{ka fé fwèt isi} \)
It PROGR do cold here
“It's cold in here”

(9b) (\( \text{*I} \)) \( \text{té ka fé cho adan légлиз-la} \)
It ANT PROGR do hot in church-DEF
“It was hot in the church”

(10a) (\( \text{*I} \)) \( \text{sé Fabyen ki enmé Mari} \)
It COP\(_{\text{pre}}\) Fabian that love Mary
“It's Fabian that loves Mary”

(10b) (\( \text{*I} \)) \( \text{sété mwen ki té kaché dèyè pot-la} \)
It COP\(_{\text{past}}\) me that ANT hidden behind door-DEF
“It was me who was hiding behind the door”

The inconsistency in the behaviour of the expletive pronoun makes it difficult to make generalizations. The lack of the expletive in cleft sentences can be accounted for by saying that the copula of GC might have originated from the French strings \( \text{c'est [se]} \) (“it/this is”) and \( \text{c'était [se'tɛ]} \) (it/this was”), incorporating in some ways the French demonstrative pronoun \( \text{ce} \) in its structure. However, this explanation cannot hold for the \( \text{V fo} \) or for existential constructions, and more so for the lack of
impersonal weather Vs.

On the whole, all of these phenomena constitute a problem for the classification of GC, as this language has both features of pro-drop languages (the dropping of the expletive pronoun) and features of non-pro-drop ones (in that its functional morphology is poor and the overt expression of the personal pronoun is always compulsory in main clauses). The investigation of these features and their natures could be an interesting subject of research for further works on GC.

9.1.3 Complement pronouns

Complement pronouns immediately follow the verb that selects them. Unlike subject pronouns, complement pronouns are enclitic either on the selecting verb or on the selecting P. In fact, not only do they follow the selecting V or the P directly, but they also constitute a single phonological unit with them. In writing, this phenomenon is signalled by means of an obligatory dash which systematically appears between the two units.

As we can see in the table below, also these pronouns have two different series of forms, a strong and a weak one. This phenomenon is not surprising, and can be accounted for by saying than, in a language that does not mark Case, the same forms can easily occupy both the subject and the object position:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Weak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sp</td>
<td>-mwen</td>
<td>-an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sp</td>
<td>-vou</td>
<td>-w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sp</td>
<td>-li</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>-nou</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>-zòt</td>
<td>-zò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>-yo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notice that, again, 1PP and 3PP only seem to have a full form, and no reduced
counterpart. I will discuss this more in detail in 9.1.4. The following examples are instances of complement personal pronouns in their weak (11a-f) and strong forms (11a'-f'):

(11a) * Ба-an dlo*
   
   “Give-me water”
   
   Give me some water

(11a') * Tiprens-la té di-mwen aprésa […]* (TP)
   
   Little Prince ANT say-me after:that
   
   “After that, the little Prince told me […]”

(11b) * An pé pa vin jwé épi-w* (TP)
   
   I can NEG come play with-you
   
   “I can't come and play with you”

(11b') * An ka ba-vou on bo* (TP)
   
   I PROGR give-you a kiss
   
   “I give you a kiss”

(11c) * Vyé misyé-la di-y: Otila ou sòti ?* (TP)
   
   Old man-DEF say-him: where you come?
   
   “The old man asked him: Where do you come from?”

(11c') * Flè-la réponn-li toudous […]* (TP)
   
   Flower-DEF answer-him sweetly
   
   “The flower sweetly told him […]”

(11d) * Yo vwè-nou*
   
   They see-us
   
   “They saw us”

(11e) * An ka vwè-zò* (TP)
   
   I PROGR see-you
   
   “I can see you”

(11e') * I konnèt-zòt* (TP)
   
   He/she know-you (PLUR)
   
   “She knows you”
Notice that, when the GOAL and the THEME of a ditransitive V are both pronouns, they are realized as direct objects and their order is always DATIVE-ACCUSATIVE (12a-d). In this respect, GC differs from French that has the order DATIVE-ACCUSATIVE in all cases excepted when the DATIVE is assigned to the 3PS clitic pronoun and the ACCUSATIVE to the 3PS/P ones: in fact, in such cases the superficial order becomes ACCUSATIVE-DATIVE (12a'-d'):

\[(12a)\text{ } Ou \text{ ban-}m\text{wen }li\]
You give-me it
“You gave it to me”

\[(12b)\text{ } Ou \text{ ban-mwen }yo\]
You give-me them
“You gave them to me”

\[(12c)\text{ } Ou \text{ ban-}y\text{ li}\]
You give-her it
“You gave it to her”

\[(12d)\text{ } Ou \text{ ban-}y\text{ yo}\]
You gave-her them
“You gave them to her”

\[(12a')\text{ } Tu \text{ me }la \text{ donnes}\]
You to.me it give
“You give it to me”

\[(12b')\text{ } Tu \text{ me }les \text{ donnes}\]
You to.me them give
“You give them to me”

174 Notice that I use these terms to make a clear comparisons with French, even though Case-assignment does not seem to be performed in GC, and thus is not visible on GC pronouns.
(12c') *Tu la lui donnes*
You it to.him give
“You give it to him”

(12d') *Tu les lui donnes*
You them to.him give
“You give them to him”

**9.1.4 A classification based on structural deficiency**

The examples in 9.1.2 and 9.1.3 seem to suggest that the only difference between the pronouns of the strong series and those of the weak one lies in the fact that the former can be focalised in examples as (13a), very similar to the correspondent French construction (13b):

(13a) *Mwen, an doctè*
Me, I doctor
“Me, I am a doctor”

(13b) *Moi, je suis médecin*
Me, I am doctor
“Me, I am a doctor”

In all other cases in fact, the strong and the weak pronouns seem have similar distribution, as they both can be used not only as subjects (14a) but also as objects (14b) of the V that selects them:

(14a) *Mwen/an bèl toutbòlman*
“I'm very beautiful”

(14b) *I enmé-mwen/-an*
“She loves me”

As mentioned in 9.1.3, the fact that the pronouns of both series have the same uses in
these cases is not surprising, as this phenomenon can be accounted for as a consequence of the fact that the verbs in GC do not assign ACC Case to their internal object. Moreover, the INFL of this language is unlikely to be able to assign NOM Case to the external argument of the V, as the distinction between finite and non-finite tense seems to be lacking in its grammar. Nonetheless though, in a number of cases, the pronouns of the strong series are in complementary distribution with the weak ones, and this for a number of reasons that I will try to show here. In this section in fact, following Cardinaletti&Starke (1994) I will make some predictions on the different degrees of structural deficiency of these forms.

Cardinaletti&Starke (1994) (henceforth, C&S) explain that in the unmarked case “one and the same pronoun (semantically / functionally defined) falls into distinct classes”. For this reason, “the third person plural feminine nominative Italian pronouns […] divide into two distinct classes with respect to coordination and reference”. The examples they give are those in (15a-b), Notice that class 1 pronouns can be coordinated but can only have [+HUMAN] referents, whereas class 2 do not allow coordination but can have both [+HUMAN] and [-HUMAN] referents:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>[+HUMAN]</th>
<th>[-HUMAN]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(15a) Class 2 <em>Esse</em> (*e quelle accanto) sono troppo alte</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(15b) Class 1 <em>Loro</em> (*e quelle accanto) sono troppo alte</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.fp.NOM (and those besides) are too tall

However, they say that “in many cases, the two classes are not only functionally but also phonetically non-distinct”, and they cite the case of French (16a-b), where “the class which can be coordinated can only refer to human entities”. Notice that the same pattern is found in GC175 (16a'-b'), except for the fact that my informants do not seem to exclude the possibility of coordinating two pronouns with non-human referents:

---

175 Throughout this chapter, I group French and GC because the morphosyntactic properties of their personal pronouns are very similar. These similarities are discussed at the end of the chapter.
They explain that elements like French elles (FR) are similar realizations of two distinct underlying functional elements, and that “the existence of regular synonymous (and often homophonous) pairs is a rare, if not unique, characteristic of the class 1 /class 2 distinction”. As shown by the examples above, this is true for GC yo-like pronouns as well.

In order to explain what structurally deficient means, C&S start from the example of singular masculine pronouns in their nominative form, and show that French has two of them: they are morphologically distinct but related (17a-b). The same happens with pronouns in their ACC form as well, of which they give an Italian example (18a-b). In GC such distinction between feminine and masculine 3PS pronouns does not exist, but two different morphological forms (for all referents), i and li, are possible. Their behaviour is exemplified in (17a'-b') and in (18a'-b'). Again, notice that in GC the [-HUMAN] reference is not impossible in coordinated structures:

**Class 2**

(16a) **Elles** (*et celles d’à coté) sont trop grandes  
3.fp.NOM (and those besides) are too tall  

(16a') **Yo** (*épi sè lézot-la) two gran  
They (*and PLUR other-DEF) too tall  

(16b) **Elles** (et celles d’à coté) sont trop grandes  
3.fp.NOM (and those besides) are too tall  

(16b') **Yo** (épi sè lézot-la) two gran  
They (and PLUR other-DEF) too tall

They explain that elements like French elles (FR) are similar realizations of two distinct underlying functional elements, and that “the existence of regular synonymous (and often homophonous) pairs is a rare, if not unique, characteristic of the class 1 /class 2 distinction”. As shown by the examples above, this is true for GC yo-like pronouns as well.

In order to explain what structurally deficient means, C&S start from the example of singular masculine pronouns in their nominative form, and show that French has two of them: they are morphologically distinct but related (17a-b). The same happens with pronouns in their ACC form as well, of which they give an Italian example (18a-b). In GC such distinction between feminine and masculine 3PS pronouns does not exist, but two different morphological forms (for all referents), i and li, are possible. Their behaviour is exemplified in (17a'-b') and in (18a'-b'). Again, notice that in GC the [-HUMAN] reference is not impossible in coordinated structures:

**Class 2**

(17a) **Il** (*et celui de Jean) sont beaux  
He (*and the one of John) are beautiful  

(17a') **I** (*épi lézot-la) bèl  
He (*and other-DEF) beautiful
(17b) Class 1 *Lui* (et celui de Jean) sont beaux
He (and the one of John) are beautiful

(17b') *Li* (épi lézot-la) bèl
He (and other-DEF) beautiful

(18a) Class 2 Non metterò mai *loro* (*e loro*) il cappuccio
Not I will put never them (*and them) the cap

(18a') An achté *yo* (*épi sé lézot-la) onpil ponm
I bought them (*and PLUR other-DEF) many apples

(18b) Class 1 Non metterò mai il cappuccio a *loro* (e a quelle altre)
Not I will put never the cap (to) them (and to those others)

(18b') An achté onpil ponm ba *yo* (épi ba sé lézot-la)
I bought many apples to them (and PLUR other-DEF)

According to them, a confirmation of the correctness of the class 1/class 2 distinction lies in “the fact that the morphological differences exactly correlate with coordination possibilities and with possibilities [of] human reference”. Moreover, they state that “class 2 personal pronouns are systematically reduced with respect to class 1 personal pronouns”. For all these reasons, they call the former deficient and the latter strong. In passing, notice that the distribution of GC *yo* is more similar to that of Italian *loro* than that of French *leur*, which allegedly precedes both the finite and the infinite V’s (*Je ne leur mettrai jamais de capuchon / Je n’ai pas envie de leur mettre un capuchon*). Moreover, as in Italian, its form does not change when it is constructed with a P (*à yo / a loro*), whereas in French a specialised form for these
examples does exist (à elles / à eux).

As for the distributional properties of the two different classes of pronouns, C&S say that the pronouns of the deficient series (class 2) and those of the strong one (class 1) have different distributions when constructed with Vs like French *touver* (“to find”) (19a-b). Their GC counterpart is given in (19a′-b′). Notice that the final position of the focalised pronoun is never possible in GC, as it must follow the selecting V that not only in cases of emphasis (19b′′) but also with ostension (19b′′′). Again, the parallelism between human referent and coordination does not hold in GC:

\[ [+\text{HUMAN}] \quad [-\text{HUMAN}] \]

(19a) Class 2  
*Je les (*et celles d’à coté)* trouve belles

Jean them.F (*and those besides) finds beautiful

(19a′)  
*An touvé-*yo (*épi lézot-la) bèl

I find-them (*and other-DEF) beautiful

(19b) Class 1  
*Jean trouve elles*\(^{176}\) (*et celles d’à coté)* belles

John find them.F (and those besides) beautiful

(19b′)  
*An touvé bèl \rightarrow yo* (*épi lézot-la)(pa Fabyen)

I find beautiful them (and Mary)(not Fabian)

(19b′′)  
*An touvé \rightarrow yo* épi sé lézot-la bèl

yes ?

(19b′′′)  
*An touvé \rightarrow yo* épi sé lézot la bèl

yes ?

According to C&S, this asymmetry of the French language proves that “one class [the deficient one] has an impoverished distribution w.r.t. the other [the strong one]”: whereas strong pronouns have the “distributional liberty” of the corresponding full nominal expression, “there are three types of positions a deficient pronoun cannot

\(^{176}\) Notice that this order is possible only if the pronoun *elles* is associated to a contrastive interpretation. The position is not grammatical in the unmarked order.
occupy”. These are the following:

- 0-positions;
- peripheral positions;
- c-modification and coordination.

**Θ-positions** (also called argumental or base positions) can only be occupied by pronouns and full NEs. For this reason, strong pronouns can occupy both base and derived positions, whereas deficient pronouns can only appear in argumental ones. This is shown by C&S in the examples that follow, where they illustrate the base positions of subjects (20a), and of indirect and direct objects (20b and 20c, respectively). Their GC counterparts are provided in (20a’-c’). The authors choose to exemplify these phenomena by observing the behaviour of Italian instead of that of French, which is not surprising given that in Italian the 3PS/3PP pronouns have two different phonetic realizations each depending on whether they are strong or deficient. Differently, as shown above, in French the morphosyntactic difference IS present, but it is not visible.

(20a) {Essa$_D$; lei$_S$; Maria} forse l'ha fatto {*essa$_D$; lei$_S$; Maria} da sola
   {she$_D$; she$_S$; Mary} maybe it-has done {*she$_D$; she$_S$; Mary} alone

(20a') {Io$_D$; li$_S$, Mari} di sa {*i$_D$; *li$_S$; *Mari}
   {she$_D$; she$_S$; Mary} said this {*she$_D$; *she$_S$; *Mary}

(20b) Non dirò mai {loro$_D$; *a loro$_S$; *a Gianni} tutto {*loro$_D$; a loro$_S$; a Gianni}
   Not I.will.say never {them$_D$; *to them$_S$; *to Gianni} everything {*them$_D$; to them$_S$; to Gianni}

(20b') An pé ké di {yo; *ba-yo; *ba Jan; Jan} sa {*yo; ba-yo; ba Jan; *Jan}
   I NEG IRR say {they; *to-they; *to Jan; Jan} this {*they; to-they; to Jan; *Jan}

(20c) Gianni {li$_D$; *loro$_S$; *questi studenti} stima {*li$_D$; loro$_S$; questi studenti}
   Gianni {them$_D$; *them$_S$; *these students} estimates {*them$_D$; them$_S$; these students}
(20c') Jean {yo_D; yo_S; sé fanm-lasa} enmé {yo_D; yo_S; sé fanm-lasa}
Jean {they_D; they_S; *PLUR woman DEM} love {they_D; they_S; PLUR woman-DEM}

Notice that example (20a) is not a valid test for GC because this language, as French and English, does not allow post-verbal subjects. Also, whereas Italian and French allow pre-verbal DO and IO pronouns, GC does not. This suggests that in this respect the properties of the pronouns of the former two languages might be different from those of the latter. Also, notice that (20b') seems to confirm the prediction that the double object construction might be the unmarked order for ditransitive Vs (see 5.2.1.2). In fact, the weak pronouns seem to be able to appear only when they are treated as direct objects, whereas their strong counterparts always appear in the postverbal position. Consequently, their base position is likely to be that of direct objects.

Peripheral positions can only be occupied by pronouns of the strong series and full NEs. These positions are found in marked orders like cleft sentences (21a), left dislocations (21b), right dislocations (21c), and in isolation (21d). Along with all of these examples taken from C&S, I provide a GC similar example (21a'-d'):

(21a) È {essa_D; lei_S; Maria} che è bella
It.is {*she_D; she_S; Mary} that is beautiful
(21a') Sé {i_D; li_S; Mari} ki janti
COPpres {*she_D; she_S; Mari} that nice
(21b) {*}Essa_D; lei_S; Maria}, lei è bella
{*she_D; she_S; Mari}, she is beautiful
(21b') {*}I_D; li_S; Mari}, i janti
{*she_D; she_S; Mari}, she nice
(21c) pro arriverà presto, {*}essa_D; lei_S; Maria}
ØEXPL will.come soon, {*she_D; she_S; Mary}
C-modification is triggered by adverbs that modify pronouns and full NEs (called c-modifiers): thus, as C&S explain, it can be seen on strong pronouns (22a-b), but not on deficient ones (22c-d). Predictably, this happens in GC as well (22a'-d'):

(22a) {Vraiment; seulement; …} lui
{Really; only; …} hes
(22a') {Vreman; sèlman; …} li
(22b) Lui {seul; aussi; …}
HeS {only; also; …}
(22b') Li {sèlman; osi …}
(22c) *{Vraiment; seulement; …} il
{Really; only; …} heD
(22c') *{Vraiment; seulement; …} i
(22d) *I{seul; aussi; …}
HeD {only; also; …}
(22d') I {sèlman; osi …}

As a consequence of all of these observations, C&S state that “the strong form is impossible where the deficient form is possible, and the strong form is possible where the deficient form is independently excluded”. En passant, notice that the deficient forms are excluded not only in c-modification and coordination, but also in the presence of contrastive stress and pointing gestures. This happens both in French (23a-b) and in GC (23a'-b'):
All of these data lead to some generalizations on the nature of GC personal pronouns. These generalizations are quite interesting because they had never been done before. In fact, even if the personal pronouns of GC had already been described as being either strong or weak, their distribution had never been tested in all of the contexts seen above. My systematic observation of the behaviour of personal pronouns of GC confirms the bipartition already described in the literature, but leads to the conclusion that all persons must have at their disposal two forms, a strong and a deficient one, also the pronouns that do not display a formal distinction between the two. Also, the pronouns of the deficient series might be clitic instead of weak, as suggested by the possibility of being combined with their strong counterpart (see examples (2-3)) (Cardinaletti&Starke (1999)). The fact that these clitic object pronouns systematically appear in a postverbal position is not surprising, as this possibility is observed in other languages as well (for example, in ancient Italian and in English) and might be an option offered by UG. Also, it is interesting to observe that GC allows something that is impossible in French and English, that is, the possibility of using both the pronouns of the strong and those of the deficient series as direct complement, indistinctly. This is probably due to the fact that Case-marking does not seem to be active in GC: as a consequence then, its personal pronouns do not change their form according to the Case they are assigned. Also, since my informants admit that the choice between the strong or the deficient pronoun in such cases depends on the “origins of the speaker”, it is possible that two different grammars exist. In fact, some speakers might have only the strong series at their disposal, whereas others
might have both series, and systematically choose to use the most deficient pronoun when possible, as predicted by C&S.

Also, notice that GC behaves in a way that is unexpected by C&S as it allows coordination with pronouns whose referents are [-HUMAN]. This phenomenon is quite difficult to explain for two reasons: first, it would be quite complex to affirm that GC has a strong and a deficient pronominal series like many other languages but behaves differently from all of them; second, I suspect that C&S's data are in some way incomplete. In fact, some French informants with whom I had a number of private conversations did not exclude the possibility of coordinating pronouns referred to [-HUMAN] referents, and similarly some Italian speakers of the Venetian region and I agree on saying that when there are no specialised forms for the same strong and deficient pronoun the [-HUMAN] interpretation is not always excluded in Italian. Without questioning the value of C&S's work in any way, two possible explanations can be given to these unexpected phenomena: first, it might be that C&S only took into consideration Standard Italian and French, without analysing the morphosyntax of the personal pronouns of more regionally connoted varieties of these variegated languages; second, the coordination of two pronouns might belong to a high register and seem unnatural to many informants, as instead of a construction like *elles et celles d'à coté* in everyday speech it is more common to use demonstrative pronouns, as in (24a-b). My informants confirmed these data for GC as well (24c):

(24a) *Queste e quelle accanto sono troppo grosse*  
These and those besides are too big

(24b) *Celles-ci et celles d'à coté sont trop grandes*  
These-here and those besides are too big

(24c) *Séla épi sé lézot-la two gran*  
These and PLUR other-DEF too big

As a consequence, it might be interesting to verify whether the coordination/
[+HUMAN] generalization fails to describe also other varieties of Italian and French, and other languages and dialects. Maybe, studying a fair amount of languages that behave like GC could help finding more generalizations or sharpening C&S's ones. Moreover, it would also be interesting to verify whether this feature and that of the lack of Case of GC are systematically found in combination or not.

To conclude, the table of GC personal pronouns should be analysed as follows, that is, just changing the labels assigned to the two pronominal series from strong/weak into strong/clitic, and postulating that the pronouns that were described as only having a strong form actually have two of them: a strong and a deficient one, which have the same phonological form but different structural and syntactic properties. Then, basing the analysis on C&S, I postulate that *nou* (“we/us”) and *yo* (“they/them”) are in fact composed of *nous/noud* and *yos/yod*. Also, the pronouns of GC should no longer be divided into subject and object, as all of them can occupy different positions depending not on a S/DO/IO distinction but on the distributional properties described in C&S.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Clitic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mwen</td>
<td>An</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vou</td>
<td>Ou/w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li</td>
<td>I/y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nous</td>
<td>Noud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zôt</td>
<td>Zòt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yos</td>
<td>Yod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I will not go any further in the description of GC personal pronouns, as such judgements of grammaticality are very difficult to obtain when it is not possible to have face-to-face conversations with the informants. An even deeper comparative study of the micro- or macro-variations found in the pronominal systems of all of the French-creoles of the Caribbean and Bourbonnais areas could be an excellent subject for future research.
9.2 Possessive pronouns

In chapter 8 we observed that in GC possession can be expressed by means of a determiner or by a N+P+N sequence. Possessive pronouns indicate the possessor of something but occur independently, as they must be free in their governing category. Germain (1976) and Bernabé (1983) (among others) claim that the internal structure of the singular form is *ta(n)-personal pronoun-DEF*, whereas that of the plural one is *séla-personal pronoun-DEF*, as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular referent</th>
<th>Plural referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sp</td>
<td>Tan-mwen-la</td>
<td>Séla-an-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sp</td>
<td>Ta-w-la</td>
<td>Séla-w-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sp</td>
<td>Ta-y-la</td>
<td>Séla-y-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>Tan-nou-la</td>
<td>Séla-an-nou-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>Ta-zot-la</td>
<td>Séla-zôt-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>Ta-yo-la</td>
<td>Séla-yo-la</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, according to the traditional literature on GC the pronoun for the 1st plural person would constitute an exception to the general rule when its referent is plural: in fact, the P-*an-* is inserted between *séla* and *nou*, which does not happen in all other cases.

However, my informants seem to use different forms of possessive pronouns, which requires a modification of the traditional theory. The examples in (25a-f for the singular,) and (25a'-f' for the plural forms) are instances of S possessive pronouns:

(25a) *Kaz a-w gran, tan-mwen(-la) piti*
   
   House of you big, of-me(-DEF) little
   
   “Your house is big, mine is little”

(25b) *Maman-mwen dous, ta-w(-la) osi*
   
   Mother-me sweet, of-you(-DEF) too
   
   “My mother is very sweet, your too”
Mari an-mwen ka rantré ta léswa, ta-y(-la) ka ranté a senkèdswa
Husband of-me HAB come.home late evening, of-she(-DEF) HAB come.home at 17
“My husband gets home late in the evening, hers gets home at 5pm”

Manman-y dous, janmè tan-nou(-la) pa ka rédé nou
Mother-she kind, never of-us(-DEF) NEG HAB help us
“Her mother is kind, ours never helps us”

Fanmi an-mwen ka rédé-mwen onlo, men ta-w(-la), awa
Family of-me HAB help-me a.lot, but of-you(-DEF), no
“My family helps me a lot, whereas yours don't”

Pap-an-mwen ka pwan byen épi nou, ta-yo(-la) séryé kon pen rasi
Father-of-me HAB take well with us, of-they(-DEF) serious like bread rotten
“My father is very nice, theirs is extremely serious”

Désen a-w bèl toubòlman, (sé) tan-mwen(-la) lèd
Drawing of-you nice extremely, (PLUR) of-me(-DEF) ugly
“Your drawings are beautiful, mine are bad”

Chat an-mwen blan, tout (sé) ta-w(-la) nwè
Cat of-me white, all (PLUR) of-you(-DEF) black
“My cat is white, yours are all black”

Sé chyen an-mwen-la ka fè on pakyèt dèzòd, (sé) ta-w(-la) pa ka jen japé
PLUR dog of-me-DEF HAB do a lot noise, (PLUR) of-you(-DEF) NEG HAB never bark
“My dogs are very noisy, yours never bark”

Sé tonton a-zòt-la rich, (sé) tan-nou(-la) razè, razè, razè
PLUR uncle of-you(PL)-DEF rich, of-us poor poor poor
“Your uncles are very rich, ours are poor”

Timoun an-mwen zanti, (sé) ta-zòt(-la), awa
Child of-me good-mannered, (PLUR) of-you(PL)(-DEF), no
“My children are good-mannered, yours are not”
In the following examples the possessive pronouns are the object (26a-f singular, 26a'-f' plural) of the sentence, but their form does not undergo any variation:

(26a) *Pwennbik a-w kasé, an ka prété-w tan-mwen(-la)*

Pen of-you broken, I PROGR lend-you of-me(-DEF)

“Your pen is broken, I'll lend you mine”

(26b) *Kréyon an-mwen pa ka maché, ou ka ban-mwen ta-w(-la) ?*

Pencil of-me NEG PROGR work, you PROGR give-me of-you(-DEF)

“My pencil doesn't work, will you give me yours?”

(26c) *Bisikèt an-mwen byen, men an pisimé ta-y(-la)*

Bike of-me good, but I prefer of-she

“My bike is not bad, but I prefer hers”

(26d) *Si ou enmé chokola, an ka konséyé-w gouté tan-nou(-la)*

If you love chocolate, I PROGR advise-you try of-us(-DEF)

“If you love chocolate, I advise you to try ours”

(26e) *An té ké enné adopté tout sé chyen-lasa, man an pisimé ta-zòt(-la)*

I ANT IRR love adopt all PLUR dog-DEM, but I prefer of-you(-DEF)

“I'd love to adopt all of these dogs, but I prefer yours”

(26f) *Si ou kontan bèl kaz, an ka konséyé-w alé vizité ta-yo(-la)*

If you happy nice house, I PROGR advise-you go visit of-them(-DEF)

“If you like nice houses, I advise you to go visit theirs(SG)”

(26a') *An enné chyen a-w, lè ou ké vin Pari an ké montré-w (sé) tan-mwen(-la)*

I love dog of-you, when you IRR come Paris I IRR show-you (PLUR) of-me(-DEF)

“I love your dogs, when you come to Paris I'll show you mine(PL)”
(26b) *Mi timoun an-mwen ! An té kè byen enné kontré sé ta-w(-la) on jou*

Here child of-me ! I ANT PROGR well love meet (PLUR) of-you(-DEF) one day

“Here's my children! I'd love to meet yours too one day”

(26c) *Gato a-w té bon men an pisimé (sé) ta-y(-la)*

Cookie of-you ANT good but I prefer (PLUR) of-her(-DEF)

“Your coockies were good, but I preferred hers(PL)”

(26d) *Si ou enmé chyen, pasé vvè (sé) tan-nou(-la)*

If you love dog, come see (PLUR) of-us(-DEF)

“If you love dogs, come see ours(PL)”

(26e) *Timoun an nou byen édiké, moun ja palé-mwen anbyen dé (sé) ta zòt(-la) tou*

Child of-me well-mannered, person already talk-me good of (PLUR) of-you(PL)(-DEF) too

“My children are well mannered, and they told me yours(PL) are too”

(26f) *Sé bonbon an-mwen-la pa té mové mé, fout !, mwen enmé (sé) ta-yo(-la)*

PLUR cake of-me-DEF NEG ANT bad but geez! I love (PLUR) of-they(-DEF)

“My cakes weren't bad, but geez! I loved theirs(PL)”

All of these examples show that there is an important formal difference between the possessive pronouns described in the literature *(Online course on GC, Germain (1976), Bernabé (1983), among others)* and those actually used by my informants. In fact, the plural paradigm does not seem to exist, which could mean both that it has disappeared or that it has never existed in GC. The description of possessive pronouns as having distinct forms for singular and plural referents could be over-generalizations, that is, descriptions grouping under the label of *Lesser Antillean Creole* or just *Creole* a number of different varieties. As happens very often in fact, in this case the paradigm described by scholars is that of Martinican Creole, not of all of the varieties of Caribbean French-based creoles. Also, the use of these new forms, (partially) attested by Poullet&Telchid (2010), could constitute part of the natural evolution of GC.
Following the examples above, the trend at work in GC seems to be that of using the same form both for singular and plural referents, no matter whether they are subjects or objects, with or without the DEF-marker. Notice also that the plural form can actually be preceded by the PLUR-marker sé, but the use of this element is not consistent. Of course, when sé appears the overt expression of the DEF-marker is compulsory. Notice that, when asked if a (singular or plural) possessive is grammatical with -la or a plural possessive with sé, my informants always confirm that it is so. Nonetheless, when asked to translate a French sentence containing a possessive pronoun into GC, they tend to omit both the DEF-marker and the PLUR-marker. Notice also that this phenomena cannot be due to a misinterpretation of the original sentence, and this because all of my informants are native speakers of French, but also because (differently from English) French has specialised possessive pronouns for each person, with an actual difference between forms associated to singular and plural referents.

Thus, the actual paradigm of possessive pronouns of GC is summarized in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Singular referent</th>
<th>Plural referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sp</td>
<td>Tan-mwen(-la)</td>
<td>(Sé) tan-mwen(-la)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sp</td>
<td>Ta-w(-la)</td>
<td>(Sé) ta-w(-la)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sp</td>
<td>Ta-y(-la)</td>
<td>(Sé) ta-y(-la)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pp</td>
<td>Tan-nou(-la)</td>
<td>(Sé) tan-nou(-la)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pp</td>
<td>Ta-zot(-la)</td>
<td>(Sé) ta-zot(-la)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pp</td>
<td>Ta-yo(-la)</td>
<td>(Sé) ta-yo(-la)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.3 Demonstrative pronouns

Demonstrative pronouns are pro-forms used to substitute a full NE containing a demonstrative determiner. For example, the English phrase “this book” (DET+N) corresponds to the pronominal expression “this (one)”, exactly as in Creole the NP
“liv-lasa” (book-this) can be substituted by the pronoun “sila” (this). We will see that, as it is often the case in this language, there are no distinctive forms for feminine and masculine referents. Nevertheless, Creole demonstrative pronouns do vary, namely along two distinct parameters related to the referent: its number (whether it is singular or plural) and its proximity to/distance from the speaker and the listener of the utterance. As all other pronouns, they obey Principle B of the Binding theory (Chomsky (1989)), and must be free in their governing category. In fact, the relationship they bear to their antecedent is non-local.

The table below groups all of the demonstrative pronouns of Guadeloupean Creole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>M/F</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Singular</td>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>Sila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Sala/ Tala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plural</td>
<td>Proximity</td>
<td>Sa / a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance</td>
<td>Séla</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in the table, for the singular pronouns the situation is the same as in English (that has two distinct forms for proximity and distance, namely *this* and *that*), whereas when the referent is plural the opposition proximity/distance (expressed in English by the forms *these/those*) is lost in the morphology of Guadeloupean Creole. Thus, in GC this opposition can only be understood thanks to the linguistics context, as only the form *séla* is available. In fact, the form *sé-tala*, once used for plural referents and marked by a [+proximity] feature, seems to have completely disappeared. Moreover, notice that the form *sala*, completely disappeared in the related Creole spoken in Martinique, is still found in Guadeloupe. Nonetheless, it is important to keep in mind the fact that the use of *tala* is definitely more frequent. Also, it is important to keep in mind that these forms are used for both masculine and feminine referents, both animate and inanimate.

Moreover, differently from English but similarly to French, GC has the pronominal form *sa*, which is used as a pro-form for neuter and clausal referents. Notice that also
the reduced neuter demonstrative pronoun *a* is used to introduce cleft negative sentences. Despite the frequency with which this pronoun appears in the discourse of GC people, it is not mentioned in the literature on the language. Its morphosyntax is discussed in chapter 5.

The following examples contain instances of pronouns referring to masculine or feminine entities (27a-c for singular referents, 27d-f for plural ones), to neuter ones (28a-f), and of cleft sentences introduced by *a* (29a-d). Notice that the pronouns in (27a-e) could refer both to [+ANIMATE] and [+HUMAN] referents. Also, the example in (27f), where one of my informants used the form *séla* followed by the DEF-marker, suggests that there might be a new trend at work of distinguishing the proximal from the distal plural pronoun by adding -*la* to the former:

(27a) **Sila pli piti ki sala/tala**
This more little than that
“This (one) is smaller than that (one)”

(27b) **Ban-mwen sila, i agou an-mwen**
Give-me this, it liking my
“Give me this (one), it is to my liking”

(27c) **Sila sé li yonn tousèl an tê pé rivé a pwan pou zanmi**
This COP pres the one all alone I ANT can arrive at take for friend
“This person is the only one I managed to make friends with”

(27d) **Sélal toujou an rita**
These/those always at delay
“These people are always late”

(27e) **Séla ou vé pa tann la, sé yo ka palé plis**
These/those you want NEG hear DEF₂, COP₃ pres they HAB speak more
“Those you don't want to listen, it's them who talk the most”

(27f) **Pran séla-la, yo ka santi pli bon**
Take these-DEF, they HAB smell more good
“Take these ones, they smell nicer”
(28a) **Sa pa bon**
This NEG good
“It/that isn't good”

(28b) **An gadé sa**
I look this
“I looked at this”

(28c) **Sa sê réyèl**
This COP\textsubscript{pres} real
“This is real”

(28d) **Ou pé di sa**
You can say this
“You can say that”

(28e) **Sa pa pé soupwann-mwen onlo**
This NEG can impress-me a lot
“That couldn't impress me much”

(28f) **Su posib**
This possible
“It/that is possible”

(29a) **Si on nomn pa ka bwè womm, a pa on nonm sé on zongnon !**
If a man NEG HAB drink rhum, this NEG a man COP\textsubscript{pres} an onion
“That's not a man but a little child!”

(29b) **A pa èvè-nou ou ka jwé**
This NEG with-us you PROGR play
“It's not with us you're gonna mess”

(29c) **A pa té ponmoun i té konnèt**
This NEG ANT nobody he ANT know
“That wasn't anyone he knew”

(29d) **A pa an tan an-mwen ou té kay fè pon granmoun sa**
This NEG at time of-me you ANT HAB.go do any adult this
“You couldn't treat adult people like that when I was younger”
9.4 Interrogative pronouns

Interrogative pronouns are pro-forms that stand for an unknown element, that is, the one that is questioned. As the morphosyntax of interrogative clauses will be analysed in chapter 7; in this chapter I just list the interrogative pronouns of GC, and give some examples (30-35):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Referent(s)</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kimoun</td>
<td>[+HUMAN]</td>
<td>S / DO / IO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilès</td>
<td>[+HUMAN]</td>
<td>S / DO / IO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibèt</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]+ANIMATE</td>
<td>S / DO / IO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kisa</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>S / DO / IO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibiten</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>S / DO / IO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kijan</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimmanyè</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O(la)</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kikotè</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otila</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pa si koté</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitan</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)kilè</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poukisa</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(A)konmen</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>Adv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ka</td>
<td>[-HUMAN]-ANIMATE</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(30a) **Kimoun ou yé ?**

Who you COP<sub>int</sub>

“Who are you?”

(30b) **Kimoun ou vwè ?**

Who you see

“Who did you see?”
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(30c) **Kimoun ou ba sa ?**
Who you give this
“To whom did you give this?”

(31a) **Kilè (adan zòt) ka chanté ?**
Who (inside you(PL)) PROGR sing
“Which one of you is singing?”

(31b) **Kilè (adan yo) ou ka vwè ?**
Who (inside them) you PROGR see
“Which one of them can you see?”

(31c) **Kilè (adan yo) ou ba sa ?**
Who (inside them) you give this
“To which one of them did you give this?”

(32a) **Kibèt ka japè konsa ?**
Which(animal) PROGR bark like this
“Which animal is barking like this?”

(32b) **Kibèt ou kouyé yè ?**
Which(animal) you kill yesterday
“Which animal did you kill yesterday?”

(32c) **A kibèt ou donné yonn koudpyé ?**
To which(animal) you give a kick
“Which animal have you kicked that way?”

(33a) **Kisa/kibiten ka santi bon ?**
What PROGR smell good
“What smells (so) good?”

(33b) **Kisa/kibiten ou pòtè ?**
What you bring
“What did you bring?”
(33c) **Kisa/kibiten ou ba on tjouk?**
What you give a tjouk
“To what did you give punch?”

(34a) **Kijan ou maré kravat a-w la?**
How you tie tie of-you DEF
“How did you tie your tie?”

(34b) **Kimannyè yo fè pasè?**
How they do pass
“How did they manage to pass?”

(34c) **O(la) yo sòtì**
Where they come from
“Where did they come from?”

(34d) **Oti’la ou rivé la**
From where you arrive here
“From where did you get here?”

(34e) **Kikoté yo kay**
Where they PROGR go
“Where are they going?”

(34f) **Pa si koté yo ka rété**
To on corner they HAB live
“In which zone do they live?”

(34g) **Kitan/(a)kilè ou ké vini?**
When you IRR come
“When will you come?”

(34h) **Poukisa ou ka poupoulé-y?**
Why you PROGR tease-he
“Why are you teasing him?”

(34i) **Akonmen nou yé?**
How many we COP
“How many are we?”
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9.5 Indefinite pronouns

Indefinite pronouns are pro-forms substituting full NEs with an indefinite meaning, ranging from no one/nothing to everybody/everything. As other pronouns, their forms do not vary along with their syntactical functions, so as they can occupy every nominal position in the sentence without undergoing morphological variations. They behave exactly the same they do in English. This type of pronominal forms has already been massively studied in the traditional works on GC (Moïse (2005), Bernabé (1983), but also Poullet&Telchid (2010)). I will just list the most frequent ones in the table that follows, and then give some concrete examples in (36a-n):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moun</td>
<td>“One”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On moun</td>
<td>“Someone/somebody”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponmoun</td>
<td>“No one/nobody”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chakmoun</td>
<td>“Everybody/everyone/each one”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiék moun</td>
<td>“Someone/somebody”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nenpôt-kilès/nenpôt-kimoun</td>
<td>“No matter who”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Déotwa/dotwa/détwa</td>
<td>“A few/a little”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Désèrten moun</td>
<td>“Some people”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayen/ahak/angnen</td>
<td>“Nothing/anything”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kèchôz</td>
<td>“Something”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponyonn</td>
<td>“No one/none/nobody”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(36a) *Moun pa ka fè dézòd lékol*
One NEG HAB make mess school
“You don't/one doesn't mess in school”

(36b) *On moun manjé koko an-mwen*
Someone eat coconut of-me
“Someone ate my coconut”

(36c) *Ponmoun pa té vini*
Nobody NEG ANT come
“Nobody came”

(36d) *Chakmoun té pòtè on bwason*
Each one ANT bring a soft drink
“Each one brought a soft drink”

(36e) *Si kyèk moun vini, di-y an pa la*
If someone come, tell-her I NEG here
“If someone should come, tell her I am away”

(36f) *Nenpòt-kilès adan-yo pé vini*
No.matter.who inside-them can come
“Each one of them can come”

(36g) *An sé moun-la, anki déotwa ki ho*
In PLUR person-DEF, there a.few that tall
“Among these people, there are a few tall ones”

(36h) *Dèsèrten moun enné menti*
Some person love lie
“Some people love lying”

(36i) *Ou vé pa angnen/ahak*
You want NEG nothing
“You don't want anything”

(36j) *Ba-y kèchòz pou i arété palé!*
Give-her something for her stop talk
“Give her something (to drink) to make her stop talking!”
(36m) *Ponyonn adan-yo pa vini*
None inside-them NEG come
“None of them did not come”

(36n) *Yo pa ta ponmoun*  
They NEG that.of nobody
“They don't belong to anybody”

Notice that GC has no polarity items of the type of English *anybody/nobody*. As a consequence of the lack of this distinctions, pronouns like *ponmoun* (“nobody/anybody) and *angnen* (“nothing/anything”) are used in all contexts.
Chapter 10
On relative clauses and their structure

In this chapter I will outline a detailed description of the morphosyntax of relative clauses, focusing my attention on Guadaloupean Creole and making systematic comparisons to other French-based Creoles as well as to English, French and Italian. The chapters are organized as follows: after a brief generic overview of relative clauses and their structure (10.1), the relative clauses of Guadeloupean Creole are analysed in depth (10.2), making a distinction between subject relative clauses (10.2.1), direct object relative clauses (10.2.2) and indirect object relative clauses (10.2.3); in (10.2.4) some observations on the use of wh-like elements in GC are carried out, and then the morphosyntax of free relative clauses of this language is described briefly (10.3). At the end of this work (Appendix 1), a corpus of relative clauses can be found.

Before starting the description of how RCs behave in GC, let us just discuss briefly some fundamental issues on the nature and structure of relative clauses in general. Not to over-complicate this work, throughout the following sections I will adopt the simple analysis of RCs proposed by Haegeman&Guéron (1999)'s, postulating that relative clauses are phrasal modifiers of the noun phrase, exactly as the adjectives and phrasal modifiers in (1a-c):

(1a) \[NP[\text{A question } [\text{AP related to this problem }]]\] will be dealt with later
(1b) \[NP[\text{The issue } [\text{PP behind this problem }]]\] will be dealt with later
(1c) \[NP[\text{The question } [\text{CP which is related to this problem }]]\] will be dealt with later

Relative clauses are introduced by a relative pronoun (either explicit or null) situated in the COMP of the relative clause which anaphorically refers to the noun phrase it modifies. The noun phrase that plays the role of antecedent of the relative pronoun is...
also referred to as the *head of the relative clause*. Relative clauses can be of two different types: they can either restrict the reference of the noun phrase they belong to or add a secondary predication which does not modify the reference of the noun. Relative clauses of the first type are referred to as *restrictive* (2a-b), whereas those of the second type are called *non-restrictive* or *appositive* (2c-d). For more clarity, I put all relative pronouns (and later all relativizers) in bold:

(2a) *The person who you asked for help is my neighbour*
(2b) *The book which you bought yesterday was published almost 50 years ago*
(2c) *Mary, who you asked for help, is my neighbour*
(2d) *'Syntactic Structures', which you bought yesterday, was published almost 50 years ago*

In English, restrictive relative clauses can be constructed with a *null relative pronoun*, that is, a relative pronoun present in the structure but not realized in the phonetic string. In such cases, the complementator *that* or the null complementator appear, as in (3a-b):

(3a) *The person (that) you asked for help is my neighbour*
(3b) *Mary, (that) you asked for help, is my neighbour*

In Italian the complementator *che* can be used with both types of relative clauses, whereas the relative pronoun *il quale* only appears in appositive relative clauses whose antecedent is human and not in the S position (4a-e):

(4a) *Il libro che è appena uscito è già esaurito*
   The book that is just published is already sold out
   “The book that has just been published is already sold out”
(4b) *Il libro il quale è appena uscito è già esaurito*
   The book the which is just published is already sold out
   “*The book which has just been published is already sold out*”
(4c) Ho rivisto Marco, il quale è stato molto gentile
I saw Marco, the which is been very kind
“"I saw Marco, who has been very kind, again”"

(4d) Harry Potter 2002, che è appena uscito, è già esaurito
Harry Potter 2002, that is just published, is already sold out
“"Harry Potter 2002, that has just been published, is already sold out”"

(4e) *?Harry Potter 2002, il quale è appena uscito, è già esaurito
Harry Potter 2002, which has just been published, is already sold out
“"*?Harry Potter 2002, which has just been published, is already sold out”"

Interestingly, French has two different complementizers whose distribution depends on the grammatical function of the antecedent. *Qui* is used when the referent is in the S position or is constructed with a P (and thus is an IO), whereas *que* is used for DOs. These complementizers are compatible both with restrictive (5a-c) and appositive relative clauses (5d-f) and cannot be omitted in any case (5a'-f'):

(5a) Le garçon qui t'aime s'appelle Jean
The boy that.S you.CL love himself.CL call Jean
“The boy that loves you is called Jean”

(5b) Le garçon que tu aimes s'appelle Jean
The boy that.O you love himself.CL call Jean
“The boy that you love is called Jean”

(5c) Le garçon à qui tu parles est Jean
The boy to that you speak is Jean
“The boy to whom you're speaking is Jean”

(5d) Antoine, qui t'aime, est un bon ami
Antoine, that.S you.CL love is a good friend
“Antoine, that loves you, is a good friend”

(5e) Antoine, que tu aimes, est un bon ami
Antoine, that.O you love is a good friend
“Antoine, that you love, is a good friend”
Antoine, à qui tu parles, est un bon ami

Antoine, to that you talk, is a good friend

“Antoine, to whom you're speaking, is a good friend”

(5a') *Le garçon Ø t'aime s'appelle Jean

“The boy Ø loves you is called Jean”

(5b') *Le garçon Ø tu aimes s'appelle Jean

“*The boy Ø you love is called Jean”

(5c') *Le garçon à Ø tu parles est Jean

“*The boy to Ø you're speaking is Jean”

(5d') *Antoine, Ø t'aime, est un bon ami

“*Antoine, Ø loves you, is a good friend”

(5e') *Antoine, Ø tu aimes, est un bon ami

“*Antoine, Ø you love, is a good friend”

(5f') *Antoine, à Ø tu parles, est un bon ami

“*Antoine, to Ø you're speaking, is a good friend”

Differently, the relative pronoun *lequel* is only compatible with appositive relative clauses whose antecedent is a S (6a-d) and with restrictive and appositive relative clauses whose antecedent is an IO (7a-d):

(6a) *Le garçon *lequel* t'aime s'appelle Jean

The boy who you.CL loves himself.CL call Jean

“*The boy who loves you is called Jean”

(6b) *Le garçon *lequel* tu aimes s'appelle Jean

The boy who you love himself.CL call Jean

“*The boy who you love is called Jean”

(6c) Antoine, *lequel* t'aime, est un bon ami

Antoine, who you.CL loves, is a good friend

“Antoine, who loves you, is a good friend”
(6d) *Antoine, lequel tu aimes, est un bon ami
   “*Antoine, who you love, is a good friend”

(7a) Le garçon auquel tu parles s'appelle Jean
    The boy to-who you speak himself.CL call Jean
    “The boy to whom you're speaking is called Jean”

(7b) Le garçon duquel tu parles s'appelle Jean
    The boy of-who you talk himself.CL call Jean
    “The boy about whom you're talking is called Jean”

(7c) Antoine, auquel tu parles, est mon ami
    Antoine, to-who you speak, is my friend
    “Antoine, to whom you're speaking, is my friend”

(7d) Antoine, duquel tu parles, est mon ami
    Antoine, of-who you talk, is my friend
    “Antoine, about whom you're talking, is my friend”

10.1 Relative clauses in Guadeloupean Creole

In the previous section much attention was paid to the behaviour of French relative clauses because it is very important to make a parallel between their morphosyntax and that of the relative clauses in GC. In the present chapter, I show how relative clauses work in CG, making a distinction between relative clauses whose antecedent is a S (10.2.1) and those whose antecedent is a DO (10.2.2) or an IO (10.2.3). Of course, I systematically show both the behaviour of restrictive RCs and of appositive ones. I also make distinguish between the behaviour of relative pronouns and complementizers. Finally, a discussion on free relative clauses is be held in (10.2).

The relative clauses of CG have not been deeply investigated yet. The only statement on relative clauses of GC made by Poullet&Telchid (2010) is that “with the

178 Auquel is the contraction of the P+relative pronoun construction à lequel (that cannot appear in the uncontracted form).
179 Similarly to auquel, duquel is the contraction of the P+relative pronoun construction de lequel (that cannot appear uncontracted).
exception of the [French] relative pronoun\textsuperscript{180} “qui” that is translated as \textit{ki} or \textit{i}, all other relative pronouns do not have an actual translation [my translation]”. These unexpressed relative pronouns are commonly considered null pronouns and the position they occupy in the structure is signalled by means of the symbol Œ (Ludwig\textit{&alii}, 2002). Bernabé (1999), in the chapter dedicated to relative clauses (\textit{Leçon 46}), explains that the same phenomenon also occurs in Martinican Creole (henceforth, MC), and introduces the usage of the resumptive DP-final definiteness marker \textit{la}. I will describe the functioning of this peculiar element more in detail later. Bernabé also introduces the syntax of the relative pronoun\textsuperscript{181} \textit{éti}, which can optionally co-occur with the (overt or covert) complementizer. Nevertheless, as this element is peculiarly martinican I will not focus my attention on it. Damoiseau (2012) confirms what Bernabé had already said and adds a very important consideration, namely the fact that “in the four creoles [Martinican, Guadaloupean, Guyanese and Haitian], some speakers copy French “que” [and realize it] as \textit{kè, ke} or \textit{ki}” [my translation]. I will discuss this issue briefly in the following sections. Of course, other authors have investigated the subject over the years, but none of them has done so in depth. The only exception is constituted by Delumeau (2006), a PhD thesis in which the author takes into account a number of complex structures of GC from the point of view of the \textit{génération automatique d’énoncés} (NLP). I will quote his work massively throughout this work, and borrow many of his examples.

As far as I know, nobody has ever described the relative clauses of GC by making a distinction between restrictive and appositive ones, which I will systematically try to do in the next chapters. Moreover, I do not think that anybody has ever distinguished between different types of \textit{relativizers}\textsuperscript{182}, possibly because no generative analysis of the RCs of GC has been carried out yet. Differently, in section 10.1.4 I try to make a distinction between \textit{complementizers} and \textit{relative pronouns}, be they overt or covert.

\textsuperscript{180} I disagree with this definition, as I consider \textit{qui} to be a \textit{complementizer}, not a relative pronoun.

\textsuperscript{181} I suggest this element should be considered a relative pronoun because it co-occurs with the (overt or covert) complementizer.

\textsuperscript{182} I suggest the term \textit{relativizer} should be used in the literature to refer to any element, be it overt or null, that introduces a relative clause, when we do not want to take position on the nature of the element itself (that is, when we do not want or cannot say whether it is a complementizer or a relative pronoun).
The corpus I used for this chapter consists in more than 200 relative clauses that I extracted from the book Tiprens-la, all of which can be found in Appendix 1. I also used a number of RCs that I elicited from my informants.

10.1.1 Subject relative clauses

Subject relative clauses have a NE as an antecedent. As Bernabé (2003) and Poullet&Telchid (2010) (among others) correctly pointed out, these RCs are introduced by the complementizer *ki*, which is likely to derive straightly from the French complementizer *qui*. Let us now observe a number of examples that I elicited through a translation task. Notice that not only is the form *ki* possible, but all of my informants also accept the use of its reduced counterpart *i*.

However, Delumeau (2006) says that subject and object relative clauses should not be introduced by any relativizer, which I do not agree with. In fact, subject relative clauses are always introduced by a complementizer, be it *i* or *ki*. Not considering *i* a relativizer is a big mistake, because if it was a simple pronoun it would change according to the antecedent of the embedded clause, which is not the case. The examples of subject relative clauses given by Delumeau (2006) are those in (8a-b). As you can see, they are introduced by *i*. If *i* was a pronoun rather than a relativizer, it would be possible to change the antecedent of the relative clause and use other pronouns, for example *yo* (“they”), which is not possible (9a-b).

(8a) *An vwè ti-boug la (k)i jiré-w yè-la*
   I see child DEF that insult you yesterday-DEF
   “I saw the child that insulted you yesterday”

(8b) *Fò-w kriyé boug-la (k)i ka okipé-y dè jaden-la*
   Must-you call guy-DEF that HAB occupy-he of garden-DEF
   “You must call the guy who does the gardening”
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For this reason and differently from Delumeau, I postulate that \textit{i} is relativizer, or better the reduced equivalent of the French-like relativizer \textit{ki} or even its predecessor\textsuperscript{183}. In 4.2.1.1, I demonstrate that the situation is actually a complex one, as the omission of any type of relativizer seems to be possible in some cases, although this does not justifies Delumeau's analysis of \textit{i} as a personal pronoun in the sentences that I discussed before. Differently, I totally agree with him when he says that object relative clauses should always be introduced by a null complementizer as in (10a), and that the use of \textit{kè} is substandard (10b):

\begin{enumerate}
\item[(10a)] \textit{I présanté-mwen boug-la Ø Pòl bizwen kyuyé-la}
\textit{She introduce-me guy-DEF Ø Paul want kill-DEF}
\textit{“She introduced me to the guy that Paul wants to kill”}
\item[(10b)] \textit{I présanté-mwen boug-la kè Pòl bizwen kyuyé-la}
\textit{She introduce-me guy-DEF that Paul want kill-DEF}
\textit{“She introduced me to the guy that Paul wants to kill”}
\end{enumerate}

Damoiseau (2012) explains that these two phenomena are present in other creoles as well, as you can see from the examples of subject (11a-c) and object (12a-c) relatives that I borrowed from his work\textsuperscript{184}:

\begin{enumerate}
\end{enumerate}

\textsuperscript{183} It is likely that the original form of the relativizer is \textit{i}, in which case \textit{ki} would be but a later French influence. This seems to be confirmed by the fact that the most prestigious form is \textit{i}, as \textit{ki} is rarely found in written texts. If this prediction was correct, it would be incorrect to call \textit{i} the contraction of \textit{ki}. However, as I lack evidence to be sure about this and as it is not a crucial point for the present work, I will not take a precise position and leave the answer for a future work.

\textsuperscript{184} I do not agree with Damoiseau's analysis according to which in object relatives the DO would be a “élément charnière” (linking element) between the main clause and the relative clause. In my opinion in fact, the cohesion between these two elements is assured by the presence of a (null) relativizer in the CP-layer. For this reason, I will not adopt Damoiseau's transcription and simply
(11a) *Man wè tifi-a ki ka travay épì'w la*  
I see girl-DEF that HAB work with you DEF  
“I saw the girl with whom you work”

(11b) *Mo wè tifi-a ki ka travay ké to a*  
I see girl-DEF that HAB work with you DEF  
“I saw the girl with whom you work”

(11c) *Mwen wè tifi a ki ap travay ak ou a*  
I see girl DEF that HAB work with you DEF  
“I saw the girl with whom you work”

(12a) *Man wè tifi-a ou té kriyé a*  
I see girl-DEF you ANT call DEF  
“I saw the girl (that) you had called”

(12b) *Mo wè tifi to té aplé a*  
I see girl you ANT call DEF  
“I saw the girl (that) you had called”

(12c) *Mwen wè tifi ou te rele a*  
I see girl you ANT call DEF  
“I saw the girl (that) you had called”

But let us now see how restrictive and appositive subject relative clauses work in GC. I will leave the description of the behaviour of direct and indirect object relative clauses respectively in (10.1.2) and (10.1.3).

### 10.1.1.1 Restrictives RCs

To describe the functioning of relative clauses of GC, I asked my informants to translate the following French sentences (13a-f). As the structure of French RCs has already been discussed in depth above, I do not give the glosses. I put the relativizers in bold:

Insert the symbol Ø between the antecedent of the relative clause and the relative clause itself, as to indicate the presence in the structure of a phonetically non-realized functional element.
(13a) *La fille qui chante bien est Martina, celle qui chante mal est Marie*

“The girl that sings nicely is Martina, the one that sings badly is Marie”

(13b) *La fille qui danse avec Emmanuel est Marie, celle qui danse avec Fabien est Martina*

“The girl that is dancing with Emmanuel is Marie, the one that is dancing with Fabian is Martina”

(13c) *La fille qui est en couple avec Jean aime Fabien, celle qui est en couple avec Fabien préfère Jean*

“The girl that is in a relationship with Jean loves Fabian, the one that is in a relationship with Fabian prefers Jean”

(13d) *La fille qui t'a présenté Jean s'appelle Sylvie*

“The girl that has introduced you to Jean is called Sylvie”

(13e) *La fille qui t'a fait un bisou est ma petite soeur*

“The girl that kissed you is my little sister”

(13f) *La fille qui t'a offert ce cadeau est amoureuse de toi*

“The girl that gave you a present is in love with you”

The translations are those in (13a'-f'). I will discuss some minor differences found in the translations done by my informants in the footnotes (15-17). As many of them do not know how to write GC, I asked them to write it freely and then tried to adapt their writing to the rules suggested by Moïse (2005). Notice that the omission of the overt complementizer is not ungrammatical. This is something I was not expecting to find in my data, as all the literature seems to deny the possibility of constructing a restrictive relative clause whose antecedent is a S with a covert complementizer. Apparently, then, these clauses can show the presence of two complementizers: an overt one, *ki* (or *i*), and a covert one, Ø (14a'-c'):

(13a') *Fi-la ki ka chanté byen (la) sé Martina, tala¹⁸⁵ ki ka mal chanté (la) sé Marie*

Girl-DEF that PROGR/HAB sing well (DEF) COP Martina, the-one that PROGR/HAB bad sing (DEF) COP marie

¹⁸⁵ Also *sila* is possible.
(13b') * Fi-la *ki* ka dansé avè Emmanuel (la) sé Marie, tala *ki* ka dansé avè Fabien (la) sé Martina
   
   Girl-DEF that PROGR dance with Emmanuel (DEF) COP Marie, the-one that
   PROGR dance with Fabian (DEF) COP Martina

(13c') * Fi-la *ki* ka soti avè Jean (la) enné Fabien, tala *ki* ka soti avè Fabien (la)
   préféré Jean
   
   Girl-DEF that PROGR date with Jean (DEF) love Fabian, the-one that
   PROGR date with Fabian (DEF) prefer Jean

(13d') * Fi-la *ki* présenté-w Jean (la), (nom a-y) sé Sylvie
   
   Girl-DEF that introduce-you jean (DEF), (name of-she) COP Sylvie

(13e') * Fi-la *ki* bo-w186 (la) sé ti sè an-mwen
   
   Girl-DEF that kiss-you (DEF) COP little sister of-me

(13f') * Fi-la *ki* ba-w on kado (la) amourèz dè-w187
   
   Girl-DEF that give-you a present (DEF) in-love of-you

(14a) [...] tala ka mal chanté sé Marie
   
   […] the-one Ø PROGR bad sing COP Marie

(14b) [...] tala ka dansé avè Fabien sé Martina
   
   […] the-one Ø PROGR dance with Fabian COP Martina

(14c) [...] tala ka soti avè Fabien préféré Jean
   
   […] the-one Ø PROGR date with Fabian prefer Jean

Notice that, in my elicited clauses, the zero-complementizer seemed to be possible only when the antecedent was a demonstrative pronoun. However, this is not always true, as it is also possible with other nominals (15a-c). Sentences of this type closely resemble to their gerundive French counterparts in (15a'-c'):

(15a) * On rina *ka sanm sanmil dot rina
    
    A fox Ønat HAB look.like hundred.thousand other fox
    
    “A fox that looks like hundred thousand other foxes”

---

186 Also *ki ba-w on bo* and *ki fê-w on bo* (“that gave you a kiss”) are possible.
187 Also *enné-w* is possible (“loves you”).
(15b) *Sé moun ka fè Fwans-la*  
   PLUR person Øthat HAB do France-DEF  
   “The people who went to France”

(15c) *Sèl biten ka fè-mwen lapenn*  
   Only thing Øthat HAB do-me sorrow  
   “The only thing making me struggle”

(15a’) *Un renard ressemblant à cent mille d'autres renards*  
(15b’) *Les gens habitant en France*  
(15c’) *La seule chose me faisant de la peine*

Also, notice the possibility of inserting what seems to be a *resumptive definiteness marker* (*la*) at the very end of the *definite nominal expression* containing a relative clause. Its presence in the NE is not obligatory and it is more often used in very long and heavy NE (as a *definiteness reminder*) than in short and light ones. It delimits the rightmost border of the definite NE containing a relative clause, so it is *always* inserted at the very end of the NE. Notice that in writing I found it in *every* definite relative clause I analysed, whereas its presence in the oral production is not always guaranteed. It is likely that the language is undergoing a structural simplification due to reasons of *linguistic economy*: probably today the second definiteness marker *la* is more and more omitted when its absence from the sentence does not give rise to ambiguity.

**10.1.1.2 Appositive RCs**

In order to elicit appositive subject relative clauses, I asked my informants to translate the following French clauses into GC (16a-f):

(16a) *Martina, qui chante bien, est ma copine*  
   “Martina, that\(^{188}\) sing nicely, is my friend”

---

\(^{188}\) I use the English complementizer *that* and not the relative pronoun *who* because the very original French sentence is constructed with a complementizer.
(16b) *Marie, qui chante mal, est ma copine*

   “Marie, that sings nicely, is my friend”

(16c) *Martina, qui danse avec Fabien, est très belle*

   “Martina, that is dancing with Fabian, is very beautiful”

(16d) *Martina, qui danse avec Emmanuel, est très gentille*

   “martina, that is dancing with Emmanuel, is very kind”

(16e) *Caterina, qui aime Fabien, est en couple avec Jean*

   “Caterina, that loves Fabian, is in a relationship with Jean”

(16f) *Martina, qui préfère Jean, est en couple avec Fabien*

   “Martina, that prefers Jean, is in a relationship with Fabian”

The translations are those in (16a'-f'). As for restrictive relative clauses, also in appositive ones both the complementizer *ki* and its contracted counterpart *i* are accepted. Also, the omission of the overt complementizer seems to be possible, which was not expected because the literature on GC does not talk about this option.

En passant, notice that the resumptive definiteness marker *la* is never used in appositive relative clauses:

(16a') *Martina, ki ka chanté bien, sé copin an-mwen*

   Martina, that PROGR sing well, COP friend of-me

(16b') *Marie, ki ka chanté mal, sé copin an-mwen*

   Marie, that PROGR sing bad, COP friend of-me

(16c') *Martina, ki ka dansé épi Fabien, bien bèl*

   Martina, that PROGR dance with Fabian, very beautiful

(16d') *Martina, ki ka dansé épi Emmanuel, bien jenti*

   Martina, that PROGR dance with Emmanuel, very nice

(16e') *Caterina, ki enmé Fabien, (ka soti) èvè Jean*

   Caterina, that love Fabian, (HAB date) with Jean

(16f') *Martina, ki préfère Jean, (ka soti) èvè Fabien*

   Martina, that prefer Jean (HAB date) with Fabian
Interesting enough, one of my informants never constructed the appositive relative clauses as expected and, instead of a relativizer of any type, preferred to use either a resumptive demonstrative pronoun (17a-b) or a resumptive NE (17c-f). The resumptive NEs and pronouns are those in **bold**:

(17a) *Martina, *sila\(^{189}\) *ka chanté byen, sè zanmi an-mwen*

Martina, the-one PHAB/PROGR sing well, COP friend of-me

“Martina, the one that sings/is singing nicely, is a friend of mine”

(17b) *Martina, *sila *ka mal chanté, sè zanmi an-mwen*

Martina, the-one HAB/PROGR bad sing, COP friend of-me

“Martina, the one that sings/is singing badly, is a friend of mine”

(17c) *Martina, *fanm-la *ki ka dansé avè Fabien, fout\(^{190}\) *i bèl*

Martina, woman-DEF that PROGR dance with Fabian, EXCL she beautiful

“Martina, the woman that is dancing with Fabian, she's nice!”

(17d) *Martina, *fanm-la *ki ka dansé avè Emmanuel, fout i genti*

Martina, woman-DEF that PROGR dance with Fabian, EXCL she nice

“Martina, the woman that is dancing with Fabian, she's nice!”

(17e) *Caterina, *fanm-la *ki enmé Fabien, i ka soti avè Jean*

Caterina, woman-DEF that love Fabian, she HAB date with Jean

“Caterina, the woman that loves Fabian, is in a relationship with Jean”

(17f) *Martina, *fanm-la *ki préféré Jean, i ka soti avè Fabien*

Martina, woman-DEF that prefer Jean, she HAB date with Fabian

“Martina, the woman that prefers Jean, is in a relationship with Fabian”

Notice that this special use could be due to the high level of computational difficulty of appositive relative clause, or to the fact that this type of relative clauses is rarely

---

189 The GC demonstrative pronoun is said to be *tala*. Nonetheless, even if *sila* should be Martinican, many of my informants tend to use it, which makes me think of the possibility that there might be some influence by MC at work. This is not unpredictable, as the two varieties are spoken in rather close places and that their linguistic closeness is likely to give rise to confusions. Moreover, let us not forget that many Guadaloupean people were born and raised in mixed Guadaloupean-Martinican families.

190 *Fout* is an exclamative marker, that always occupies the first position in exclamative clauses. *Fout i bèl!* is the equivalent of the French constructions *Qu'est-ce qu'/qu'elle est belle!* Thus, FR *que/qu'est ce que* and GC *fout* seem to behave exactly in the same way in exclamative contexts.
used in spontaneous production. This was confirmed to me by Guglielmo Cinque\textsuperscript{191}, who taught me that the presence of this phenomenon in GC is not surprising, as it is quite common in almost every (oral) language. Interestingly, during a test I did last year with native speakers of a variety of the Venetian dialect\textsuperscript{192}, I observed that the majority of people did not compute appositive relative clauses correctly either, whereas everybody perfectly understood and produced restrictive ones.

Maybe, inserting a resumptive pronoun or NE is a way of simplifying the interpretation of the relative clause, which in this way actually turns into a restrictive one. Moreover, notice that in (17e-f) the relative clause is a restrictive one (and is separated from the rest of the clause by a pause), and the S is resumted by means of a personal pronoun (in the examples above, I underlined it), as happens in Clitic Left Dislocation (henceforth, CLD).

10.1.2 Direct Object relative clauses

Object relative clauses have as their antecedent a DO, and can be both restrictive or appositive. I will analyse object relative clauses that take an IO as their antecedent later (10.1.3). Object relative clauses (be they direct or indirect) are not dealt with in the linguistic literature, where they are just said not to be introduced by any complementizer or, rarely, by the French-like forms I listed in (10.1). Concerning the speakers who produce such unexpected Creole relativizers, Delumeau (2006) says that “accusés de parler un créole « trop francisé », les locuteurs qui utilisent ces formes relatives le font d'une manière automatique, témoignant de la grande variation dans la langue créole et de l'influence du français sur cette dernière\textsuperscript{193}”. I totally agree with this analysis. Nevertheless, I think that GC relative clauses must always be introduced by both a possessive pronoun and a complementizer, be they overt or covert.

\textsuperscript{191} Private communication.
\textsuperscript{192} The test was done for the redaction of a term paper.
\textsuperscript{193} I prefer to use the original French sentence because it is more effective than the English counterpart: “The speakers who use these forms are accused of speaking a Creole “francisé” and, as it is natural for them to do so, their behaviour is an evidence of the huge range of variation found in this Creole language and of the influence that French has on it”.
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10.1.2.1 Restrictive RCs

The French sentences containing a restrictive object relative clause that I had my informants translate into GC are the following (18a-f):

(18a) *La fille que tu regardes s'appelle Caterina*
     “The girl that you're looking at is called Caterina”
(18b) *La fille que tu aimes est partie eux Etats-Unis*
     “The girl that you love has left for the US”
(18c) *L'homme que tu as connu à la fac est mon père*
     “The man that you met at university is my dad”
(18d) *La pomme que je t'ai donnée était pourrie*
     “The apple that I gave you was rotten”
(18e) *La fille que je t'ai présentée est gentille*
     “The girl that I introduced you to is nice”
(18f) *Le cadeau que tu m'as offert était beau*
     “The present that you gave me was beautiful”

The translations I got from my informants are the following (18a'-e'):

(18a') *Fi-la ou ka gadé (la) (nom a-y) sé Caterina*
     Girl-DEF Ø you PROGR watch DEF (name of-she) COP Caterina
(18b) *Fi-la ou enmé (la) pati Ozétazuni*
     Girl-DEF you love (DEF) go United-States
(18c') *Boug-la ou jwen à linivevsitè (la), sé pè an-mwen*
     Man-DEF Ø you meet in university (DEF), COP dad of-me
(18d') *Ponm-la an ba-w (la) té gatè*
     Apple-DEF Ø I give-you (DEF) ANT rotten
(18e') *Fi-la an présenté-w (la) té jenti*
     Girl-DEF Ø I introduce-you (DEF) ANT nice
As you can notice, exactly as happens in S restrictive relative clauses, in these RCs it is possible to find the resumptive definiteness marker la, which I put into brackets in the examples. Moreover, notice that when the French-like complementizer kè is used (which rarely happened in the clauses that my informants translated) the personal pronoun that introduces the relative clause always belongs to the strong series\textsuperscript{194}, as in (19a-b):

\begin{quote}
(19a) Tifi-la kè mwen présenter-w (la) jenti
Girl.DEF that I introduce-you (DEF) nice
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(19b) Kado la kè ou ban-mwen (la) té bèl
Present-DEF that you give-me (DEF) ANT beautiful
\end{quote}

**10.1.2.2 Appositive RCs**

The French sentences containing an appositive object relative clause that I had my informants translate into GC are the following (20a-f):

\begin{quote}
(20a) Martina, que tu aimes beaucoup, est ma meilleure amie
“Martina, that you love a lot, is my best friend”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(20b) Caterina, que Jean préfère à Martina, est très belle
“Caterina, that Jean likes better than Martina, is very beautiful”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(20c) Fabien, que tu ne connais pas, est le recteur de cette université
“Fabian, that you don't know, is the president of this university”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(20d) Martina, que Jean aime, est ma femme
“Martina, that Jean loves, is my wife”
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
(20e) Jean, que nous connaissons depuis toujours, est très gentil
“Jean, that we've known for ages, is very nice”
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{194} The discussion of personal pronouns is held in chapter 9. Notice that in the clauses in which the complementizer kè appears the personal pronoun is always strong.
(20f) *Emmanuel, que tu aimes comme un frère, est mon copain*

“The Emmanuel, that you love as a friend, is my friend”

The translations by my informants are those in (20a'-e'). Notice that, in this peculiar type of relative clauses, the French-like complementizer *kè* is never omitted:

(20a') *Martina, kè ou enmè onpil, sé mèyè zanmi an-mwen*

Martina, that you love a-lot, COP best friend of-me

(20b') *Caterina, kè Jean préféré à Martina, bien bèl*

Caterina, that Jean prefer to Martina, very beautiful

(20c') *Fabien, kè ou pa connet, sé rectè à université-la*

Fabien, that you NEG know, COP president of university-DEF

(20d') *Martina, kè Jean enmè, sé fanm an-mwen*

Martina, that Jean love, COP woman of-me

(20e') *Jean, kè nou konnet dépi toujou, genti onpil*

Jean, that we know since always, nice a-lot

(20f') *Emmanuel, kè ou enmè konm on fwè, sé zanmi an-mwen*

Emmanuel, that you love as a brother, COP friend of-me

Notice that once again, as noted with S appositive relative clauses, sometimes my informants preferred to use a resumptive demonstrative pronoun (21a-b) or a resumptive nominal (21c-e) and turned the relative clause into a restrictive one, instead of constructing an actual appositive relative clause. I suggest that these examples should be given the same analysis I proposed in (9.1.1.2).

(21a) *Martina, tala ou bien enmè, sé mèyè zanmi an-mwen*

Martina, the-one you a-lot love, COP best friend of-me

“Martina, the one you really love, is my best friend”

(21b) *Caterina, tala Jean préféré a Martina, bien bèl*

Caterina, the-one Jean prefer to Martina, very beautiful

“Caterina, the one that Jean prefers to Martina, is very beautiful”
(21c) *Martina, fanm-la ou enmè onpil (la), sé mèyè zanmi an-mwen*
   Martina, woman-DEF you love a-lot (DEF), COP best friend of-me
   “Martina, the woman that you really love, is my best friend”

(21d) *Caterina, fanm-la Jean enmè pliss ki Martina, fout i bèl*
   Caterina, woman-DEF Jean love more than Martina, EXCL she beautiful
   “Caterina, the woman that Jean loves more than Martina, she's beauriful!”

(21e) *Fabien, boug-la ou pa konnèt (la), missië sé rektè a l(université-la)*
   Fabien, man-DEF you NEG know (DEF), man COP pres. of university-DEF
   “Fabian, the man you don't know, the man is the president of the university”

Notice that in (21d) we have an instance of clitic resumption, whereas in (21e) the informant even decided to resumpt the dislocated NE by means of another full NE. All of these examples seem interesting to me, as they have never been cited in the linguistic literature on GC so far.

**10.1.3 Indirect Object relative clauses**

In this chapter we will observe the morphosyntax of relative clauses whose antecedent is an IO. We will see that, on the whole, they behave exactly as DO relative clauses do, even in the use of resumptive NEs and the consequent transformation of appositive relative clauses in restrictive ones. For this reason, I will not analyse these clauses as in depth as I did for DO relative clauses, and address the reader to my discussion in 10.1.2.2.

**10.1.3.1 Restrictive RCs**

Restrictive IO relative clauses seem to be always constructed with a null complementizer. My informants never used the French-like complementizer *kè* in their translations, but its presence is not excluded. The French sentences I had my informants translate are those in (22a-c) and the translations are those in (22a'-c'):
(22a) La fille dont tu parles est Marie
   “The girl you are talking about is Mary”
(22b) Le garçon dont tu parles est mon copain
   “The boy you are talking about is my friend”
(22c) La fille dont tu apprécies la sincérité est ma fille
   “The girl whose sincerity you appreciate is my daughter”

(22a') Fanm-la ou ka palé ban-mwen la sé Marie
   Woman-DEF Ø you PROGR speak to-me DEF COP Marie
(22b') Tioug-la ou ka palé ban mwen la sé zanmi an-mwen
   Boy-DEF Ø you PROGR speak to-me DEF COP friend of-me
(22c') Tifi-la ou enmé sincérité a-y sé fi an-mwen
   Girl-DEF Ø you love sincerity of-she COP daughter of-me

As for other types of indirect object relative clauses, Delumeau (2006) says that “the French relative construction à qui does not have an equivalent in Guadaloupean creole”. The example he gives (22d) is the GC correspondent of French “l’homme à qui j’ai parlé”:

(22d) Nonm-la an palé ba-y la
   Man-DEF Ø I talk to-him DEF
   “The men I talked to”

We observe that, in such cases, the relativizer is null (as can be seen in the gloss, where I put the symbol Ø), and the syntax of the embedded clauses is more similar to that of English (in which there can be pied-piping of the preposition) than to that of French (in which pied piping is not possible). The difference between GC and English in this case is that in the former the sentence ends with the definiteness marker (la).
10.1.3.2 Appositive RCs

Appositive IO relative clauses show the same phenomena we observed in DO relative clauses. Once again, I think that these special uses should be considered a direct consequence of the computational complexity of appositive relative clauses, which are often hard both to understand and to produce. In order to observe their behaviour, I asked my informants to translate into GC the clauses in (23a-c):

(23a) *Marie, dont tu m'as beaucoup parlé, est ta meilleure amie*
    “Mary, about whom you spoke me a lot, is your best friend”

(23b) *Antoine, dont tu m'as beaucoup parlé, est mon ami maintenant*
    “Antoine, about whom you spoke me a lot, is my friend now”

(23c) *Marie, dont tu apprécies la sincérité, est ma fille*
    “Marie, whose sincerity you appreciate, is my daughter”

As happens in DO appositive relative clauses, the French-like complementizer *kè* must always be expressed in IO appositive relative clauses as well (24a-b). Also in this type of relative clauses the strategy of *nominal resumption* (and transformation of the appositive relative clause into a restrictive one) is used, as in (25a-c). I translate the clauses that contain a resumptive nominal expression, which I underline:

(24a) *Marie, kè ou palé-mwen onpil dé-y, sé meillé zanmi a-w*
    Marie, that you talk-me a-lot of-she, COP best friend of-you

(24b) *Antoine, kè ou palé-mwen onpli dé-y, sé zanmi an-mwen jodijou*
    Antoine, that you talk-me a-lot of-he, COP friend of-me today

(24c) *Marie, kè ou enné sincérité a-y, sé tifi an-mwen*
    Marie, that you love sincerity of-she, COP daughter of-me

(25a) *Marie, fanm-la ou palé-mwen la, sé meillé zanmi a-w*
    Marie, woman-DEF you talk-me DEF, COP best friend of-you
    “Marie, the woman you talked me a lot about, is your best friend”
(25b) Antoine, misyé-la ou palé-mwen la, sè zanmi an-mwen jodijou
Antoine, man-DEF you talk-me DEF, COP friend of-me now
“Antoine, the man you talked me a lot about, is now my friend”

(25c) Marie, fanm-la ou enmé sincérité la, sè tifi an-mwen
Marie, woman-DEF you love sincerity DEF, is daughter of-me
“Marie, the woman whose sincerity you appreciate, is my daughter”

Notice that my youngest speaker also accepts the possibility of using the French-like relativizer *don*, as in (26a-c):

(26a”) Marie, don ou palé-mwen onpil, sè meillè zanmi a-w
(26b”) Antoine, don ou palé-mwen onpil, sè zanmi an-mwen jodijou
(26c”) Marie, don ou enmé sincérité, sè tifi an-mwen

This very special use, that seems to be refused by all the other informants and is never found in writing, is in my opinion a clear signal of a linguistic levelling towards French that GC is undergoing among the young.

10.1.4 On the use of wh-like elements

In the book *Tiprens-la*, I noticed the use of two different wh-like elements in relative clauses: *ola* (“where”) (27a-c) and *otila* (“from where”) (28a-c). These examples constitute a very little part of my corpus, namely 6 out of about 200 relative clauses:

(27a) Tout tè *ola* moun ka rété
All land where person HAB live
“Each land where people live / each inhabited land”

(27b) Prêmyé koté *ola* moun ka viv
First place where people HAB live
“The first place where people live / the first inhabited place”
Nevertheless, when I tried to elicit some clauses containing a wh-element, I never succeeded in the task. In fact, all my informants tended to avoid using those types of elements and modified the original relative clause, namely maintaining the semantics but not the structures. In the following examples (29-31), (a) constitutes the French sentence I asked my informants to translate and (b-d) their translations. They never translated the French relative clause containing a wh-element with a correspondent relative clause in CG:

(27c) On planèt ola on fennyan té ka rété
    A planet where a lazy bone ANT HAB live
    “A planet where a lazy bone lived”

(28a) Planèt-la otiila i té soti la
    Planet-DEF from-where he ANT come DEF
    “The planet from where he had arrived”

(28b) Planèt-la otiila Tiprens-la té soti la
    Planet-DEF from-where Littleprince-DEF ANT come DEF
    “The planet from where the Little Prince had arrived”

(28c) Planèt-la otiila i soti la
    Planet-DEF from-where he come DEF
    “The planet from where he came”

(29a) Le pays d'où tu viens est très chaud
    “The country where you come form is very hot”

(29b) Ka fè cho an péyi-la ou soti la
    Do hot in country-DEF you come DEF
    “It is hot in the country you come (from)”

(29c) An péyi-la ou ka vin la, ka fè cho mem
    In country-DEF you HAB come DEF, Ø HAB do hot also
    “In the country you come (from), it is hot”
(29d) Péyi-la ou ka vin la trè cho
Country-DEF you HAB come DEF very hot
“The country you come (from) is very hot”

(30a) Le pays où tu es né est très froid
“The country where you were born is very cold”

(30b) Ka fè frèt an péyi-la ou fèt la.
Ø HAB do cold in country-DEF you born DEF
“It is cold in the country (where) you were born”

(30c) An péyi la ou fèt la, ka fè fwet menm
In country-DEF you born DEF, Ø HAB do cold also
“In the country (where) you were born, it is very cold”

(30d) Péyi-la ou fèt très fwa
Country-DEF you born very cold
“The country (where) you were born is very cold!”

(31a) Le jour où je t’ai connu j’étais très heureuse
“The day (when) I met you I was very happy”

(31b) An té tèhman hérèz jou-la an jwen vou
I ANT Ø so happy day-DEF I meet you
“I was so happy the day I met you”

(31c) Jou-la mwen konnet vou, an té kontan menm
Day-DEF I meet you, I ANT Ø happy also
“The day I met you, I was very happy”

These structures might be either too difficult from a computational point of view and thus tend to be avoided, or these wh-like elements are not well-known by the whole population. It is possible that they belong to a stylistic register which only educated Creole-speaking people know and use.
10.2 Free relative clauses in GC

The relative clauses described so far were headed relative clauses, that is, RCs containing a head. Namely, the head of these nominal modifiers is their antecedent. Differently, free relative clauses are free in the sense that they are not bound to any head. In a sense, they can be interpreted as containing a head which is clearly understood in the context. For example, an English free RC like *Where we met* is interpreted as *The place where we met*, with [the place] being the hidden antecedent.

In GC, free RCs are always introduced by wh-elements, as the use of complementizers would probably make the sentence too difficult to compute. The examples in (32a-c) are instances of GC free relative clauses.

(32a) *Lè you ka mandé-y si i vé mayé*  
When Ø that you HAB ask-her if she want marry  
“When you ask her if she wants to get married”

(32b) *Sa yo té mandé-w fé*  
What Ø that they ANT ask-you do  
“What you were asked to do”

(32c) *Toutlè ou té vlé*  
Every.time Ø that you ANT want  
“Everytime you wanted”

However, notice that the examples of free RCs were extremely limited in number, especially if compared to the massive number of occurrences of headed RCs.
Conclusions

The aim of this dissertation is that of providing a description of the core grammar of Guadeloupean Creole. The work was done with the help of previous studies, of a large corpus of written examples, and of native speakers who provided additional examples and judgements of grammaticality. The approach adopted for the redaction of this work has been mainly descriptive and comparative. In fact, many comparisons between the grammar of Guadeloupean Creole, English, French and other French-based creoles were systematically made. My main desire was that of showing which phenomena were authentically “Guadeloupean”, thus making a distinction between this language and other varieties of French creoles. Also, I tried to point out how today this language is changing in the direction of French among the youngest generations, and I showed that some beliefs about these languages are actually incorrect and can be changed by means of a deep analysis of its grammar.

In this work I showed that Guadeloupean Creole is syntactically independent from French, in fact, despite the lexical similarities and some grammatical correspondences, the DP- and IP-layers of the two languages are very different. A few similarities do exist, but they actually work at a very superficial level, whereas the deepest structures of Guadeloupean Creole do not resemble those of French: they are either original, or African-derived, or they originated from French but underwent a process of grammaticalization or specialization in their use. Nonetheless, we must note that some structures are changing in the direction of French today: they can be accounted for either admitting that French is so socially prestigious that it is taken as a model by speakers of Guadeloupean and/or postulating that this linguistic evolution is a natural process.

I also showed that most phonological phenomena of this language can be accounted for as ways of adapting the phonology of loanwords to its phonology and of simplifying their syllabic structure. These phenomena were at work when French words were borrowed in the passage to Guadeloupean and are still at work when new
words are borrowed today.

Also, I argued that it is not correct to say that Guadeloupean and all other French-based creoles are morphologically poor languages, as morphological poverty only affects their functional morphology. The lack of inflectional morphology observed in Guadeloupean creole is a common characteristic of all French-based Creoles: as a generalization, it is possible to say that no functional morphology is visible on Ns and As (Case, Gender, Number), and that their verb systems have very little functional morphemes belonging to the IP-layer. As pointed out in the Introduction and explained in detail in Part 3, the TMA system is common not only to all French-based creoles, but also to a massive number of Creole languages of different descent, which raises some questions on creole genesis and seems to suggest that in the process that gave birth to Creoles the UG might have been at work (Part 3). In fact, all French-based creoles do not have any functional verbal suffix, but rather a very small number of rigidly ordered pre-verbal morphemes carrying Tense, Mood, Aspect and Agreement features. These TMA markers, widely described in the linguistic literature, should probably be analysed more in detail to understand their actual origins. I believe that understanding why French-based Creole languages have so little inflectional morphology could probably help their syntactic description as well. Moreover, given their common origins and similarities, a comparative approach to their micro- and macro-morphosyntactic variation could be preferable.

When analysing the XP movements of wh-interrogatives and of various types of dislocations, I demonstrated that the former is justified by the checking of a [+INT] feature associated with the CP-layer, whereas the latter are driven by the necessity of placing a salient element in a position of Topic or Focus. Predictably, all changes with respect to the unmarked order are associated to a peculiar meaning.

To study the VP of this language, I made a distinction between lexical and functional verbs basing my description on the number of selected arguments and on the type of theta-roles assigned by the different verbs. This analysis led to the postulation of the
existence of different classes of Vs: transitive, ditransitive and monoargumental verbs, as well as verbs of different types which take a complement containing a bare-stem V and/or modify the thematic structure of their internal argument. This description is quite interesting, as it explains the reasons behind the massive number of occurrences of bare-stem verbs in this language (see Appendix 3), which had never been investigated before.

I also described the peculiar behaviour of the expletive i and pointed out the possible existence of two different grammars. In fact, Guadeloupean Creole is a non-pro-drop language, but the variety spoken by the oldest speakers seems to be pro-drop as far as expletives are concerned, whereas the variety of the youngest is on the whole non-pro-drop. The re-setting of this Parameter might have been influenced by French, which is strictly non-pro-drop and uses il as an expletive.

Also, I showed that all types of appositive relative clauses turn out to be computationally difficult, since they are either constructed with resumptive nominals or avoided and turned into restrictive relative clauses. These phenomena are very interesting and suggest that their computational complexity might make it difficult for most speakers to produce them. This might be due to the fact that very few constructions of this type are found in oral languages: in fact, when analysing Guadeloupean one should never forget that this language is more used in oral than in written productions, so it is not surprising that it should be so. I also argue that the morphosyntax of GC relative clauses massively resembles to that of French. This similarity might be related to the fact that the former derived directly from the latter. Also, Guadeloupean relative clauses might be a late French loan, and not belong to the original Creole grammar. In fact, as relative clauses are very complex from a computational point of view, it is possible to state that maybe that they did not appear in the grammar of ancient Antillean Creole and were simply borrowed from French in a second moment. The generalization of the forms “kè, ke and ki” in object relative clauses could then constitute the completion of this process of francisation that is affecting the Nominal Expressions of this language (and of other Antillean Creoles as
well). As a consequence, a good theoretical account of the morphosyntax of these nominal modifiers in GC should probably be based on a systematic comparison with French.

This dissertation, which I would like to enlarge in the future, is the result of a 3-year research which would not have been possible without the precious help of Giuliana Giusti and of all of the Creole people with whom I had the chance to work. Even though some other interesting aspects of this language have not been analysed here, I hope that this work, along with all other works on creoles, will help Creole people understand that the kréyol languages they speak are not dialects or instances of broken French, but genuine languages with regular grammars and patterns common to all the idioms spoken worldwide. In fact, as all other languages, creoles develop, change, borrow and influence, can be attached to stigma or prestige and might die. For these reasons, Creole people should not be afraid of speaking their native languages and of teaching them to their children. This should be done in order to prevent these idioms from fading away, as a real praise of Creoleness.
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Appendix 1
Corpus of relative clauses

The following table lists a large number of examples of relative clauses taken from the books Tiprens-la and Poullet&Telchid (2010). For each example, the source is indicated in the rightmost column, whereas the nature of the relative clause and its relativizer\(^*\) are described in the left columns. The symbols used in the table are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOrC</td>
<td>Direct object relative clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRe</td>
<td>Free relative clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrC</td>
<td>Indirect object relative clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Null relativizer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>Subject relative clause.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X're</td>
<td>Non-argumental relative clause.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^*\) Notice that I use the term relativizer because I do not want to take position on the nature of the element introducing the relative clause, even though \((k)i/kê\) are likely to be complementizers and \(ola/lê\) etc look as wh-elements (and so they might be relative pronouns).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Relativizer</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>A pa té ponmoun i té konnèt</em></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This NEG ANT nobody Øₜₜ that he ANT know “That wasn't anyone he knew”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Sa ou rivé v韦</em></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This Øₜₜ you arrive see “What you could see”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Oν kolyé-chou anlò manman-mwen té lêsè ban-mwen</em></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A necklace golden Øₜₜ mother-me ANT leave to-me “A golden necklace my mother had left me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Tousa ou té ni pou f韦</em></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All Øₜₜ you ANT have do “All you were supposed to do”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>On bon rézon fo-zòt pwan an konsidérasyon</em></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A good reason Øₜₜ must-you take in consideration “A good reason (that) you must take into consideration”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>On mouton nou pa konnèt</em></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A mutton Øₜₜ we NEG know “A mutton (that) we don't know”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Onsèl biten i f韦</em></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only one thing Øₜₜ he do “The only thing he did”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Zafè mo-la ou pwan avè-y la</em></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thing death-DEF Øₜₜ you take with-it DEF₂ “The death thing you [keep in mind] along with it”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Kach-né anlo a-y-la i pa jan té ka kitè la</em></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarf golden of-he-DEF Øₜₜ he NEG never ANT HAB leave DEF₂ “The golden scarf he would never go without”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>On dlo-tijé yo ka étenn</em></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A gush Øₜₜ they PROGR turn-off “The only thing you [keep in mind] along with it”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>“A gush they're stopping”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Dëzod-la an fè la Mess-DEF Ø₃ that I do DEF₂ “The mess I did”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Tout koté moun ka rété Every place Ø₃ person HAB live “Every inhabited place”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Tout bèlté a kado a nwèl an té ka risivwè All beauty of present of christmas Ø₃ that I ANT HAB get “All the beauty of the Christmas presents I used to be given”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Maché-la nou maché Walk(N)-DEF Ø₃ we walk “All of the path we walked through”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>On tou yo fouyé dièktèman an sab-la A hole Ø₃ they dig directly in sand-DEF “A hole they dug on the sand”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Dënyé tigout dlo-la an té ni èvè mwen Last little.drop water-DEF Ø₃ I ANT have with me “The last little drop of water I had with me”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Tan-la an pèd ba woz an-mwen-la Time-DEF Ø₃ I lose to rose of-me-DEF “The time I lost for my rose”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Tan-la ou pèd ba woz a-w-la Time-DEF Ø₃ you lose to rose of-you-DEF “The time you lost for you rose”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Biten yo obliyé bon obliyé la Thing Ø₃ they forgot well forgot DEF₂ “Things they had forgotten for good”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Sé onsel montangn-la i té janné konnèt la PLUR only mountain-DEF Ø₃ he ANT ever known DEF₂ “The only mountains he has ever known”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>Liv pli enpotan i ni</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| DOrc | Book most important Ø that he have
“The most important book he has” |
| --- | --- |
| TP | *Chèz a-y i té ka ralé*
Chair of-him Ø that he ANT HAB trail
*“His chair that he used to trail”*
| TP | *Désant an solèy an lanmè i té kay chèché limenm limenm a-y an tan lontan*
Setting of sun in sea Ø that he ANT HAB.go look himself himself of-he in time far
*“The settings of the sun behind the sea he himself had been looking for a long time before”*
| TP | *Travay-la an ka fè la*
Work-DEF Ø that I HAB do DEF₂
*“The work I do”*
| TP | *Travay-la i ka fè la*
Work-DEF Ø that he HAB do DEF₂
*“The work he does”*
| TP | *Lidè sè granmoun-la té ni*
Idea Ø that PLUR adult-DEF ANT have
*“The ideas that adult people had”*
| TP | *Milyon a sè tibiten-la moun ka vvè délè adan syèl-la*
Million of PLUR little.thing-DEF Ø that person HAB see sometimes in sky-DEF
*“Millions of those things we see sometimes in the sky”*
| TP | *Lantou-la i fè koté-lasa*
Tour-DEF he do corner-DEM
*“The tour he made on that spot”*
| TP | *Lantou-la an fè owa Wa-la*
Tour-DEF Ø that I do around King-DEF
*“The tour I made around the King”*
| TP | *Chapo-la ou ka poté la*
Hat-DEF Ø that you HAB/PROGR wear DEF₂
*“The hat you wear/you're wearing”*
| TP | *Lenbè a désant a solèy an lanmè a-y-la i té raté la*
| DOrc | Ø | **Sorrow of setting of sun in sea of-him-DEF Ø**<sub>that</sub> he ANT miss DEF<sub>2</sub>  
``The sorrow for the sun setting behind the sea he had missed”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Désant an lannè a solèy-la ou mandé la**  
Descent in sea of sun-DEF Ø<sub>that</sub> you ask DEF<sub>2</sub>  
``The setting of the sun in the sea you asked for”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Lod an ka bay**  
Order Ø<sub>that</sub> I HAB give.he  
``The orders I give to him”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **On lod an ka ba-w**  
An order Ø<sub>that</sub> I PROGR give-you  
``An order I give you”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Mouton an-mwen i té ni an poch a-y**  
Mutton of-me Ø<sub>that</sub> he ANT have in pochet of-he  
``My mutton, which he kept in his pocket”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Sé dè tipawol i di**  
PLUR two little.word Ø<sub>that</sub> he say  
``The very few things he said”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Lakontantman i té yé**  
Happiness Ø<sub>that</sub> he ANT COP<sub>past</sub>  
``The happiness (that) he felt”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Mouton-la ou vlé-la**  
Mutton-DEF Ø<sub>that</sub> you want-DEF<sub>2</sub>  
``The mutton (that) you want”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Sé dè onsèl désen-la an té sav fè la**  
PLUR two only drawing-DEF Ø<sub>that</sub> I ANT know do DEF<sub>2</sub>  
``The only two subject I could draw”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Tout kouyon an té ka touvé sa kouyon lwen bon lwen-la**  
All idiotic Ø<sub>that</sub> I ANT PROGR find this idiotic far very far-DEF  
``Despite the stupid I thought this was”** |
| DOrc | Ø | **Désen limèwo 1 an-mwen-la an toujou ka gadé asi mwen**  
**TP** |
| DOrc | Ø | Drawing number 1 of-me-DEF $\theta$ that I always HAB have on me “My first drawing, which I always have with me” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Plibon potré [...] an rivé fè dè-y* Best portrait $\theta$ that I arrive do of-he “The best portrait of him (that) I managed to do” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Lidé an té ni asi-yo* Idea $\theta$ that I ANT have on-they “What I thought about them” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Sé bok-la désen limëwo 1 ë désen limëwo 2 an mwen té pwan* PLUR failure-DEF $\theta$ that drawing number 1 and drawing number 2 of me ANT take “The failures that my first and second drawing experienced” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Lonnè a timoun-la granmoun-lasa té yé antanlontan* Honour of child-DEF $\theta$ that adult-DEM ANT COP past past “The honour of the child (that) this adult was a long time ago” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Plibon zanmi an ni asi Latè* Best friend $\theta$ that I have on Earth “The best friend (that) I have” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Sé pyëwoz-la yo ka sanm onlo la* PLUR plant.rose-DEF $\theta$ that HAB seem a.lot DEF “The plant of roses that they look like” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Lison-la an té ka bay la* Lesson-DEF $\theta$ that I ANT HAB give.he DEF “The lesson (that) I was giving to him” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Onsèl anmizman ou të ni* One.just amusement $\theta$ that you ANT have “The only amusement you had” |
| DOrc | Ø | *Mi sa i té ka sanm* Here what $\theta$ that he ANT PROGR seem “Here's what it looked like” |
| Doe | Ø | On flè asifi i gadè-y pou i santi kyè a-y kontan | A flower Øₜₐₜₜ be.sufficient he look-it for he feel heart of-he happy  “A flower he just needed to see to feel happy” | TP |
| Doe | Ø | Flè la ou enmé la | Flower DEF Øₜₐₜₜ you love DEF₂  “The flower you love” | TP |
| Doe | Ø | On grenn kèk moun té menné dèpi kek koté ponmoun pa té konnèt ola | A seed Øₜₐₜₜ some person ANTbring from some place nobody NEG ANT know where  “A seed someone had brought from an unknown place” | TP |
| Doe | Ø | Tousa i té ni si kyè a-y | All Øₜₐₜₜ he ANT have on hearth of-he  “Everything he felt inside of him” | P&T |
| Doe | Ø | Fanm eskandalèz ou ka tann palé é ri | Woman scandalous Øₜₐₜₜ you PROGR hear speak and laugh  “Scandalous women you can hear speak and laugh” | P&T |
| Doe | Ø | Tousa ou vlé | All Øₜₐₜₜ you want  “Everything you desire” | P&T |
| Doe | Ø | On manjè toutmoun pa'a manjè | A food Øₜₐₜₜ everybody NEG'HAB eat  “A dish that isn't eaten by everybody” | P&T |
| Doe | Ø | Tala nou jwenn yè la | The.one Øₜₐₜₜ we join yesterday DEF₂  “The one we joined yesterday” | P&T |
| Doe | Ø | Moun-la an ka palé-w la | Person-DEF Øₜₐₜₜ I PROGR speak-you DEF₂  “The person I'm telling you about” | P&T |
| Doe | Ø | Kaz-la an té ké enmé achté la | House-DEF Øₜₐₜₜ I ANT IRR love buy DEF₂  “The house I would love to buy” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Dé moun misyé pa té konnèt  
Two person $\emptyset$ man NEG ANT know  
“Two people (that) the man didn't know” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Tousa i ka vwè  
All $\emptyset$ she PROGR see  
“Everything she sees” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Tousa i ka vwè  
All $\emptyset$ he PROGR see  
“Everything he sees” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Tousa an ké ba-w fè  
All $\emptyset$ I IRR give-you do  
“Everything I'll tell you to do” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Onsèl biten moun pé fè  
Only thing person can do  
“The only thing $\emptyset$ that people can do” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Tout mizè-la siklòn-la té lésé dèyè do a-y la  
All mess-DEF $\emptyset$ cyclone-DEF ANT leave behind back  
of-it DEF₀  
“All of the mess that the cyclone left behind its back” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Kochon-la yo pou kyouyé pou jou-lasa  
Pig-DEF $\emptyset$ they for kill for day-DEM  
“The pig that is to be killed on that day” | P&T |
| DOrc | Ø | Lidé Tiprens-la té ni asi biten i té ka fé fo  
Idea $\emptyset$ Little.prince-DEF ANT have on thing $\emptyset$ he  
ANT PROGR do must  
“The ideas that the Little prince had about the things he  
was supposed to do” | TP |
| DOrc | Ø | Sé pyéwôz-la yo ka sanm onlo la lè yo toupiti piti  
PLUR rose-DEF $\emptyset$ they HAB look.like a.lot DEF₀  
when they all.little little  
“The little roses they look like when they're very very  
little” | TP |
| FreeRc | Ø | Sa té rivi la  
What $\emptyset$ ANT happen DEF  
“What happened” | TP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>Ha</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè solèy ka desann an lanmè</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ sun PROGR set in sea</td>
<td>“When the sun sets into the sea”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè i anmidi Ozétazini</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ it noon USA</td>
<td>“When it is 12am in the US”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Toutlè ou té vilé</td>
<td>Every.time $O_{\text{that}}$ you ANT want</td>
<td>“Everytime you wanted”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè nwèsè té ka rivé</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ night ANT PROGR come</td>
<td>“When the night would come”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè an té timoun</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ I ANT child</td>
<td>“When I was a child”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè yo té palé ba-w</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ they ANT speak to-you</td>
<td>“When you were spoken to”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Sa yo té mandé-w fè</td>
<td>What $O_{\text{that}}$ they ANT ask-you do</td>
<td>“What you were asked to do”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè ou ké granmoun [ou ké fè menm biten]</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ you IRR adult [you IRR do same thing]</td>
<td>“When you are an adult [you'll do the same thing]”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FreeRc Ø</td>
<td>Lè you ka mandé-y si i vé mayè</td>
<td>When $O_{\text{that}}$ you HAB ask-her if she want marry</td>
<td>“When you ask her if she wants to get married”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc Ø</td>
<td>Twa volkan an ka kiré andidan a-yo chak simenn</td>
<td>Three volcano $O_{\text{that}}$ I HAB cure inside of-they each week</td>
<td>“Three volcanoes I take care of every week”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc Ø</td>
<td>On danjé yo té ka viv kot-a-kot épi-y dépi nanni-nannan</td>
<td>A danger $O_{\text{that}}$ they ANT HAB live close with-it since long.before</td>
<td>“A danger they had had to deal with for very a long time”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>Tag</td>
<td>Word(s)</td>
<td>Meaning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Tala an té palé-w la</em></td>
<td>The one Ø_{that} I ANT tell-you DEF₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The one I told you about yesterday”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Kaz-la i ka rété la</em></td>
<td>House-DEF Ø_{that} she HAB live DEF₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The house where she lives”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Sa ou di-mwen</em></td>
<td>What Ø_{that} you tell-me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“What you told me”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td><em>Lari-la an ka rété la</em></td>
<td>Street-DEF Ø_{that} I HAB live DEF₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The street where I live”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>otila</td>
<td><em>Planèt-la otila i té soti la</em></td>
<td>Planet-DEF from.where he ANT arrive DEF₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The planet from where he had arrived”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>otila</td>
<td><em>Planèt-la otila Tiprens-la té soti la</em></td>
<td>Planet-DEF from.where Little.prince-DEF ANT arrive DEF₂</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The planet from where the little prince had arrived”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOrc</td>
<td>otila</td>
<td><em>Planèt-la otila i soti la</em></td>
<td>Planet-DEF from.where he come DEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The planet from where he came”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td><em>Adan pyès pòyò-la i té owa kaz-la</em></td>
<td>In banana plantation-DEF that ANT close house-DEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Inside the banana plantation that lied close to the house”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td><em>Kanmarad i wouvwè-mwen</em></td>
<td>Friend that again.see-me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The friend who saw me again”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td><em>On pakyèt ti sonnèt i konnèt ri</em></td>
<td>A lot little bell that know laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A lot of little bells that can laugh”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td><em>Zétwal i konnèt ri</em></td>
<td>Star that know laugh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xxii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Src</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Stars that can laugh [=that know how to laugh]”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On flè i ka touvé-é adan on zétwal</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A flower that PROGR find-it inside a star</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A flower that finds itself on a star”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>(An sé) on nomn i pa ka jwé</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(I COP{pres}) a man that NEG HAB play</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(I'm) a man who doesn't play”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Lannuit-la i ka vin la</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Night-DEF that PROGR come DEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The night that is coming”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On zozyo i ka mo</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A bird that PROGR die</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A bird that is dying”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On sot-kalité sépan jon i ka fin bat épi-w an trant sègond</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A type snake yellow that PROGR/HAB end fight with-you in thirty second</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A type of yellow snake that kills you in thirty seconds”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Dlo-la i té ka kontinyé gouvé la</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water-DEF that ANT PROGR continue tremble DEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The water that was still trembling”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Potré a on woz i ka kléré adidan a-y</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Image of a rose that PROGR shine inside of-he</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The image of a rose that shines inside of him”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Sé mèch chivé-lasa i té ka bat an van-la</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLUR lock hair-DEM that ANT PROGR wave in wind-DEF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“These hair locks that were waving in the wind”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Onsèl-la i ni adan Linivè</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Only-DEF that have in Universe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The only one that exists in the Universe”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On rina i té ka sanm sanmil dot rina</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A fox that ANT HAB look.like hundred.thousand other fox</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A fox that looked like a hundred thousand other foxes”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Src | i | Séla i ka chasé-mwen la  
Those that HAB hunt-me DEF2  
“Those who hunt me” |
|----|---|---|
| Src | i | Biten i ja tou fèt  
Thing that already all done  
“Something already prepared” |
| Src | i | Blé-la i ni koulè lo la  
Weat-DEF that have colour gold DEF₂  
“The weat that has the colour of gold” |
| Src | i | Sé twa volkan-la i té ka ban-mwen an jounou  
PLUR three volcano-DEF that ANT HAV give-me to knee  
“The three volcanoes that are about up to my knee” |
| Src | i | Nènpot ti lilèt i ni an granlanmè Pasifik-la  
Any little oxbow that have in big.sea Pacific-DEF  
“Some little oxbow that exist in the Pacific ocean” |
| Src | i | Sé dè milya moun-la i ka rété asi Latè  
PLUR two billion person-DEF that HAB live on Earth  
“The two billion people that live on the Earth” |
| Src | i | Onsèl lanpadè-la i té ni an pol Sid-la  
Only lamp-DEF that ANT have in pole South-DEF  
“The only lamp there was in the South pole” |
| Src | i | Onsèl lanpadè-la i té ni an pol No-la  
Only lamp-DEF that ANT have in pole North-DEF  
“The only lamp there was in the North pole” |
| Src | i | Tiprens-la i pa té janné toulongalé an vi a-y lagé modan asi on kèksyon  
Little.prince-DEF that NEG ANT never throughout of life of-he leave biting on a question  
“A little prince that in all of his life had never let a question go” |
| Src | i | Biten i la pou touttan  
Thing that there for alway  
“Something that had always been there” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Src</th>
<th>i</th>
<th>On moun i té kékè fè on mové èsploratè</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A person that ANT IRR do a bad explorer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A person that would be a bad explorer”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On èsploratè i té kék ka bwè two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An explorer that ANT IRR HAB drink too.much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“An explorer that would drink too much”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On èsploratè i té kék ka manti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An explorer that ANT IRR HAB lie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“An explorer that would lie”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On biten i vo lapenn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A something that worth the.thing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A worthy something”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On grangrèk i konnèt ola sé lanmè-la yè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A savant that know where PLUR sea-DEF COP int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A savant who knows where the seas are”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On vyé misyè i té ka maké dé kalité gwomanman liv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>An old man that ANT HAB write some quality huge book</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“An old man who used to write such big books”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Moun-la i ka limé lanpadè-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Person-DEF that HAB turn.on lamp-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The person who turns on the/this lamp”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On travay i bèl toubolman menm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A work that beautiful a.lot even</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A work that's very beautiful”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>(An sè) on nomn i pa ka jwè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(I COP pres) a man that NEG HAB play</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm a man who doesn't play”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On lilèt i pa ta ponmoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A little.island that NEG that.of anyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A little island that doesn't belong to anyone”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>On dyaman i pa ta ponmoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A diamond that NEG that.of anyone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A diamond that doesn't belong to anyone”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sé dé tibiten koulé lo i ka fè fennyan révé
PLUR some little.things colour gold that HAB make
lazy.bone dream
“These little golden things that make lazy bones dream”

Dé tibiten i ka kléré
Some little.things that HAB shine
“Some little things that shine”

On nomn i konnèt larézon poubon menm
A man that know reason a.lot also
“A very reasonable man”

Souvenans a planèt a-y i té rété tousèl
Memory of planet of-he that ANT stay all.alone
“The memory of his planet that had remained all alone”

On zafè a rèv i pwan-y on pakyèt tan
A thing of dream that take-he a lot time
“A thought that took him a lot of time”

On mouton i kay pé viv lontan
A mutton that PROGR.go can live long
“A mutton that will be able to live long”

Vi an-mwen i té an jè
Life of-me that ANT in danger
“My life that was in danger [=the fact that my life was in
danger]”

On timoun i pèd chimen an mitan dézè-la
A child that lose track in middle desert-DEF
“A child that gets lost in the middle of the desert”

Bèl chimen-la i té trasé ban-mwen adan lapenti
Nice path-DEF that ANT sketch to-me in painting
“The nice future that waited for me in the field of
painting”

On nomn i sitèlman konnèt mèt larézon la
A man that so know put reason DEF
“A very reasonable man”

Lidè a on bèl chimen i té ké ka atann-mwen adan lapenti
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Idea of a nice path that ANT IRR PROGR wait-me in drawing  
“The idea of a nice future in the field of drawing that would have been waiting for me” | **On sépan boa i té ka fè on éléfan désann**  
A snake boa that ANT PROGR make an elephant go.down  
“A boa that was digesting an elefant” | TP |
| “On Tiprens i té ka rétè asi on planèt i té jistikont pli gran pasé-y”  
A Little.prince that ANT HAB live on planet that ANT just more big than-he  
“A little prince that lived on a planet that was just a little bigger than him” | **Tout plas-la i ni asi planèt-la**  
All place-DEF that have on planet-DEF  
“All the place there is on the planet” | TP |
| “On jan lanprèsman i té sézi ko an-mwen”  
A type lacking.time that ANT take body of-me  
“An impression of lacking time that took control over me” | **Sé flè-la i ni pikan-la**  
PLUR flower-DEF that have thorn-DEF  
“The flowers that have thorns” | TP |
| “Dlodous-la i té ka fin piti a piti asi nou la”  
Drinkable.water-DEF that ANT PROGR end little to littke on us DEF2  
“Our drinkable water that was finishing little by little” | **On biten i té ka sann-li lèd kon pa tini**  
A thing that ANT PROGR/HAB seem-he ugly how NEG have  
“Something that seemed extremely bad-looking to him” | TP |
| “On flè i pa ni p'onlot kon-y adan tout sè pakyêt ê pakyêt zétwal-la”  
A flower that NEG have NEG'a.lot like-it in all PLUR lot | | TP |
and lot star-DEF
“A flower that is quite rare in all of the stars”

Src  i  Moun-la i enmè flè-la
Person-DEF that love flower-DEF
“The person that loves the flower”

Src  i  On Tiprens i té bizwen yo ba-y konfowtasyon
A Little.prince that ANT need they give-he cheer.up(N)
“A Little prince that needed to be cheered up”

Src  i  Tizèb-lasa i pa té ka sanm p'on sé lèzot tizèb-la
Little.plant-DEM that NEG ANT HAB look NEG'a
PLUR other little.plant-DEF
“A little plant that didn't look like the other plants”

Src  i  Pawol i pa té ni p'on valè
Word that NEG ANT have NEG'a value
“Some meaningless words”

Src  i  Lavol a on bann zozyo sovaj i té ka pasé
Flight of a flock bird savage that ANT PROGR pass
“The flight of a flock of savage birds that had passed
[over those places]”

Src  i  On flè i té sitèlman plen santiman
A flower that ANT so full feeling
“A flower that had so many feelings”

Src  i  On timoun i té ja vakabon
A child that ANT aleady rolling.stone
“A child that was already a rolling stone”

Src  i  Tifi-la i té bò fontenn-la yè
Girl-DEF that ANT edge fountain-DEF yesterday
“The girl that was close to the fountain yesterday”

Src  i  Sa i rivé manzè krikèt
What that happened miss grasshopper
“What happened to miss Grasshopper”

Src  ki  Woz an-mwen ki t'an mwen
Rose of-me that that'of me
“My very rose”

xxviii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Src</th>
<th>ki</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **On lajan ki tan-mwen** | A money that that.of-me  
“Some money of mine” | P&T |
| **On jenn tikrikèt ki té onjan fengnan** | A young little.criquet that ANT a.type lazy.bone  
“A young cricket that was a lazy bone” | P&T |
| **Banbrannèz ki lésé tout branbrann a-yo** | Bracelet.lover that leave all bracelet of-them  
“Bracelet lovers that did not take off all of their bracelets” | P&T |
| **Anni biten ki pa fusil pou touvé** | Only thing that NEG easy to find  
“Only things that aren't easy to find” | P&T |
| **Tout vyé zèb ki té alantou a sé tonm-la** | All bad grass that ANT around of PLUR tomb-DEF  
“All of the weed that lied around the tombs” | P&T |
| **Pakèt moun-la ki douvan sé tab-la** | Lot person-DEF that in.front PLUR table-DEF  
“The many people that are in front of the tables” | P&T |
| **Moun ki ra-vou** | Person that hate-you  
“People who hate you” | P&T |
| **Tiprens-lasa ka domi la** | Little.prince-DEF Ø that PROGR sleep DEF2  
“The little sleeping prince” | TP |
| **On biten ka fè-w santi i la** | A thing Ø that PROGR make-you feel it there  
“Something making you feel its presence [=that makes you feel its presence” | TP |
| **On flè moun pa ka vwè** | A flower Ø that person NEG HAB see  
“A flower that nobody can see” | TP |
<p>| <strong>On vandè té ka vann kaché pou opozé moun swèf</strong> | A sellerØ that ANT HAB sell pill for oppose person thirst | TP |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Src</th>
<th>TP</th>
<th>P&amp;T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“A seller selling pills for people not to feel thirsty”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sé tren-la ka chayé-yo alé la&lt;br&gt;The trains bringing them there”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sé moun-la ka fé kommès la&lt;br&gt;Theose who are salespeople”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On rina ka sanm sanmil dot rina&lt;br&gt;“A fox that looks like hundred thousand other foxes”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On tiboug tou ka sanm sanmil dot tiboug&lt;br&gt;“A child that looks exactly like hundred thousand other children”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On Tafyatè té ka rété la&lt;br&gt;“An Heavy drinker living there [=that lived there]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planét-la té ka vin apré la&lt;br&gt;“The planet that came after [=the following planet]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An ja ni on travay ka atann-mwen&lt;br&gt;“I already have a job waiting for me”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sé moun ka fé Fwans-la&lt;br&gt;The people who went to France”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ka vwa byen sé timoun-la ka fé jé épì-y&lt;br&gt;“He sees clearly the children making fun of him”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fanm dousinèz pa ka ba nomn a-yo on chans&lt;br&gt;“Clinging women not leaving their men alone”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Src</td>
<td>DOrCe</td>
<td>Ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|     |       |   | Only thing Œ_{hat} HAB do-me sorrow | P&T
|     |       |   | “The only thing making me struggle”  |
|     |       |   | Limèdlanpadè-lasa i té sitèelman ka suis lod-la yo té ba-y la | TP
|     |       | I  | Lighter.of.lamp-DEM that ANT so HAB follow order-DEF Œ_{hat} they ANT give-he DEF |
|     |       |   | “This lamp lighter that would always obey the order they had given to him”  |
| Sro |       | i | On biten kriyan i ka rivé  |
|     |       |   | A thing unbelievable that PROGR arrive  |
|     |       |   | “Something unbelievable that was going on”  |
| X'rc |      | lè | Jou bonmaten-la lè an vin konnèt-vou la |
|     |       |   | Day morning-DEF when I come know-you DEF |
|     |       |   | “The morning of the day when I got to know you”  |
| X'rc |      | Ø | Lannuit-la i ka vin la |
|     |       |   | Night-DEF Œ_{hat} he HAB come DEF |
|     |       |   | “The night he came”  |
| X'rc |      | Ø | Lannuit-la ka vin la |
|     |       |   | Night-DEF Œ_{hat} PROGR come DEF |
|     |       |   | “The night that is coming”  |
| X'rc |      | Ø | Jou an tonbè asi Latè |
|     |       |   | Day Œ_{hat} I fall on Earth |
|     |       |   | “The day I [accidentally] fell on the planet Earth”  |
| X'rc |      | Ø | Prèmyé fwa i té gadé pouboun trézo a-y |
|     |       |   | First time Œ_{hat} he ANT look best treasure of-he |
|     |       |   | “The first time he had looked at his most precious treasure”  |
| X'rc |      | Ø | Sè si mwa-la manjè-la ka pwan pou désann an fal a-yo la |
|     |       |   | PLUR six month-DEF Œ_{hat} eat(N)-DEF take for go.down in intestine of-they DEF |
|     |       |   | “The six months (that) the food takes to be digested”  |
| X'rc |      | Ø | Toupatou i pasè |

xxxi
| X're | ola | Everywhere Øₕₜₐₜ he pass
“Everywhere he goes” |
| X're | ola | **Pi-la ola nou té rivé la**
Well(N)-DEF where we ANT arrive DEF₂
“The well we had joined” |
| X're | ola | **Prémyé koté ola moun ka viv**
First side where person HAB live
“The first place where people live [=the first inhabited place]” |
| X're | ola | **Tout tè ola moun ka rété**
All land where person live
“All lands where people live [=all inhabited lands]” |
| X're | ola | **On planèt ola on fennyan té ka rété**
A planet where a lazy.bone ANT HAB live
“A planet where a lazy bone lived” |
| X're | ola | **On planèt ola ni on misyé tou wouj lahont i yé**
A planet where have a man all red shame he COP
“A planet where there is a man who dies of shame” |
| X're | ola | **On rëstoran ola yo ka manjé on bon manger kréyòl**
A restaurant where they HAB eat a good food creole
“A restaurant where you can eat good Creole food” |
Appendix 2
Distribution of adjectives

This table groups a corpus of Nominal Expressions containing at least one adjective. Adjectives are not very frequent in GC and it is very uncommon to find NEs containing more than one adjective. As a matter of fact, virtually all NEs containing an adjective of the book Tiprens-la appear in this table, whereas those taken from Poullet&Telchid (2010) are only a casual selection. Each entry was classified on the basis of its type (first column): type 1 groups NEs containing a prenominal adjective, type 2 postnominal adjectives, type 3 NEs containing more than one adjective (regardless of their position with respect to the N), and type 4 are special cases of Ns behaving like adjectives. In the second column the internal order of the NEs is given, and in the rightmost column I list the source from which it was taken. All of the symbols used in this table are explained at the beginning of this work (see Symbols).

The adjectives of Guadeloupean Creole are invariant. They do not display gender (1a-b) or number (1c-d) agreement (Damoiseau (2012), Poullet&Telchid (2010), among others).

(1a) On bèl fanm
“A beautiful woman”

(1b) On bèl nomn
“A handsome man”

(1c) Bèl fanm-la / Bèl nomn-la
Beautiful woman-DEF / Handsome man-DEF
“The beautiful woman / The beautiful man”

(1d) Sé bèl fanm-la / Sé bèl nomn-la
PLUR beautiful woman-DEF / PLUR handsome man-DEF
“The beautiful women / The beautiful men”
Nonetheless, among Poullet&Telchid (2010)'s examples, I found some adjectives bearing a [+FEMININE] functional suffix, -èz (2a-b). Notice that the [+MASCULINE] feature seems to be associated to a zero suffix (2c-d). In a system that does not mark gender or number on adjectives, these anomalies closely recall those observed in the class of gender-variable Ns discussed in Part 3:

(2a) *Fanm dousinèz*  
Woman clinging  
“Clinging women”

(2b) *Fanm eskandalèz*  
Woman scandalous  
“Scandalous women”

(2c) *Nomn dousinè*  
Man clinging  
“Clinging men”

(2d) *Nomn eskandalè*  
Man scandalous  
“Scandalous men”

Guadeloupean creole is traditionally believed to have very little adjectives, most of which are said to occupy a post-nominal position (Bernabé (1983), Hazaël-Massieux (2011) and the online course on Guadeloupean Creole, among others). This class of adjectives is said to be a closed one and to contain a little number of rigidly-prenominal elements. These adjectives are semantically and in some cases (ti-, gran-) also phonologically bound to the N they precede. Predictably, the semantics of the original N is considerably modified by the union with the adjective and in most cases its meaning does not correspond to that of the resulting compound. In fact, compound Ns of this type cannot be separated from their “adjectival” part without undergoing a considerable loss in meaning. For this reason, in the linguistics literature they are sometimes referred to as *adjectival prefixes* or *prefix-like elements* (Hazaël-Massieux (2011)).
Moreover, even though some authors (see Online course on GC) say that the “switch in meaning” that some adjectives undergo on the basis of where they are placed with respect to the N is witnessed by their different forms (as for example the couple *ti*/-*piti*), some contradictory examples are present in my corpus. In fact, I found some prenominal combinations of *piti* (that should only be postnominal) and *ti-* (3a-b), which confirms that the two elements have different meaning and different natures:

(3a) *An vwè on piti tiboug*

    I see a little little.person

    “I saw a little child”

(3b) *Jean sé on gran granmoun*

    Jean COP pres a big big.person

    “Jean is a big adult”

However, very often the meaning of this kind of compounds is not the result of the sum of the compounding elements. It is possible to say that such nouns lack semantic *transparency*. For example, a *ti moun* (a child) is not a *moun ki piti* (a little person), nor is a *vyé nèg* (a rude person) the same thing as a *moun ki vyé* (an old person). As we can see, the postposed adjective preserves its original meaning, whereas the preposed prefix-like adjective tends to acquire a value or affective connotation. Poulet&Telchid (2010), for example, report several possible meanings of the adjective *vyé*. According to them, it does not just mean “old” but (depending on the context in which it happens to find itself) but it can also mean “ancient, used, ugly, impracticable, unpleasant, bad, unhealthy, nasty, awkward, dirty”. Moreover, the couple *ti/piti* shows that the difference between apparently corresponding adjectives can easily be accounted for if we consider that in some cases their forms vary according to the position they occupy in the sentence.

Actually, the table that follows shows that the traditional description of Guadeloupean creole having very little prenominal adjectives (*ti, gran, vyé, jèn, gwo, bèl*) is not correct. In fact, Guadeloupean Creole, as all other languages, has a wide
range of adjectives, all of which clearly derive from French. Interestingly, these origins are visible not only in their morphology but also in their syntax, as their distribution is exactly the same as that of their French counterparts. As a consequence, Guadeloupean Creole displays more adjectives than predicted, many of which are prenominal. Very likely, all previous descriptions were not incorrect, yet incomplete. Actually, Guadeloupean Creole is very likely to have had very little adjectives at first and then to have borrowed many new adjectives from French. These can be both predicative (4a-b) and qualificative and can be prenominal, postnominal, undergo degree variations (4c-d), be modified by adverbs and combine with each other.

(4a) *Mari bèl toubolman*

Mari beautiful extremely
“Mary is extremely beautiful”

(4b) *Jean té janti kon pa tini*

Jean ANT kind as NEG have
“Jean was exceptionally kind”

(4c) *Jean té janti janti*

Jean ANT kind kind
“Jean was very kind”

(4d) *Mari té pli bèl ki Katrin*

Mari ANT more beautiful that Katrin
“Mary was more beautiful than Catherine”

Today Guadeloupean Creole has many adjectives whose behaviour is exactly the same as that of English adjectives, which are invariant but present. The existence of adjectives in French-based creoles, questioned by Véronique in many of his works (1983, 2000 and 2007), and then discussed also in Hazaël-Massieux (2011), is actually undeniable: both their origins and the following table witness this prediction.
## Distribution of adjectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Num>N-DEF | Twazyèm | Twazyèm alèt-la  
“Third alarm-DEF” | P&T |
| 1    | On>A>N | Gwo | On gwo pyé-fomajé  
“A big kapok tree” | P&T |
| 1    | On>A>N>P>N | Bon | On bon sòs a piman  
“A good sauce of spice” | P&T |
| 1    | A > A > N > P > N-DEF | Prèmyè ti | Prèmyè ti limyè a solèy-la  
“The first sunbeams” | P&T |
| 1    | Num>N | Wonz | (Ni) wonz lanné  
“Eleven years” | TP |
| 1    | On>A>N | Vyé | On vyé misyé  
“An old man” | TP |
| 1    | A>N-DEM | Vyé | Vyé rat-lasa  
“This old rat” | TP |
| 1    | On>A>N | Vyé | On vyé bilbokèt  
“An old weathercock” | TP |
| 1    | On>A>N | Vyé | On vyé min  
“A gloomy appearance” | TP |
| 1    | On>A>N | Vyé | On vyé rat  
“An old rat” | TP |
| 1    | On>A>N>P>N | Vyé | On vyé kalité grenn  
“A seed of bad quality” | TP |
| 1    | A>N | Vyé | Vyé zèb  
“Bad Grass” | P&T |
| 1    | On>A>N | Véritab | On vérétab travay  
“A real job” | TP |
| 1    | On>A>N | Véritab | On vérétab lawmé  
“A real army” | TP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Word(s)</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 | PLUR>Deg>A>N-DEF | Gran | *Sè pli gran timoun-la*  
PLUR more big child-DEF  
“The biggest children” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N>Poss | Tour | *Tout piti a-y*  
All child of-he  
“All of his children” | P&T |
| 1 | On>A>N>Poss | Gran | *On gran frè a-y*  
A big brother of-he  
“A big brother of his” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N | Sél | *Sél biten*  
Only thing  
“The only thing” | P&T |
| 1 | Adv>A>N | Bon | *Kyèk bon chomaj*  
“Some good entertainment” | P&T |
| 1 | On>N>P>Num>N | Douz | *On kaz a douz étaj*  
A home of twelve floor  
“A twelve floor house” | P&T |
| 1 | On>A>tiN | Jenn Ti | *On jenn tikrikèr*  
“A young little cricket” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N | Tout | *Tout fanm*  
“All women” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N | Dot | *On dòt fi*  
An other girl  
“Some other girl” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N | Dot | *On dot koté*  
An other place  
“Somewhere else” | P&T |
| 1 | On>A>N | Ayen | *On ayen tan*  
A nothing time  
“A little moment” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Bèl | *On bèl désen*  
“A nice désen” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Bèl | *(Avè) on bèl tchip*  
(With) a nice gasp  
“With a big gasp” | TP |
| 1 | Deg>A>N | Bèl | *Pli bèl déko*  
Most beautiful decoration  
“The most beautiful decoration” | TP |

xxxviii
| 1 | N>P>On>A>N | bèl | *Lidé a on bèl chimen*  
Idea of a nice path  
“The idea of a nice path” | TP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | On>A>A>N | bèl gran | *On bèl gran bouch*  
“A beautiful big mouth” | P&T |
| 1 | On>A>tiN | bèl ti | *On bèl tifi*  
“A beautiful girl” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N-DEF | bon | *Bon planét-la*  
Nice planet-DEF  
“The pleasant planet” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | bon | *On bon moman*  
A good moment  
“For some time” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | bon | *Bon zèb*  
“Good grass [=as opposed to weed]” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | bon | *Bon grenn*  
“Good seeds” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | bon | *(Ban-mwan) bon lodè*  
“Nice smell” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | bon | *(Di-yo) bon biten*  
“Nice things” | TP |
| 1 | A>N>N | bon | *(I té ka bay) bon jan lod*  
Good type order  
“Reasonable orders” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | bon | *Bon zyé*  
“Good eyes” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N>POSS | dé | *Dé pyé an-mwen*  
Two foot of-me  
“My two feet” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N | dé | *Dé potré*  
“Two portraits” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N | dé mil | *Dé mil fwan*  
“Two thousand Franc” | P&T |
| 1 | PLUR>Num>N-DEF | dé milya | *Sé dé milya moun-la*  
PLUR two billion person-DEF  
“The two billion people” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N>N>POS S | dé Koko | *Dé koko-zyé an-mwen*  
Two big-eye of-me  
“My two big eyes” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>A>N>N-DEF | Dényé | *Sé dényé plan baobab-la*  
PLUR last plant baobab-DEF  
“The last baobabs” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | Dényé | *(Pou) dényé fwa*  
“Last time” | TP |
| 1 | A>tiN>N-DEF | Dényé Ti | *Dényé tigout dlo-la*  
Last little.drop water-DEF  
“The last little drop of water” | TP |
| 1 | A>N>DEM | Dényé Ti | *Dényé tibiten-lasa*  
Last little.thing-DEM  
“This last little thing” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>Num>A>N-DEF | Dé Onsél | *Sé dé onsél désen-la*  
PLUR two only drawing-DEF  
“The(se) two only drawings” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>Num>N-DEF | Dé Ti | *Sé dé tipawol [la]*  
PLUR two little.words DEF  
“The(se) two littlewords” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N-DEF | Dényè | *Dézyèm modé-la*  
Last bite-DEF  
“The last bite” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N-DEF | Dézyèm | *Dézyèm kou-la*  
Second knock-DEF  
“The second knock” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N-DEF | Dézyèm | *Dézyèm planèt-la*  
Second planet-DEF  
“The second planet” | TP |
| 1 | A>A>N | Dot Granmanman | *Dot granmanman désen*  
“Other huge drawings” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Gran | *On gran kalkilasyon*  
“A big calculation” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Gran | *On gran lékopèch*  
“A big perch” | P&T |
| 1 | A>N | Gran | *Ni gran gou*  
Have big taste  
“Difficult tastes” | P&T |
| 1 | On>A>N | Gran | *On gran tristès*  
“A big sadness” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Gran | *On gran montangn*  
“A big mountain” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | Gran | *(Pwan an)* **gran** konsidéración  
“Serious consideration” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | Gran | **Gran lanmè**  
“Big seas” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | Gran | *(Pa sèvi)* **gran** zafè  
“Big things [=important things]” | TP |
| 1 | A>N>POSS | Gran | **Gran chouval a-y**  
Big horse of-he  
“His big horse” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>A>N-DEF | Gwo | **Sé gwo bêt-la**  
PLUR big beast-DEF  
“The(se) big beasts” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Gwo | **On gwo kalandriyé**  
“A big calender” | TP |
| 1 | On>A>N | Gwo | **On gwo montangn**  
“A massive mountain” | TP |
| 1 | A>N | Gwo | *(Ki)* **gwo liv (ésa?)**  
“Big book” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N-DEF | Katryèm | **Katryèm planèt-la**  
Fourth planet-DEF  
“The fourth planet” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>A>N-DEF | Lézot | **Sé lézot planèt-la**  
PLUR other planet-DEF  
“The other planets” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>A>N-DEF | Lézot | **Sé lézot planèt-la**  
PLUR other planet-DEF  
“The other planets” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>A>N-DEF | Lézot | **Sé lézot maché-la**  
PLUR other market-DEF  
“The other markets” | TP |
| 1 | A>N-DEF | Menm | **Menm biten-la**  
Same stuff-DEF  
“The same stuff” | TP |
| 1 | A>N-DEF | Menm | **Menm biten-la**  
Same stuff-DEF  
“The same studd” | TP |
| 1 | A>N-DEF | Menm | **Menm lajouné-la**  
Same day-DEF  
“The same day” | TP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A&gt;N-DEF</th>
<th>Menm</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Menm lè-la</td>
<td>Same hour-DEF</td>
<td>“The same hour”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Menm jan-la</td>
<td>Same kind-DEF</td>
<td>“The same kind”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Menm déko</td>
<td>“The same decorations”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Menm biten</td>
<td>“The same things”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Menm zétwal</td>
<td>“The same stars”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Menm tan</td>
<td>“Same time”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N-DEM</td>
<td>Menm rézon-lasa</td>
<td>Same reason-DEF</td>
<td>“The same reason”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A-tiN-DEM</td>
<td>Menm tijé-lasa</td>
<td>Same little.game-DEM</td>
<td>“This same little game”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Mové plant</td>
<td>“A bad plant”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Mové rêv</td>
<td>“A bad dream”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Mové zèb</td>
<td>“Bad grasses”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Mové grenn</td>
<td>“Bad seeds”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>On mové lidé</td>
<td>“A bad idea”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Mové pakyèt mové biten</td>
<td>“A lot of bad things”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Mové èsploratè</td>
<td>“A bad explorer”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A&gt;tiN</td>
<td>Nènpot liilèt</td>
<td>Any little oxbow</td>
<td>“Any little oxbow”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Nouvo kanmarad</td>
<td>“A new friend”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xlii
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;Adv</td>
<td>Ondot</td>
<td><strong>Ondot rêzon anko</strong>&lt;br&gt;Other reason also&lt;br&gt;“Some other reasons”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Onlo</td>
<td><strong>(Avé) onlo rêspé</strong>&lt;br&gt;“A lot of respect”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Onlo Bon</td>
<td><strong>Onlo bon biten</strong>&lt;br&gt;A lot good thing&lt;br&gt;“A lot of good things”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Onsèl</td>
<td><strong>Onsèl anmizman</strong>&lt;br&gt;Only distraction&lt;br&gt;“The only distractions”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Onsèl</td>
<td><strong>Onsèl lanpadè-la</strong>&lt;br&gt;Only lamp-DEF&lt;br&gt;“The only lamp”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLUR&gt;A&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Onsèl</td>
<td><strong>Sè onsèl montangn-la</strong>&lt;br&gt;PLUR only mountain-DEF&lt;br&gt;“The only mountains”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Onsèl</td>
<td><strong>Onsèl biten</strong>&lt;br&gt;“The only things”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Onsèl</td>
<td><strong>Onsèl batzyé</strong>&lt;br&gt;Just one blink of an eye&lt;br&gt;“Just one blink of an eye”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Piti</td>
<td><strong>On piti timoun</strong>&lt;br&gt;A little little person&lt;br&gt;“A little child”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adv&gt;A&gt;N&gt;POSS-DEF</td>
<td>Piti</td>
<td><strong>Sitèlman piti planèt a-w-la</strong>&lt;br&gt;So little planet of-you-DEF&lt;br&gt;“This so little planet of yours”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;POSS</td>
<td>Piti Ti</td>
<td><strong>Piti tiboug an-mwen</strong>&lt;br&gt;Little man of-me&lt;br&gt;“My little man”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Piti Ti</td>
<td><strong>Piti tiboug!</strong>&lt;br&gt;Little little person&lt;br&gt;“Little child! [=sweet child]</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deg&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Plibon</td>
<td><strong>Plibon zanmi</strong>&lt;br&gt;“Best friend”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Deg&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Plibon</td>
<td><strong>Plibon potré</strong>&lt;br&gt;“Best portrait”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | On>Num>N | Prémyé | *On prémyé balan*  
“A first stock” | TP |
|---|-----------|--------|------------------------------------------------|-----|
| 1 | A>N-DEF  | Prémyé | *Prémyé swa-la*  
First evening-DEF  
“The first evening” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N-DEF | Prémyé | *Prémyé kou-la*  
First knock-DEF  
“The first knock” | TP |
| 1 | PLUR>A>N-DEF | Prémyé | *Sé prémyé vwayajè-la*  
PLUR first voyager-DEF  
“The first voyagers” | TP |
| 1 | On>Num>N | Prémyé | *On prémyé tan*  
A first time  
“At first” | TP |
| 1 | A>N      | Prémyé | *(Pou) prémyé fwa*  
“First time” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N>POSS | Prémyé | *Prémyé désen an-mwen*  
First drawing of-me  
“My first drawing” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N>POSS | Prémyé | *Prémyé fwa a-y*  
First time of-he  
“His first time” | TP |
| 1 | Num>N    | Prémyé | *Prémyé fwa*  
“First time” | TP |
| 1 | A>A>N    | Sanmil Dot | *Sanmil dot tiboug*  
Hundred.thousand other person  
“A hundred thousand other people” | TP |
| 1 | A>A>N    | Sanmil Dot | *Sanmil dot rina*  
Hundred.thousand other fox  
“A hundred thousand other foxes” | TP |
| 1 | A>N-DEF  | Senkyèm | *Senkyèm jou-la*  
Fifth day-DEF  
“The fifth day” | TP |
| 1 | A>N-DEF  | Senkyèm | *Senkyèm planèt-la*  
Fifth planet-DEF  
“The fifth planet” | TP |
| 1 | On>N>A   | Senp    | *On senp woz*  
“A simple rose” | TP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Words</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Num&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Sétyèm</td>
<td>7th planet-DEF, “The seventh planet”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLUR&gt;Num&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Si</td>
<td>PLUR six month-DEF, “The six months”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Num&gt;N</td>
<td>Sis</td>
<td>6 months, “Six months”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Num&gt;N</td>
<td>Sis</td>
<td>6 years, “Six years”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Num&gt;N</td>
<td>Swasantdémil sensan-onz</td>
<td>Sixty hundred thousand and five hundred eleven lamp lighters</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>TiN&gt;POSS</td>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>Little walk of-her, “Her nice way of walking”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>On&gt;tiN</td>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>A little thing, “A little thing”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Tibwen</td>
<td>Some sorrow, “A little sorrow”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>A&gt;P&gt;N&gt;POSS</td>
<td>Tousèl</td>
<td>Alone on kind on-he, “Alone in his species”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>A&gt;A&gt;P&gt;N&gt;P&gt;N</td>
<td>Tout</td>
<td>All beauty of present of Christmas DEF, “All the beauty of the Christmas present”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>A&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Tout</td>
<td>All place-DEF, “All of the place”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>A&gt;N</td>
<td>Tout</td>
<td>All places, “All places”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>A&gt;A&gt;N&gt;POSS</td>
<td>Tout</td>
<td>All good smell of-he, “All of his good perfume”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A&gt;A&gt;N&gt;POSS</td>
<td>Tout</td>
<td>All little time of-he, “All of his sweet time”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>A&gt;A&gt;N&gt;POSS</td>
<td>Tout Ti</td>
<td>Tout ti tan an-mwen</td>
<td>“All little time of-me” “All of my own sweet time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>P&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Trant</td>
<td>An trant ségond</td>
<td>“In thirty seconds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Num&gt;N</td>
<td>Twa</td>
<td>Twa volkan</td>
<td>“Three volcanoes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>PLUR&gt;Num&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Twa</td>
<td>Sè twa volkan-la</td>
<td>PLUR three volcano-DEF “The three volcanoes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Twa Gran</td>
<td>(Avè) twa gran pa</td>
<td>“(With) three big step”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Twasyèm</td>
<td>Twazyèm jou-la</td>
<td>Third day-DEF “The third day”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Num&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Twasyèm</td>
<td>Twazyèm kou-la</td>
<td>Third knock-DEF “The third knock”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Num&gt;N</td>
<td>Uit</td>
<td>(Pou) uit jou</td>
<td>“Eight days”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A</td>
<td>Têknik</td>
<td>On lékol tèknik</td>
<td>A school technical “A technical school”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A</td>
<td>Manbèz</td>
<td>Fanm manbèz</td>
<td>Woman fit “Fit women”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A-DEF</td>
<td>Ankristal</td>
<td>Boul ankrystal-la</td>
<td>Ball crystal-DEF “The crystal ball”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Anlo</td>
<td>On braslé anlo</td>
<td>“A bracelet golden”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A</td>
<td>Anlo</td>
<td>(I ni) chivé anlo</td>
<td>Hair golden “Golden hair”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Anlò</td>
<td>On kolyé-chou anlò</td>
<td>A necklace golden “A golden necklace”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A</td>
<td>Antyé</td>
<td>Latè antyé</td>
<td>Earth entire “The entire Earth”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | On>N>A>P>N | Apiyé | *On lod apiyé asi larézon*  
*An order based on reason  
“A reasonable order”* | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Asiré | *On maché asiré*  
*A walking determined  
“A determined walking”* | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A>NEG_ A | Ayenafè Présé | *On lavi ayenafè é pa présé*  
*A life idle and NEG stressed  
“An idle, unstressed life”* | TP |
| 2 | N>Deg>A | Bèl Byen | *(An sé) nomn pli bèl, pli byen*  
*Man most beautiful, most well  
“The most beautiful and proper man”* | TP |
| 2 | N>A-DEM | Béni | *Planèt bëni-lasa*  
*Planet blessed-DEM  
“This blessed planet”* | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Etranj | *On bèt étranj*  
*A beast strange  
“A strange beast”* | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Blé | *On gyn blé*  
*“A blue jean”* | P&T |
| 2 | N>A-DEM | Blenm | *Fwon blenm-lasa*  
*Forhead pale-DEM  
“This pale forhead”* | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Boufisan | *On travay boufisan*  
*A job exhausting  
“An exhausting job”* | TP |
| 2 | N>A-DEF | Bougonnè | *Biznèsmann bougonnè-la*  
*Businessman grumpy-DEF  
“The grumpy businessman”* | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Dousinèz | *Fann dousinèz*  
*Woman clinging  
“Clinging women”* | P&T |
| 2 | On>N>A | Drésé | *An rina drésé*  
*A fox domesticated  
“A domesticated fox”* | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Elèktrik | *Kouran-élèktrik*  
*Current-electric  
“Electric current”* | TP |
| 2 | B>Deg>important | Enpotan | Liv pli *enpotan*  
Book most important  
“The most important books” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Eskandalèz | *Fanm eskandalèz*  
Woman scandalous  
“Scandalous women” | P&T |
| 2 | N>A-DEF | Etenn | *Volkan étenn-la*  
Volcano extinguished-DEF  
“The extinguished volcano” | TP |
| 2 | PLUR>N>A-DEF | Etenn | *Sé volkan étenn-la*  
PLUR volcano extinguished-DEF  
“The extinguished volcanoes” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Etenn | *On volkan étenn*  
A volcano extinguished  
“An extinguished volcano” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Ewopéyen | *(Poté) lenj éwopéyen*  
Clothes European  
“European clothes” | TP |
| 2 | N>A-DEF | Fèmé | *Boa fèmé-la*  
Boa closed-DEF  
“The closed boa” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Fèmé | *Boa fèmé*  
Boa closed  
“Closed boas” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Fèmé | *(Sizé) bouch fèmé*  
“Mouth shut” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Fèmé | *Zyé fèmé*  
“Closed eyes” | TP |
| 2 | PLUR>N>A-DEM | Fèmé | *Sé zyé fèmé-lasa*  
PLUR eye closed-DEM  
“These closed eyes” | TP |
| 2 | N>P>on>N>A | Fosan | *Bout a on réparasyon fosan*  
End of a repair exhaustin  
“The end of an exhausting fixing up” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Frajil | *On ja-lo frajil*  
A treasure fragile  
“A fragile treasure” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Fré | *Pen fré*  
“Fresh bread” | P&T |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N&gt;POSS&gt;A&gt;Adv &gt;A DEF</th>
<th>Gonflé</th>
<th>(Avè) lèstonmak an-mwen gonflé bon gonflè la Stomach inflated well inflated DEF “Pompous”</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;Adv&gt;A</td>
<td>Gran</td>
<td>On astéwoyid sitèlman gran An asteroid so big “So big an asteroid”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;Adv&gt;A</td>
<td>Granzfè</td>
<td>On planèt sitèlman granzfè A planet so huge “So huge a planet”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;Adv&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>Gwo</td>
<td>On sitèlman gwo lenbè A so big sorrow “So big a sorrow”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>On koul zéklè jon A shot lightning yellow “A yellow lightning”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Jon</td>
<td>On sot-kalité sèpan jon A quality snake yellow “A type of yellow snake”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A</td>
<td>Kontan</td>
<td>(Ni) kyè kontan “Happy heart”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;Adv&gt;A</td>
<td>Kouyon</td>
<td>On mansonj sitèlman kouyon A lie so idiotic “So idiotic a lie”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Kriyan</td>
<td>On biten kriyan A thing extraordinary “Something extraordinary”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;POSS&gt;A&gt;Adv</td>
<td>Lévé</td>
<td>Chapo a-y lévé anlè Hat of-he raised in.the.air “His hat raised in the air”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A-DEM</td>
<td>Lontan</td>
<td>Tan lontan-lasa Time old-DEM “Those old times”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>PLUR&gt;N&gt;A-DEF</td>
<td>Nèg</td>
<td>Sé wa nèg-la PLUR king black-DEF “The Black kings”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N&gt;A-DEM</td>
<td>Nofrap</td>
<td>Souse nofrap-lasa Sweetness calm-DEM “This calm sweetness”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | N>POSS>A | Nwè | *(Evè) dwèt an-mwen nwè*  
  (With) finger of-me nwè  
  “Black fingers” | TP |
| 2 | O>N>A | Onsél | *On flè onsél*  
  A flower only  
  “A unique flower” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Oséryé | *On biten oséryé*  
  A thing serious  
  “Something serious” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Ouvè | *Boa ouvè*  
  Boa opened  
  “Opened boas” | TP |
| 2 | N>POSS>A>P>N | Ouvè | *Lèv a-y ouvè a dimi*  
  Lip of-he open at half  
  “His lips half-opened” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Owdinè | *On moun owdinè*  
  A person tidy  
  “A tidy person” | TP |
| 2 | N>A | Owdinè | *Flè owdinè*  
  Flower orderly  
  “Orderly flowers” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Pasé | *On moman pasé san nou palé*  
  A moment spent without we talk  
  “A moment spent without talking” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Piblik | *On plas piblik*  
  A place public  
  “A public place” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>N>A | Plen | *On délégasyon boutèy plen*  
  A delegation bottle full  
  “A delegation of full bottles” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Présé | *On maché présé-présé*  
  A walking hurried  
  “A hurried walking” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>A | Senp | *On tronn senp*  
  A trone simple  
  “A simple trone” | TP |
| 2 | On>N>Adv>A | Séré | *On boulon two séré*  
  A screw too tight  
  “Too tight a screw” | TP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Phrase</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2  | On>N>A | Séré | *On nomn séryé*  
A man serious  
“A serious man” | TP |
| 2  | On>N>N>A | Solid | *On pakyèt moun solid*  
A lot person honest  
“A lot of honest people” | TP |
| 2  | N>A>POSS-DEF | Sou | *Boug sou an-mwen-la*  
Friend drunk of-me-DEF  
“My drunk friend” | TP |
| 2  | N>A | Tèbè | *(mé kijan) lidé tèbè (ésa?)*  
Idea stupid  
“Stupid idea” | TP |
| 2  | On>N>A | Téré | *On ja-lo téré*  
A treasue buried  
“A buried treasure” | TP |
| 2  | On>N>A | Tirk | *On diktaté tirk*  
A dictator Turk  
“A Turk dictator” | TP |
| 2  | PLUR>N-DEF>A>POS | Tousèl | *Sé timoun-la tousèl tousèl a-yo*  
PLUR child Ø alone alone off-they  
“These very lonely children” | TP |
| 2  | N>A | Tousèl | *Bondyé tousèl (sav)*  
God only  
“Only God” | TP |
| 2  | On>N>N>A | Vid | *On délégasyon boutèy vid*  
A delegation bottle empty  
“A delegation of empty bottles” | TP |
| 2  | On>N>A | Wouyé | *On pouli wouyé*  
A pulley rusted  
“A rusted pulley” | TP |
| 2  | On > N > A | alamonté | *On chimen alamonté*  
A road sloping  
“A sloping road” | P&T |
| 3  | On>A>tiN>N | Bon Ti | *On bon ti ji marakouja*  
A good littje juice passion.fruit  
“A nice, good passion fruit juice” | P&T |
| 3  | On>A>tiN>N | Dé Ti | *On dé ti pyès kaz*  
A two little room house  
“A house with two little rooms” | P&T |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>bèl nwè</td>
<td>A beautiful braid hair black</td>
<td>“A beautiful braid of black hair”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;Adv&gt;A</td>
<td>bèl blan</td>
<td>Beautiful tooth well white</td>
<td>“Beautiful shining-white teeth”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>bèl fin</td>
<td>Nice finger slim</td>
<td>“Nice slim fingers”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;tiN&gt;A</td>
<td>bèl ti inosan</td>
<td>A nice little plant innocent</td>
<td>“A nice, innocent little plant”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;tiN&gt;A&gt;A</td>
<td>bèl ti penpan</td>
<td>A nice little suit elegant-elegant</td>
<td>“A very elegant, nice suit”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N&gt;P&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>bèl kaz an brik woz</td>
<td>A nice house in brick rose</td>
<td>“A nice house with pink bricks”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>bon kréyòl</td>
<td>Good food creole</td>
<td>“Good Creole food”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Num&gt;N&gt;Adv&gt;A</td>
<td>dé won</td>
<td>Two lip well rounded</td>
<td>“Two well-rounded lips”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Num&gt;A&gt;tiN&gt;A</td>
<td>dé bèl ti doux</td>
<td>Two beautiful little hand soft</td>
<td>“Two beautiful, soft little hands”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;A&gt;Deg&gt;A &gt;N</td>
<td>dé gran dé</td>
<td>Two tree big like two church</td>
<td>“Two trees as big as two churches”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Num&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>dé kwomanman liv</td>
<td>Two quality huge book</td>
<td>“Two very big books”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A&gt;tiN&gt;Deg&gt;A</td>
<td>détwéa ti séryé</td>
<td>Some little thing more serious</td>
<td>“Some more serious stuff”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>détwéa rézon séryé</td>
<td>Some reason serious</td>
<td>“Some serious reasons”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On&gt;Num&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N&gt;</td>
<td>Dézyèm Tout Limé</td>
<td>On dézyèm trenrapid tout limyè limé</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N&gt;De g&gt;A</td>
<td>Di Gran</td>
<td>(Sêté) on planèt di fwa pli gran “A planet ten time more big”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>granN&gt;&gt;-DEF</td>
<td>Gran Pasifik</td>
<td>Granlanmè Pasifik-la “The Pacific Ocean”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N&gt;A&gt;A</td>
<td>Gwo Tou Wouj</td>
<td>On gwo misyé tou wouj “A big man all red”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Karé Wouj</td>
<td>On karé madras wouj “A square red tissue”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Plen Onflè</td>
<td>On jaden plen woz onflè “A garden full of bloomy roses”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TiN&gt;A&gt;P&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Ti Fré</td>
<td>Ti lavi chimèrik a-w-la “Your little utopic life”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>TiN&gt;A&gt;POSS-DEF</td>
<td>Ti Chimèrik</td>
<td>Ti lavi chimèrik a-w-la “Your little utopic life”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N&gt;A&gt;N&gt;A&gt;POSS S</td>
<td>Toupl Anlo</td>
<td>Chivé toupl en koulè anlo a-y “His golden hair”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;Num&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Twazyèm Tout Limé</td>
<td>On twazyèm trenrapid tout limyè limé “A third flyer all light turned.on”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On&gt;A&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Vyé Lontan</td>
<td>On vyé kaz lontan “A far, old house”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>Wousi</td>
<td>Výann kochon wousi “Browned porc meat”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N&gt;N</td>
<td>Manjé lapen</td>
<td>Food rabbit</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The rabbits’ food”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Larèstan lannuit-la</td>
<td>Rest night-DEF</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The rest of the night”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Larèstan lajouné-la</td>
<td>Rest day-DEF</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The rest of the day”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;N&gt;N</td>
<td>On dènyé modèl baobab</td>
<td>A last model baobab</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A last model of baobab”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;N&gt;N</td>
<td>On granjan kalité prens</td>
<td>A big.type quality prince</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“An important type of prince”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A&gt;N</td>
<td>On sot-kalité gran mistè</td>
<td>A type big mistery</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A type of big mistery”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N&gt;N</td>
<td>(An) zwazo lanmè</td>
<td>Bird sea</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Sea bird”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>PLUR&gt;N&gt;N-DEF</td>
<td>Sé liv jéografi-la</td>
<td>PLUR book geography-DEF</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The geography books”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N&gt;N</td>
<td>Dlo lanmè</td>
<td>Water sea</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Sea water”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>On&gt;N&gt;A</td>
<td>On chimiz koulè kako</td>
<td>A shirt colour kaki</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A kaki shirt”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3

Corpus of bare-stem verbs

The following table provides a large number of examples of sentences containing verbs in their bare-stem form, that is, verbs not associated to any overt functional morpheme belonging to the IP-layer. The morphosyntax of such Vs is widely described throughout Part 4 of this work. For each example, I indicate the source (which is either the book Tiprens-la or Poullet&Telchid (2010)) on the rightmost column and I explain the reasons for the lack of overt verbal morphology on the left column. Of course, as some examples contain more than one base-stem V, I class them following their linear order. The symbols used are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNEXP</td>
<td>Unexpected occurrence of a tensed V. The reasons why the example is unexpected are indicated into brackets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyp</td>
<td>Hypothetic clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N+V</td>
<td>Noun plus verb construction. Allegedly in fact, GC does not use prepositions to indicate the relation between a N and a qualifying V. Consequently, French NEs like \textit{envie de travailler} become \textit{lanvi travayè} in GC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Monoclausal constructions containing two verbs whose meanings are complementary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Modal V. Allegedly, modal verbs are inherently tensed and never preceded by TMA markers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>A verb selected by a modal V never has TMA morphology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A+V</td>
<td>As happens in V+V and N+V constructions, the verbal complement of an adjective is not introduced by any overt preposition. Thus, French APs like \textit{content de parler} (“happy to talk”) become \textit{kontan palè} in GC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>When a V is the complement of a P, it is does not have any overt verbal morphology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restr+V</td>
<td>Restructring Vs take infinitival phrasal complements as their internal argument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imper</td>
<td>Imperatives occur in their base-stem form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Simple past (allegedly never expressed by any overt TMA marker with eventive Vs).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>Never preceded by any overt TMA marker to indicate present meaning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bare-stem Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>From</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNEXP (gerund)</td>
<td><em>I té mété-y ka tousé déotwa fwa</em>&lt;br&gt;He, ANT put-he, PROGR cough some time&lt;br&gt;“He (willingly) coughed a bunch of times [=he put himself coughing a bunch of times]”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEXP (fo+tensed V¹)</td>
<td><em>Kifè té fo-mwen té chwazi ondôt travay</em>&lt;br&gt;So ANT must-me ANT choose another job&lt;br&gt;“So that I had to choose another job”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEXP (konmansé + gerund)</td>
<td><em>An té adan on gran kalkilasyon davwa pann an-mwen-la té konmansé ka sanm-mwen sa i té séryé bon séryé la</em>&lt;br&gt;I was in one big calculation as breakdown of-me-DEF ANT start PROGR seem-me that it ANT serious good serious DEF&lt;br&gt;“I was taking into consideration many possibilities, as the breakdown of my engine had started to look very very serious to me”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEXP (Kwè + gerund)</td>
<td><em>Yo ka kwè yo ka fè-moun pè avè pikan a-yo...”</em>&lt;br&gt;They HAB think they HAB make-person fear with thorn of-they&lt;br&gt;“They think they can scare people with their thorns”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 Notice that this is unexpected because modal Vs like *fô* should not select a tensed V. Nonetheless, this might happen in GC: in fact, structures like those in (i-iii) convey slightly different meanings and are used in hypothetic clauses:

(i) *fô S V* : *Fô ou vini* “You must come”
(ii) *fô S té V* : *Fô ou té vini* : “You should have come [=and you still have the time to]”
(iii) té *fô S V* : Té *fô ou vini* : “You should have come [=but now it’s too late]”
(iv) té *fô S té V* : Té *fô ou té vini* : “You should have come [=referred to a certain time in the past when it was already too late for you to come]”
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| Hyp | N+V | | Sí an pwan tan rakonté-zòt sé tibiten-lasa [...]  
If I take time tell-you PLUR little.thing-DEM  
“If I take the time to tell you these details [...]” |
|---|---|---|---|
| Hyp | Mod | Mod | Mod+V | Anka sì on jou yo vwayajé, sa pé rivé sêvi-yo  
IN.case if one day they travel, this can arrive be.useful-they  
“In case they would travel one day, this might turn out to be useful to them” |
| A+V | | | | Alòs, granmoun-la tè ka byen kontan konté avè on nomn [...]  
Consequently, adult-DEF ANT PROGR well happy talk with a man  
“Consequently, the adults were delighted of being able to speak to [such] a man” |
| A+V | | | | È sa pa séryé chèchê-sav poukisa flè ka ba kò a-yo tann mal pou fè pikan i pa ka jamné sèvi ahak ?  
And this NEG serious try-know why flower HAB give body of-they such.big trouble for make thorn that NEG HAV never be.of.service nothing  
“And isn’t it serious to try to understand why the flowers go to such a fair amount of trouble to grow some thorns that aren’t of any service?” |
| A+V | | | | Mé flè-la pa té ka las ranjé kò a-y pou i tè pé sa parèt bèl  
But flower-DEF NEG ANT PROGR tired prepare body of-it for it ANT can that look nice  
“But the flower wans't tired of taking care of itself in order to have a chance of looking good” |
| A+V(Mod) | Mod+V | | Kifè sa pa fasil manm rivé vvè-yo adan on télèskòp  
So this NEG easy even arrive see-they inside a spyglass  
“For which reason it isn't easy to even get to see them with a spyglass” |
| | V+V | | An té présè konmansé démonté motè an-mwen  
I ANT in.a.hurry start disassemble engine of-me  
“I was in a hurry to start disassembling my engine” |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **P+V** | *Sa ka sèvi toubòlman, pou anka ou pèd-chimen on jou lannuit*  
This PROGR be.useful extremely, for in.case you lose-track a day night  
“This is very useful, in case you lose track one day at night” | TP |
| **V+V** | *[…] nou té kay fè konmisyon, tousa avan nou té ay lékòl*  
We ANT HAB.go do shopping, all.this before we ANT go school  
“We would do the shopping, and this before we went to school” | P&T |
| **V+V** | *Ola sé tifi-la té kay bengné ?*  
Where PLUR girl-DEF ANT PROGR.go swim?  
“Where were the girls going to swim?” | P&T |
| **V+V** | *Nou kay okipé dè nòstròm*  
We PROGR.go occupy of our.man  
“We're going to deal with that [=with that man]” | P&T |
| **V+V** | *An kay wouvè lenj adan savann*  
I PROGR.go hang linen in garden  
“I'm going to hang the linen in the garden” | P&T |
| **V+V** | *Nou pa kay bangné an rivyé*  
We NEG PROGR.go bath(V) in river  
“We're not going to swim in the river” | P&T |
| **V+V** | *Nou té kay fè manjè lapen*  
We ANT HAB.go make eat(N) rabbit  
“We would prepare the rabbit's food” | P&T |
| **V+V** | *I kay travay(V)*  
He PROGR.go work  
“He is going to work” | P&T |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V+V</th>
<th>Nou pa kay bangré an rivye</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We NEG PROGR.go bath(V) in river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We're not going to swim in the river”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Sé tifi-la té kay bengré an rivye-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLUR girl-DEF PROGR.go swim in river-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The girls were going to swim in the river”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An kay youvè lenj adan savann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I PROGR.go hang linen in garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I'm going to hang the linen in the garden”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Nou kay okipé dè mòstròm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We PROGR.go occupy of our.man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We're going to deal with that [=with that man]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An té kay chèchê-y mé...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I ANT PROGR.go look.for-him but</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was going to look for it, but...”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>I té ay fè on gran montray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>He ANT go make a big exposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“He had gone doing a big exposition”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Kanmarad an-mwen ay fè chimen a-y épi mouton a-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friend of-me fo make track of-he with mutton of-he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My friend made his way with his mutton”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V(Mod)</td>
<td>Ou pa kay jannè pé rivè a bout a-y aprèsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You NEG PROGR.go never can arrive at end of-it after.this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You will never be able to get to the end of that after this”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V+V | V+V | *An kay éseyé [...] fè dè pòtrè ka sanm-li piplis*  
I PROGR.go try make two portrait PROGR resemble-he more  
“I will try to do two more faithful portraits of him” | TP |
| Mod | Mod+V | *Flè-la ou enmé la pa bizwen pè ayen...*  
Flower-DEF you love DEF2 NEG need fear nothing  
“The flower you love doesn't need to fear anything...” | TP |
| SP | Restr+V | *Tiprens-la fè-y óbsèvé*  
Little.prince-DEF make.him observe  
“The Little prince pointed out” | TP |
| Restr+V |  | *Tiprens-la té fè-y rimakyé*  
Little.prince-DEF ANT make-he notice  
“The Little prince had him notice” | TP |
| Restr+V |  | *I té ka fè-w vvè on sèpan boa ka vale on bèt fèròs*  
It ANT HAB make-you see a snake boa PROGR swallow a beast wild  
“It showed a boa swallowing a wild beast” | TP |
| SP | Restr+V | *Sa fé-mwen gratè têt an-mwen onlo asi tribilasyon a lajeng*  
This make-me scratch head of-me a.lot on problem of jungle  
“This made me think a lot about the problems of the jungle” | TP |
| Restr+V |  | *On sepan boa i té ka fè on éléfan désann*  
A snake boa that ANT PROGR make an elephant go.down  
“A boa that was swallowing an elefant” | TP |
| SP | V+V | *É an apwann fè avyon volé*  
And I learn make plane flight  
“And I learnt how to make planes flight” | TP |
<p>| SP | Restr+V | An fe avyon volé tibwen toupatou asi latè | I make plane flight a bit everywhere on earth | “I made planes flight quite everywhere on Earth” | TP |
| SP | Restr+V | An fe Tiprens-la obsévè sé baobab-la a pa dé tipyèbwa | I make Little.prince-DEF observe PLUR baobab-DEF it NED some little.tree | “I made the Little Prince notice that the baobabs, they're not little trees” | TP |
| SP | Restr+V | Lidè a tout on krèy éléfan la fe Tiprens-la ri | Idea of all a herd elephant DEF make Little.prince laugh | “The idea of a whole herd of elephants made the Little Prince laugh” | TP |
| Restr+V | Yo ka fe planèt-la payé an pach | They HAB make planet-DEF blow.up | “They make the planet blow up” | TP |
| Restr+V | É sa ka fè-y gonflé lèstomnak a-y plen santiman | And this PROGR make-he inflate stomach of-he lot.of feeling | “And this makes him swell with pride” | TP |
| Restr+V | Tiprens-la té fè-y rimakyè | Little.prince-DEF ANT make-he notice | “The Little prince had him notice” | TP |
| Restr+V | É dlodous-la i té ka fin piti a piti asi nou la té ka fè-mwen krenn plimové biten ankò | And drinkable.water-DEF that ANT PROGR finish little to little on we DEF; ANT PROGR make-me fear worst thing even | “And the drinkable water we had, which was finishing, had me fear for the worst” | TP |
| Restr+V | I té fo-mwen té fè tout sévèl an-mwen maché pou rivé konpwann [...] pwoblèm-lasa | It ANT must-me ANT make all brain of-me function for arrive understand problem-DEM | “And I had to abuse of my brain functions to get to understand that problem [alone]” | TP |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restr+V</th>
<th>N+V</th>
<th>Sé granmoun-la té fè-mwen pèd lanvi kontinyé</th>
<th>PLUR adult-DEF ANT make-me lose desire go.on</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“The adults had me lose the desire to go on [doing so]”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restr+V</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>On pwoblèm asi kilès i té fè lèspri a-y maché onlo san dì ayen</td>
<td>A problem on which he ANT make spirit of-he work a.lot without say nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A problem about which he thought a lot without saying a word”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N+V</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>On bon rézon fo-zòt pwan an konsidérasyon</td>
<td>A good reason must-you(PL) take in consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A good reason you must take into consideration”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Fo pa blanmé-yo</td>
<td>Must NEG blame-they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“One shouldn't blame them”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Fo pa sé timoun-la montré-yo two rèd (=duri) avè sé granmoun-la</td>
<td>Must NEG PLUR child-DEF reveal-they too harsh with PLUR adult-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The children mustn't be too harsh with the adults”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Mé la, ké fo-zòt èskizé-mwen</td>
<td>But here, IRR must-you escuse-me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“But now, you'll have tu excuse me”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Mé si sé on mové plant, fo raché plant-la</td>
<td>But if COP pres a bad plant, must pull.out plant-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“But if the plant is weed, you must pull it out”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Fo lavé planèt-la byen-byen pwòp</td>
<td>Must wash planet-DEF well-well clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“One must keep the planet brilliant”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>E an tan-lasa, fò ou té fè tousa ou té ni pou fè san jen di mokouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>E an tan-lasa, fò ou té fè tousa ou té ni pou fè san jen di mokouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And in time-DEM, must you ANT do everything you ANT have to do without nothing say fly(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;And at that time, you had to do everything you were supposed to without saying a word&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mod+V(Mod)</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Tè ké [...] fo on moun pé ay an Frans adan on ayen tan pou i sizé-gadé solèy-la ka desann an lannè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ANT IRR must a person can go in France in a nothing time for she admire sun PROGR go.down sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It should be possible for people to go to France in a very little time so that they could admire the sun setting in the sea”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>E an tan-lasa, fò ou té fè tousa ou té ni pou fè san jen di mokouk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And in time-DEM, must you ANT do everything you ANT have to do without nothing say fly(N)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“And at that time, you had to do everything you were supposed to without saying a word”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>SP</td>
<td></td>
<td>Jéografi, fo di, rédè-mwen onlo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Geography, must say, help-me a.lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Geography helped me a lot, I must admit it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>Fo ou ranjé-w kon ou vilé pou ou pé sa raché près touléjou kon jou fèt sè baobab-la [...]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Must you organise-you as you want for you can this pull.out almost everyday as day festive PLUR baobab-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“You must get prepared as you wish so that you can pull out the baobabs everyday, as on holiday!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N+V(Mod)</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td></td>
<td>[...] rivé ou rivé rikonnèt-yo parapòt a sé pyéwòz-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Arrive(N) you arrive(V) distinguish-they from of PLUR rose-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Once you get to distinguish them from the plants of roses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>Sentence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Imper | Manzè Lizèt, vini-w tibwen | Miss Lisette, come-you a.little  
“Miss Lisette, please come on!” |
| Imper | Baré-y, baré vòlé-la | Stop-him, stop thief-DEF!  
“Stop him, stop that thief!” |
| Imper | Rakonté-mwen kijan sa pasé | Tell-me what this happen  
“Tell me what happened” |
| Imper | Pa mandé-yo manjé dòt biten ki pen | NEG ask-them eat other thing than bread  
“Don't ask them to eat other things than bread” |
| Imper | Ay bo-yo pòyò oben fouyapen | Go give-them banana or breadfruit  
“Try to give them some bananas or breadfruits [=if you dare]” |
| Imper | An di-y : “Tonton, arèsté bwe wonm si ou sé on nomn!” | I say-him : “Uncle, stop drink rhum if you COP a man!  
“I told him : “Uncle, stop drinking rhum if you're a real man!”” |
| Imper | É mwen, démèwdé-mwen, pou ba sé timoun-la manjé | And me, put.my.fingers.out-me, for give PLUR child-DEF food  
“And me, put my fingers out! To feed the kids” |
| Mod+V | On Tiprens i té bizwen yo ba-y konföwtasyon ! | A Little.prince that ANT need you give-he comfort(N)  
“A Little Prince who needed to be comforted” |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Role+Role</th>
<th>Role+Role+Role</th>
<th>Role+Role+Role+Role</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| A+V  | An té *kapab rikonnèt*  
I ANT able distinguish  
“I could recognize” | TP | | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | É si an *ba-zòt konnèt liméwo a-y* […]  
And if I give-you know number of-it  
“And if I allow you to know its number […]” | TP | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | *Mé fo atann*…  
But must wait  
“But one must wait” | TP | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | *Yo pé vin, sé tig-la, avè grif a-yo!*  
They can come, PLUR tiger-DEF, with claws of-they  
“They can come, the tigers, with their claws!” | TP | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | *A pa toutmoun i pé dì yo té ni on zanmi*  
EXPL NEG everybody that can say they ANT have a friend  
“Not everyone can affirm they have a friend” | TP | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | | | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | V+V | *Ou pé konmansé dékòlè*  
You can start calm-down  
“You can calm down, now” | P&T | |
| Mod  | Mod+V | V+V | P+V | *Si sé on plan […] a wòz, ou pé lésé-y tijé kon i vlé*  
If COP prez a plant […] of rose, you can let-it grow as it wish  
“If it's a plant of roses, you can let it grow as it pleases” | TP | |
| Restr+V | | | | *Men sa pa ka opozé-w dansé*  
But this NEG HAB prevent-you dance  
“But this doesn't prevent you from dancing!” | P&T | |
<p>| P+V | | | | <em>San mandé ponmoun ka yo ka vann</em> | P&amp;T |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Without ask anyone what they HAB think “Without asking anyone what they think”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>Ou ka monté si mwen san di bonjou!</em> You HAB come across me without say hi “You come across me without saying hi!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>Yo ka monté si granmoun san yo di ni bonjou, ni mèsi, ni ovwa, ni ahak</em> They HAB bump into adult without they say nor good.morning, nor thank.you, nor goodbye, nor nothing “They bump into adults without saying hello, thank you, goodbye, anything”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>Ou ka monté si mwen san di bonjou!</em> You HAB come across me without say hi “You come across me without saying hi!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>Pou mèt Tiprens-la antò a-y</em> For put Little.prince-DEF high of-it “To put the Little Prince up to it [=the rose]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>Pou ba Tiprens-la rimò</em> For give Little.prince-DEF regret “To make the Little prince feel guilty”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>Sè si mwa-la manjé-la ka pwan pou désann an fal a-yo la</em> PLUR six month-DEF food-DEF HAB take for go.down in guts of-they DEF 2 “The six months the food takes to get digested”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V</td>
<td><em>An ké ba-w on kòd osi pou maré-y lajouné</em> I ANT give-he a rope also for fasten-it day “I also gave him a rope so that he could fasten it during the day”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P+V | Sa pa té pou soupwann-mwen onlo  
This NEG ANT for surprise-me a.lot  
“This wasn't very surprising for me” | TP |
| P+V | Sé pou an pa oblîyé-y  
COPpr for I NEG forget-it  
“It's [meant] for me not to forget [about] it” | TP |
| P+V | Blîpman i mandé-mwen, san avèti [...]  
Suddenly he ask-me, without advise  
“Suddenly he asked me, without advising [...]” | TP |
| P+V | Poukisa flè ka ba kò a-yo tann mal pou fe pikan [...]?  
Why flower HAB give body of-they this.much bad for do thorn  
“Why do the flowers go to such a fair amount of trouble to grow some thorns?” | TP |
| Mod+V | I pa té pé janbè rivyè-la, i té malad  
He NEG ANT can jump river-DEF, he ANT sick  
“He couldn’t jump over the river, he was sick” | P&T |
| Mod | Sa pé an vin dèmen  
This can I come tomorrow  
“It is possible that I come tomorrow” | P&T |
| Mod+V | I pa té pé janbè rivyè-la, i té malad  
He NEG ANT can jump river-DEF, he ANT sick  
“He couldn’t jump over the river, he was sick” | P&T |
| Mod | Timoun alè pé di yo malélivè!  
Child today can say they bad-mannered  
“Today's children can call themselves bad-mannered!” | P&T |

lxvii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>He even couldn't say anything</td>
<td>&quot;He even couldn't say anything&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>This might have been a new type of baobab</td>
<td>&quot;This might have been a new type of baobab&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P+V V+V V</td>
<td>And it's useless to ask them to do you a service</td>
<td>&quot;And it's useless to ask them to do you a service&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Mod+V</td>
<td>You can say you bad-mannered (You can say) you're bad-mannered</td>
<td>&quot;(You can say) you're bad-mannered&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Mod+V</td>
<td>Today's children can call themselves bad-mannered!</td>
<td>&quot;Today's children can call themselves bad-mannered!&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Mod+V V+V</td>
<td>You can start calm (You can calm down now)</td>
<td>&quot;You can calm down now&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod+V V+V</td>
<td>And it might happen to me to become like the adults, who always have but numbers in their mind</td>
<td>&quot;And it might happen to me to become like the adults, who always have but numbers in their mind&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ixxviii
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>&quot;Ou pé di yo rèd pou menné&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You can say they difficult for bring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“(You can say) they are difficult to upbring!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P+restr</th>
<th>Restr+V</th>
<th>&quot;Pou byen fè sa rantré an kabèch a timoun bòkaz&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For well make this enter in head of child home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“For our children to remember this well”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>V+V</th>
<th>&quot;Epi penga mandé-yo rann-vous pon sèvis&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>And useless ask-them do-you any service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“And it's useless to ask them to do you a service”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>&quot;An rивé désiné prèmyé désen an-mwen&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I arrive draw first drawing of-me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I managed to make my first drawing”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>&quot;Pou sé granmoun-la té pé rивé konpwann&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For PLUR adult-DEF ANT can arrive understand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“For adults to manage to understand”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>&quot;Yo pa ka rивé imajiné kaz-lasa&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They NEG HAN arrive imagine house-DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They really can't imagine this house”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>&quot;Mé mwen [...] an pa ka rивé vwe on mouton andidan on kès&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mut me, I NEG HAB arrive see a mutton inside a box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But I […], I can't see a mutton [that's] inside a box”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>&quot;I pa janné rивé enné ponmoun&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He NEG never arrive love someone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“He could never love anyone”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| P&T | TP | P&T |
| SP | Lè nou rive dētwa wasou channda  
When we arrive some bird leave  
“When we arrived, some birds left” | P&T |
| SP | Lè yo rive bò rivyè-la, pa té ni ponmoun  
When they arrive riverside-DEF, NEG ANT have anyone  
“When they got to the riverside, no one was around” | P&T |
| SP | La otila an sòti...  
There form.where I come  
“(The place) where I came from…” | TP |
| SP | I rive i té on grenn  
It arrive it ANT a seed  
“It arrived a seed [=he was a seed when he arrived]” | TP |
| SP | I fōsè si tousè a-y  
He force on cough of-it  
“It exagerated its coughs” | TP |
| SP | Tiprens-la [...] mété-y adan on ayen tan ka doubté dè-y  
Little.prince-DEF put-he inside a nothing time PROGR doubt(V) of-it  
“The Little prince started to doubt it for a while” | TP |
| SP | On jou i di-mwen an zorèy  
One day he say-me in ear  
“One day he wispered in my ear” | TP |
| SP | V+V | SP | UNEXP gerund | Mé vitman tipyèbwa-la arété tijé, è mété-y ka préparé on flè  
But soon little.plant-DEF stop grow, and put-it PROGR prepare a flower  
“But very soon the little plant stopped growing, and started to prepare a flower” | TP |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>UNEXP</th>
<th>I prés [ka gadè-mwen] estebék [gerund]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(gerund)</td>
<td>He stay PROGR look-me astonished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“He went on looking at me astonished”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>A + V</td>
<td>Mé an prés [bon békwè-] la [vwè figi] a jenn jij an-mwen klér [èvè lakontantman] i tè yè</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N + V</td>
<td>But I stay well surprised-DEF see figure of young judge of-me light-up with happiness he ANT COP_int</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“But I stook there astonished to see my young judge's face start shining with happiness”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>P + V</td>
<td>I pa janné fè ayen apa fè kalkilasyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He NEG never do nothing aside do calculations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“He never did anything but calculations”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>V + V</td>
<td>An mété [mwen] annaks pou té [ésèvè] rivé a bout a on réparasyon fôsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I put-me in.condition for ANT try arrive at end of a fixing-up exhausting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I put myself in the best conditions to try to make an end of an exhausting fixing-up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restr+V</td>
<td>An ni détwa rézon sèry [ka fè-mwen] Kwè planèt-la otila Triprens-la té sôti la sé astéwoyid 612-la</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I have some reason serious PROGR do-me believe planet-DEF from.where Little.prince-DEF ANT come DEF2 COP_pers asteroid B 612-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I have some serious reasons that are making me believe that the planet from where the Little Prince came is the asteroid 612”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>Imper</td>
<td>I réponn-mwen : “Tigason ay ponn !”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He answer-me : “Boy, go lay (an egg) !”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“He told me : “Boy, go get lost!””</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>N + V</td>
<td>I pwan [tan gadè]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>He took time watch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“He took the time to watch [the drawing]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>An vin pou fé on déklarasyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I come to do a declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I came to declare [what happened to me]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>An vin pou fé on déklarasyon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I come to do a declaration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I came to declare [what happened to me]”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>Sa pwan-mwen onlo tan pou konpwan ola i té sòti</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>This take-me a.lot time for understand where he ANT come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“It took me a lot of time to understand where he came from”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>Sé pli gran la pwofité ou pa la pou yo ay drivé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PLUR more big DEF take.advantage.of you NEG there for they go hang.around</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The bigger ones have taken advantage of your absence to hang around”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Mod +V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mwen éséyé mé an pa rivi fé-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I try but I NEG arrive do-it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I tried but I didn't manage to do it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>Plibon pòtré an rivi fé dè-y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Best portrait I arrive do of-he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“The best portait of him I managed to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>P+V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>On flè asifi i gadè-y pou i santi kyè a-y kontan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A flower Øthat be.sufficient he look-it for he feel heart of-he happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“A flower he just needed to see to feel happy”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>V+V</th>
<th>An vin atann-yo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I come wait-them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I came to wait for them”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

lxxii
| SP   | V+V       | Dèwò-la, prèmyè ti limyè a solèy-la **konmansé kléré**  
Outside-DEF, first little light of sun-DEF start shine  
“Outside, the first sunbeams started to shine” | P&T |
| SP   | V+V       | É on jou i **konséyé-mwen pwan** tout ti tan an-mwen pou réyision bél désen  
An one day he suggest-me take all little time of-me for do nice drawing  
“And one day he suggested I should take all my own sweet time to realise a nice drawing” | TP |
| SP   | V+V       | **Adan onsèl kou i mété pléré-gwodlo atè**  
In only-one time he put cry-tear to.the ground  
“And all of a sudden, he started crying” | TP |
| SP   | V+V       | **Adan on ayen tan mwen apwann konnèt flè-lasa plibyen**  
In a nothing time I learnt know flower-DEF better  
“And in a very little time I got to know that flower better” | TP |
| SP   | V+V       | Dèwò-la, prèmyè ti limyè a solèy-la **konmansé kléré**  
Outside-DEF, first little light of sun-DEF start shine  
“Outside, the first sunbeams started to shine” | P&T |
| SP   | V+V       | **Kifè an désidé-mwen chèché-sav plis asi tousa**  
So I decide-me try-know more on all.this  
“So I decided to try to learn more about all this” | TP |
| SP   | Restr+V   | **On diktatè tirk fòsé pèp a-y pôté lenj éwopéyen**  
A dictator turk force people of-he wear clothes european  
“A Turk dictator had his people wear [only] European clothes” | TP |
| SP   | V+V       | **Astronom-la viré fè montray a-y an 1920 (tornò a fare)**  
Astronomer-DEF come.back do exposition of-he in 1920  
“The astronomer came back to do his exposition [again] in 1920” | TP |
| SP | V+V | Après nou **fin lavé-kò an-nou lématen**  
After we finish wash-body of.us morning  
“After we finish washing ourselves in the morning” |
|----|-----| TP |
| SP | V+V | **I kouri gadé**  
She run look  
“She ran to see what was happening” |
|    |     | P&T |
| SP | P+V(Mod) Mod +V | Lè an **fin pa rivé di on pawòl, an di-y konsa**  
When I finish for say a word, I say-he like.this  
“When I finally managed to say a word, I told him so” |
|    |     | TP |
| SP | V+V | **Mé an moman-lasa an vin sonjé an té lontan plis apwann jéografi [...]**  
But at moment-DEM I come realize I ANT way more learn geography  
“But at that moment I realised I had learnt way more geography [than how to draw]” |
|    |     | TP |
| SP | V+V | Sé konsa, twazyèm jou-la, an **vin touvé-mwen okouran a penn é tribilasyon a sé baobab-la**  
COP **pres** like.this, third day-DEF, I come find-me abreast of pain and suffering of PLUR baobab-DEF  
“And it's like this that, the third day, I found myself abreast of the problems of the baobabs” |
|    |     | TP |
| SP | V+V | **An vin atann-yo**  
I come wait-them  
“I came to wait for them” |
|    |     | P&T |
| SP | V+V | **E sé konsa an vin konnèt Tiprens-la**  
And COP **pres** like.this I come know Little.prince-DEF  
“And that's how I got to know the Little Prince” |
|    |     | TP |
| SP | V+V | Sé konsa an **vin apwann on dézièm biten fondal toubòlman**  
COP **pres** like.this I come learn a second thing fundamental extremely  
“That's how I got to learn a second, fundamental thing” |
<p>|    |     | TP |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>V+V</th>
<th>Tiprens, sè konsa an vin konpwann, piti a piti, ti lavi chimèrik a-w-la</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Little prince, COPpres like this I come understand, little to little, little life sad of-you-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Little Prince, that's how I got to understand, little by little, your saddish life”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>V+V</th>
<th>An vin apwann dényé tibiten-lasa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I come learn last little thing-DEF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“I got to learn this last, little thing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SP</th>
<th>Vstate</th>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>Kifè an viv tousèl tousèl an-mwen, san ni ponmoun pou palé osèryé</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>So I live alone alone of-me, without have nobody for talk seriously</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“So that I lived all on my own, without anyone to talk to seriously”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vstate</th>
<th>Mé ou sav byen an malad!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But you know well I sick</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But you perfectly know that I'm sick!”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Sé on travay bousian, mé i pé pa pli fasil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COP pres a job exhausting, but it can NEG more easy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“It's an exhausting job, but it couldn't be any easier”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vstate</th>
<th>Ou sav an pa sitèlman ennè lammè</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>You know I NEG so much love sea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“You know I'm not much of a sea person”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>P+P</th>
<th>Yo vé viv adoumanman, san yo fósé pou hak</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They want live quietly, without they make efforts for nothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“They want to live quietly, without making any sort of efforts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>V+V</th>
<th>Rènéliz é Fanélya vlé ay bengné</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rènéliz and Fanélya want go bath(V)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Rènéliz and Fanélya want to go swimming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEXP (time adj)</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>Sé baobab-la, avan yo vin gran, yo ka toupeyi pou konmansé. PLUR baobab-DEF, before they come big, they PROGR all.little to start “The baobabs, before becoming big, (they) are very little”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Yo ka pisimyé ay bòdlammé lè tan-la two fwè They HAB prefer go seaside when weather-DEF too cold “The prefer going to the seaside when it's a bit too cold”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>É an pa té jammé apwann désiré ahak dôt ki boa fémé é boa ouvè And I NEG ANT never learn draw nothing other than boa closed and boa open “And I had never learnt how to draw anything but closed boas and opened ones”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Ou pa ka nôz pa kouté You NEG HAB dare NEG listen “You don't dare listening”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An té ké enmè konmansé istwa-lasa menmjan ki on kont a prens é prensè I ANT IRR love start story-DEM same as a fable of prince and princess “I would (have) love(d) to start this story as a fairy tale”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An té ké enmè di [ … ] I ANT IRR love say “I would love to say”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>É i té bizwen ni on zanmí. And he ANT need have a friend “And he needed (to have) a friend”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An désidé pa rété bouch fémé ankô I decide NEG stay mouth shut still “And I decided non to keep my mouth shut any longer”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>On jou, an vivè solèy desann an lanmè karant-twa fwa ! On day, I see sun go.down in sea 44 time “One day, I saw the sun set into the sea 44 times”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An té okipé bon okipé la an moman-lasa ka ēsèy débridé on boulon two sèrè adan motè an-mwen I ANT busy good busy DEF at moment-DEM PROGR try release a bolt too fasten inside engine of-me “At that moment, I was very busy trying to release a bolt that was too fasten in my engine”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>Pa ni tig asi planèt an-mwen “There are no tigers on my planet”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>An ray sé kourandè-la toubòlman I fear PLUR draft-DEF extremely “I am very scared of drafts”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>An bizwen on mouton I need a mutton “I need a mutton”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Rènéliz é Fanélya vlé ay bengné Rènéliz and Fanélya want go bath(V) “Rènéliz and Fanélya want to go swimming”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>V+V(Mod)</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>An vlé on mouton i kay pé viv lontan I want a mutton that PROGR.go can live long “I want a mutton which can live long”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Yo toujou bizwen ou kléré-yo They always need you clarify-they “They always need you to explain them everything”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>Après sa, yo pa fouti déplasé</td>
<td>After this, they NEG manage move “After, they can't move”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>P+V</td>
<td>Pa ni hak pou fe</td>
<td>NEG have nothing for do “There is nothing to do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>I pé kriyé-y : “astéwoid 325-la”</td>
<td>He can call-it asteroid 325-DEF “He can call it Asteroid 325”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Mod+V</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Chaklè ou pé ay chèché Rènéliz Every time you can go look for Renelise “Every time you can go look for Renelise”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>I pa enné dansé, i pa enné ponmlé [...] i pa enné li, i pa enné fè mennaj She NEG love dance, she NEG love walk [...] she NEG love read, she NEG love do housekeeping “She doesn't love dancing, she doesn't love going for walks, she doesn't love reading, she doesn't love doing the housekeeping”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>Yo ka pisimyè ay bòdlannè lè tan-la two fwè They HAB prefer go seaside when weather-DEF too cold “The prefer going to the seaside when it's a bit too cold”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vstate</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>V+V</td>
<td>An pa gyè enné fè-mwen pasé pou on filozòf ka ba-moun lison I NEG at.all love make-me pass for a philosopher HAB give-person lesson “I don't want people to think I'm one of those philosophers who indoctrinates people”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 The analysis is the same for all clauses.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>P+V</th>
<th>Mod</th>
<th>Mod+V</th>
<th>Vstate+V</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lè you ka mandè-y si i vé mayé</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When you HAB ask-her if she want marry
“When you ask her if she wants to get married” |
| Mod    | Mod+V |
| Yo vé viv adoumanman, san yo fôsé pou hak |
They want live(V) quietly, without they make.efforts for nothing
“They want to live quietly, without making any sort of efforts” |
| Mod    | Mod+V |
| Sa sé granmoun-la toujou vlé kwè [sa] |
This COPpres adult-DEF always want believe [this]
“It's the adults that always want to believe [this]” |
| Vstate | Vstate+V |
| Mé pouki ou vlé sé mouton a-w-la manjé sé tibaobab-la ?” |
But why you want PLUR mutton of-you-DEF eat PLUR little.baobab-DEF
“But why do you want your muttons to eat the little baobabs [=but why do you think that the muttons would...]?” |
Appendix 4
Corpus of direct questions

This corpus provides some instances of direct wh- and yes/no questions taken from Poullet&Telchid (2010) and the book Tiprens-la. In the leftmost column, I classify the questions of the central column according to their type and interrogative element (when phonetically realized). I provide the source of each example in the rightmost column. For more details on the structure of interrogative sentences, see Part 3. The symbols used are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WH</th>
<th>Wh-question. They imply the presence of a wh-like element that raises towards the CP-layer.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Yes/no question. They are constructed either with the interrogative element es or with no element.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS</td>
<td>In situ. The interrogative element does not leave the position where it generates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X + N</td>
<td>The interrogative pronoun X is combined with a N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Kibiten</td>
<td><em>Sensan milyon kibiten?</em> Five hundred million of what?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Kimoun</td>
<td><em>Yo sé ta kimoun?</em> They COP prez that of who “They belong to whom?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Kisa</td>
<td><em>Pou obliyé kisa?</em> To forget what “To forget what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Kisa</td>
<td><em>Minis a kisa?</em> Minister of what “Minister of what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Kisa</td>
<td><em>On kisa?</em> “A what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Kisa</td>
<td><em>Atann kisa?</em> Wait what “Wait for what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InS Poukisa</td>
<td><em>Wont poukisa?</em> Shame why “Shame of what?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Asi kisa</td>
<td><em>Monsénỳè...asi kisa ou mèt?</em> My king...on what you rule “My king...on what do you rule?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Asi kisa</td>
<td><em>Asi kisa Wa-la té pé byen ka fè gòj konsa?</em> On what King-DEF ANT can well HAB do yoke like this “On what could the King be able to rule?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Hokonsa+N</td>
<td><em>Hokonsa lajan pap’a-y ka gannyé?</em>” How much money dad of he HAB make “How much money does his dad make?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Hokonsa+N</td>
<td><em>Hokonsa kilo i ka pèzé?</em> How many kilo he HAB weight “How many kilos does he weight?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Hokonsa+N</td>
<td><em>Hokonsa frè i ni?</em> How many brother he have</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH Ka</strong></td>
<td><strong>Translated</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;How many brother does he have?&quot;</td>
<td>Mé ka i ka fè sa ka rivé-mwen ? But what it PROGR make this PROGR arrive-me “But what makes this happen to me?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;But what it PROGR make this PROGR arrive-me&quot;</td>
<td>Ka ou ka di la ? What you PROGR say here “What are you saying?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What are you saying?&quot;</td>
<td>Eben ka i fè, tifi-lasa ? So what she do, girl-DEM “So what did that girl do?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;So what did that girl do?&quot;</td>
<td>Ka yo pé ka rakontè konsa ? What they can PROGR tell like this “What can they possibly be talking about?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What can they possibly be talking about?&quot;</td>
<td>Ka zò té ké vlé manjé ? What you(PL) ANT IRR want eat “What would you like to eat?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What would you like to eat?&quot;</td>
<td>Mé ka ou vlé an di-w ? But what you want I tell-you “But what do you want me to tell you?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;But what do you want me to tell you?&quot;</td>
<td>Elwa ka ou bizwen pati an Fwans fè ? Eloi what you need leave in France do “Eloi, what are you leaving to France for?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Eloi, what are you leaving to France for?”</td>
<td>E ka zò fè aprésa ? And what you(PL) do after “And what did you do afterwards?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;And what did you do afterwards?&quot;</td>
<td>Mé ka ou fè pou ou las tout las a-w lasa ? But what you do for you tired all tired of you DEM “But what have you done to be this exhausted?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;But what have you done to be this exhausted?”</td>
<td>Ka ou ni ? What you have “What do you have?/What's wrong with you?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What's wrong with you?”</td>
<td>Ka sa yé on jéograf ? What this COP in a geographer “What is a geographer?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What is a geographer?”</td>
<td>Ka sa vlé di ? What this want say “What does this mean”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;What does this mean”</td>
<td>Ka ou ka fè la ? What you HAB/PROGR do here “What do you do/what are you doing here?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Translation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And, to make hat-DEF fall to.the.ground, what to do “And what to do to make the hat fall to the ground?”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What this COPint thing-DEM “What's this/that thing?”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>But...what you PROGR do here “But...what are you doing here?”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What it have madame? “What's going on, Madame?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What they PROGR/HAB say? “What do they say/What are they saying?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you have? “What do you have?/What's going on?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do you want do? “What do you want to do?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you catch ? “What did you catch?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What you do Adalbert? “How are you doing, Albert?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good morning dear, what you do ? “Good morning dear, how are you doing?”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What age og-he “What's his age”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What sound of voice of-he “What's the sound of his voice?”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki</td>
<td><strong>Ki non a-w?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki+N</td>
<td><strong>Jik ki lè sé moun-la ka rêtè an simityè-la?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki+N</td>
<td><strong>Mé adan ki kinmin antré a kous-la ké fèt lanné-lasa?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki+N</td>
<td><strong>A ki lè?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki+N</td>
<td><strong>Asi ki planèt ou sòti?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki+N</td>
<td><strong>Ki lè i yé?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Ki+N</td>
<td><strong>Ki nouvèl a-w?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Kifè</td>
<td><strong>Kifè ou anpenn?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Kijan</td>
<td><strong>Kijan fé në machann la?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Kijan</td>
<td><strong>Kijan ou ké démélè-y?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Kijan</td>
<td><strong>Kijan fé ou fën tout fën a-w lasa</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Kijan</td>
<td><strong>Kijan jë i pisimyè?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WH | Kijan | *Kijan a vòlé-la daprè sa ou rivé vwé ?*  
Which type of thief-DEF according to that you arrive see?  
“How was the thief, according to what you could see?” | P&T |
| WH | Kijan | *Kijan i yé ?*  
How he COP<sub>int</sub>  
“What does he look like?” | P&T |
| WH | Kijan | *Kijan fè i té ka tann dézòd ?*  
How make she ANT PROGR hear noise?  
“How came she was hearing some noise?” | P&T |
| WH | Kilès | *Kilès i non a-w? Klèrnita oben Gyenbo ?*  
Which that name of-you? Klèrnita or Gyenbo?  
“When is your name? Klèrnita or Gyenbo?” | P&T |
| WH | Kilès+N | *Kilès konséyé-la ou konnèt-la ?*  
Which counselor-DEF you know DEF  
“What is the counselor you know?” | P&T |
| WH | Kimoun | *Kimoun ka okipè di-y ?*  
Who PROGR take.care of-it  
“Who's going to take care of it?” | P&T |
| WH | Kimoun | *Kimoun ou yé ?*  
Who you COP<sub>int</sub>  
“Who are you?” | P&T |
| WH | Kimoun | *Kimoun sa té pé yé ?*  
Who this ANT can COP<sub>int</sub>  
“Who could it be?” | P&T |
| WH | Kisa | *Kìsa lòd-la ka di ?*  
What order-DEF HAB say  
“What does the rule say?” | TP |
| WH | Kisa | *Kìsa an ka fè épi yo ?*  
What I HAB do with they  
“What do I do with them?” | TP |
| WH | Kisa | É *kìsa ou ka fè avè sé zétwal-lasa?*  
And what you HAB do with PLUR star-DEM  
“And what do you do with these/those stars?” | TP |
| WH | Kisa | É *kìsa ou ka fè avè sen-san milyon zétwal ?*  
And what you HAB do with five-hundred million star  
“And what do you do with five hundred millions of stars?” | TP |
| WH |  | *Sé pikan-la, kìsa yo ka sèvi ?*  
<p>| | | | |
| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kisa</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLUR thorn-DEF, what they HAB be.useful</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Alò sé pikan-la, kisa yo ka sèvi ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kisa</strong></td>
<td><strong>So PLUR thorn-DEF, what they HAB be.useful</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Kitan sa ké fèt ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>When this IRR do</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Konmen timoun ou ka vwè douvan-w ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>How many child you PROGR see in.front.of-you</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Woulé pou dé jou, é pou konmen lajan ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work for two day, and for how.much money</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>O ou kay Elwa ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where you PROGR.go Eloi</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola nou kay pè manjé sa ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where we PROGR.go can eat this</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola ou vlé chayé mouton an-mwen alé ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where you want fasten mutton of-me go</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola sa yé sa “akaz a-w” ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where this COP in this “house of-you”</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola sak a-w té yé ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where bag of-you ANT COP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola ou ka rété ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where you HAB live?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola zôt té kay ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where you(PL) ANT PROGR.go</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Ola sé tifié-la té kay bengné ?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WH</strong></td>
<td><strong>Where PLUR girl-DEF ANT PROGR.go swim?</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WH Ola | Fannélya ola zôt kay konsa ?  
Fanélya where you(PL) PROGR.go like.this?  
“Fanélya, where are you(PL) going like this [=in those swimsuits]?” | P&T |
| WH Ola | *Ola nou kay ? Bòdlanmè oben bòrivyè ?*  
Where we PROGR.go? Seaside or riverside?  
“Where are we going? To the seaside or to the riverside?” | P&T |
| WH Ola | *Ola i kay ?*  
Where he PROGR.go?  
“Where is he going?” | P&T |
| WH Ola | *Ola ou yé ?*  
Where you COP int?  
“Where are you?” | P&T |
| WH Ola | *Ola kanklo sòti ?*  
Where snail come.from?  
“Where does the snail¹ come from?” | P&T |
| WH Ola | Kijansa, ola ou soti ?  
What, where you come.from?  
“What? Where do you come from?” | P&T |
| WH Pouki | Pouki ou ka lévé cho ?  
Why you PROGR raise hot  
“Why are you getting mad [at me]?” | P&T |
| WH Pouki | Mé pouki ou vlé sé mouton a-w-la manjé sé tibaobab-la ?  
But why you want PLUR mutton of-you-DEF eat PLUR little.baobab-DEF  
“But why do you want your muttons to eat the little baobabs?” | TP |
| WH Pouki | Pouki ?  
“Why?” | TP |
| WH Pouki | Mé poukisa ou sòti woulimé-y?  
But why you just again.turn.on-it  
“But why have you just turned it on again?” | TP |
| WH Pouki | Poukisa ou ka bwè ?  
Why you HAB/PROGR drink?  
“Why do you drink/why are you drinking?” | TP |
| WH | Poukisa pa tini, adan liv-lasa, dôt granmanman désen kon  
| TP |

¹ The snail is one of the two characters of a dialogue I found in Poullet&Telchid 2010 (page 8).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poukisa dësen a sè baobab-la ?</td>
<td>Why NEG have, in book-DEM, other big drawing like drawing of PLUR baobab-DEF “Why aren't there, in this book, other big drawings like that of the baobabs?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH Poukisa Poukisa moun té ké pè on chapo ?</td>
<td>Why person ANT IRR can fear(V) a hat “Why should you fear a hat?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WH What Ka sa vlé di “annadorasyon” ?</td>
<td>What this want say “admiring(A)” “What does “a fanatic of mine” means?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Tijan, ou ja filé kouto-la ?</td>
<td>Little.jean, you already sharpen knife-DEF “Little Jean, have you already sharpened the knife?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Ou pa'a rivé dòmi?</td>
<td>You NEG'HAB arrive sleep “You can't get any sleep?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Ou ka tann vwa ?</td>
<td>You HAB heat voice “Do you hear voices?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Ou ka kwè an ké géri manzè Vyoléta ?</td>
<td>You PROGR believe I IRR recover miss Violet “Do you believe I'll get better, miss Violet?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N I kay suiv tou-la asi bisiklèt a-y ?</td>
<td>He PROGR.go follow tour-DEF on bicycle of-he “Will he be following the tour with his bike?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Karakala sé boug a-w ?</td>
<td>Caracala COP prés friend of-you “Caracala is your friend?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Mari, ou vvè tifi-la i té bò fontenn-la yè?</td>
<td>Mari, you see girl-DEF that ANT edge fountain-DEF yesterday “Mary, did you see the girl who was by the fountain yesterday?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N On travay ka atann-vou ?</td>
<td>A work PROGR wait-you “A job that's waiting for you?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N E sé sa ki lasi-w konsa ?</td>
<td>And COP prés this that exhaust-you(SG) like.this “And is it this that exhausted you so?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N Zò pa jen rivé trapè-y alò ?</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>You(PL) NEG ever arrive catch-it then “You never managed to catch it, then?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Ou malad?</em> You sick “Are you sick?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Ou ni sé zétwal-la?</em> You have PLUR star-DEF “You own the stars?” (astonishment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>É dèzant an lamè a solèy-la an mandé-w la?</em> And setting in sea of sun-DEF I asked-you DEF2 And what about the sun setting I asked you for?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>É sé zétwal-la yo ka kouté-w?</em> And PLUR star DEF they HAB listen-you “And the stars, do they obey you?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Asi tousa?</em> On all.this “[You rule] on all of these things?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Asi toutbiten?</em> On everything “[You rule] on everything?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>An pé sizé?</em> I can sit.down “Can I take a sit?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Ou pa té ké ni on paravan délè?</em> You NEG ANT IRR have a screen of air “Don't you have an air screen, by any chance?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Menm sé flè-la i ni pikan-la?</em> Also PLUR flower-DEF that have thorn-DEF2 “Also the flowers that have thorns?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>On mouton, si i ka manjé sé tipyebwa-la, i ka manjé sé flè-la osi?</em> A mutton, if it HAB eat PLUR little.tree-DEF, it HAB eat PLUR plower-DEF also “If a mutton eats the little trees, does it eat the flowers as well?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Sa vlé di ou sòti asi ondòt planèt alò?</em> This want say you come from another planet then “Does this mean you that came from another planet, then?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Ou ka di mouton-lasa ké bizwen onlo zèb?</em> You PROGR sat mutton-DEM IRR need a.lot grass “Are you saying that this mutton will need a lot of grass?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Sa vwé sa?</em> This true this “Is this true?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>A pa ponmoun ou konnèt?</em> COP NEG nobody you know? “Wasn't it anyone you know?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Pa té ni pon dòt moun la?</em> NEG ANT have other person there? “Weren't there any other people?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Ou ka travay?</em> You HAB work? “Do you work?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Zòt pa té kay bò rivyé-la?</em> You(PL) NEG ANT PROGR.go riverside-DEF “Weren't you(PL) going to the riverside?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>E-w menm, sa kay?</em> And-you self, this PROGR.go? “And you, is everything fine?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Sé-w i la alô Wobè?</em> COP prez-you that there so Robert? “Is that you, Robert?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N (rhetoric)</td>
<td><em>Sa pa pli séréyé è pli fondal ki tout kalkilasyon on gwo misyé touwouj ka fè ?</em> This NEG more serious and more essential than all calculation a big man all.red HAB do “And isn't this more serious and essential than all the calculations that a big reddish man does?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N (rhetoric)</td>
<td><em>É sa pa séréyé chèché-sav poukisa flè ka ba kò a-yo tann mal pou fè pikan i pa ka jammé sèvi ahak ?</em> And this NEG serious try-know why flower HAB give body of-they so trouble to make thorn that NEG HAB never be.useful nothing “And isn't it serious to try to understand why the flowers go to a lot of trouble to grow some thorns that aren't useful are all?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td><em>Es ou kay suiv tou-la, lanné-lasa?</em> INT you PROGR.go follow tour-DEF, year-DEM “Will you be watching the Tour [=of Guadeloupe] this year?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

xci
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Y/N</th>
<th>Es</th>
<th>P&amp;T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Es zò dakò pou fè mas ?</strong>&lt;br&gt;INT you(PL) agree(A) to do mask&lt;br&gt;“Do you agree on getting disguised?”</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P&amp;T</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mé ès ou ka konpranndi an ké babyé dëjè-y ?</strong>&lt;br&gt;But INT you PROGR understand I IRR scold after-he&lt;br&gt;“But do you (really) think I'm going to scold him?”</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>P&amp;T</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Es ou annadorasyon kon annadorasyon ka maké douvan mwen oséryè ?</strong>&lt;br&gt;INT you adoring(A) like adoring(A) that written in.front me seriously&lt;br&gt;“Are you seriously a true fan of mine?”</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Es i ka sanblé papiyon ?</strong>&lt;br&gt;INT he HAB collect butterfly&lt;br&gt;“Does he collect butterflies?”</td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TP</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 5
Corpus of dislocations

This corpus provides some instances of dislocated elements (Topics and Focus) giving rise to unmarked word orders. They are taken from Pouillet&Telchid (2010) and from the book Tiprens-la. In the leftmost column, I classify the marked orders of the central column according to their type. I provide the source of each example on the rightmost column. For more details on the structure of dislocations, see Part 3. The symbols used in the table are the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLD</th>
<th>Clitic Left Dislocation.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td>Cleft sentence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Left dislocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Right dislocation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Exemple</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASIDE</td>
<td>Yo pé vin, sé tig-la, avè grif a-yo !</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They can come PLUR tiger-DEF with claw of-they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“They can come, the tigers, with their claws!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Sé granmoun-la yo pa ka janmè konpwann ayen yomenm tousél tousél a-yo</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLUR adult-DEF they NEH HAB never understand nothing themself alone alone of-they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The adults, they never understand anything all by themselves”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>On boa sa danjérè</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A boa this dangerous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“A boa, that’s dangerous”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>É on éléfan sa ka pwan onlo plas toubòlman</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And an elephant this HAB take a.lot place extremely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“And an elephant, that requires a lot of space”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Akaz an-mwen sa tou piti</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>House of-me this all little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“My place, that’s very little”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Padavwa akaz an-mwen sa tou piti...</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Because house of-me this all little</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Because my place, that’s very little”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Astéwoyid-lasa yo rivé vwè-y yenki onsèl fwa adan on téléskòp</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This asteroid, they managed to observe it only once with a spyglass”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Sé granmoun-la yo ennmé chif</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLUR adult-DEF they love number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The adults, they are fond of numbers”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Mé sé grenn-la ou pa ka bvè-yo</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But PLUR seed-DEF you NEG HAB see-they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But the seeds. you can't see them”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>É si sé baobab-la yo a twòp</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>And of PLUR baobab-DEF they in school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“And if the baobabs..if they're a lot”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td>Mé danjérozité a sé baobab-la moun pa gyè konnèt-li</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>But dangerousness of PLUR baobab-DEF person NEG at.all know-it</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“But the dangerousness of baobabs..people are never aware of that”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td><strong>Alò sé pikan-la, kisa yo ka sèvi ?</strong> So PLUR thorn-DEF what they HAB be-useful “So the thorns, what are they useful for?”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td><strong>Sé pikan-la, yo pa ka sèvi ayen</strong> PLUR thorn-DEG they NEG HAB be.useful nothing The thorns..that's useless”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td><strong>Tiprens-la, li i té ka vényé rivé a on manman bouton</strong> Little.prince-DEF he he ANT PROGR look arrive of a hige blossom “The Little Prince, he was waiting for a huge blossom to bloom”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td><strong>Travay, […]</strong>, sa ké lasi kò a-y Work(N), this IRR exhaust body of-he “Working, that would exhaust him”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td><strong>Sé pikan-la, yo pa ka sèvi ayen, sé movëzété a sé flè-la</strong> PLUR thorn-DEF they NEG HAB be.useful COPpres bad.thing of PLUR flower-DEF “The thorns, they aren't useful: that's bad”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLD</td>
<td><strong>Travay, a pa pou-y</strong> Work(N), EXPL NEG for-he “Working, that's not his cup of tea”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><strong>Si on nomn pa ka bwè wonm, a pa on nonm sé on zongnon !</strong> If a man NEG HAB drink rhum, EXPL NEG a man COP an onion! “If a man doesn't drink rhum, that's not a man but a little child!”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><strong>A pa èvè-nou ou ka jwé</strong> EXPL NEG with-us you PROGR play “It's not with us you're gonna play”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><strong>A pa té ponmoun i té konnèt</strong> EXPL NEG ANT nobody he ANT know “That wasn't anyone he knew”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><strong>A pa kouyonnad !</strong> EXPL NEG nonsense! “This isn't nonsense!”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><strong>A pa an tan an-mwen ou té kay fè pon granmoun sa</strong> EXPL NEG at time of-me you ANT HAB.go do any adult this “It's not at my times that you could do this to an adult” (“You couldn't treat adult people like that when I was younger”)</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><strong>Yo ka fè konsi a pa ba-yo ou palé</strong> They HAB do as.if EXPL NEG to-them you speak “They will do as if it wasn't to them you're speaking” (“They</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td></td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>will pretend you're not talking to them</em>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>A pa ban-mwen ou palé?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL NEG to-me you speak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It's not to me you're speaking to?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>A pa ponmoun ou konnèt ?</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL NEG nobody you know?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Wasn't it anyone you know?”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>An fè Tiprens-la obsèvé sé baobab-la a pa dè tipyèbwa</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make Little.prince-DEF observe PLUR baobab-DEF EXPL negative plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I made the Little prince notice that the baobabs, that's not little plants”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>Pou mwen sétique lavi oben lanmò i tè ka atann-mwen</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For me COP past life or death that ANT PROGR wait me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“For me that was a matter of life or death”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>Sé dyèktèman konsa an té vlé-y</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP pres exctly like this I want it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That's exactly how I wanted it”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>E sé konsa an vin konnèt Tiprens-la</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And COP pres like this I come know Little.prince-DEF</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And that's how I got to know the Little prince”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>Sé on avyon.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP pres a plane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That's a plane”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>Sé avyon an-mwen.</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP pres plane of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That's my plane”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>A pa on biten</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL NEG a thing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That's not a thing”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>A pa pa èspré mwen fè-y</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL NEG for purpose I do-it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I didn't do that on purpose”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>E a pa venki twèl yo ka vann la</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>And EXPL NEG only tissue they HAB sell there</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“And they aren't just selling tissues there”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>Sé sa ou ka réponn-mwen</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COP pres what you PROGR answer me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“That's what you're telling me”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td><em>A pa tout jé an ka pran Elvina</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXPL NEG all joke I HAB take Elvina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“It's not that I can stand all kinds of jokes, Elvina!”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLEFT</th>
<th>CLEFT</th>
<th>“Pa on mouton sa sè on bélyé”&lt;br&gt;This NEG a mutton this COPₚₑᵣₛ a ram&lt;br&gt;“That's not a mutton, that's a ram!”</th>
<th>TP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td>CLEFT</td>
<td>“Mé a pa on nonm sa sè on zôrèy-bwa!”&lt;br&gt;But EXPL NEG a man this COPₚₑᵣₛ a mushroom&lt;br&gt;“But that isn't a man, that's a mushroom!”</td>
<td>TP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Misyè, mwen, an kay travay mwen&lt;br&gt;Mister, me, I HAB.go work me&lt;br&gt;“Mister, me, I have a job...me!”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Dësen an-mwen a pa té on chapo i té ka montré&lt;br&gt;Drawing of-me EXPL NEG ANT a hat it ANT HAB show&lt;br&gt;“My drawing, that wasn't a hat it showed”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Së granmoun-la sè konsa yo yé&lt;br&gt;PLUR adult-DEF COPₚₑᵣₛ like.this they COPₚₑᵣₛ&lt;br&gt;“The adults, they're like that”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LD</td>
<td>Së granmoun-la sè konsa yo yé&lt;br&gt;PLUR adult-DEF COPₚₑᵣₛ like.this they COPₚₑᵣₛ&lt;br&gt;“The adults, they're like that”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>È sa ka izé sè timoun-la, ba-yo lèsplikasyon toulongalé konsa...&lt;br&gt;And this HAB exhaust PLUR child-DEF give-they explanation all.the.time like.this&lt;br&gt;“And it is exhausting for the kids to always have to explain them everything this way”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>È sa vré, jéografi, fo di, rédé-mwen onlo&lt;br&gt;And this true geography must say help-me a.lot&lt;br&gt;“And that's impossible to deny: geography helped me a lot”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Sa pa ka krenn ayen wounèt travay a-w a plita&lt;br&gt;This NEG HAB fear nothing postpone work of-you of later&lt;br&gt;“And that's not big deal to postpone your work”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Sa sitèlman étranj, péyi a pléré-gwodlo-la.&lt;br&gt;This so bizarre, land of tear-DEF&lt;br&gt;“That's so bizarre, the land of tears!”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Ka sa yé biten-lasa ?&lt;br&gt;What this COPₑᵣₛ thing-DEM&lt;br&gt;“What's it, this thing?”</td>
<td>TP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RD</td>
<td>Sa an pé fè sè vvè on boug an-mwen&lt;br&gt;This I can do COPₚₑᵣₛ see a person of-me&lt;br&gt;“What I can do is speaking to someone I know”</td>
<td>P&amp;T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>