



Archetypal areal features in the African English-lexifier Creoles

Kofi Yakpo

The University of Hong Kong • kofi@hku.hk

WOCAL 8 • 20-24 August 2015 • Kyoto

Objectives



- To argue for strong **areal affinities** of the African-Caribbean English-lexifier Creoles (henceforth AECs) with the *Macro-Sudan Belt* (Güldemann 2008), specifically the *West African littoral convergence zone* (e.g. Ameka 2005)
- To present linguistic evidence from the African grouping of the AECs, looking at three **isoglosses** at different structural levels.
- To introduce the concept of “**archetypal areal feature**” to characterize the emergence of areal features found in the AECs.



Major African-Caribbean English-lexifier Creoles (AECs)



Smith (2015) *Ingredient X: the shared African lexical element in the English-lexifier Creoles*

West-African/Trans-atlantic Sprachbund?



Muysken & Smith (2015) *Surviving the middle passage: The West Africa-Surinam Sprachbund*

The phenomenon: areal affinities of the African AECs



- Specific types of multi-verb constructions (e.g. Alleyne 1980)
- Two-tone systems (e.g. Berry 1971; Faraclas 1996; Rivera Castillo & Faraclas 2006; Yakpo 2009)
- Complex locative constructions (e.g. Essegbey & Bruyn 2002; Yakpo & Bruyn 2015; Yakpo, to appear a)
- Asymmetric negation systems (Yakpo, to appear b)
- Split copular systems (e.g. Mazzoli 2013)
- Causatives (Yakpo 2012a)
- Modal complementation, subjunctive mood



AEC tone systems



1. West African (litoral) “minimal” system: 2 level tones
2. Lexical tone, with tonal minimal pairs and maximal tonal contrasts over bisyllabic words (**cf. handout ex. 1-2**)
3. Use of grammatical tone (**ex. 3**) including a possibly areal pattern in which compounds and reduplications feature a nonprominence-prominence prosodic pattern (cf. Yakpo 2012b)
4. Tonal declination (downdrift, and downstep) (cf. Yakpo 2009)



Tone in words of Yoruba origin in Krio



Yoruba

àkẹ̀tẹ̀

‘cap’

àpáta

‘rock’

ọmọ

‘child’

Krio

àkété

‘old, battered hat’

àkpátá

‘flat stone’

ómó-

‘child’ (in composite names)

Yoruba mid-tone: unmarked

(cf. handout, 4)



Asymmetric negation systems



AECs show areal-typological alignment with Macro-Sudan:

1. Asymmetric verbal paradigms, involving the use of suppletive portmanteau forms that incorporate TMA category and negative polarity in standard negation (**ex. 5-6**) (cf. Jungraithmayer 1988; Cyffer, Ebermann & Ziegelmeyer 2009)
2. Asymmetric copular paradigms with suppletive forms conditioned by the use of specific TMA categories, finiteness and negative polarity (**ex. 7-9**)



AEC asymmetric copular negation: overview



Copula type/language	Krio/Pichi		Nigerian Pidgin		Ghanaian Pidgin	
Polarity	+	-	+	-	+	-
Locative/existential	<i>dé</i>	<i>NEG dé</i>	<i>dé</i>	<i>NEG dé</i>	<i>dé</i>	<i>NEG dé</i>
Identity/equative	<i>ná</i>	<i>nótò</i>	<i>ná / bí</i>	<i>NEG bí</i>	<i>bí</i>	<i>NEG bí</i>
Identity/equative + TMA	<i>bí</i>	<i>NEG TMA bí</i>	<i>bí</i>	<i>NEG TMA bí</i>	<i>bí</i>	<i>NEG TMA bí</i>



Asymmetry cline

(cf. handout, ex. 10-11)



AEC subjunctive mood: an areal phenomenon?

- Isogloss: unitary marking of deontic modality in specific main & subordinate clause types. Instantiation of deontic force, “manipulation” (e.g. Givón 1995)



Subjunctive (“jussive, optative”) complementizers in the AECs and Macro-Sudan languages



Clause type	SBJV COMP?
1. Factive clause: <i>I know that she will come</i>	No
2. Directives: <i>come (sg)!, come (pl)!, let’s go! let them come!</i>	Yes
3. In complements of strong deontic verbs:	Yes
3.1. Indirect imperatives: <i>I told her to come</i>	Yes
3.2. WANT: <i>I want him to come</i>	Yes
3.3. Causatives: <i>I made him leave, I allowed her to go home</i>	Yes/No
4. Preference/aversion: <i>It’s good/better for him to leave now, I fear that he should leave me</i>	Yes
5. Purpose clauses: <i>She went to Accra in order to get treatment</i>	Yes
6. Temporal limit clause: <i>I waited until she came</i>	Yes/No
7. Epistemic possibility: <i>It is possible that she arrives tomorrow</i>	No

Deontic

(cf. handout, ex. 13)

“Manipulation” (Givón 1995: 125ff.)



Subjunctive complementizer



1. AECs: instantiated in use of modal complementizer + null TMA marking in the predicate AECs (ex. 13)
2. Macro-Sudan: most widespread pattern in sample is modal complementizer + null or overt mood marking in the predicate (ex. 14-15)



Micro-survey of SBJV in selected Macro-Sudan languages

<i>Family</i>	<i>Languages</i>	<i>SBJV complementizer?</i>	<i>Mood in predicate?</i>
Atlantic	Temne	X	
Kwa	Gun	X	
	Ewe	X	X
Kwa	Asante Twi, Fante, Baule	X	X
Gur	Kabye		X
Mande	Samogokan		X
Mande	Susu,	X	X
Yoruboid	Yoruba	X	
Igboid	Igbo	X	
Bantuoid	Bafut	X	
AECs	Krio, Pichi, NigP, GhaP, CamP	X	

The archetypal areal feature



- Ad-/substratal convergence effects lead to levelling and loss of less prototypical Macro-Sudan features in the AECs.
- “Archetypal areal feature” instantiates the intersecting set of (sub-)features of an isogloss in Macro-Sudan languages in contact with AECs, i.e. the most frequent, most widespread sub-features of an isogloss.
- Can be modelled: multidimensional scaling, structural phylogenetics



Conclusions



- The AECs share broad, leveled out areal features with Macro-Sudan reflecting the convergence and accommodation processes that characterize the emergence and use of these languages in contexts of extensive individual and societal multilingualism
- Studying the West African English-lexifier Creoles, the variation between them and the stratal forces that influence this variation contributes to understanding areal dynamics in the region

