

## *Creole Language Library (CLL)*

A book series presenting descriptive and theoretical studies designed to add significantly to the data available on pidgin and creole languages.

### **Editors**

Miriam Meyerhoff  
University of Edinburgh

Umberto Ansaldi  
University of Amsterdam

### **Editorial Advisory Board**

Mervyn C. Alleyne  
Kingston, Jamaica

Marlyse Baptista  
Ann Arbor, USA

George L. Huitlar  
Dallas, USA

John Holm  
Coimbra, Portugal

Silvia Kouwenberg  
Kingston, Jamaica

Susanne Michaelis  
Leipzig, Germany

Salikoko S. Mufwene  
Chicago, USA

Pieter Muysken  
Nijmegen, The Netherlands

Peter Mühlhäusler  
Adelaide, Australia

Shobha Satyanath  
Delhi, India

John Victor Singler  
New York, USA

Norval Smith  
Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Sarah G. Thomason  
Ann Arbor, USA

Tonjes Veenstra  
Berlin, Germany

### **Volume 33**

**Roots of Creole Structures. Weighing the contribution of substrates and superstrates**

Edited by Susanne Michaelis

## **Roots of Creole Structures**

Weighing the contribution  
of substrates and superstrates

*Edited by*

Susanne Michaelis

Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology /  
Justus-Liebig University, Giessen

John Benjamins Publishing Company  
Amsterdam / Philadelphia



The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of American National Standard for Information Sciences - Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Roots of Creole structures : weighing the contribution of substrates and superstrates /

edited by Susanne Michaelis.

p. cm. (Creole Language Library, ISSN 0920-9026 ; v. 33)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Creole dialects--Grammar. 2. Substratum (Linguistics) 3. Languages in contact. I.

Michaelis, Suzanne.

PM7683.LR66 2008

417'.2--dc22

ISBN 978 90 272 3255 5 (Hb; alk. paper)

2008019875

© 2008 - John Benjamins B.V.

No part of this book may be reproduced in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, or any other means, without written permission from the publisher.

John Benjamins Publishing Co. · P.O. Box 36224 · 1020 ME Amsterdam · The Netherlands  
John Benjamins North America · P.O. Box 27519 · Philadelphia PA 19118-0519 · USA

## *A la recherche du "superstrat"*

What North American French can and cannot tell us about the input to creolization\*<sup>1</sup>

Ingrid Neumann-Holzschuh  
University of Regensburg

Within the field of French creolistics it is above all Robert Chaudenson who, in various publications, has emphasized that a better knowledge of the "marginal Frenches" in North America may help to answer certain questions concerning the European input into creolization. On the basis of data collected for a research project on the varieties of Acadian French I will try to show that a closer investigation of Acadian French does indeed shed light on the language spoken by the settlers, one major component of the "feature pool" (Mufwene) accessible to the slaves, and thus provides the source of numerous specific creole forms and structures.

Apart from being a linguistic "window to the past", the varieties of North American French enable us to discern areas within French grammar that are particularly prone to intrasystemic changes. The question, however, remains as to what extent the phenomena observed in Acadian French can be usefully applied in explaining the creolization process, especially since some of the developments that are particularly interesting from a creolist's point of view are rather recent.

On the basis of some examples, I will show that the heuristic value of a close examination of marginal Frenches lies above all in retracing the source of specific

---

\*I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer of this article, and to Susanne Michaelis for their helpful suggestions on the analysis and presentation of this article.

1. The word *superstrate* is put in quotation marks for good reasons. Both terms *substrate* and *superstrate* were originally used within Romance linguistics to denote the languages in contact with Latin, substrates being those languages first spoken and finally given up by the people conquered by the Romans and superstrates being the languages first spoken by the Germanic invaders and then also gradually given up in favour of Latin (von Wartburg 1950). However, since both terms are frequently used in creole studies – they were also part of the conference title –, the term *superstrate* in the sense of the varieties of French the slaves were exposed to in the colonies' has been kept, although this does not mean the same as it does in diachronic Romance linguistics.

formal, functional and semantic peculiarities of creole languages; creolization itself, however, implies restructuring processes that go far beyond those that marginal Frenches have undergone in the course of time.

## 1. Introduction

It is a well established fact in French diachronic linguistics that research on the varieties of North American French (NAF) may provide information about the spoken French of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries (Mougeon & Beniak 1994). As to the relevance of the NAF varieties for creole studies, it is the French creolist Robert Chaudenson who has repeatedly emphasized the interest that the overseas varieties of French have for this discipline.<sup>2</sup> The French varieties of North America – in particular the "marginal" varieties like Louisiana Cajun French, Missouri French and the *patois* of St. Barthélemy – constitute the state of French that is closest to the *terminus a quo* of creolization, which "actually lay in varieties of non-standard French from the north and west of France" (Chaudenson 2001: 146) and can thus be considered an open window to the French spoken by the settlers at the time of colonization – i.e., the European "input" into French creoles.<sup>3</sup> To gain an impression of the linguistic competence of the French colonists, about which our knowledge is limited, the analysis of NAF varieties provides a good research tool.

On the basis of data from Acadian French I will try to show that a closer look at NAF can indeed be helpful in understanding the French input, but that its importance should not be overestimated.

## 2. The role of North American French in the study of creolization

Why do NAF varieties constitute a critical reference point in the study of creolization?

2. Cf. Chaudenson (1973, 1998, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2005a, 2005b), Chaudenson & Mougeon & Beniak (1993), Brasseur (1997) as well as Bollée & Neumann-Holzschuh (1998, 2002).

3. For the crucial issues of the *terminus a quo* of creolization, cf. also Chaudenson (2001: 151–152, 163–164; 2003: 145f.). It was Chaudenson who coined the term 'français marginal', which will be kept here, although 'français périphérique' might be another option.

i. These varieties, which go back to popular and dialectal French of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries, provide some clues as to what Robert Chaudenson calls the "construction material" of the French creoles (2003: 177),<sup>4</sup> or, in Mufwene's words, the European part of the "feature pool" that slaves were exposed to in a multilingual society (2005: 71). Since the NAF varieties have always been essentially oral and were never exposed to normative pressure, they still show considerable variability and thus – according to Chaudenson – allow several hypotheses concerning both the highly variable European linguistic input into French creoles, as well as those areas of French grammar that are particularly susceptible to linguistic variability.<sup>5</sup> ii. Again according to the French scholar, these varieties also help us to better understand what he calls "self-regulating processes" (*processus autorégulateurs*, Chaudenson 2003: 183), i.e., a bundle of internal language change processes that were going on primarily in the French spoken by the colonists during the early stages of the homestead phase, i.e., before creolization proper.

Leaving aside for the moment the epistemological reservations that may arise from the term "self-regulating processes",<sup>6</sup> it becomes apparent that this scenario incorporates two processes that should initially be kept apart:

- universal processes of internal language change such as reanalysis, grammaticalization, or analogy, which produce certain language-specific internal changes;<sup>7</sup>
- contact-induced changes such as dialect levelling and koineization.

With regard to the first set of changes, it is tempting to assume that NAF varieties have undergone certain processes of language development, which may

4. Chaudenson's definition of the term is wide: "The bulk of the linguistic material, word order, and semantic values, is common to all regional and/or older folk French varieties, marginal French varieties, and creoles" (2001: 180).

5. Chaudenson (2003: 199) speaks of "zones of weakness", an unfortunate metaphor in my view.

6. Cf. Alleyne (1996: 38): "L'expression de 'processus auto-régulateurs' suggère une activité propre à un organisme autonome, encore beaucoup plus intentionnelle et téléologique que l'activité suggérée par le terme modeste de 'tendances évolutives.'" Cf. also Chaudenson (2001: 167).

7. Cf. Chaudenson (2001: 158) and also Chaudenson & Mougeon & Beniak (1993: 16), who speak of 'restructurations à caractère présumé optimalisant' and refer to Frei's universal "needs" for brevity, expressiveness and invariability (Frei 1929).

also have operated similarly within the language of the colonists during the initial phase of colonization. It should, however, be kept in mind that these varieties have been in contact with English for a long time, and that Cajun French especially has been exposed to a language attrition process. Both factors certainly had effects on the specific evolution of these varieties.

As far as the main external cause of language change, language contact, is concerned, it is very likely that dialect levelling took place in early colonial times that led to a reduction in differences between the different French dialects and hence a gradual homogenization of the vernacular speech in the colonies.<sup>8</sup> It cannot be assumed with any certainty, however, that within the colonies a stabilized contact variety developed, let alone a koiné characterized by a certain degree of uniformity (Kerswill 2002). For that, the demographic conditions on the individual islands were much too diverse.<sup>9</sup>

iii. It is important to separate from those restructuring processes that French underwent during the homestead phase a second set of "self-regulating" processes which took place after the emergence of the creole languages and which were responsible for making French creoles new, *autonomous* systems with respect to their base language, "an autonomy that American French varieties do not have" (Chaudenson 2001: 148).

According to Chaudenson, creolization is thus essentially the result of the complex interplay of three sets of overlapping processes:

1. The "radicalization" and "transmission" of restructuring processes for which 'marginal' French varieties offered variants and provided the direction. These varieties are, in some ways, the missing links in the reconstruction of an

8. With respect to our Acadian data, it is interesting to note that most of the specific Acadian features are not attested in the French creoles (*je-collectif*, the demonstrative pronoun *c'èi*, the interrogative pronoun *quoi?*). This is not really surprising since the settlers leaving for Nova Scotia at the beginning of the 17<sup>th</sup> century came from a rather restricted area in western France (cf. Massignon 1962), while the colonists leaving for the colonies in the Indian Ocean and the Caribbean came from all over northern and western France.

9. The questions which naturally arise here are that of distinguishing between regional dialect levelling and koinization on the one hand, and on the other, that of the interrelatedness of language-internal and/or universally induced change and change resulting from substrate influence, this latter being far more complex methodologically (cf. Heine & Kuteva 2005: 243).

evolution that goes from French to creoles, *affecting some aspects of the system but not the whole system*.<sup>10</sup>

2. The emergence (outside of *français zero*<sup>11</sup>) of structures not attested in French varieties spoken in communities where French is transmitted as a native language. These new structures are due to readjustments tied to language learning and linguistic contact [...].
3. Internal evolution linked to the system's own dynamics [...] (2001: 171).

It is generally accepted that creolization occurs through a complex interplay of universal processes of language change, contact-induced changes as well as strategies of Second Language Acquisition (SLA), which took place at different points in time. More controversial, however, is the question of to what extent these "self-regulating processes" within the French input could have actually been "transmitted" into the new languages and to what extent they could "radicalize". Can there actually be "the *continuation of forms and processes* (my italics), which were, and occasionally still are, present in certain French varieties" (Chaudenson 2001: 182)?<sup>12</sup> I shall return to this problem at the end of my article.

At this point, I would simply like to claim that NAF varieties do provide data on non-standard French that were previously unknown. A better knowledge of these varieties may help to evaluate the degree of material and functional continuity in the French creoles with respect to their European base language (Detges 2002), and they may also help to identify those creole phenomena for which vernacular French does not provide an explanation.<sup>13</sup> If it should turn out (and it will in fact) that certain varieties of French have "creole-like" restructurings in their morphosyntax that are not necessarily due to recent language erosion, the debate on the role of the "superstrates" within creolization will have to take that into account.

10. "It is evidently in this area that the slaves' languages can be claimed to have influenced their appropriations of the target language" (Chaudenson 2001: 183).

11. The term *français zero* (*F0*) is a variation model that refers to variability within French. According to Chaudenson, it is the "set of variables, which depending on place and time, will be recognized as variants [...]. Of course, for a given variety of French, not all the variables will necessarily be involved. [...] creolization begins when variability extends to parts of the system located outside" (2001: 170).

12. According to this theory, the tendency toward invariability, the tendency to prefer salient or expressive forms are "possibilités d'évolution du français qui s'est pleinement réalisé en créole parce qu'elles n'ont jamais rencontrés aucun obstacle en chemin" (Fattier 2000: 117).

13. Or as DeGraff (2005: 300) puts it with respect to Haitian Creole: "Notwithstanding pervasive etymological and structural continuities between Haitian Creole and French, there exist striking and robust morphosyntactic differences between the two languages".

### 3. Sociohistorical background on North American French

This article is based on data collected within a research project whose aim is a comparative grammar of the varieties of Acadian French still spoken in Canada in the Maritime Provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Prince-Edward-Island and on the Peninsula of Port-au-Port on Newfoundland as well as in Louisiana.<sup>14</sup> Like other varieties of North American French – as for example the French spoken in the New England States and Missouri and like the French of St. Barthélemy – these varieties have developed ever since the 17<sup>th</sup> century without any normative pressure in relatively isolated and very distant regions. Being perfect representatives of what Chaudenson calls "marginal Frenches", their description promises interesting insights into the French spoken at the time of colonization and – at least tentatively – the "feature pool".

The Acadian diaspora has its origin in the "Great Migration" (Grand Déplacement, 1755–1762), one of the first instances of ethnic cleansing in modern times. In the course of the colonial wars between France and England, the Acadians, whose ancestors came from the Poitou region in Western France and had settled in Nova Scotia ever since 1604, were expelled by the British for political and religious reasons. This happened more than fifty years after this part of *La Nouvelle France* had become part of the British colonies in the Treaty of Utrecht 1713.<sup>15</sup> While only some of the Acadians sought refuge in the woods of today's New Brunswick and in Quebec, most of the refugees fled to the New England States. Others sought refuge in Newfoundland, on the West Indies or in France. After an odyssey of several years' duration, about 3,000–4,000 Acadians found a new home in Louisiana, where they have been living as "Cajuns" since 1765. Those Acadians who returned

to their homelands from New England and Quebec after 1764 are the ethnic basis of today's Franco-Canadians in the Maritime Provinces.

The contemporary situation of the Acadians may be described thus: In the Maritime Provinces of Canada, most francophones live in New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince-Edward-Island in a non-compact settlement structure. While the Acadian population has special cultural and linguistic rights in New Brunswick the situation of the Acadians in Nova Scotia is less favorable. In this province, French is still spoken in four non-connected regions (Baie Ste. Marie, Pubnico, Île Madame and Chéticamp), but here the vitality of French is much weaker than it is in New Brunswick.<sup>16</sup> The situation of the Acadians in Newfoundland is precarious (King & Butler 2005).

The situation in Louisiana has always been even more complex. From the very beginning the Acadian refugees were in close contact with other francophone groups who spoke different varieties of 18<sup>th</sup> century French, one of the consequences being dialect levelling. In those parishes especially where Acadians and non-Acadians lived in close proximity to one another, language contact caused the early loss of characteristic Acadian features, for example, the so-called *je-collectif* (i.e., the use for the pronoun *je* instead of the 1<sup>st</sup> PL pronoun *nous*). Other Acadian features, however, continue to coexist with "standard" forms in certain parishes even today.<sup>17</sup> Contemporary Cajun French – some scholars try to avoid this term and prefer Louisiana French instead – thus appears as the variety of Acadian French that has been at least partly "deacadianized". In spite of the so-called Cajun Renaissance, Louisiana French is an endangered language today: with the exception of a few older speakers, all francophone Louisianians are bilingual (Dubois 2001). The loss of language is drastic, especially among the young; but even among speakers of other generations, the number of semi-speakers is high.<sup>18</sup>

14. Financed by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft, this project is directed by Raphaële Wiesmath (Munich) and myself in collaboration with Patrice Brasseur (Avignon). We use the following abbreviations after the examples: NB = Nouveau Brunswick (New Brunswick), NE = Nouvelle Écosse (Nova Scotia), IPE: Île du Prince Édouard (Prince-Edward-Island), TN = Terre Neuve (Newfoundland), LOU = Louisiana. Several corpora collected by ourselves or made available to us by other researchers constitute the data base. For New Brunswick we have had access to the corpus of R. Wiesmath, for Newfoundland to the corpus of P. Brasseur (cf. also Brasseur 2001). As far as Louisiana is concerned, we have worked with the data of Stäbler (1995a), Guilbeau (1950), Smith (1994) and Rottet (1995, 2001) as well as with the corpus of A. Valdman and his research group (*L(ouisian)F(rench)L(anguage)D(atabase)*). In addition, we have relied on already existing analyses of Acadian French.

15. For an introduction to the history, culture and language of the Acadians, cf. Kolboom & Mann (2005), Neumann-Holzschuh (2003b, 2005a) and Neumann-Holzschuh & Wiesmath (2006).

16. New Brunswick is the only officially bilingual province in Canada since 1968. The percentage of monolingual French speakers is 2% in New Brunswick and 0.1% in Nova Scotia (Wiesmath 2006: 41).

17. A good example is the coexistence of the inanimate interrogatives *qui* and *quoi*; both meaning 'what'. While the latter is the truly Acadian form, inanimate *qui* was frequent in other varieties of 18<sup>th</sup> century French and seems to be the basis of the corresponding Louisiana Creole pronouns (Rottet 2004).

18. A semi-speaker is "someone whose competence in the minority language was flawed from the very outset, because of incomplete acquisition due to the interruption of language transmission, i.e., the semi-speaker has not learned his or her language by way of normal acquisition processes (...) but rather "by chance", by interacting more than usual with elderly members of the community" (Rottet 1995: 36–37). The linguistic consequences of language erosion in Louisiana have been described by Rottet (1995, 2001) and Dubois (2001, 2005).

zeux [zø],<sup>20</sup> all going back to French tonic forms, show a regional distribution (Neumann-Holzschuh et al. 2005).<sup>21</sup>

- (1) *quand même* *eusse* *comprend*, *eusse* *veut* *pas* *parler*  
 although they.SBJ understand they.SBJ want.SG/PL NEG speak.INF  
 'Although they understand, they don't want to speak.' (LOU – Rottet 2001: 127)
- (2) *si* *ieux* *pouaient* *le* *ramasser* *dans* *ène* *bouteille*  
 if 3PL.SBJ can.3PL.IPFV it collect.INF in a bottle  
 'If they could collect it in a bottle.' (TN – GT 109209)
- (3) *nous-autres* *on* *haisait* *pas* *les* *Anglais*  
 we 3SG.INDF hate.3SG.IPFV NEG the English.PL  
*comme/coumme* *que* *zeux* *les* *haisont* *hein*  
 as 3PL.SBJ them hate.3PL DM  
 'We didn't hate the English as much as they hate them.' (NB – 3 D492)
- (4) *les autres* *comprend'* *mais* *eux-autres* *peut* *pas* *le* *parler*.  
 the others understand.SG/PL but 3PL.SBJ can.3SG NEG it speak.INF  
 'The others understand but they can't speak it.' (LOU – R.2001: 120)

The pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person plural are predominantly *nous-autres* and *vous-autres* in Louisiana and Newfoundland; in the Maritime Provinces *on*, *nous*, *je* (1PL) and *vous* (2PL) occur frequently as well.

While the substitution of tonic for atonic pronouns is particularly advanced in the plural, the same phenomenon can be observed in the singular, especially in the 3rd person singular.

- (5) *mon* *père* *mangeait* *ça*, *lui* *aimait* *ça*  
 my father eat.3SG.IPFV this 3SG.SBJ love.3SG.IPFV this  
 'My father ate this, he loved this.' (NB – 1B285)

As far as the 1st and 2nd person singular are concerned, the rule conflict between tonic and atonic seems to be a recent phenomenon. It is only in the speech of the Louisiana semi-speakers, that the tonic forms *moi/mon* et *toi* can replace (*moi*) *je* or (*toi*) *tu*.<sup>22</sup>

20. [ø] has been attested in popular French since the 17<sup>th</sup> century (cf. Thurot vol. II 1881: 35). The pronoun *eux* [ø] is rare in Acadian French. For a dialectological comment on *eux* and *zeux*, see Brasseur (2001).

21. As in the singular, *ça*, *ç* can replace the other 3rd plural pronouns with animate and non-animate referents, especially in New Brunswick and in Louisiana.

22. Cf. Rottet (1995, 2001). Dubois (2001) shows convincingly that there is in fact an age-continuum as to the use of *je* (older generation) – *moi* *je* (middle generation) and *mon* (young people with reduced exposure to traditional Cajun).

In Louisiana as well as in the Maritime Provinces language attrition is closely connected to the English influence on Acadian French. Apart from code-switching and intensive lexical borrowing, interferences can also be observed on the structural level (Perrot 1995; King 2000). The methodological problem which presents itself here has already been indicated: An analysis of the varieties of North American French must distinguish carefully between the respective traditional varieties, which may indeed be something like an "open window" to the *terminus a quo* of creolization, and the contemporary varieties, such as the Cajun spoken by semi-speakers for example. Since some of the developments in the varieties of North American French that are particularly interesting from a creolists' point of view have only recently been observed, especially in moribund Louisiana Cajun, it would be unwise to draw any hasty conclusions with regard to the possible European input into creolization.

#### 4. Three case studies

On the basis of our Acadian French data base (see n. 14), three examples will be analyzed in this section in order to illustrate the interest that the varieties of North American French can have for creole studies: the subject pronouns (§4.1), the object pronouns (§4.2), and the syntax of *pour* (§4.3).

##### 4.1 The subject pronouns

Personal pronouns are of special interest for our purpose, since it can be shown not only that the different creole pronouns can easily be traced back to the regional French forms still alive in the NAF varieties, but also that the pronoun paradigms of NAF have undergone certain restructuring processes which have close parallels in the French creoles such as the generalization of tonic pronouns and the abandonment of the gender distinction.<sup>19</sup>

The inventory of pronominal forms is complex in Acadian French, especially as far as the plural is concerned. In the 3rd person plural, polymorphism is especially marked: while the atonic standard form *ils* (and its allomorphs) is rare in all three varieties, the forms *eusse* [ø], *ieusses* [jøs], *ieux* [jø(z)], *eux-autres* and

19. Chaudenson, too, repeatedly uses the pronominal system to illustrate his theory (2001: 175f., 2003: 396f., 2005b), Chaudenson & Mougeon & Beniak (1993: 103f.).



- (6) *Moi a deux t'is enfants.*  
1SG.SBJ have.3SG two little.PL child.PL  
'I have two little children.' (LOU – Dubois 2001: 150)
- (7) *Mon a déjà acheté zen.*  
1SG.SBJ AUX.3SG already buy.PP ADV  
'I have already bought of them.' (LOU – Rottet 2001: 194)
- (8) *Toi peux donner du gombo à eusse?*  
2SG.SBJ can.2SG give.INF PART okra to them  
'Can you give them some okra?' (LOU – Rottet 2001: 212)

### Discussion

If the hypothesis is accepted that the inventory of forms we find in marginal Frenches provides a certain idea of the "feature pool" which was available to the slaves, then Chaudenson is right when he claims that (non seulement les créoles peuvent, dans leur émergence, choisir dans le "feature pool" du français ou dans le français zéro [...] des variantes différentes pour une même variable, mais ils peuvent aussi, pour une même variante, opter pour des traitements différents) (2003: 401).<sup>23</sup> Thus the 3rd person plural Acadian French pronouns can easily be correlated with their corresponding creole pronouns: *yo/ye* (creoles of the American-Caribbean region) go back to a dialectal form *ieux* as attested in Newfoundland; the forms *zot* (Indian Ocean creoles, old Haitian Creole) derive from *eux-autres*.<sup>24</sup> As far as the 1st and 2nd person singular pronouns are concerned, however, the loss of the atonic pronouns is a recent development in the speech of semi-speakers of Cajun. In the language of the early settlers, the current forms were undoubtedly *moi je* and *toi tu*.<sup>25</sup>

Nevertheless, with regard to the importance of NAF for the research on creolization, this means first of all only the following:

23. "During their emergence, the creoles may not only choose different variants for one and the same variable in the "feature pool" of French or *français zéro*, but they can also opt for different treatments of one and the same variant."
24. I do not believe, however, that "koinized French" had just the form *yé zot*, from which the Caribbean creoles took the first element *yé* and the Indian Ocean creoles the second part *zot* (Chaudenson 2005b: 21).
25. Chaudenson (2001: 176) states with respect to the colonial society: "In such contact settings, the native speaker has a tendency to over-use the person markers, as for example in the distribution of tasks: *Toi tu fais ça, moi je fais ça, eux* (or rather *eux-autres*) *i font ça*, etc."

- i. If we want to know what the settlers spoke, we should look at the traditional Cajun or the speech of today's fluent speakers;
- ii. Language attrition has apparently led to similar selections that can be observed in creolization.<sup>26</sup>

Apart from these conclusions it is impossible to ascertain from the Acadian data:

- i. what determined the selection of the different forms in the different areas;
- ii. what brought about specific developments in the creole languages such as the fact that the second- and third-person plural forms of the subject pronouns are identical in the Indian Ocean creoles, i.e., *zot*, which can also be the possessive determiner 3rd person plural (cf. Chaudenson 2001: 176–177, 183–184) or that the 1st and 2nd person plural pronoun is identical in Haitian Creole (*nou*).

It is precisely at this point that explanatory parameters must be brought to bear which take into account the particular language acquisition situation in the colonies and in the African substrate languages.

- i. As far as the generalization of the tonic pronouns is concerned, research on language acquisition has shown that stressed, expressive and phonologically salient forms are learnt preferably; a development that was reinforced in the process of non-guided SLA such as we find it in the plantation society.<sup>27</sup>
- ii. With regard to the use of *zot* as subject pronoun for the 2nd and 3rd person plural, the fact that the element [*zot*] appears both in *vous-autres* as well as in *eux-autres* may have favoured the generalization of *zot* in the Indian Ocean creoles, but most likely because Malagasy provided the structural model (Chaudenson 2001: 183–184, 2003: 307–308). Otherwise it would be difficult to explain why

26. The preference for nonditic over the traditional clitic pronouns in enclave language settings and situations of language erosion is described by Rottet (2001: 220f.) for Louisiana and by King (1983) for Newfoundland. King assumes that this change may be partially due to influence of English. From a more general point of view Siewierska (2004: 281) however notes that "it is not always easy to determine whether a particular change in person marking is due to the influence of another language or to language internal factors".

27. For the acquisition of French L1 cf. Clark (1985: 714); cf. also Mather (2006). Chaudenson's description is based on a metaphor: "How does language appropriation proceed (in acquisition and learning)? The acquirer or learner proceeds by identifying perceptible elements in utterances of the target language to which he/she has been exposed. He/she grasps them, rather as a shipwrecked person holds on to floating driftwood or other objects and organizing these elements into a communication system. Understandably, the individual appropriating the language will identify elements that are frequent, salient, meaning bearing, etc." (2001: 158).



the French creoles of the Caribbean have different 2nd and 3rd person plural pronouns (2PL *zot*, 3PL *yé*).

iii. The European base language cannot easily provide an explanation for the use of subject pronouns as possessive determiners or for the formal identity of 1st and 2nd person plural in Haitian Creole.<sup>28</sup> Apart from that, it should be kept in mind that the development of the inventory of pronominal forms was gradual in each individual creole and that more diachronic research is necessary in order to fully understand the interplay of substrates and superstates in this area.<sup>29</sup>

#### 4.2 The object pronouns

The cooccurrence of atonic and tonic forms is also characteristic of the object pronouns in Acadian French. Although the pattern with preverbal clitics is still the most frequent one, examples of the postverbal tonic pronouns in the function of a direct or indirect object (with and without a "redundant" preverbal clitic) can be found in all varieties of Acadian French. Other phenomena to be observed are the weakening of gender and the weakening of case in the 3rd person plural. It cannot be excluded that these patterns were widespread in the settlers' language that thus provided the model for analogical patterns in the emerging creoles. "It is also quite possible that the French varieties that were fed into the genesis of H[aitian] C[reole] were more like Cajun French and Missouri French than Standard French vis-à-vis cliticization possibilities" (DeGraff 2005: 334).<sup>30</sup>

(a) with preverbal clitic

- (9) *Y a un qui m' a attrapé moi*  
 ADV have.3SG someone who 1SG.OBJ AUX.3SG catch.PP 1SG.OBJ  
*par en arrière.*  
 from behind

'There was someone who caught me from behind.' (LOU – Stäbler 1995a: 37)

28. Cf. Lefebvre (1998: 141f.) and Fattier (2002) for a possible substratal explanation of this phenomenon. We have, however, found the following examples in Acadian French: *amenez vous-autres bébelles en-dedans pour eusse pas être trempés* 'Bring in your toys that they don't get wet' (LOU – Rottier 2001: 202) and *ieux poisson* 'their fish' (TN – Brasseur 2001: 254).

29. Thus, the generalization of *zot* was not yet given at the end of the 18th century in Reunion Creole according to A. Bollée (personal communication). Cf. also Fattier (2002) for the gradual evolution of the Haitian Creole pronominal system.

30. Cf. also DeGraff (2000), Sycra (2000) and Fattier (1994, 1996). According to Highfield (1979: 75) the position of the object pronouns is not fixed in St. Thomas.

- (10) *Ça fait moi j' allais avec mon prétendu la rejoindre elle.*  
 DM I I go.1SG.IPFV with my fiance 3SG.OBJ meet.INF 3SG.CLPR  
 'Well, I went with my fiancé to meet her.' (LOU – LFLD, Evangeline, Chataigner)

- (11) *Elle l' aimait à lui.*  
 she 3SG.OBJ love.3SG.IPFV PREP 3SG.OBJ  
 'She loved him.' (LOU – Guilbeau 1950: 159)

- (12) *Ils nous a assisté nous-autres.*  
 they 1PL.OBJ AUX.3SG help.PP 1PL.OBJ  
 'They have helped us.' (LOU – Stäbler 1995a: 212)

- (13) *C' est là-dessus qu' elle les nourrissait, ieusses.*  
 that is above this that she 3PL.OBJ nourish.3SG.IPFV 3PL.OBJ  
 'It's more than this that she gave them to eat.' (TN – AC 059206)

(b) without preverbal clitic

- (14) *mais il dit a moi*  
 but he say.3SG PREP 1SG.OBJ  
 'but he says to me...' (LOU – LFLD, Evangeline)

- (15) *Mon père i parle à elle.*  
 my father he talk.3SG PREP 3SG.OBJ  
 'My father talks to her.' (LOU – Corpus Dubois)<sup>31</sup>

- (16) *Son amie venait ici trouver ielle.*  
 her/his friend.F come.3SG.IPFV here find.INF 3SG.OBJ  
 'Her/his friend came here to get her.' (TN – Corpus Brasseur)

- (17) *Je gardais tout le temps yeux.*  
 I take care.1SG.IPFV all the time 3PL.OBJ  
 'I was taking care of them all the time.' (NB – Motapanyane 1997: 41)

Some Missourian and Ontarian data confirm that object pronoun position in the marginal Frenches may differ considerably from the French patterns.<sup>32</sup>

- (18) *Quand j' leur parle là, i comprend moi en français.*  
 When I them talk.1SG DM he understand.3SG.1SG.OBJ in French  
 'When I talk to them, he understands me in French.' (ONT – Nadasdi 2000: 72)

- (19) *M' as manger lui.*  
 I AUX.1SG eat.INF 3SG.OBJ  
 'I will eat him.' (MIS – Thogmartin 1970: 67)

- (20) *La pollution commence à détruire nous-autres.*  
 the pollution begin.3SG to destroy.INF 1PL.OBJ  
 'Pollution begins to destroy us.' (ONT – Nadasdi 2000: 71)

31. I am grateful to Sylvie Dubois who gave me access to her Cajun database in 2005.

32. Cf. also Mather (2006: 260) for the same structures in L2 French in Togo.

- (21) *Chips* ... il a payé eux-autres.  
 chips he AUX.3SG PAY.PP 3PL.OBJ  
 'Chips... he has paid them.' (ONT - Nadaadi 2000: 71)

Although it can be assumed that these structures occur more frequently in the speech of semi-speakers, the postverbal object pronoun is nevertheless not a recent phenomenon in Acadian French. Its appearance in many varieties of NAF as well as attestations from the 17<sup>th</sup> century French<sup>33</sup> permits the conclusion that these constructions belonged to the linguistic repertoire of the French settlers in the 17<sup>th</sup> century. The fact that they are more frequent in the speech of bilinguals may, of course, be due to the prolonged contact with English, where object pronouns are placed postverbally.

In negative imperative constructions, the object pronouns can follow the verb in the Acadian varieties like in popular French (Riegel et al. 1994: 204):

- (22) *Demande* -moi pas.  
 ask.2SG.IMP 1SG.OBJ NEG  
 'Don't ask me.' (TN - Brasseur LI)
- (23) *Frappe* -nous pas.  
 hit.2SG.IMP 1PL.OBJ NEG  
 'Don't hit us.' (LOU - Papen/Rottet 1996: 244)

#### Discussion

As far as the syntactic behavior of the object pronouns is concerned, French creoles, which consistently place the object pronoun behind the verb, differ considerably from their French input. As in other creole structures, the generalization of the V-ObjPro pattern was certainly due to the interplay of several causes.

- i. Even if we admit that the postverbal object position is a structural option in the varieties of overseas French, our contemporary data, for which the influence of English cannot be completely excluded, does not allow any hasty conclusions to the 'feature pool' accessible to the slaves. The language of the settlers certainly contained non-standard V-ObjPro-constructions, but still and all, hypotheses on the settlers' language remain vague without more diachronic and dialectological research in this domain.

- ii. The postverbal object pronoun position is in line with the dominant V-ObjPro pattern in some African languages such as Fon (Lefebvre 1998: 149f., Fattier 2003: 13). '[C]urrent results in acquisition research make it quite likely that VO patterns in the substratum would have favored the adoption by L2 learners of congruent VO patterns into the incipient creole' (DeGraff 2005: 336).<sup>34</sup>
- iii. It must also be taken into account that the specific communicative situations on the plantations favoured certain types of speech acts. In the colonies, speech appeared almost exclusively in its *pragmatic mode*, i.e., in functionally restricted utterances, closely linked to the situational context and nonverbal communication. In view of the fact that the speech act of commanding was particularly frequent in colonial societies, imperatives and their formal and syntactic peculiarities may be an additional factor in the explanation of certain creole structures such as the postposition of the object pronouns (Bruyn & Muysken & Verrips 1999; DeGraff 2005).<sup>35</sup>

#### 4.3 The syntax of *pour*

In Acadian French *pour* can be used in two ways:

- i. as a preposition that corresponds to standard French *pour*; à and *de*.<sup>36</sup>
- (24) *Là, la mère restait avec cinq z- enfants pour elle*  
 there the mother stay.3SG.1PFV with five LIAIS child.PL PREP 3SG  
 'The mother was left behind with five children.' (LOU - LFLD, Acadia)
- (25) *Ils ont raison pour ça.*  
 they have.3PL right PREP this  
 'They are right there.' (LOU - LFLD, Évangéline, Mamou)

34. Cf. Fattier (2002: 116): 'Les apprenants africains ont mis fin à l'exception que les pronoms constituaient en régularisant la langue-cible'. Furthermore, 'the avoidance of clitics in L2 French may be a general SLA strategy' (Mather 2006: 260).

35. DeGraff (2000: 105): 'Si B[ruijn], M[uyksen] & V[errips] ont, raison, alors les impératifs positifs de FR, qui présentent des objets pronominaux post-verbaux, ont sans doute aussi incité l'apprenant engagé dans la genèse de CH à faire l'hypothèse que la grammaire émergente devait présenter uniformément des pronoms objets post-verbaux' (FR = français, CH = créole haïtien). The importance of certain speech-acts for the explanation of creole structures has also been underlined by Koch (1993), Fattier (1994: 61), Chaudenson (2001: 176) and Neumann-Holzschuh (2003a).

36. Cf. Chaudenson & Mougeon & Beniak (1993: 27).

33. Note, however, that the postverbal position of the tonic pronoun is only described for the indirect object (cf. Haase 1965: 26f.; Nyrop 1925: 224f.; Brunot/Bruneau 1949: 277).

- (26) *Je serai ici pour midi.*  
I be.FUT.1SG here PREP noon  
'I will be here by noon.' (LOU – Dichy 1932: 171)
- (27) *Quoi il parlait pour dans ce chanson?*  
what he talk.3SG.IPFV PREP in this.M song  
'What was he talking about in this song?' (LOU – LFLD, Acadie Churchpoint)

This last example is a case of preposition stranding after a *wh*-interrogative, a phenomenon quite frequent in all the varieties of Acadian French. Although "orphan prepositions" are not unknown to colloquial French as well, King (2000: 136) is probably right in claiming that constructions with stranded prepositions are the result of language contact.<sup>37</sup>

The same structures are attested in various French creoles:

- (28) *Li fin aste sa pu mua.*  
he ANT buy this PREP 1SG  
'He bought it for me.'  
(Mauritian Creole – Véronique 1999: 201)

- (29) *Mo di li pu asi*  
I tell 3SG COMP sit.down  
'I told him to sit down.'  
(Louisiana Creole – Neumann 1985: 305)

(b) *pour* is part of the Acadian French verbal periphrases *être pour* 'to be on the point of doing something, être sur le point de' (inchoative), and *avoir pour* 'to have to do something'. It should be noted, however, that these periphrases are surprisingly rare in today's Acadian French (Wiësmath 2005).<sup>38</sup>

- (30) *J' étais pour partir là, chez mon garçon -là.*  
I be.1SG.IPFV PREP go.away.INF there to my son DEF  
'I was about to go to my son.'  
(LOU – LFLD, Terrebonne, Isle Jean Charles)

- (31) *J' avais pas pour travailler dans le clos.*  
I have.1SG.IPFV NEG PREP work.INF in the field  
'I didn't have to work in the field.'  
(LOU – LFLD, Evangeline)

37. According to King, however, these structures are not the result of direct syntactic borrowing. "Rather, I shall argue that lexical borrowing has triggered reanalysis of the Prince Edward Island French preposition system" (King 2000: 136).

38. Cf. Wiësmath (2005), Bollée & Neumann-Holzschuh (1998), Stäbler (1995b: 76f). Note that *avoir pour* does not exist in New Brunswick and Newfoundland but is attested in St. Thomas (Highfield 1979: 117); *être pour* is very frequent in Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, rare in Louisiana and non-existent in New Brunswick. Cf. Chaudenson (2003: 155): "Contre toute attente, les périphrases sont très peu présentes dans les textes de français populaire du XVII<sup>e</sup> et du XVIII<sup>e</sup> siècles". A well known example for *être pour* is found in Molières *Dom Juan* (act II/2): *je sommes pour estre marié ensemble*.

In the French creoles, the modal marker *pou* can express obligation and/or futurity.<sup>39</sup>

- (32) *Mwen pou marye semèn pwochè.*  
I FUT get.married week next  
'I have to get married next week.'  
(Haitian Creole – Fattier 2003: 7)

- (33) *Tut sòlda pu vini laplas kunyé a.*  
all soldier OBLIG come square now DEF  
'All the soldiers must come to the square now.'  
(Haitian Creole – Koopman & Lefebvre 1982: 71)

- (34) *Li pu vini si li kapav.*  
he FUT come if he can  
'He will come if he can.'  
(Mauritian Creole – Véronique 1999: 201)

(c) *pou* is part of the purpose subordinator *pou (pas) que*, which can lose the element *que* especially in Louisiana French.

- (35) *Ça nous a été donné pour on écoute.*  
this us AUX.3SG be.PP give.PP COMP 3SG.INDF listen.3SG  
'That was given to us so that we listened to it.'  
(LOU – Stäbler 1995a: 216)

- (36) [...] *pou pas que la mer peuve rentrer.*  
[...] COMP NEG CONJ the sea can.SUBJ.3SG enter.INF  
'[...] so that the sea cannot enter.' (NB – M, 57)

As in popular French, an infinitival sentence can replace a purpose or consecutive subordinate clause with subjunctive.<sup>40</sup> According to Rottet (2001), the emergence of non-finite subordinate clauses stands out as a significant pattern in the speech of semi-speakers. In Louisiana the complementizer *que* is usually omitted, and the pronoun of the subordinate is usually tonic.

- (37) *Eusse i a donné de l' argent pour lui aller*  
they him AUX.SG/PL give.PP PART money COMP him go.INF  
*au magasin.*  
to the store

'They gave him some money so that he went to the store.'  
(LOU – Guilbeau 1950: 223)

39. In Louisiana Creole, the auxiliary *gen pou* (Neumann 1985: 227) expresses obligation and futurity (with a strong nuance of obligation).

40. Cf. Neumann-Holzschuh (2003a, 2005b). The identity of the subject in the main and the subordinate clause is not a constraint in semi-speakers' Cajun French.

- (38) *Mom elle faisait du thé de sassafras pour*  
 Mum she make.3SG.IPFV PART tea GEN sassafras COMP  
*nous-autres boire ça.*  
 us drink-INF this

'Mum made some sassafras tea or another kind of tea to make us drink that.'

(LOU - LFLD, Évangéline)

These purpose constructions, apparently rare in New Brunswick and Newfoundland, were well known in Old French and are still used in popular and dialectal French.<sup>41</sup> It is therefore wrong to assume an exclusively English influence here, even though the analogous English patterns (as in examples (41) and (42): *for him to go, for us to drink*) naturally contributed to their reinforcement.

The same constructions with *pour* as a purpose subordinator can be found in different French creoles and in St. Thomas.

- (39) *Tchè cœn tit bèké pour èl pa ièbé*  
 hold a little bit COMP she NEG fall  
 'Hold her a little so that she won't fall.' (St. Thomas - Highfield 1979: 118)
- (40) *Frem la port pu pa li wa nuzot.*  
 close the door COMP NEG he see us  
 'Close the door so that he won't see us.' (Louisiana Creole - Neumann 1985: 348)
- (41) *Li pran sò bisiklet pu li vini.*  
 he take his bicycle COMP he come  
 'He takes his bicycle to come.' (Mauritian Creole - Véronique 1999: 201)
- (42) *Mo gè ò baay pu m montre u.*  
 I have a chose COMP I show you.  
 'I have a thing to show you.' (Haitian Creole - Koopman & Lefebvre 1982: 70)

In the speech of the semi-speakers of Cajun, however, *pour* also appears in non purpose constructions (Rottet 1995: 274-5, 2001: 255-257).

- (43) *J'aimerais pour toi manger en tit brin.*  
 I like.COND.2SG.IPFV COMP you eat a little bit  
 'I want you to eat a little bit.'  
 (LOU - Rottet 1995: 275)
- (44) *Il vous avait euh demandé pour vous se [...] marier.*  
 he you AUX.3SG.IPFV DM ask.PP COMP you REFL.3SG [...] marry-INF  
 'He had asked you to get married.' (LOU - LFLD, Évangéline, Mamou)

41. Cf. Bauche (1946: 123: *Il lui a donné ce jouet pour elle s'amuser*), Frei (1929) and Grevisse (1975: §1027).

- (45) *Eusse veut pour nous-autres aller pour 7h.*  
 they want.3SG COMP us GO-INF PREP 7 o'clock  
 'They want us to be there by 7:00.'  
 (LOU - Rottet 2001: 255)

Note also that beside the *pour* + SubjPro + Infinitive constructions, there are SubjPro + *pour* + Infinitive constructions in semi-speakers' Cajun French.

- (46) *Qué magasin tu veux mon pour aller.*  
 what store you want.2SG me PREP GO-INF  
 'What store do you want me to go to?'  
 (LOU - Rottet 1995: 275)

As Rottet (1995: 274) convincingly states, we can observe a first step towards the grammaticalization of Cajun *pour* as a general subordinate marker devoid of any particular semantic interpretation.

In Haitian Creole as well, *pu* can function as a general conjunction; in Seychelles Creole, Michaelis (1994: 141f.) observes the evolution of *pour* as a subordination marker for non-finite forms.<sup>42</sup>

- (47) *Li bòn [pou m t a pati].*  
 it good COMP I ANT FUT leave  
 'It is good for me to leave' [lit.: 'It is good that I leave']  
 (Haitian Creole, Lefebvre 1998: 188)
- (48) *I vremen fer lapem pour mwan tir tou ledan en zanfan.*  
 it really make pain PREP me pull-INF all tooth a child  
 'It makes me sad, when I have to pull out all the teeth of a child.'  
 (Seychelles Creole - Michaelis 1994: 144)

#### Discussion

i. A comparison between the use of *pour* in the varieties of Acadian French and its use in French creoles illustrates that in this case material continuity goes hand in hand with an astonishingly large measure of functional continuity in so far as its use as a preposition and a future and obligation marker is concerned.<sup>43</sup> Although this limits to a certain extent the hypothesis stated by Detges, who speaks of an almost total functional discontinuity between the French creoles and their base language with respect to grammatical paradigms (2002: 71), the "superstrate data"

42. Cf. Michaelis (1994: 145), Véronique (1999), Koopman/Lefebvre (1982: 81f.), Lefebvre (1998: 187-193).

43. Lefebvre (1998: 119) does not mention the French periphrasis *avoir pour*, which perfectly explains the obligation value that *pu* has in Haitian Creole.

frequent, transparent, information-bearing and salient – creates a methodological problem, for the question is clearly one of completely dissimilar language contact situations.<sup>45</sup>

Third, although I am convinced that a better knowledge of the specific structures of non-standard Frenches provides important information on the type of French the settlers spoke, I doubt whether these varieties provide any clues as to the evolutionary mechanisms effective during creolization. There is no doubt that a comparison of the French creoles with the "marginal" varieties – even with the most "progressive" ones – may help to locate specific restructurings that are outside the realm of changes that French undergoes under specific sociolinguistic conditions such as isolation, a lack of normative pressure, intensive language contact, or language death. However, it is less evident whether creolization is to a certain extent based on "the radicalization and transmission of restructuring processes, for which 'marginal' French varieties offered variants and provided the direction" (Chaudenson 2001: 171).

Can universal processes of language change and language-specific internal changes – and it is this combination that the "self-regulating processes/evolutionary tendencies" are about – be "transmitted" or "continued" in the very special context of unguided second language acquisition as it presumably existed in plantation society (cf. Chaudenson 2001: 182)? Or as Alleyne (1996: 37) puts it:

Est-ce qu'une langue peut posséder de telles tendances d'une façon tellement inéluctable qu'un autre peuple, en adoptant cette langue, se voie obligé de les continuer? Cela impliquerait qu'une langue est un organisme autonome existant hors des mentalités et des comportements des gens qui la manient et hors des contextes sociaux dans lesquels elle se parle. Evidemment, ce n'est pas le cas. Autrement dit, comment pourrait-il se faire qu'un peuple, en adoptant une langue, perçoive ces tendances et les continue?<sup>46</sup>

45. Chaudenson repeatedly points out that "la créolisation reproduirait, en quelque sorte à l'inverse, les processus de l'attrition ou de l'étiollement linguistiques" (2005a: 23, cf. also 2003: 206). Alleyne (1996: 39) as well notes that internal language change and second language acquisition share certain features: "l'acquisition d'une langue seconde, surtout là où il n'existe pas de pression correctrice, peut produire des effets tout à fait parallèles à ces tendances évolutives (perte de flexions, structures syntaxiquement transparentes etc.)."

46. "Can a language have such unavoidable tendencies that another people, upon adopting that language, finds itself forced to continue them? This would imply that a language is an autonomous organism that exists outside of the minds and the behaviour of the people using it, and outside of the social contexts in which it is spoken. This is evidently not the case. In other words, how could a people that adopts a language perceive these tendencies and continue them?"

do not answer the questions why *pou* has become so prominent in some creoles, why it has the semantics it has today, or how the innovative combinations of *pou* with other markers can be explained.<sup>44</sup>

ii. As far as the use of the subordinator is concerned, the parallels between the non-standard varieties of French and the creole languages are obvious. However, similar to the subject pronouns of the 1st and 2nd person singular, this is a question of relatively recent developments in the speech of semi-speakers especially in Louisiana, so that substrate influence cannot totally be excluded here. Nevertheless, the fact that *pou* can perfectly well introduce complements of verbs of the *want*-class in NAF should be taken into account (cf. Lefebvre 1998: 189).

## 5. Conclusions

In view of what has been stated so far, the following conclusions can be tentatively drawn:

First, the value of a comprehensive data base of New World French lies primarily in providing material to reconstruct at least part of the possible European "input" and its intralinguistic variation – no more and no less. I am aware, of course, that there is a risk involved in drawing conclusions from the contemporary varieties of North American French about the language of the colonists; nevertheless, creolists should look here not only for the "construction material" as far as lexical and grammatical forms are concerned but also for specific functional patterns – there are not too many other sources.

Second, the developments that the "marginal Frenches" have gone through until now have been diverse. The extent of these developments differs not only from variety to variety, but also from category to category. The above-mentioned examples have shown that, in addition to the specific changes that French goes through when not under any normative pressure, there are also changes that are triggered by contact with English as well as by language attrition. That language attrition, creolization and non-guided second language acquisition may partially yield similar linguistic outcomes – all three favour elements that are regular,

44. Cf. the descriptions of the different reanalysis and grammaticalization processes as provided by Detges (2000, 2002), DeGraff (2005) and Fattier (2000, 2003). For the functions of *pou* in the French creoles cf. Lefebvre (1998), Véronique (1999), Detges (2002), Fattier (2002), Chaudenson (2003: 359–361).

One must certainly be careful not to take the terms "transmission" and "continuation" too literally nor should one deduce an uninterrupted chain of language evolution. The fact that some creole-specific restructuring processes look like "transmissions" or "radicalizations" of analogous processes in French does not mean that this scenario makes sense linguistically. While the "transmission" of specific internal developments may be plausible for the francophone regions in North America,<sup>47</sup> the situation was completely different on the islands of the Caribbean and the Indian Ocean, where language transmission was not "normal" (Thomason & Kaufman 1988). Here, there was at most a certain continuity with regard to the universal strategies at work in the evolution of oral languages in general, which, however, is now somewhat tautological insofar as these processes are always active anyway.<sup>48</sup>

And fourth, creolization itself is a specific case of language change coupled with uncontrolled second language learning under unique social, historical and demographic conditions.<sup>49</sup> The restructuring processes that in the course of time led to the emergence of new languages comprises various universal processes of language change such as reanalysis and grammaticalization as well as contact-induced changes such as grammatical replication (Heine & Kuteva 2005: 242–243) or selections based on convergence.<sup>50</sup> Two recent definitions of creolization as "an interesting division of labor between universals and substratum influence"

47. "La notion de continuation des tendances est plus pertinente là où la langue continue d'être parlée par ces locuteurs originels et ce sont eux, aidés sans doute par les nouveaux apprenants, qui font progresser ces tendances évolutives" (Alleyne 1996: 39).

48. This view, shared by Manessy (1985), is doubted by Chaudenson (2001: 167), who underlines the importance of intrasystemic changes.

49. According to DeGraff (2005: 339): "[T]here is no precise and operational structural litmus test, and no coherent theoretical framework, that consistently and reliably discriminates where 'language change' ends and where 'creolization' begins". Although in my opinion the NAF data do not permit the conclusion that there was a sharp break in transmission between the lexifier language and the French creoles (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 206), Chaudenson's view is equally too exclusive: "L'étude socio-historique me semble démontrer qu'il n'y a pas de rupture dans la transmission de la langue, mais plutôt [...] un changement de structure sociale [...] et de cible linguistique pour les bossales" (2003: 204).

50. Cf. Fattier (2002: 110–111): "Une autre piste également fructueuse (...) et celle de l'influence qu'ont pu exercer les langues africaines de substrat dans la sélection entre variantes de la koinè d'oïl: au cas où plusieurs variantes étaient employées dans la langue d'oïl à quoi ils étaient exposés, les locuteurs se sont approprié plus facilement celle qui avait un équivalent proche dans les langues de substrat". According to Fattier only those "substrate" structures that were common to various African languages could have had an influence on the emerging creole languages.

(Mather 2006: 268) or as "the conspiracy of both factors" (Plag 2002) tries to take into account that the emergence of creole languages can only be explained by a multicausal approach. It should not be ignored, however, that the interplay between substrates and the highly variable "superstrate" differed from area to area, and that creolization as a gradual phenomenon did not affect all categories at the same time and in the same way.<sup>51</sup> After all, each creole possesses its own distinct history.<sup>52</sup>

#### Special abbreviations

APR	atonic pronoun
CONJ	conjunction
DM	discourse marker
ANT	anteriority
PART	partitive article
PREP	preposition
TPR	tonic pronoun
PP	past participle
ADV	adverbial
NAF	North American French
NB	Nouveau Brunswick (New Brunswick)
NE	Nouvelle Écosse (Nova Scotia)
IPE	Île du Prince Édouard (Prince Edward Island)
TN	Terre Neuve (Newfoundland)
LOU	Louisiana

#### References

- Alleyne, Mervyn. 1996. *Syntaxe historique créole*. Paris: Karthala – PUC.  
 Bauche, Henri. 1946. *Le langage populaire*. Paris: Payot.  
 Bollée, Annegrët. 2007. Every Creole has its own history. In Bollée, Annegrët. *Beiträge zur Kreolistik* (edited by Ursula Reutner). Hamburg: Buske. 173–187.

51. Cf. Neumann-Holzschuh (2000: 387): "Ce ne sont pas des langues entières qui sont restructurées, mais des catégories grammaticales individuelles". This view is shared by Fattier (2002: 116): "tout ne change pas au même rythme, y compris à l'intérieur d'une même classe syntaxique, y compris au cours du processus historique particulier baptisé créolisation".

52. This view is very clearly taken by Mufwene (2001) and more recently by Bollée (2007) and Mather (2006).

- Bollée, Annegret & Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 1998. Français marginaux et créoles. In Brasseur, Patrice (Ed.), *Français d'Amérique. Variation, créolisation, normalisation*. Avignon: Université d'Avignon, Centre d'Études Canadiennes (CECAV). 181–203.
- Bollée, Annegret & Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 2002. La créolisation linguistique: Un processus complexe. *Études Créoles* XXV/1. 87–104.
- Brasseur, Patrice. 1997. Créoles à base lexicale française et français marginaux d'Amérique du Nord: quelques points de comparaison. In Hazaël-Massieux, Marie-Christine & De Robillard, Didier (Eds), *Contacts de langues, contacts de culture, créolisation, Mélanges offerts à R. Chaudenson*. Paris: L'Harmattan. 141–66.
- Brasseur, Patrice. 2001. *Dictionnaire des régionalismes franco-terreneuviens*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Brasseur, Patrice & Falkert, Anika (Eds). 2005. *Français d'Amérique: Approches morphosyntaxiques*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Brunot, Ferdinand & Bruneau Charles. 1949. *Précis de grammaire historique de la langue française*. Paris: Masson.
- Bruyn, Adrienne, Muysken, Pieter & Verrips, Maaike. 1999. Double object constructions in the Creole languages: Development and acquisition. In DeGraff, Michel (Ed.), *Language creation and language change*. Cambridge MA: The MIT Press. 329–73.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1973. Pour une étude comparée des créoles et parler français d'outre-mer: Survivance et innovation. *Revue de Linguistique Romane* 57: 76–90.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1993. De l'hypothèse aux exemples. Un cas de créolisation: La formation des systèmes de démonstratifs créoles. *Études Créoles* XVI/1: 1993. 17–38.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1998. Variation, koïnisation, créolisation. In Brasseur, Patrice (Ed.), *Français d'Amérique. Variation, créolisation, normalisation*. Centre d'Études Canadiennes (CECAV), Université d'Avignon 1998. 163–80.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2001. *Creolization of language and culture*. Revised in collaboration with Salikoko S. Mufwene. London: Routledge.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2002. Une théorie de la créolisation: Le cas des créoles français. *Études Créoles* XXV/1: 25–44.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2003. *La créolisation: Théorie, applications, implications*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2005a. Français d'Amérique et créoles français: origines et structures. In Valdman, Albert, Auger, Julie & Piston-Hatlen, Deborah (Eds). (2005). 505–16.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 2005b. Français marginaux et théorie de la créolisation: Les cas des marques personnelles. In Brasseur, Patrice & Falkert, Anika (Eds). 15–25.
- Chaudenson, Robert, Mougéon, Raymond & Beniak, Édouard (Eds). 1993. *Vers une approche panlectale de la variation*. Paris: Didier.
- Clark, Eve V. 1985. The acquisition of Romance, with special reference to French. In Slobin, Dan Isaac (ed.), *The crosslinguistic Study of Language Acquisition*, Vol. 1. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 687–782.
- DeGraff, Michel. 2000. À propos de la syntaxe des pronoms objets en créole haïtien: Points de vue croisés de la morphologie et de la dialectologie. In Véronique, Daniel (Ed.), *Syntaxe des langues créoles*. *Langages* 138: 89–113.
- DeGraff, Michel. 2005. Morphology and word order in 'Creolization' and beyond. In Cinque, Guglielmo & Kayne, Richard S. (Eds), *The Oxford handbook of comparative syntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 293–372.
- Detges, Ulrich. 2000. Two types of restructuring in French Creoles: A cognitive approach to the genesis of tense markers. In Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid & Schneider, Edgar W. (Eds), *Degrees of restructuring in Creole languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 135–62.
- Detges, Ulrich. 2002. Créolisation et changements linguistiques. *Études Créoles* XXV/1: 71–86.
- Ditchy, Jay K. 1932. *Les Acadiens louisianais et leur parler*. Paris: Droz.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 2001. Attrition linguistique ou convergence dialectale: JE, MOI/ JE et MOI en français cadien. *Langues de diaspora – langues en contact*. 2001. 149–65.
- Dubois, Sylvie. 2005. Un siècle de français cadien parlé en Louisiane. In Valdman, Albert, Auger, Julie & Piston-Hatlen, Deborah (Eds), (2005). 287–305.
- Fattier, Dominique. 1994. Un fragment de créole colonial: Le manuel des habitants de Saint-Domingue de S.J. Ducoeurjoly, 1802. Réflexions sur l'apprentissage et la créolisation. In Daniel Véronique (ed.), *Créolisation et acquisition des langues*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence. 53–88.
- Fattier, Dominique. 1996. Regards sur les pronoms personnels de l'Haïtien (Dans une perspective comparative). In Véronique, Daniel (Ed.), *Matériaux pour l'étude des classes grammaticales dans les langues créoles*. Aix-en-Provence: Publications de l'Université de Provence. 213–42.
- Fattier, Dominique. 2000. Genèse de la détermination postnominale en haïtien: l'empreinte africaine. *L'information grammaticale* 85: 39–46.
- Fattier, Dominique. 2002. La créolisation du français en Haïti: Partir du produit pour penser le processus. *Études Créoles* XXV/1. 105–22.
- Fattier, Dominique. 2003. Grammaticalisations en créole haïtien: Morceaux choisis. *Créolica*, 23 avril 2003. 1–17.
- Frei, Henri. 1929. *La grammaire des fautes*. Genève: Bellegarde.
- Guilbeau, John. 1950. The French spoken in Lafourche Parish, Louisiana. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of North Carolina.
- Grevisse, Maurice. 1975. *Le bon usage. Grammaire française avec des remarques sur la langue française d'aujourd'hui*. 10<sup>e</sup> édition. Gembloux: Duculot.
- Haase, Albert. 1965. *Syntaxe française du XVII<sup>e</sup> siècle*, Nouv. éd. trad. et rem. par M. Olbert. Paris & München: Delgrave & Hueber.
- Heine, Bernd & Kuteva, Tania. 2005. *Language Change and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Highfield, Arnold R. 1979. *The French Dialect of St. Thomas U.S. Virgin Islands*. Ann Arbor MI: Karoma.
- Kerswill, Paul. 2002. Koïnization and accommodation. In Chambers, John K., Trudgill, Peter & Schilling-Estes, Natalie (Eds). *The handbook of language variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell. 669–702.
- King, Ruth. 1983. Variation and Change in Newfoundland French. A Sociolinguistic Study of Clitic Pronouns. Ph.D. Dissertation, Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- King, Ruth. 2000. *The lexical basis of grammatical borrowing. A Prince Edward Island French case study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- King, Ruth & Butler, Gary. 2005. Les Franco-Terreneuviens et le franco-terreneuvin. In Valdman, Albert, Auger, Julie & Piston-Hatlen, Deborah (Eds), *Le français en Amérique du Nord. État présent*. Saint-Nicolas (Québec): Les Presses de l'université Laval. 169–85.
- Koopman, Hilda & Lefebvre, Claire. 1982. *Pu: Marqueur de mode, préposition et complément*. In Lefebvre, Claire, Magloire-Holly, Hélène & Pitou, Nanié (Eds), *Syntaxe de l'haïtien*. Ann Arbor MI: Karoma. 64–91.
- Koch, Peter. 1993. Kyenbé-Tyonbo. *Wurzeln kreolischer Lexik. Neue Romania* 14: 259–87.
- Kolboom, Ingo & Mann, Roberto (Eds). 2005. *Akadien: Ein französischer Traum in Amerika. Vier Jahrhunderte Geschichte und Literatur der Akadier*. Heidelberg: Synchron Publishers.



- Lefebvre, Claire. 1998. *Creole genesis and the acquisition of grammar. The case of Haitian Creole*. Cambridge: CUP.
- LFLD = Louisiana French Lexical Database, coord. by Valdman, Albert. Indiana University Bloomington. (*A la découverte du français cadien à travers la parole/Discovering Cajun French through the spoken word*, CD-ROM 2004).
- Manessy, Gabriel. 1985. Français, créole français, français régionaux. *Bulletin du Centre d'étude des plurilinguismes* 7-8, 1-24.
- Massignon, Geneviève. 1962. *Les parlers français d'Acadie. Enquête linguistique*. 2 Vols. Paris: Klincksieck.
- Mather, Patrick-André. 2006. Second language acquisition and creolization: Same (t-) processes, different (e-) results. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 21(2): 231-74.
- Michaelis, Susanne. 1994. *Komplexe Syntax im Seychellen Kreol. Verknüpfung von Sachverhaltsdarstellungen zwischen Mündlichkeit und Schriftlichkeit*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Motapanyane, Virginia. 1997. *Acadian French*. München: Lincom.
- Mougeon, Raymond & Beniak, Édouard. (Eds). 1994. *Les origines du français québécois*. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2005. *Créoles, écologie sociale, évolution linguistique*. Paris: L'Harmattan.
- Nadasdi, Terry. 2000. *Variation grammaticale et langue minoritaire. Le cas des pronoms clitiques en français ontarien*. München: Lincom.
- Neumann, Ingrid. 1985. *Le créole de Breaux Bridge, Louisiane - Étude morphosyntaxique - textes - vocabulaire*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 2000. Restructuration dans un créole conservateur: Le cas du créole louisianais. In Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid & Schneider, Edgar W. (Eds), *Degrees of restructuring in Creole languages*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 382-407.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 2003a. Formes verbales invariables en créole - un cas de réanalyse. In Kriegel, Sibylle (Ed.), *Grammaticalisation et réanalyse. Approches de la variation créole et française*. Paris: CNRS. 69-86.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 2003b. *Externe Sprachgeschichte des Französischen in den Vereinigten Staaten*. In Ernst, Gerhard, Gießgen, Martin D., Schmitt, Christian & Schweickard, Wolfgang (Eds), *Romanische Sprachgeschichte*, Vol. 1. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 911-21.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 2005a. Si la langue disparaît.... Das akadische Französisch in Kanada und Louisiana. In Kolboom, Ingo & Mann, Roberto (Eds), *Akadien: Ein französischer Traum in Amerika*. Heidelberg: Synchron-Wissenschaftsverlag der Autoren. 773-99.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid. 2005b. Le subjonctif en français acadien. In Brasseur, Patrice & Falkert, Anika (Eds), 125-44.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid, Brasseur, Patrice & Wiesmath, Raphaële. 2005. Le français acadien au Canada et en Louisiane. In Valdman, Albert, Auger, Julie & Piston-Hatlen, Deborah (Eds), (2005). 479-503.
- Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid & Wiesmath, Raphaële. 2006. Les parlers acadiens: un continuum discontinu. In Papen, Robert A. & Chevalier, Gisèle (Eds). Les variétés de français en Amérique du Nord. *Evolution, innovation et description. Revue canadienne de linguistique appliquée* 9(2) *Revue de l'Université de Moncton* 37.2: 233-239.
- Nyrop, Kristoffer. 1899-1930. *Grammaire historique de la langue française*, Vol. I-VI. Kopenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel Nordisk Forlag.
- Papen, Robert A. & Rottet, Kevin J. 1996. Le français cadien du bassin Lafourche: Sa situation sociolinguistique et son système pronominal. In Dubois, Lise & Boudreau, Annette (Eds), *Les Acadiens et leur(s) langue(s): Quand le français est minoritaire*. Moncton: Éditions d'Acadie. 233-52.
- Perrot, Marie-Ève. 1995. Aspects fondamentaux du métissage français/anglais dans le chic de Moncton (Nouveau-Brunswick, Canada). Ph.D. Dissertation, Université de la Sorbonne Nouvelle III, Paris.
- Plag, Ingo. 2002. On the role of grammaticalization in creolization. A reassessment. In Gilbert, Glenn (Ed.), *Pidgin and Creole linguistics in the 21st century. Essays at the millennium's end*. New York NY: Peter Lang. 229-46.
- Riegel, Martin, Pellat, Jean-Christophe & Rioul, René. 1994. *Grammaire méthodique du français*. Paris: PUF.
- Rottet, Kevin J. 1995. Language shift and language death in the Cajun French-speaking communities of Terrebonne and Lafourche Parishes, Louisiana. Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, Bloomington IN. Ann Arbor MI: UMI.
- Rottet, Kevin J. 2001. *Language shift in the coastal marshes of Louisiana*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Rottet, Kevin J. 2004. Inanimate interrogatives and settlement patterns in francophone Louisiana. In *Journal of French Language Studies* 14: 169-88.
- Siewierska, Anna. 2004. *Person*. Cambridge: CUP.
- Smith, Jane S. 1994. A morphosyntactic analysis of the verbal group in Cajun French. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Washington.
- Stäbler, Cynthia. 1995a. *La vie dans le temps et l'espace. Ein Korpus von Gesprächen mit Cadiens in Louisiana*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Stäbler, Cynthia. 1995b. *Entwicklung mündlicher romanischer Syntax. Das französische cadien in Louisiana*. Tübingen: Narr.
- Syea, Anand. 2000. L'absence de pronoms clitiques en créole mauricien. In Véronique, Daniel (Ed.), *Syntaxe des langues créoles*. *Langages* 138: 70-88.
- Thogmartin, Clyde. 1970. *The French dialect of Old Mines*. Ann Arbor MI: UMI.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Kaufman, Terence. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley CA: University of California Press.
- Thurot, Charles. 1881. *De la prononciation française depuis le commencement du XVIIe siècle d'après les témoignages des grammairiens*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale.
- Valdman, Albert, Auger, Julie & Piston-Hatlen, Deborah (Eds). 2005. *Le français en Amérique du Nord. État présent*. Saint-Nicolas (Québec): Les Presses de l'Université Laval.
- Véronique, Daniel. 1999. L'émergence de catégories grammaticales dans les langues créoles: Grammaticalisation et réanalyse. In Lang, Jürgen & Neumann-Holzschuh, Ingrid (Eds), *Reanalyse und Grammatikalisierung in den romanischen Sprachen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 187-209.
- von Wartburg, Walter. 1950. *Die Ausgliederung der romanischen Sprachräume*. Bern: Francke.
- Wiesmath, Raphaële. 2005. Les périphrases verbales en français acadien. In Brasseur, Patrice & Falkert, Anika (Eds). 145-58.
- Wiesmath, Raphaële. 2006. *Le français acadien. Analyse syntaxique d'un corpus oral recueilli au Nouveau-Brunswick & Canada*. Paris: L'Harmattan.