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**AAE** African American English  
**BC** Bajan Creole  
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**BCE** Bastimentos Creole English  
**BahCE** Urban Bahamian Creole  
**CEC** Caribbean English Creole  
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1 first person  
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AP associative plural
CMPR comparative
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COMPL completive
CONJ conjunction
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COP copula
DEF definite article
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EXC exclamation
FUT future
HAB habitual
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ITER iterative
MOD modal
NEG negative
POSS possession
PROG progressive
PRSP prospective aspect
PL plural
PREP preposition
PR propensity
PST past
Q question particle
REFL reflexive
REL relative
SG singular
SUP superlative
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ELAR Endangered Languages Archive
ELDP Endangered Languages Documentation Programme
UFC The United Fruit Company
UNESCO (Atlas of the World’s Languages in Danger)
Abstract

This study has one main aim, which is to ascertain how the semantic categories of tense-aspect-modality (TMA) are expressed in a lesser-known Caribbean Creole variety, Bastimentos Creole English (BCE). It presents an analysis of TMA markers in BCE and their interaction, as well as exploring the functions of the unmarked verb, on the basis of cross-linguistic discussions of tense-aspect-modality subcategories from different theoretical angles. Semantic areas such as continuative aspect and counter-presupposition prove particularly interesting based on typological generalisations.

The motivations behind this synchronic description of BCE is to put the language into its linguistic and regional context by making some comparisons with other English Creole varieties in the Caribbean. This is of interest since Ethnologue assigns the same language ISO classification code (International Organisation for Standardisation) to both Jamaican Creole (JC) and BCE. The findings presented here challenge to some extent the basic idea that BCE is no different from JC. This study sets out from the beginning to treat BCE as a language in its own right. Semantic areas in which BCE differs to JC are past tense, habitual aspect, and non-epistemic possibility, amongst others.

The second motivation is to document an endangered vernacular that receives no official identification as a language, other than a general English-based Creole in Panama (which is the identification given both by UNESCO and Ethnologue), and to ascertain to what extent BCE is an endangered language based on the evaluations of the degree of vitality provided by these official bodies.

A final motivation is to challenge the idea that creole languages are simpler than non-creole languages. In this respect, it is important that detailed studies of grammatical systems of more creole languages continue to be carried out, in order to address naïve views of the structure and genesis of creoles.
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Identification codes of BCE data examples

All examples of BCE data presented in this thesis are given an identification code which serves to inform the reader. The examples are coded to protect the anonymity of the speakers concerned, and thus the speaker identification number is relevant only to the author. Almost all examples are taken from recorded data; where this is not the case, the file number 00 refers to field notes. Other information conveyed in the identification code is file number, age of speaker, type of data (see below) and year. The example below contains the following information: file number - 09; speaker identification - 6, age - 87; type of data - natural conversation; year - 2012:

(09-6:87n2012)

Each example includes a transcription in BCE and a free translation in English. Where a Spanish word appears in the transcription, the translation is annotated with the abbreviation (Sp.), followed by the Spanish word, then the English translation:

[Sp. ducha ‘shower’].

Reference to type of data includes the following (see 4.2.4 for further information on data collection):

- **n** natural conversation
- **nr** natural conversation with Heidi Reid
- **np** natural conversation in the presence of Heidi Reid
- **e** elicited by Heidi Reid
- **en** natural conversation arising during elicitation session
- **p** narrating of picture book, ‘Frog, where are you?’ (Mayer 1969)
- **pr** narrating of picture book in the presence of Heidi Reid
- **fr** re-telling of fairy tale (without book) as told to Heidi Reid
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1 Chapter one: Introduction

1.1 Aims and scope of this thesis

The aim of this thesis is to provide a synchronic grammatical description of tense-aspect-modality (see 1.2.1 and 1.3) of a lesser known English Creole, spoken in the Republic of Panama (see 3.3 for map). In this thesis, this vernacular is referred to as Bastimentos Creole English (BCE) (see 3.4.1 for an explanation). The analysis is informed by cross-linguistic descriptions of grammatical categories of tense-aspect-modality (see 1.2). This description of BCE relies wherever possible on naturalistic data, although elicited data also fills important gaps. As a result of collating data for this thesis, an audio and video digital documentation of BCE has been made which is deposited with the Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR): https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI604663 (see 4.2.2).

BCE is a language spoken on Isla de Bastimentos (see 3.3) and its speakers are of Afro-Antillean ancestry (see 3.5.1). The linguistic data represents the BCE speakers who reside in the town of Ol’ Bank. Bastimentos Island is located in the remote archipelagic province of Bocas del Toro, just off the coast of mainland Panama in the Caribbean Sea and close to the Costa Rican border (see 3.3). The lexifier of BCE is English, and it co-exists in a diglossic relationship with Spanish (see 3.10), the latter language serving as the official language of Panama. Most BCE speakers are bilingual, albeit to varying degrees in Spanish (Snow 2000a: 166). Some of the community’s oldest residents are monolingual speakers of BCE, but the number of BCE speakers with no ability to speak Spanish is very low (Snow 2007: 168).

Detailed studies of grammatical systems of more creole languages continue to be important in order to address simplistic views of the structure and genesis of creoles. This study contributes to this research agenda by examining the tense-aspect-modality system in BCE, revealing the full extent of the meanings(s) of the tense-aspect-modality (TMA) markers, as well as the interesting ways in which they interact both with each other and
with lexical aspect (6.2.2). A variety of theoretical notions inform the analysis, but no single theoretical framework is relied upon to account for patterns in the data (see 1.2). The analysis presented in this thesis is based on first-hand data, both naturalistic and elicited, which was acquired during fieldwork courtesy of the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme, SOAS (see 4.2.2). The analysis is also informed by my own transcriptions and annotations of Aceto’s (1996, 1998) recordings (see 4.2.1).

Most of the TMA markers that are discussed in this thesis are identified as grammatical markers on the basis that they are predominantly found in preverbal position, with no intervening constituent. The order of the preverbal markers is the following: epistemic modality - tense - non-epistemic modality - aspect (see 1.3.2). The markers of epistemic modality behave somewhat differently insofar as they are found utterance-initially (see 8.3). Preverbal markers discussed in chapter 6 on aspect include those that either change lexical aspect (6.5) or mark viewpoint aspect (6.2.1). In contrast, other TMA markers such as miebi (8.4.1) and mosi (8.5.1 and 9.3.2.1) are lexical markers since they are syntactically unconstrained. Such markers are included in the analysis of tense-aspect-modality in BCE on the basis that they fill a gap in the semantic paradigm of modality.

The default interpretation of the unmarked dynamic verb is past, whilst the unmarked stative verb receives a present interpretation (see 5.2). There are other semantic tense-aspect-modality subcategories that are not formally encoded in BCE and are expressed via the unmarked verb, namely, the present habitual (7.4.1) and present perfect (7.4.2). Also considered in this thesis is the relationship between tense-aspect-modality and negation (see 5.5, 6.4.3.1.1.1 and 6.4.3.1.2.1), as well as counterfactuality and conditionals (see chapter 10 and 5.4), although these are not intended to be fully systematic explorations. These interactions are included either because they prove unexpected in terms of compositionality or it is interesting to make certain comparisons with other Caribbean English Creoles (CECs) (see 3.2).
There appears to be a general trend amongst creolists pursuing fieldwork to avoid documenting and describing relatively small CEC populations: Studies of Jamaican Creole (JC), Guyanese Creole (GC), and to a lesser extent, Belizean Creole (BelC) and Trinidadian Creole, for example, eclipse work on other related CECs (Aceto 2003: 94). Winford (2000: 65) remarks on the brevity of most descriptions in the domain of modality. Migge (2006), Winford & Migge (2007), Migge & Winford (2009), and Essegbey et al. (2013) attempt to address this lacuna. The Surinamese Creoles are not included in the group of CECs based on the categorisation of Winford (1993: 4), but this thesis includes them here (again, see 3.2). Tense and aspect of CECs are more widely covered in the literature than modality, although very little is known about the English Creole variety spoken in Costa Rica (Herzfeld 1983, Herzfeld 1983). Descriptions of tense and aspect are available for BelC (Winford 2001, Winford 2006), JC (Durrleman 2000, Farquharson 2013), GC (Winford 1993, Winford 2001), Sranan Creole (Winford 2001), and Urban Bahamian Creole (Hackert 2004). Summaries of tense-aspect-modality are found for San Andres Creole (Bartens 2003, Bartens 2009, Bartens 2013b), Providence Island Creole (Bartens 2009), and Nicaraguan Creole (Bartens 2009, Bartens 2013a). Past marking in JC is described in detail in Patrick (1999). Slightly more general studies of tense-aspect-modality are available in Schneider (2008) as well as Holm & Patrick (2007). The above list is not exhaustive and reference to relevant literature is made throughout the thesis.

It is not the aim of this thesis to make a sociolinguistic study of any kind since there was no attempt made in the field to systematically collect data for a subsequent quantitative analysis. Recordings were made, however, to represent a wide range of ages from 19 years to 87 (see 4.2.4). There is evidence of variation within the TMA system of BCE, both stable and non-stable, and it is interesting to remark on how the variation may have arisen, albeit sometimes based on speculative/anecdotal evidence. The term variant in this thesis refers to two or more grammatical markers that are phonetically distinct whilst at the same time encoding the same semantics. Any variation observed in this description of tense-aspect-modality in BCE is explored from a qualitative perspective by assessing the formality of the situation and/or taking note of the speaker’s age, as well as
considering semantic and syntactic context. Sometimes this variation correlates to social meaning in BCE, for example, the formality of the situation as subjectively perceived by the speaker. This accounts to some extent for the presence/absence of the progressive variants which take the form of preverbal de and verbal suffix -in (see 6.4.1.1). Likewise, modal variants fi (9.3.2.4) and supuostu (9.3.2.5) which encode weak non-epistemic necessity (see 9.2). Although the BCE community is relatively small (see 3.7), it cannot be argued that no social stratification exists therein since four distinct neighbourhoods are identifiable in Ol’ Bank (see 4.2.4). In several instances, the phenomenon of variation becomes particularly apparent if I am present in a recording and/or where speakers generally feeling somewhat self-conscious about being recorded. Naturally, to counteract this phenomenon, an attempt is made in all instances to keep the Observer’s Paradox (Labov 1971) to an absolute minimum (see 4.2.4 for data collection methods) mainly by my absence during recordings.

Creolists often seek to represent the archaic, idealised version of a creole language, opposed conceptually to the standard lexifier (Patrick 1999: 5). This in turn can result in the basilectal variant of a TMA marker being favoured over any other variant for description purposes, the marker that is deemed to resemble the lexifier least (see 2.2 for a definition of ‘basilect’). Mufwene (1999: 170) contends that creole languages should not be typically characterised by structures that make them totally different from their lexifiers. With this in consideration, even if some of the variation observed in BCE becomes more easily identifiable when speakers are attempting to accommodate to English, the fact that they have access to two variants for expressing the same semantic domain is in and of itself interesting and worth noting. Related to this is the tendency in creole literature to correlate any observed variation to the post-creole continuum and decreolisation (see 2.2 for definitions). Mufwene (1999: 168) wonders how claims related to decreolisation can be made without diachronic evidence. Variation need not necessarily reflect any recent change in a Creole language. For example, it may be the case in BCE that progressive variants de (6.4.1.1.2) and -in (6.4.1.1.3) have been present in the vernacular for some time due to the socio-history (see 3.6) and demographics (see 3.7) of the speech community.
Although progressive -in undoubtedly originates in the English verbal suffix -ing, the contact language of BCE is not English but Spanish and this fact has to be taken into consideration when deliberating whether the concept of a post-creole continuum is at all applicable to BCE (see 3.10).

The existence of variation may also be the result of grammaticalisation processes (see 1.2.2), which is the case for BCE modal markers mosi and mosbi (see 8.5.1 for an explanation). These variants express both epistemic and non-epistemic modality. In the non-epistemic domain, mos(i) co-occurs with with nouns and prepositions and mos with dynamic verbs, thus there seems to be syntactic constraints on each variant. This correlation, however, is not evident in the epistemic domain, where the choice between these variants appears to be arbitrary, most likely the result of this modal being constrained to marking copula bii.

Relative/prospective aspect variants gwain and waan appear to be an example of unstable variation. There is some anecdotal evidence that speakers do not so much use these variants interchangeably but based on their age (see 7.6.2). Variation and change is also evident in the domain of past tense, where overlap of function(s) between past copula wo and past marker di (see 7.5.5 for a discussion) is observable in the speech of the youngest BCE speakers in the data.

Naturally, there are limitations in terms of available data for the analysis of tense-aspect-modality in BCE including the issue of variation, and areas for potential future research with respect to linguistic and potential extralinguistic factors are addressed at relevant points throughout the thesis.

A final point to make about the aims of this thesis before moving onto the motivations, is to state categorically that no attempt is made to add to the debate on creole genesis by commenting on the different theories of pidgin and creole formation. The technical distinction between a ‘pidgin’ and a ‘creole’ are also not deliberated (see Siegel 2008).
There are several motivations for wishing to explore the area of tense-aspect-modality of BCE. MA research conducted in Reid (2010) on tense-aspect-modality in BCE proved interesting enough to motivate further exploration (see also 4.2.1). In addition, the wish to highlight the linguistic uniqueness of BCE has been another motivation, to identify similarities and/or differences in form and function with JC and other related CECS (see 3.2) such as those spoken in Belize, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and the (Colombian) islands of San Andrés and Providence Island. The language family assigned to these Creole varieties by Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons et al. 2014) is ‘Creole-English based-Atlantic-Western’ (again, see 3.2). The ISO (International Organisation for Standardisation) classification code assigned to Jamaican Creole [jam] by Ethnologue (see 3.4.4) is shared with BCE. Nonetheless, a comparison of BCE with other Creole varieties is not the main aim of this thesis, which, has already been outlined, is to provide a synchronic description of the tense-aspect-modality system of BCE.

A further motivation of this thesis is to ascertain to what extent BCE is an endangered language. UNESCO deems BCE (or some variety of Panamanian Creole English) to be ‘definitely endangered’, based on the assumption that ‘children no longer learn the language as a mother tongue in the home’ (see 3.4.4). Ethnologue describes it as ‘vigorous’ on the basis that ‘the language is used for face-to-face communication by all generations and the situation is sustainable’. Both official bodies acknowledge that PCE is restricted in use to the domains of a vernacular. A final motivation for this thesis is to challenge the idea that creole languages are simpler than non-creole languages. In this respect, it is important that detailed studies of grammatical systems of more creole languages continue to be carried out, in order to address naïve views of the structure and genesis of creole languages.

1.2 Framework and general approach

The analysis pursued in this thesis does not rely on a single theoretical framework to account for patterns in the data. The general theoretical approach adopted is to base
grammatical analysis on a broad semantic conceptualisation informed by functional-typological approaches. The analysis does not commence with any a priori grammatical categories but relies on pre-defined, cross-linguistically attested semantic categories. From here, it is ascertained which semantic categories are encoded formally in BCE, with the understanding that they may have language-specific manifestations both at the level of form and semantics. The analysis also accounts for grammaticalisation sources, for variation, and for overlaps in the expression of certain concepts.

There are reasons for not presupposing the existence of grammatical categories for any individual language from the outset. Croft (1995: 88) remarks the following:

In general, cross-linguistic identification cannot be accomplished on purely formal (structural) grounds for two reasons. First, variation across languages is too great…Second, formal definitions are internal to the structural system of a single language…For these reasons, typologists generally use definitions that are ‘external’ to the linguistic system, that is semantic, pragmatic or discourse-based definitions.

The assumption here, naturally, is that semantic/pragmatic/discourse categories are inevitably pre-defined and universal. However, as the number of grammatical descriptions of individual languages increases, this might turn out to not be entirely true. Furthermore, it is a matter of debate whether semantic and discourse-based categories are external to the linguistic system. Nevertheless, initiating grammatical analysis by observing patterns in the data, as opposed to relying on pre-established grammatical categories, is useful. As Payne (1997: 235) observes, TMA marking can have functions beyond the clause-level syntax, being deployed in interesting ways in the discourse. For example, the English present tense is often used to make a narrative describing past situations more animated (see also 5.2). The term ‘notion’ is helpful here for referring to features both semantic and pragmatic in nature (Palmer 2001: 18). A notional approach aids in the identification of aspects of grammar that are not marked by one single, ‘dedicated’ marker, or indeed, by a combination of markers. This phenomenon is observable in BCE in the expression of past
counterfactuality (see chapter 10), a meaning which tends to arise cross-linguistically from a semanticisation of pragmatic information in contexts where a combination of TMA markers are present (Van linden and Verstraete 2008) (see chapter 10).

Studies on semantic typology that contribute to informing the analysis of tense and aspect in BCE include (amongst others) Vendler (1967), Comrie (1976, 1985), Dahl (1985), Smith (1997). And on modality, Van der Auwera & Plungian (1998). These studies do not concern themselves with any one specific language nor on direct comparisons with any number of languages. Instead, they present tense-aspect-modality as part of a general linguistic theory, taking examples of individual languages to support theoretical points being made about semantic typology. Palmer (2001) takes the grammatical category as the starting point and describes cross-linguistic patterns based loosely on formal, grammatical marking, which also contributes to informing the analysis of modality in BCE. Language specific descriptions of the English language are also relied upon, especially in cases where the form of the TMA marker in BCE resembles that of English (Coates 1983, Palmer 1986), particularly in expressions of future situations (see 7.6).

1.2.1 Tense, aspect, modality

This section outlines some basic concepts and definitions related to tense-aspect-modality as background information for the forthcoming chapters. Detailed information on tense-aspect-modality subdomains are mentioned as the thesis progresses and at relevant points.

Tense-aspect-modality grammatical categories tend to be delimited along semantic lines, for example, tense, by definition, might be considered the grammatical expression of location in time (de Haan 2011: 52-53). Tense-aspect-modality meanings sometimes overlap, for example, future is debated to belong to either tense or modality (see 7.2 for more information). Additionally, the perfect (7.4.2) in some languages is treated as a subcategory of tense, whereas in others it is treated as a subcategory of aspect (de Haan 2011: 456). Dahl (1985) goes so far as to treat the perfect as a grammatical subcategory of neither tense nor aspect, distinguishing it from both. In BCE, grammatical markers of
tense-aspect-modality may have several functions, but one semantic category at its core. For example, BCE *di* is a past marker, its function being to mark stative verbs (6.2.2) for simple past (7.5.1.1). However, it also marks dynamic verbs (6.2.2) for counter-presupposition (7.5.1.2), as well as both dynamic verbs and stative verbs in the protasis of unreal conditionals (see 5.4.1.1.2). Dahl (1985: 13) observes that in spite of the great similarities between tense-aspect-modality systems in different languages, there is hardly any distinction that is marked in all languages. Furthermore, the loss of information entailed by not marking a potential distinction bears little impact on the quality of the communication that takes place between speakers. Although there are usually optional means at speakers’ disposal for making distinctions if needed, these are, according to Dahl (1985: 13), infrequently relied upon (presumably on the basis that discourse context plays such a large role in communication).

Grammatical categories can be expressed by morphological or syntactic (auxiliaries, particles) constructions. According to Comrie (1976: 9, note 1), the French periphrastic construction *être en train de* ‘to be in the process of’ is not a grammatical category but a free syntactic construction expressing progressive meaning. Comrie (1976: 8) remarks that despite the fact that the German perfect is not formally marked, its various subcategories are still able to be expressed in the language. This reflects a semantics-based definition of tense-aspect-modality, which is the approach taken in this thesis (see also 1.2). The analysis presented here places importance on how BCE speakers express the various temporal, aspeccual, and modal semantic distinctions, rather than restrict itself to a more traditional understanding of the term ‘grammatical category’. This allows *miebi* ‘maybe’ (8.4.1) and *mosi* (8.5.1 and 9.3.2.1) to be included in the definition of TMA marking, modals which function as adverbs and which are essentially lexical markers (see 1.1).

Payne (1997: 233-234) provides a useful starting point for describing tense-aspect-modality, in the following:
[They] are operations that anchor or ground the information expressed in a clause according to its sequential, temporal, or epistemological orientation. **Tense** is associated with the sequence of events in real time, **aspect** with the internal temporal “structure” of a situation, while **modality** relates the speaker’s attitude toward the situation or the speaker’s commitment to the probability that the situation is true.

Hewson (2012: 511) distinguishes the category of aspect from tense based on the contrastive definitions of Guillaume (1933), stating that “[...] aspect is concerned with the representation of the time contained in the event, and tense with the representation of the time that contains the event.” Thus, aspect involves the temporal organisation of situations (Smith 1991: xvi). Whereas aspect markers have scope over the verb or the verb phrase, tense has wider scope in so far as temporal markers are found further way from the verb, placing the aspectual situation in a particular time. Aspectual meaning is expressed in languages via lexical and/or grammatical morphemes, and has two subtypes, viewpoint aspect (6.2.1) and lexical aspect (6.2.2) (Smith 1991: xvi). Both aspectual subtypes interact not only with each other but also with tense.

### 1.2.2 Grammaticalisation: Layering & bleaching

A summary of **grammaticalisation** and the subprocesses of **bleaching** and **layering** is provided here, since reference to grammaticalisation is made a few times throughout the thesis, for example, in the discussion of relative/aspect variants gwain and waan (see 7.6.2 for the discussion), past markers di and wo (see 7.5.5), in addition to modals mos and mosi (see 9.3.2.1 and 8.5.1). Grammaticalisation is a concept that accounts for aspects of language change (and variation) whereby lexical items and constructions come in certain contexts to serve grammatical functions, or already established grammatical material acquires new grammatical functions (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 1). Subprocesses of grammaticalisation include the gradual desemanticisation and phonological reduction of linguistic material (Siegel 2008: 272).
Bybee *et al.* (1994: 281) observe that the diachronic patterns created by grammaticalisation provide a useful framework for comparing form and meaning of grammatical material from a cross-linguistic perspective. As lexical material becomes more grammatical, it undergoes functional and structural changes. These structural changes exist along a ‘cline of grammaticality’ along a unidirectional path:

content item > grammatical word > clitic > inflectional affix

This path does not inevitably culminate in all semantic distinctions being expressed inflectionally in all languages. Rather, in cases where this process of grammaticalisation does occur, there is a tendency for it to occur in this direction (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 7).

‘Layering’ describes the phenomenon whereby older forms and meanings persist alongside newer forms and meanings: “[It] is the synchronic result of successive grammaticalisation of forms which contribute to the same domain” (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 124-5). Over time meanings tend to become weakened during the process of grammaticalization, but during the initial stages there is a shift in meaning, not a loss. At the very beginning of the process, a lexical item will retain its meaning, existing alongside the newly acquired one. Not unrelated to layering is the concept of ‘bleaching’, the idea of which is that the original salient meanings of a form eventually disappear. This process tends to occur at the very late stages of grammaticalisation (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 124-5). However, ascertaining to what extent an original meaning of a form has been completely lost is difficult (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 98), largely due to the fact that it is the more abstract lexical meanings of a form that are involved in the grammaticalisation process. In fact, these original abstract meanings are believed to constrain later uses of the grammaticalised form, so that claiming those meanings are no longer present can prove challenging (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 98).
Relevant to creoles as emerging and rapidly-developing languages is the distinction between grammaticalisation in its conventional meaning and **functional gap filling** (Siegel 2008: 272). According to Siegel (2008: 272), grammaticalisation as a process and as a result is a distinction not made by Heine & Kuteva (2003, 2005). In the case of creoles, the end-result of grammaticalisation can emerge almost instantaneously, that is, there is no such process of grammaticalisation to speak of. Bruyn (2008: 401-4) coins the term **apparent grammaticalisation** to describe the phenomenon by which lexical items have assumed a grammatical function, but without the usual implication of a language-internal process of grammaticalisation. In Hawai’i Creole, for example, the grammatical function of progressive aspect was transferred directly on to the English lexical item *stay*, the verb ‘stay’ being a typical source for the progressive cross-linguistically (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 128-9).

However, functional gap filling is different from contact-induced grammaticalisation, which is an areally confined process resulting from specific historical events (Heine and Kuteva 2003: 529). According to Heine & Kuteva (2005: 14), grammaticalisation and language change induced by contact are not mutually exclusive processes.

### 1.3 TMA markers in BCE

Markers of aspect in BCE include progressive variants *de* (6.4.1.1.2) and *-in* (6.4.1.1.3), completive *don* (6.5.2), habitual *doz* (6.4.3.1.1), past habitual *yuustu* (6.4.3.1.2), inchoative *go, get, kom, tiurn* (6.5.1), continuative *stie de* (6.4.2), and iterative *stodi* (6.5.3).

The tense markers in BCE are past *di* (7.5.1), copula *wo* (occasionally pronounced *woz*) (7.5.4), relative/prospective future variants *gwain* (7.6.2.1), *waan* (7.6.2.2), and *luk fi* (7.6.3), absolute future *wi* (7.6.4), and negated future *wuon* (7.6.5).

There is an overlap in the semantics of some of the markers of modality, in the domains of epistemic and non-epistemic modality. These are the modal possibility markers *kian*
(8.4.3 and 9.3.1.1), negated kiaan (8.4.4 and 9.3.1.2), and past kuda (8.4.5 and 9.3.1.3), in addition to the modal necessity markers mos(i) (8.5.1 and 9.3.2.1) and afu (8.5.2 and 9.3.2.2). Their interpretation is acquired from context as well as their syntactic position. Constrained to the domain of non-epistemic modality are necessity markers beta (9.3.2.3), fi (9.3.2.4), supuostu (9.3.2.5), and negated possibility kudn (9.3.1.4). Modals that express epistemic modality only are miebi (8.4.1), (infrequent) maitbi (8.4.2), and negated kudnea (8.4.5.1), all of which are found in the subdomain of modal possibility.

Individual TMA markers that express counterfactuality including wuda (10.2.1.1), negated wudn (10.2.1.1.2), and deontic shuda (10.2.2.1).

There are, in addition, various combinations of the above markers which are discussed at relevant points throughout the thesis (see also 1.3.2). As explained in (1.2.1), the individual markers can themselves have several functions.

Finally, BCE has three copula forms iz (see 5.3.1.1 and 5.3.1.2), woz (7.5.4), and bii (see (75) in 6.4.3.1.2 for an example of past habitual yuustu + bii). They interact with tense in so far as iz is found in present tense contexts, and woz in past contexts. These forms may also mark progressive aspect for tense, albeit infrequently (see 6.4.1.1.3.1 and 7.5.4.2). Bii never occurs on its own but in combination with other TMA markers (see example (121) in 7.6.4.1 for an example of absolute future wi + bii + progressive verbal suffix -in).

1.3.1 Position and syntactic distribution

As mentioned in (1.1), many of the TMA markers in BCE are found preverbally, as illustrated in (1):

(1) luk dem piipu dii gat a stall
    look DEM.DEF people PST got INDF style
    Look, those people had a sense of fashion.
(15-18:56n2012)
There are, however, a few exceptions, for example, progressive variant -in (6.4.1.1.3) takes the form of a verbal suffix, as in (2):

(2) yo mek-in a lik fun
2.SG make-PROG INDEF little fun
You were having a little fun.
(12-17:64n2012)

In the semantic domain of epistemic modality, some modals are constrained to occurring utterance initially. In (3), both mosi (8.5.1) and afu (bii) (8.5.2) are followed by a noun phrase:

(3) da mosi Jan. ai shuoq. afu bii him
DEM MOD John 1.SG sure MOD COP John
That must be John. I’m sure. It’s got to be him.
(19a-19:47e2012)

1.3.2 TMA combinations
The domains and subdomains of tense-aspect-modality in BCE may be encoded by combinations of individual markers, with up to three TMA markers permissible. Jamaican Creole also permits the combination of three TMA markers (Farquharson 2013: 86). In the case of combinations of three, the first TMA marker to appear in BCE is one that expresses epistemic modality (see chapter 8). This is not surprising, since cross-linguistically these modals occupy a higher position in the clause than do non-epistemic modals (see chapters 9 and 10) (Cinque 1999: 81). The difference is motivated in terms of the scope of these categories over various portions of the clause. The typical order of TMA categories is the following, which indeed is the order in BCE, which is epistemic modals, tense, other modals, and aspect (Cinque 1999):

[Epistemic M] > [T] > [Non-epistemic M] > [A]
In (4), *mosi*, a modal that encodes epistemic necessity, precedes the other TMA markers, namely, past *wo* (7.5.4) and progressive *de* (6.4.1.1.2):

(4) *shi mosi wo de slip*

```
3.SG MOD COP PROG sleep
She must have been sleeping.
(00-26:21e2012)
```

Again, in (5), *mosi* occurs in first position, this time followed by past *di* (7.5.1) and *hafu* (9.3.2.2), a modal of non-epistemic necessity:

(5) *Jan mosi di hafu kom*

```
John MOD PST MOD come
John must have come.
(20-19:47e2012)
```

### 1.4 Outline of chapters

Chapter two relates to creoles in a more general sense, considering the term ‘creole’ (2.1) and whether such languages are distinguishable purely on linguistic grounds or based on their shared socio-history. In (2.2), the term ‘creole continuum’ is explained and its applicability to BCE is deliberated.

Chapter 3 begins by defining the term ‘Caribbean English Creole’, against which BCE will be compared in subsequent chapters (3.2). The location of Bastimentos Island is detailed in (3.3), after which issues related to the name and status of BCE are presented (3.4). Context is given to the term ‘Afro-Antillean’ in (3.5), followed by an account of the socio-history of the BCE speech community (3.6), its demographics (3.7), and the socio-economic situation in the local area (3.8). The chapter ends by evaluating the socio-cultural impact of tourism on BCE culture (3.9) and language (3.10), with a summary and outlook at the very end (3.11).
Chapter 4 begins by presenting previous research on BCE and Panamanian Creole English (4.1). This is followed by the methodology (4.2), which not only provides the reason for the field trip (4.2.1) and the source of funding (4.2.2), but a description of the fieldwork situation (4.2.3) and details relating to the kinds of data on which the grammatical analysis of the tense-aspect-modality system in BCE is based (4.2.4).

The aim of chapter 5 is to familiarise the reader with some very basic grammatical details of the BCE clause. It is constrained to a few topics of core relevance and is not an attempt to provide any detailed aspects of BCE grammar. Topics include the temporal interpretation of the unmarked verb (5.2), the copula domain (5.3.1), conditional clauses (5.4), and negation (5.5).

The core of the thesis is covered in chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10. An analysis of aspect is presented in chapter 6, followed by tense (chapter 7), epistemic modality (chapter 8), and non-epistemic modality (chapters 9). Chapter 10 follows on somewhat from chapter 9, and examines (past) counterfactual constructions in conditional sentences (10.2.1) and simple clauses (10.2.2).

Chapter 11 is the conclusion. It examines formal expressions of tense-aspect-modality in BCE that prove particularly interesting, not only in the context of observable typological generalisations, but also in relation to the origin of BCE in terms of the socio-history and demographics of its speakers and the cross-Creole comparisons of tense-aspect-modality (11.1). Interesting areas for future research are highlighted, including the potential for quantitative studies that pertain to stable and unstable variation (11.2). Finally, the status of BCE is reflected in light of the evaluations of its degree of vitality provided by UNESCO and Ethnologue (11.3). This is achieved by re-examining the description of the tense-aspect-modality system in BCE to ascertain what influence both Spanish and English have on BCE now and in the future.
2 Chapter two: Creoles

2.1 A distinct linguistic group?

The approach taken in this thesis is to assume that creoles are an identifiable group of languages based on their socio-histories. According to Mufwene (2000: 79), “[t]here is nothing wrong with delineating a group of languages on socio-historical grounds and making them the subject matter of one’s research”. The commonality that creoles share is that they have emerged out of a need for communication among people who would otherwise fail to understand each other. The ancestors of Caribbean English Creole (CEC) speakers (see also 3.2) were collectively made up of distinct African ethnicities speaking different languages, all of whom were forced to work as plantation labourers. Both linguistic and sociolinguistic factors may be the cause for the grammatical features selected for the creation of a language: semantic transparency, salience, regularity, lack of markedness, number of speakers of the various languages, the languages’ prestige and power, amount of contact, and frequency of use (Siegel 2008: 149).

Although McWhorter (2000: 85) claims that creole languages are distinguishable on a purely synchronic basis, clustering around a prototype of features which are not found in older languages, this doesn’t reflect the situation in BCE. No grammatical features exist in BCE that are attributable exclusively to, or are universal in, creole languages, a claim that is evidenced by the cross-linguistic literature on semantic (sub)categories of tense-aspect-modality. Additionally, BCE has features that are unique in terms of typological generalisations, for example, the notion of counter-presupposition (see 7.5.1.2 and 5.3.1.1) but also in relation to cross-CEC comparisons, for example the grammatical expression of continuative aspect (6.4.2). Moreover, Mufwene (1999: 159) doubts that any structural features of a creole language can justifiably be identified as creole-like, since not only are some of these features shared with several other non-creole languages but the features themselves differ amongst creoles. Mufwene (1998, cited in Mufwene 2000: 66) argues that creole vernaculars are produced by identical restructuring processes that occur in any
case of language change, that is, such processes are not typical of creoles at all. Although these restructuring processes are much more rapid in creoles, these languages have nevertheless all evolved at different rates and extents (Mufwene 2000: 66). Givón (1982: 149) observes that the sources of TMA markers for creoles and non-creole languages are very similar, not putting creoles in any privileged position with respect to linguistic universals. Mufwene (2000: 65) observes that the kind of variation observed across creole languages does not support the idea of a creole prototype.

2.2 The concept of a post-creole continuum

The **post-creole continuum** is a concept that was proposed by DeCamp (1971) for Jamaican Creole (JC), to explain the alleged life-cycle of creole languages. First described in nature (not name) by Schuchardt (1883; cited in Siegel 2008: 235), the post-creole continuum is a model that involves a cline of creole features from the most creole-like (**basilect**) to the least creole-like (**acrolect**), the latter resembling more strongly the standard form of the creole’s lexifier. In situations where the contact between the established creole and the lexifier intensifies, the creole then enters a post-creole stage through a process of decreolisation. The **mesolect**, on the other hand, consists of a combination of features from both the basilect and acrolect, thus occupying the space between the two polarities of the post-creole continuum. Patrick (1999: 292-3) claims that despite the fact that the JC mesolect consists of a mixed grammar based on both acrolectal and basilectal forms and functions, it nonetheless has structural integrity.

Thus, a post-creole speech community is one in which a creole is merging with a standard, in the sense that with time it resembles more and more its lexifier (DeCamp 1971: 349). Not every creole is believed to have a post-creole stage in its life cycle, and there are also arguments against the concept entirely (see below). There are two key social conditions that must be met for a post-creole continuum to exist (DeCamp 1971: 351). Firstly, the dominant official language of the speech community must be a standard form of the lexifier, which is not the case for BCE. Secondly, the formerly rigid social
stratification must have partially broken down, that is, there must be evidence of relaxed boundaries, enough in any case to motivate large numbers of speakers to modify their speech in the direction of the standard.

The emergence of a post-creole continuum (DeCamp 1971) (see 2.2) arises from a process known as **decreolisation**, a term coined by Bickerton (1977, 1981). Synchronic changes in the direction of the lexifier results in variation in the creole language. However, Patrick (1999: 17) finds the term misguided:

> [F]or such a label to be meaningful one must be able to locate the essence of creoleness and show that it is disappearing from a variety. This requires nothing less than finding the Holy Grail of creole studies, and it seems unwise to predicate use of any term on its success (Patrick 1992, see also Mufwene 1994).

Nevertheless, according to Siegel (2008: 257), two types of decreolisation are observable: **conventional** decreolisation and **covert** decreolisation. The former process involves the replacing of creole forms with those from the lexifier. In the latter process, despite the retention of creole forms, a change occurs in their function under what appears to be influence from the lexifier, or indeed another dominant language with which it is in contact (Siegel 2008: 259). An illustration of conventional decreolisation is found in JC in some of its TMA markers (Alleyne 1980; cited in Siegel 2008: 236), where modal **wuda** (see 10.2.1.1), progressive verbal suffix **-in** (see 6.4.1.1.3), and English past tense suffix **-ed** replace the Creole forms:

- conditional: *ben + go vs. wuda*
- progressive: *(d)a + V vs. V-in*
- past tense: *ben + V vs. did + V vs. English past tense*

An illustration of covert decreolization is observable in the past tense in Hawai‘i Creole (HC). This language has no generally accepted orthography and its speakers consider the language a ‘broken’ form of English, both facts contributing to the
sociolinguistic variation that is found in HC (Siegel 2008: 262). Some HC speakers use the relative past marker *wen* following the English pattern, which is to mark all finite verbs, others continue to use *wen* only to signal situations taking place further in the past, or to establish a general past time frame (Day 1973: 150-1; cited in Siegel 2008: 262, Comrie 1985: 102).

Nonetheless, the concept of the post-creole continuum may be of no relevance at all, which is indeed the case in Tok Pisin, a dialect of Melanesian Pidgin (MP) spoken in Papua New Guinea, which continues to exist in strict diglossia with English (Siegel 2008: 256). This linguistic situation is encouraged by the fact that MP serves officially as a national language and is used in many formal domains such as in parliamentary debates, newspapers, radio broadcasting, and religion. In addition, speakers of MP also consider the language separate from English (Siegel 2008: 267). Moreover, Siegel (2008: 257) claims there was actually no variation from the outset due to insufficient exposure to its lexifier, a result of historical circumstances.

However, the idea that decreolisation accounts for the existence of internal variation within creole languages is not undisputed. Patrick (1999: 15) observes the following:

The historicist fallacy that every instance of variation is evidence of language change in progress was advanced by Bickerton (1971) and Bailey (1973) as a theory; but though it may still be accepted by some creolists, it has long since been discredited in variation studies, where the distinction between stable and changing situations is a fundamental one (Labov 1994).

The tradition of quantitative sociolinguistics has, thus, contributed much to dispelling the myth that over time creole languages will converge with their respective lexifiers, both structurally and lexically (Migge 2010: 220). In fact, many creolists, e.g., Chaudenson (2001) and Mufwene (2001), argue that a creole develops *away* from its lexifier via a process of gradual basilectalisation (Siegel 2008: 237), and thus the term **creole**
continuum is preferred over post-creole continuum (Siegel 2008: 237). On the other hand, Mufwene (1999: 168) believes that the decreolisation hypothesis is a diachronic claim that simply cannot be supported without diachronic evidence (see also concluding remarks in 11.3).

The view that creole continua constitute a single linguistic system is challenged by Edwards (1980, 1983), Rickford (1986), and Winford (1992, 1993, 1997), who claim that they are better understood as consisting of two or three discrete linguistic systems, each associated with distinct social situations and groups (Migge 2010: 219). Edwards (1983), Lawton (1980), and Siegel (1997) prefer to rely on a model that is based on two discrete systems, the creole and the lexifier (Siegel 2008: 237). Winford (1993: 10), in contrast, prefers the idea of a model that includes an intermediate system and involves code-switching between systems:

The fact that many speakers have command of a wide range of varieties does not necessarily mean that one grammar is involved. The ability to switch from basilect to mesolect to acrolect is reminiscent of the code-switching behaviour associated with bilingual situations. The fact that speakers often incorporate features from one system into another is arguably akin to the code-mixture phenomena typical of bilingual speech. Neither type of behaviour is incompatible with the notion of co-existent systems.
3 Chapter three: Background to the BCE language and community

3.1 Introduction

This chapter begins by providing a definition of ‘Caribbean English Creole’ (3.2). Some information about the location of Bastimentos is provided (3.3) before exploring issues related to the BCE language, specifically, its name (3.4.1), its identification as a language in its own right (3.4.2 and 3.4.3), and its status as an endangered language (3.4.4). The ethnic groups in Panama are listed in (3.5), and the Afro-Antillean community in the district of Bocas del Toro puts into its context (3.5.1). The socio-history of the BCE speech community is described in (3.6); the demographics of the Afro-Antillean population in Bocas del Toro in (3.7); and the impact of tourism in the regional economy and the BCE culture in (3.8) and (3.9), respectively. The general sociolinguistic situation of the BCE speech community is assessed (3.10), which includes the domains of language use of BCE and Spanish (3.10.1). A summary and outlook for the BCE language is provided in (3.11).

3.2 Caribbean English Creoles

Caribbean English Creoles (CECs) are grouped into Western CECs and Eastern CECs based on their geographical location. Aceto (2003: 95) is of the opinion that this dichotomy might possibly be supported by valid socio-historical and linguistic evidence. This is reiterated by Holm (1989: 445), who does however concede that the situation is complex with respect to settlement patterns and their linguistic consequences. Winford (1993: 3) holds it to be a very broad dichotomy that masks many significant differences within each group, as well as important similarities between them. The term CEC is used in this thesis to refer to all creole varieties in the Anglophone Caribbean including so-called Atlantic Creoles such as those of Suriname.

Panamanian Creole English (PCE) (see 3.4.2) is generally considered to be mutually intelligible with the Creole varieties of Jamaica, Belize, Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and the
islands of San Andrés and Providence Island (Snow 2005: 25; Snow 2013: 258; see also Paul 2014; Holm 1989). These make up the so-called basilectal Western CECs (Winford 1993:4) (see 2.2 for the definition of ‘basilect’). As mentioned in (4.1), there is very little available in the way of documentation and in-depth description of any variety of PCE. Eastern basilectal CECs are spoken in Antigua/Bermuda, Grenada, Guyana, Montserrat, St. Kitts/Nevis, St. Vincent, and Tobago (Winford 1993:4).

The so-called mesolectal varieties include the Western CECs of The Bahamas, Bay Islands (Honduras), and Cayman Island, and the Eastern CECs of Barbados, Dominica, St. Lucia, and Trinidad (Winford 1993: 4).

3.3 Location of Bastimentos Island

Bastimentos is located in the province of Bocas del Toro which consists of three districts: Bocas del Toro, Chiriqui Grande, and Changuinola. Nearby Bocas Town, the capital of the province of Bocas del Toro, is situated on Colón Island and serves as the departure point for Bastimentos, a ten-minute boat ride away (see figure 3.1). Bastimentos belongs to the district of Bocas del Toro, which in turn is made up of five subdivisions: Bocas Del Toro, Bastimentos, Tierra Oscura, Punta Laurel, and Cauchero (Spalding 2013: 183). The archipelagic province of Bocas del Toro is home to approximately 18,000 inhabitants, 5,000 of whom reside on Colón Island (Guerrón-Montero 2011: 23).

Bastimentos is 21 kilometres long and a few kilometres wide. BCE speakers reside in the southwest coast of the island in the town of Ol’ Bank. Bastimentos is covered by tropical forest, the only way to navigate the island is by boat or, not without its difficulties, by foot. There are four administrative areas of Bastimentos: Old Bank, Solarte, Bahia Honda, and Salt Creek (Spalding 2012). BCE is also spoken in very small communities in other areas of the island: Solarte, Bahía Honda, and Salt Creek.
3.4 Issues related to name and status of BCE

3.4.1 Name

The term ‘creole’ is an academic term, not one that surfaces in conversation with BCE speakers. In fact, ‘patois’ is the more commonly used term amongst lay people in the Anglophone Caribbean (Mufwene 1999: 160). In the presence of outsiders, BCE speakers liken their language to ‘bad English’, ‘broken English’, or indeed, ‘patwa’. Panamanians more generally refer to the vernacular as ‘Guari-guari’ (or ‘Wari-wari’) (see Herzfeld 1983a: 34 note 4; Ethnologue), the exact etymology of which is unknown. Snow (2007: 179 note 4) claims that the term is considered derogatory with folk etymology attributing to it the meaning of ‘gibberish’. Based on the above information, it was decided that for the purposes of this study the term Bastimentos Creole English (BCE) would be the most appropriate one. This acknowledges the fact that the term ‘creole’ is used extensively in
the relevant academic literature (and is therefore necessary for identification purposes), but also that BCE speakers consider their language a variety of English. As mentioned in (3.2), ‘Caribbean English Creole’ is the term used in this thesis to refer to other such varieties in the geographical area.

### 3.4.2 Official recognition and identification issues

Although there is no official identification of a creole language spoken on Bastimentos, both Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons et al. 2014) and UNESCO (Moseley 2010) acknowledge the existence of an English-based Creole spoken more generally in Panama. Estimates for the number of Panamanian Creole English (PCE) speakers range between over 100,000 (Holm 1989: 482-3, Aceto 2001/2005: 1) to 268,000 (in the year 2000) (Lewis, Simons et al. 2014). Both official bodies identify the locations for PCE as Colón Island in Bocas del Toro province, Colón district in Colón province (not to be confused with Colón Island), and Rio Abajo in Panama City (Lewis, Simons et al. 2014). Although these places reflect three key areas in which PCE is spoken, the academic literature suggests that the situation is somewhat more complex than this. Bastimentos is, in fact, the only location where the grammar of a PCE variety has ever been investigated in some detail (see 4.1 for previous research on BCE).

According to Herzfeld (1983b: 151; cited in Snow 2013: 252), there are a number of communities in the former Panama Canal Zone and possibly also a small group of PCE speakers in the Pacific coast city of Puerto Armuelles in the province of Chiriquí. In Panama City itself there are two varieties of urban PCE found in specific neighbourhoods (for a full list, see Snow 2013: 252; 266). In Colón City, the PCE varieties are claimed to be difficult to delimit by neighbourhood or other regional boundaries since Afro-Antilleans (see 3.5 and 3.5.1) are scattered throughout the city (Snow 2013: 252; 266). Two PCE varieties are believed to exist in the Bocas del Toro Province, firstly, on the islands in the Chiriquí lagoon with locations including Bocas Town (Isla Colón), Ol’ Bank (Bastimentos), Carenero, and Cayo de Agua, and secondly, in the mainland port of
Almirante as well as Base Line, Bluefield, Torres Bluff, Patterson Key, Pigeon Key, Changuinola, and Guabito, the latter of which is situated near the border with Costa Rica. Claims are also made that a small group of PCE speakers are found in extremely remote villages east of the peninsula on the Golfo de los Mosquitos (Snow 2013: 252). Thomas-Brereton (1992: 193-4; cited in Aceto 1996a: 49) reports that PCE speakers in Panama City believe the variety spoken in Bocas del Toro to be distinct from their own. Lamy (2015, 2016) informed me via personal communication that the PCE varieties spoken in Bocas Town on Colón Island and Ol’ Bank on Bastimentos Island are distinct, the former believed to be less basilectal (see 3.2 and 2.2).

3.4.3 BCE and Jamaican Creole

Ethnologue assigns to PCE the same ISO (International Organisation for Standardisation) code as Jamaican Creole (JC) [jam]. In both Creole varieties the lexifier is English, although this is not the only reason that they share the same ISO code. Based on the very limited literature to date on any geographically situated PCE speech community, it is difficult to ascertain to what extent JC and any variety of PCE are similar. This thesis, thus, contributes to this understudied area, and proves that there are indeed differences between the tense-aspect-modality systems of JC and PCE (see chapters 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and also 11.1). Certainly, the historical ties that Panama has with Jamaica are undisputable (see 3.6 and 3.7).

Nevertheless, an attempt to compare BCE with JC is not necessarily an easy task. Whereas the contact language of JC is English, for BCE it is Spanish. Jamaica has a population of 2,670,000 (in the year 2001) speaking some variety of JC (Lewis, Simons et al. 2014). In contrast, BCE has no more than 1500 native speakers (based on my own fieldwork estimates) (see also 3.7). As already mentioned (3.4.2), the number of speakers of PCE more generally is assumed to be 268,000 (in the year 2000) by Lewis et al. (2014), though estimated at merely 100,000 by Aceto (2005: 1). In any case, it is difficult to deny that the sociolinguistic situations of the two respective speech communities of BCE and JC
are quite distinct. Thus, any comparison of BCE with JC proves challenging to some extent, exacerbated by the fact that accessible descriptions of JC use different terminology (see Winford 1996 for a discussion), take different theoretical approaches, differ in their level of detail, and include gaps in the analysis of tense-aspect-modality.

3.4.4 Status as an endangered language

With respect to language vitality, the label assigned to PCE (see 3.4.2) by UNESCO is ‘definitely endangered’, based on the assumption that ‘children no longer learn the language as a mother tongue in the home’. According to Ethnologue, the degree of vitality of PCE is ‘vigorous’ on the basis that ‘the language is used for face-to-face communication by all generations and the situation is sustainable’. Both official bodies acknowledge that PCE is restricted in use to the domains of a vernacular. As already stated (4.2.2), I did not seek official permission to work with minors (under 16), and further research is required to determine how the linguistic situation manifests itself where such BCE speakers are concerned (see concluding comments in 11.3).

3.5 Ethnic groups in Panama

Historically, Panama is home to several ethnicities: ‘Latinos’ (mestizo) who are of mixed Amerindian/Spanish heritage and speak primarily Spanish; various indigenous groups who traditionally speak Chibchan and Chocoan languages (Lewis, Simons et al. 2014); Afro-Antilleans (see 3.5.1) who migrated to Panama involuntarily or voluntarily to work on different infrastructural projects in the C19th (see 3.6) and who speak some variety of PCE (see 3.4.2) (Lipski 1986: 411); and, finally, Afro-Panamanians who arrived as labourers of Spanish colonists in the C16th who speak Spanish (c.f. Lipski 1986: 409, Guerrón-Montero 2009: 58, Snow 2013: 270, note 4). For more detailed information on the linguistic landscape of Panama see Reid (in prep.).

Afro-Antilleans and Afro-Panamanians make up two distinct ethnic groups in Panama. Afro-Panamanians reside in small villages dotted along the Caribbean coast and continue
to exhibit elaborate cultural and linguistic rituals, whereas those living in the larger cities of Panama are an assimilated ethnic group (Lipski 1986: 411-12). The Afro-Antillean ethnic group is discussed in (3.5.1). Panama is also home to tens of thousands of speakers of Chinese languages, most of whom are found in Panama City and Colón, as well as larger towns of the interior. Their presence stems from the various attempts to construct the Panama Canal in the 19th and early 20th (see 3.6), but there has also been more recent immigration for commercial reasons (see 3.7 and 3.8).

3.5.1 The Afro-Antillean ethnicity

As mentioned in (3.5.1), Afro-Antilleans represent an ethnic group distinct from Afro-Panamanians, who are identified as having migrated (originally) from the Antilles to Panama either involuntarily or voluntarily, to work on different infrastructural projects in the C19th (see 3.6). Furthermore, they speak some variety of PCE (see 3.4.2).

Historically, Panamanian governments have largely ignored non-Latino ethnic groups, and Afro-Antilleans have been one of the ethnic groups at the bottom of the social, political, and economic hierarchy (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 70). They have been considered temporary migrants who do not share the culture and traditions of Panama (Guerrón-Montero 2004: 34). The 1941 Constitution deprived Afro-Antilleans of their Panamanian citizenship, although this was revoked five years later (the 1946 Constitution granted this ethnic group full citizenship) (Snow 2013: 257; see also Herzfeld 1983a: 24). According to Guerrón-Montero (2009: 65-66), the most ardent of attacks against Afro-Antilleans in Panama have coincided historically with periods of economic depression and unemployment. Successive governments have attempted to isolate and segregate the Bocas del Toro Archipelago both geographically and socially (see 3.3) (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 68) (see 3.8). Somewhat ironically, this isolation permitted the continued performance of distinctive Antillean customs and traditions, e.g., language, religious traditions, and architecture (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 70; see also Guerron-Montero 2009: 66-67).
Although the current Constitution (2002) makes no attempt to designate Panama as a multi-ethnic or multicultural country (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 224), Panama has been promoted since 1992 as an ethnically diverse nation for purposes of tourism, specifically heritage tourism and ecotourism (Guerrón-Montero 2004: 31). A series of laws in 1994 have helped to promote Panama as an ideal place for real estate and tourism investment, retirement, and leisure lifestyle (Spalding 2012) (see 3.8), which in turn has impacted both socio-culturally and linguistically on the BCE speech community (see 3.9 and 3.10, respectively).

3.6 Socio-history of the Afro-Antillean community in Panama

The history of the Bocas del Toro region has always been somewhat isolated from the rest of Panama (Aceto 1996: 48). The first European to arrive in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (see 3.3 for map) was Christopher Columbus in 1502 during his fourth and last trip to the Americas. It is claimed that as early as the C16th and C17th, British buccaneers such as Drake and Morgan were attracted to the region of Panama, although no attempt was made to settle the area (Parsons 1956: 39, cited in Snow 2007: 164, Snow 2013: 270, note 2). The first significant populations of English-speaking Afro-Antilleans in the Bocas del Toro region were the labourers of wealthy British and American landowners who arrived in the early C19th from the islands of San Andrés and Providence (Herzfeld 1983a: 36, note 12) (see also 3.2). The Shepherd brothers are understood to have made a life on the island of Cayo de Agua in Almirante Bay, Bocas del Toro, in 1818 (de Piante 1952, cited in Snow 2013: 254) (see 3.4.2). Arriving with a large number of enslaved Africans from the Caribbean area, they turned to agriculture, fishing, and trade. The Brown brothers, English-speaking colonists from the island of San Andrés, are considered to be the first to settle in Bocas Town itself on the island of Colón, the neighbouring island of Bastimentos (again, see 3.3) (Snow 2007: 164, Snow 2013: 254). Guerrón-Montero (2006: 211) suggests that the first Afro-Antilleans actually arrived in Bocas as early as the C17th from Jamaica and Barbados (see 3.7).
The year 1834 witnessed the abolition of slavery in the British Caribbean, coinciding with the settlement of Afro-Antilleans on the islands of Bocas del Toro, where they farmed, traded, and subsisted on what the sea had to offer (Snow 2013: 254). The abolition of slavery in Panama was not encountered until 1852, after which Afro-Antilleans formed a society of independent peasants living in small villages, sustaining a living through agriculture, turtle fishing, and work on banana plantations (Guerrón-Montero 2011: 24). The construction of the Panamanian Railroad, which was designed to connect the coasts of the Atlantic and Pacific, took place between 1850-1855, attracting migrants to Panama from Jamaica and Barbados (Holm 1989: 482, Guerrón-Montero 2004: 32) (see also 3.7). An increased demand for labourers from the Caribbean was the result of problems of bad health and suicide amongst labourers enlisted from China, Ireland, Colombia, and India (Newton 1984, cited in Snow 2013: 269, note 1). The construction of the Panama Canal triggered another migratory wave of Afro-Antilleans, again, mainly from Jamaica but also Barbados, St. Lucia, and Martinique (Newton 1984, cited in Snow 2013: 255) (again, see 3.7). This project was initiated by French companies between approximately 1880-1890 (Guerrón-Montero 2004: 32, Snow 2013: 254), and continued at a later date by the United States (1904-1914).

Many of these migrants found their way to the Bocas del Toro region (the majority of whom did not return to their homelands), finding work on (and later owning) banana and cocoa plantations (c.f. Herzfeld 1983a: 35, note 8, Guerrón-Montero 2011: 24). Other migrants came directly from the region to work on the banana plantations for The United Fruit Company (UFC) (Lowe 1975: 15, Diez Castillo 1981: 70). The UFC had been bought in 1899 from the Snyder Brothers Banana Company, who had founded the company in 1890, subsequently making Bocas Town on Island Colón the headquarters (see 3.3). Huge banana plantations stretched from the islands of Bocas del Toro as well as the mainland of Bocas del Toro Province, indeed, well into Costa Rica. Smaller independent growers also sold their bananas to the UFC (Snow 2013: 256).
Again, the majority of workers drawn to the Bocas and Limón (Costa Rica) UFC divisions were from Jamaica, although significant numbers came also from Barbados, Trinidad, the Leeward Islands (St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, and Grenada), in addition to the French-speaking colonies of Martinique and Guadeloupe (Bourgois 1989: 61; cited in Snow 2013: 256). Various indigenous groups (see 3.5 and 3.7) in the region also worked as temporary contractors for the UFC, eventually returning home to the mountains and remote coastal areas (Bourgois 1994; cited in Spalding 2012). A social hierarchy existed amongst the workers of various ethnicities and languages, a hierarchy that placed English speakers above French speakers, and Jamaicans above other English speakers (Bourgois 1989: 62; cited in Snow 2013: 256; see also Herzfeld 1983a: 24).

The UFC enjoyed immense success until the 1930s (Guerrón-Montero 2004: 32), with the banana ‘boom’ of 1889–1909 making the Bocas division one of the highest producers of capital for the nation’s treasury (Stephens 1987: 4-14; cited in Guerron-Montero 2006b: 6). But the vibrant economy of Bocas del Toro Province was now almost totally dependent on the success of the UFC (Jaén-Suárez 1998: 308; cited in Guerron-Montero 2006b: 68). In the 1930s, the banana plantations were struck down by a disease bringing production to a halt (Herzfeld 1983a: 36, note 11), and the UFC closed its remaining plantations on the Atlantic Coast. Afro-Antilleans who had worked as plantation labourers were able to capitalise on their position and acquire small/medium-sized plots of land on former plantation land, some of them subsequently moving upward into the rural middle class (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 68). Afro-Antillean migration to the region continued, albeit at a much slower rate (see 3.7).

3.7 Demographics for the Afro-Antillean community in Bocas del Toro

English-speaking Creole communities are dotted along the entire Caribbean Coast of Central America. Their respective socio-histories, however, are distinct. In the case of Panama and Costa Rica, immigration of Afro-Antilleans (3.5.1) has mainly (although not exclusively) occurred in the last 160 or so years (see 3.6), whereas the socio-histories of
Nicaragua, Belize, and Honduras can be traced considerably further back in time (see Aceto 2001/2005: 4 for detailed information). Conversations with BCE speakers during fieldwork for this study reveal that the original homeland of the ancestors of BCE speakers include Jamaica, the islands of San Andrés and Providence, and Nicaragua (Bluefields) (see also 3.2). There appears to be no contact today between BCE speakers and any extended family in the Caribbean area, also confirmed by Aceto (1996: 56). Snow (2007: 178) claims that the renewed interest in Jamaican culture that the BCE community is currently witnessing, is to a large extent the result of contact with family on the Caribbean Coast in Costa Rica, a region which experienced the influx of tourists two decades earlier than Bocas del Toro.

Demographics regarding the specific historical settlement of Afro-Antilleans in the Bocas del Toro region are unfortunately not available (Aceto 1996: 48). Nevertheless, census statistics provided by Herzfeld (1983a: 36, note 8) reveal some interesting facts for the years 1950 and 1960. Firstly, the original countries of Afro-Antillean-born immigrants residing in the province of Bocas del Toro from the Anglophone Caribbean are Jamaica, Barbados, ‘Other British Antilles’, Trinidad and Tobago, Bermuda, Nassau, and Curacao (with Jamaica representing the majority). Secondly, Afro-Antilleans also came from the French Caribbean, namely, Martinique and Guadeloupe, and ‘Other French Antilles’. According to the 1970 census, approximately half of the 43,531 inhabitants of the province of Bocas del Toro are Panamanians of Afro-Antillean heritage, the majority of whom reside in Bocas Town on Colón Island, the neighbouring island of Bastimentos (see 3.3) (Herzfeld 1983a: 25).

There is no official figure available for the number of BCE speakers residing in Ol’ Bank. Aceto (1996: 48) provides a figure of 1000 inhabitants living on the entire island of Bastimentos, 600 of whom are believed to be Afro-Antilleans, with the indigenous Ngäbere, who represent the largest indigenous ethnic group in Panama, making up the other 400 (Paul, Simons et al. 2014, Sil 2014) (see 3.5). Snow (2005: 25) estimates the number of Afro-Antilleans on Bastimentos Island to be 750 (96 percent of the total
population on the island). Based on my own fieldwork observations, as mentioned in (3.4.3), the number of residents in Ol’ Bank is approximately 1500, however, not all of these are Afro-Antilleans. The Ngäbe are represented by a few large families, who have moved into the community both from inland settlements on the island and neighbouring islands. A few Spanish-speaking Panamanian Latinos have been introduced into the community through exogamy. Finally, the recent surge in tourism in the last couple of decades has resulted in Europeans and North Americans living here on a permanent and semi-permanent basis (Guerrón-Montero 2004) (see 3.8).

### 3.8 Tourism

From the 1940s until the very first signs of tourism in the 1990s, the economy of the Bocas del Toro Province (see 3.3) was in a state of stagnation, organised around the limited production of the UFC (now Chiriquí Land Company) (see 3.6) in addition to small-scale agriculture, fishing, turtle hunting, and service-oriented jobs (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 68; 2004: 34; 2011: 23-24; see also Herzfeld 1983a: 25). A major earthquake hit the region in 1991, causing extensive damage to Bocas del Toro, particularly the mainland towns of Changuinola and Almirante. This furthered the demographic and economic downturn of the region, with depressed land and home prices, subsequently forcing people to move to Panama City and the city port of Colón in order to find employment and educational opportunities (Spalding 2012). Between 1990 and 2000 census data show a reduction of approximately 24% of the population of the district of Bocas del Toro (INEC 1990; 2000; cited in Spalding 2012).

As explained elsewhere (3.5.1), Panama began to promote itself in the early 1990s as an ideal place for real estate and tourism investment, retirement, and leisure lifestyle (Spalding 2012). It was at this time that migrants from outside Panama arrived and purchased land and homes in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago. The most concentrated area of development and population growth was in Bocas Town on Colón Island, the neighbouring island of Bastimentos (again, see 3.3). Lifestyle migrants from the United
States, Canada, and Europe, arrived in search of a warmer climate, a cheaper cost of living, and a higher quality of life (Spalding 2013: 180). Some had the intention of retiring and leading a simple life, whilst others bought whole blocks and abandoned buildings, in order to either build small family-run hotels and/or provide other services in the anticipation of a tourism boom that had already begun to trickle in as overflow from Costa Rica (Spalding 2012). Guerrón-Montero (2004: 33) observes that between 1990 and 2000 the number of hotels in the archipelago increased from three to thirty, some of which included hostels and boarding houses. By the year 2000 Colón Island had an airport, and then between 2001-2003 the real estate boom began (Spalding 2012).

Inevitably, this development has brought with it demographic, social, and environmental changes (Spalding 2013: 180). Naturally, a positive aspect has been the rise of employment (and the circulation of money) from which the Afro-Antillean community benefits, more so the males (however not exclusively so) (Guerrón-Montero 2004: 34). Afro-Antilleans have the advantage of being able to converse in some variety of English, enabling them to find work as tour guides, restaurant, and hotel staff. Male Afro-Antilleans work as bus and taxi drivers, construction workers, in the entertainment industry, or as owners of bars/restaurants/hostels (Guerrón-Montero 2012: 15). Their culture also serves as an attraction to tourists who visit in search of cultural diversity and richness (Spalding 2012) (see 3.9). The Archipelago has also witnessed new forms of local migration, insofar as there has been a significant influx of indigenous workers, which in turn has prompted the arrival of new Latino and Chinese immigrants in response to the growing demand for supermarkets and labour (Spalding 2012) (see 3.7 and 3.5). Indeed, the three mini-supermarkets in Ol’ Bank, Bastimentos, are owned and run by Chinese families.

At the same time, the socio-cultural situation of Bocas del Toro is negatively affected, with potential breakdown of social structures and networks, lack of integration and communication with recently-arrived residents, loss of cultural heritage, and the widespread use of drugs and alcohol (Spalding 2012). In fact, Spalding (2012) predicts the
loss of BCE as well as indigenous languages (see concluding remarks on the status/degree of vitality of BCE in 11.3).

3.9 Socio-cultural impact of tourism on the BCE community

The economic activity prevalent in Bocas Town, Colón Island, the neighbouring island of Bastimentos, (see 3.3), has made its impact felt on socio-cultural aspects of Afro-Antillean life. Perhaps unexpectedly, not in terms of the wane of ‘traditional’ Afro-Antillean cultural practices. Indeed, the situation is somewhat more complex than this.

The Afro-Antillean community is essentially responding to tourists’ preferences based on the latter’s idea of Afro-Antillean traditions. English-speaking tourists, who represent most visitors to the region, often seek out an ‘authentic’ Caribbean experience on arrival. Snow (2007: 178-9) observes that the response of the Afro-Antillean community has been the overt presentation of cultural and linguistic creole forms (see 3.10), so much so that Afro-Antilleans and their locality have in some ways emerged as representative of Panamanian identity (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 79). These cultural and linguistic performances, Snow (2007: 178-9) argues, are conducted by BCE speakers in the full knowledge that they contribute to their potential economic and social mobility. These creole forms have become currency in and of themselves for the BCE community. Bob Marley is frequently heard in the dancehall and on the main road running through Ol’ Bank, much more frequently than in previous times (Snow 2007: 178). The Blue Monday experience typical of Jamaica has been restored and recreated, a continuation of the usual weekend parties (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 77). Young males in the BCE community are surfing, smoking cannabis, and growing dreadlocks, activities, according to Snow (2007: 178), that were previously unheard of. Younger males have adopted a more laid-back Jamaican style in the hope that female tourists will find this attractive (see also 4.2.3): “[They] utilise the image that [female] tourists have of Jamaica as the site of the fulfilled desire and sensual experiences” (Guerrón-Montero 2006: 76).
Thus, the arrival of tourism has to some extent renewed the Afro-Antillean community’s Caribbean roots and old ties with Jamaica (see 3.7 and 3.6). The desires of tourists to experience all things authentic extends to architectural style. Today, the BCE community recognises the economic value of the board house as the architectural type for hosting outsiders (Snow 2007: 178). Historically, the board house in Ol’ Bank and Bocas Town has lower status, made of wood and built on pilings with room for the family boat underneath. In contrast, the architectural style of the 1960s shalét, a cement block house, has traditionally been viewed by the Afro-Antillean community as more prestigious, after Chiquita Brands International (formally United Fruit Company) (see 3.6) began to construct them for its workers. Despite the higher material value that the shalét has held within the community, tourists consider the board house far more attractive from an architectural viewpoint.

Guerrón-Montero (2006: 79) observes that the recent tourism industry has provided the Afro-Antillean community with the opportunity to recreate a suppressed identity, represented in certain cultural traits markedly Caribbean in nature (including cuisine). Snow (2007: 178-9) believes that this current situation potentially bodes well for the persistence of the BCE language (see 3.11).

Not all changes in cultural practices in the BCE community are a direct cause of contact with tourists, in so far as globalisation more generally including access to online communication is also, arguably, an impetus for change. An authentic cultural practice that I observed during fieldwork was the making of Sweet Bun in outside bakeries, located behind two or three family properties. Conversations with a few female BCE speakers who carry out this practice reveal the lack of desire on the part of their adult children to continue this family tradition. Indeed, they also no longer bring the baked goods directly to family homes for sale as they would have done traditionally.

Of course, the causes of both the arrival of tourists and globalisation do not need to be mutually exclusive. Guerrón-Montero (2006: 74) observes that a positive effect of tourism,
as perceived by the Afro-Antillean community, has been “an intangible but beneficial cultural and symbolic capital (Bordieu 1994) in the form of interaction and knowledge of the world”.

3.10 BCE language in the community

Snow (2000a: 168) describes the linguistic situation of the BCE community as one of stable diglossia (see 3.11). Certainly, fieldwork conducted for this thesis reveals that BCE and its contact language Spanish play clearly differentiated roles in the BCE community, with Spanish being reserved for formal occasions and BCE for ordinary conversation with family and friends (Snow 2000:168; see also Snow 2013: 268). Spanish, thus, holds high-prestige, and BCE, low-prestige (see 3.10.1).

Mixed race children of parents of Afro-Antillean and Ngäbere descent speak BCE (see 3.7). Children of Ngäbere families who moved to Ol’ Bank learn BCE informally through everyday interaction with BCE speakers. The few Spanish-speaking Latino women from the mainland, who have been introduced into the community through exogamy, appear to discourage their children from speaking BCE. However, this does not appear to be the case as far as American/European women are concerned, who not only attempt to learn BCE but also encourage their children to speak it. Indeed, Snow (2007: 178) observes that the BCE language is emerging as the ‘language of love’ for international English-speaking resident/tourist relations, proving generally to be a more ‘pragmatically useful code’ than Spanish (Snow 2013: 269) (see also 3.9).

Prior to 1995, most outsiders were monolingual speakers of Spanish from the mainland (Snow 2013: 269). The significant number of tourists visiting Ol’ Bank in recent years (see 3.8) has prompted BCE speakers to choose some form of English over Spanish for conversing with them (Snow 2013: 269). Certainly, tourists do not have access to BCE in any meaningful form, also because of the tendency of BCE speakers to switch from BCE to Spanish when they become aware of the presence of an outsider. Generally-speaking,
BCE speakers rely on Spanish for communicating with those who originate from Latino countries but English with all others.

Amongst BCE speakers, the BCE language continues to serve as the main language for everyday communicative purposes. This situation also extends to the Creole names that BCE community speakers use to identify each other, despite them being given official Spanish names at birth (which are reproduced on their birth certificates). Examples of this phenomenon (official Spanish name/ethnic name) include Roberto/BetBet; Rafael/Boss; Viviana/Chola; Florentina/Luch (see Aceto 2002: 588 for a full list of name changes). According to Aceto (2002: 586), these choices to favour Creole names over Spanish names relates to issues of ethnic identity, cultural maintenance, solidarity, and resistance. Place names in Ol’ Bank are also in Creole (see 3.3 for the names of the neighbourhoods that are identified by residents). Pereira de Padilla (not dated [1974]: 67-69; cited in Jamieson 2011: 176) observes that ‘English’ place names are predominant in the area, despite government interventions to attempt to eradicate them. Today, place names on Bastimentos include Salt Creek, Red Frog Beach, and Wizard Beach on Bastimentos Island, and Big Creek on Colón Island.

New words, however, always take the form of borrowings from Spanish. According to Snow (2013: 261), typical topics for Spanish borrowings include school and education, government, and cultural activities such as music and sport (reinforced through exposure to Spanish media). Aspects of so-called modern life such as food and technology also encourage (Latin American) loanwords (Snow 2013: 261), e.g., ordenador is the word for computer.

3.10.1 Domains of language use

This section presents a few examples of formal domains of speech that typically employ Spanish. As mentioned in the previous section (3.10), the use of BCE tends to be restricted to everyday ordinary conversation (in the absence of outsiders).
One formal domain in which Spanish is heard within the BCE community is the elementary school (La Escuela de Bastimentos). In Panama, the language of instruction in all public schools is Spanish regardless of students’ first language(s) (Snow 2013: 257). Panamanian Creole English (see 3.4.2) is not recognised as the first and main language of its speakers (Aceto 2005: 6). According to Snow (2007: 168, 2013: 266), many children living in Ol’ Bank arrive at school with very little (or no) knowledge of Spanish. And most of these children do not continue their schooling past the sixth grade (2013: 267). During break times students revert to conversing in BCE.

Another formal domain is the annual Mother’s Day ceremony. During fieldwork this was observed as taking place in the largest bar in Ol’ Bank, to which all mothers of all ethnicities were invited. The head teacher of the elementary school led the ceremony, speaking in Spanish the entire time.

A further formal domain is the official ceremony that marks the start of the annual parade on the 23rd of November, known as Bastimentos Day. The speeches are led by town hall officials from Bocas Town as well as a few prominent BCE speakers within the community, all of whom use Spanish for the occasion. Bastimentos Day commemorates the historical foundation of the province of Bastimentos in 1903.

Religion is another formal domain within the BCE community. Traditionally, BCE speakers have been followers of Protestant Christianity, although most are not practising today. Until a couple of decades ago, the Methodist Church had links with England (which included financial support). The situation today is such that the church no longer has its own minister. The congregation is very small, consisting mainly of older BCE speakers and young children. The services themselves are usually led by lay BCE speakers. Some hymns are sung in English, others in Spanish. In my presence, parts of the sermon were conducted in some variety of English, other parts in Spanish, although there appeared to be no rules dictating this alternation. This behaviour possibly reflects differing levels of language preference within the congregation, especially as the age gap is wide (younger
speakers are much more comfortable with Spanish). Nevertheless, it is possible that my presence at these services had an impact on language choice. In any case it was clear that the members of the Methodist church were very proud of their traditional links with England. The church service at the Adventist Church is held in Spanish. However, when the church is split into bible study groups, it is done so according to language preference, with older speakers favouring English, and the younger ones, Spanish. Older speakers in the BCE community remember a time when school children were expected by their parents to attend English instruction in the afternoons.

A final example of a domain in which Spanish is heard is the media. Television and radio programmes, according to Snow (2013: 268), have been crucial in exposing children who speak BCE to the Spanish language. Such broadcasts still represent virtually children’s only exposure to Spanish prior to starting school. Although Snow (2013: 268) claims that older BCE speakers listen to the news on shortwave radio broadcasts in varieties of American and British English, the general picture that emerged during my time in the field is that watching Spanish television channels is the norm. A few BCE speakers occasionally take advantage of internet access in neighbouring Bocas Town (internet cafes or via friends/family living there) (see 3.3) and conduct online communication in Spanish, since this is the language of literacy for speakers, albeit some are more fluent than others (Snow 2013: 268). Personally, I did not come across books, newspapers, or magazines in any bars, restaurants, or houses that I visited, a situation which most likely reflects both the economic circumstances of the average BCE speaker and the cultural norms/priorities prevalent in the BCE community.

3.11 Summary and outlook

To summarise, the BCE community finds itself in a unique and intriguing situation, both socio-culturally (see 3.9) and linguistically (see 3.10). Contrary to expectations, the resulting economic changes that have been brought about by the influx of tourists to the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (see 3.8) appear to be having the reverse anticipated effect on
BCE. Snow (2004: 116) claims that speakers are “developing [...] a source of self-regard, as a result of their language proving to be an economically viable alternative to Spanish in interactions with tourists”. Snow (2003: 8) predicts that this new sociolinguistic situation could potentially have a significant impact on language maintenance and language change. Snow (2004: 115-116) even suggests that as the region’s economy shifts from bananas (see 3.6) to tourism, the BCE language may become more vital, subsequently becoming strengthened.

The degree of vitality of BCE (or rather PCE) is considered in (11.3) against the analyses of tense-aspect-modality presented in this thesis. Insight can be gained from observing the linguistic situation of the Afro-Antillean in neighbouring Costa Rica, which experienced the influx of tourists a couple of decades prior to Bocas del Toro (see 3.8). There are 55,000 Afro-Antilleans speaking some variety of English in Costa Rica (mainly residing in the port city of Limón), which overlaps along a continuum ranging from the most basilectal variety of Limón Creole (LC) to standard Limón English (Baboolal 2011: 5) (see 2.2 and 3.2). Like the situation in BCE, LC has no official status, with Spanish representing the prestige language, that is, the language of literacy and the official language. For a long time, the LC speech community was able to maintain their language (Baboolal 2011: 173), but very few social domains remain today in which the language spoken is exclusively LC. Younger generations are gradually assimilating to the national Costa Rican identity, both culturally and linguistically (2000: 190; cited in Baboolal 2011: 3).

Spalding (2012) predicts that an inevitable outcome of the tourism boom in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago is the loss of BCE (see 3.8). However, Snow (see 2004: 115-116) finds no signs of incipient shift to the official language of Spanish, the result of which is the less intimate relationship BCE has with Spanish in ordinary everyday community life. Herzfeld (1983a: 33) observes that PCE speakers (see 3.4.2) in the Bocas region alternate the language constantly with Spanish in informal conversation, but rarely allow Spanish forms to interfere when they are speaking BCE. This suggests that the type of code-
switching involved is inter-sentential and has little impact on the grammatical structure and vocabulary of BCE. It is beyond the scope of this thesis to ascertain the extent and frequency of code-switching in BCE speech. The goal of the field trip (see 4.2.1) was to make recordings of the BCE language, and the speakers involved in the recordings were made aware of this. There is no evidence of code-switching in the recordings, indeed, of any significant use of Spanish except for established loanwords in BCE denoting new concepts (see 3.10 and concluding remarks in 11.3). As mentioned in (4.2.2), the youngest speaker in the BCE data is 19 years of age, and the fact that she was able to speak at length in sentences consisting entirely of BCE words and grammatical constructions, suggests that Spanish has minimal influence on BCE. Nevertheless, there is some evidence, albeit small, of language change within the tense-aspect-modality system of BCE (see 7.5.5). Moreover, very recent developments with respect to the language situation amongst BCE aged 18 and under are outside the scope of this thesis (see also 4.2.1 and 4.2.4). Certainly, the general current linguistic situation is that BCE continues to function as the language for everyday life.
4 Chapter four: Research background

4.1 Previous research on BCE

Overall, a relatively small amount of research has been conducted on Panamanian Creole English (PCE). Indeed, Jamieson (2011: 174) comments on the limited number of studies published on PCE, in particular, the relative absence of those of a linguistic nature. Aceto (2005: 5) observes that there has been almost no research on the Western Caribbean English creoles (CECs) (see 3.2) by local scholars or the governments of the individual nations of Central America. Snow (2013; see also Thomas-Brereton 1992) remarks on the treatment of PCE as a single language in earlier research, observing that more recent works do, however, suggest the existence of regional variation - even within the province of Bocas del Toro itself (see Cenci 1960, Cohen 1976, Herzfeld 1983a, Herzfeld 1983b, Holm 1989) (see 3.4.2), According to Jamieson (2011: 175), the PCE varieties of the north western province of Bocas del Toro and Puerto Armuelles in the south western province of Chiriquí are the most ‘creole-like’ and the least prestigious. According to Snow (2013), the vernacular in the urban PCE communities of Panama City, the former Canal Zone, and Colón, is ‘disappearing’ (see also Jamieson 2011: 174), whilst in the BCE community it is ‘thriving’. The picture that slowly emerges is not only that there are isolated pockets of PCE speech communities, but that there are linguistic differences between them. Indeed, the general socio-linguistic situation of the BCE speech community is a unique and intriguing one, in part due to its geographical location and the resulting socio-economic and cultural changes of recent years (see 3.3, 3.8, and 3.9). Consequently, claims about the linguistic nature and status of PCE would ideally be made based on in-depth ethnolinguistic studies of individual PCE speech communities.

Until now, little has been known about BCE, hence why this PhD thesis is important. Past and future markers in BCE are described in papers by Aceto (1996, 1998), which in turn are based on Aceto (1996). Aceto (2005) provides a general description of some of the grammatical features of BCE; Aceto (1995) is about the rules for the formation of a BCE

Previous research on PCE more generally includes Lamy (2015, 2016) based on (Lamy 2012), which is a socio-phonetic study of PCE including data from BCE. Snow (2013) provides a very brief discussion of a few structural features of the grammar with a list of lexical items. Holm (1983) provides an excerpt of the variety of PCE spoken in Bocas del Toro. Other research on PCE include BA dissertations (Spragg 1973, Bishop 1976, Mason 1979). Justavino (1975) is a BA dissertation that deals specifically with the PCE variety in Bocas del Toro (Herzfeld 1983a: 26). Cohen et al. (1976) is a compilation of mostly summaries of linguistic papers presented at the First Linguistic Encounter on PCE. Herzfeld (1978) analyses tense and aspect in Limón English Creole (LC), the creole variety spoken in Costa Rica, which has subsequently been rewritten and published in book form (Herzfeld 2002). A progress report on the sociolinguistics of tense and aspect is also provided by Herzfeld (1983a: 25), which compares LC with the PCE variety spoken in the province of Bocas del Toro (again, no reference made to BCE). Herzfeld (1983b) provides excerpts of LC and PCE with accompanying notes. Jamieson (2011) illustrates how PCE speakers’ culinary delicacies have been the source of loanwords in Panamanian Spanish.

Thus, while there are studies of PCE, there are relatively few in comparison to other CECs, and there is no detailed grammatical description, let alone a description of tense-aspect-modality. Therefore, the provision of such a description is where the significance of this work lies.
4.2 **Methodology**

This section addresses the methodological approach that was taken to collect the various kinds of data that form the basis of the research presented in this thesis. The data come from my own field trip, but I also used primary data provided by Michael Aceto (see 4.2.1). The motivation behind the field trip is explained, and details of the financial support given (4.2.2). The general fieldwork situation is described (4.2.3) as background for understanding the decisions that were made regarding the kinds of data that were available (4.2.4).

4.2.1 **Reasons for field trip**

My interest in BCE came from a personal trip to the region. The last linguist to collect data from the BCE community was Professor Michael Aceto (see also 4.1), who is currently based in the English Faculty at East Carolina University. Michael made two separate visits to Ol' Bank (see 3.3), in the years 1994 and 1995. Following personal communication, Michael very kindly sent me his analogue recordings, with permission to process and use them. I digitised these recordings, and these versions of the recordings are currently deposited with the Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR) (see 4.2.2). The grammatical elicitation sessions proved the easiest to transcribe due to the sound quality being very high, but also the structure and pace of this type of recording is much easier to follow. In contrast, natural conversation recorded by Aceto often takes place between numerous speakers who are very difficult to identify due to fast pace and lower audibility; and these proved more difficult to process. The resulting product from the transcriptions was an MA dissertation (Reid 2010) that was a sketch grammar of BCE. The tense-aspect-modality system (see 1.2.1) proved interesting enough to warrant further research, and thus there emerged a need for more data, importantly, more varied data, with particular emphasis on natural conversation (see 4.2.4).

A further reason for the field trip is the status of BCE as an endangered language (see 3.4.4 for a full discussion). The situation is that BCE has no standardised orthography and
no literary tradition (Snow 2000a: 166). The ethnical make-up of Bastimentos has certainly diversified in recent times (see 3.7), a result of economic and socio-cultural changes in the immediate region (see 3.8). My motivation for the orthography was to choose the one closest to the IPA, with long vowel sounds represented by a double vowel.

4.2.2 Source of funding

The field trip was generously funded by the Endangered Languages Documentation Programme (ELDP) based at the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. A Small Grant of £10,000 was awarded which covered travel, subsistence, recording equipment, and the payment of consultants, as well as permitting me to take six months out from teaching/lecturing duties. An application for a follow-up field trip was unfortunately not successful.

Ethics clearance for fieldwork was obtained by The University of Manchester and was also in line with ELDP standards. Ethics approval to record minors (speakers under 16 years), was not sought. The data comes from speakers between the ages of 19 and 87. The fieldwork itself took place over three months between November 2012 and January 2013. Apart from the first two weeks which I spent in Bocas Town on the neighbouring island of Colón, I lived the entire time in the town of Ol’ Bank on Bastimentos Island (see 3.3). I have deposited the materials in a digital form with the Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR) at https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI604663.

4.2.3 Fieldwork situation

I lived in the BCE community itself, which contributed enormously to feeling more integrated. It was also helpful insofar as I was able to reach an understanding of the daily rhythm and cultural aspects of life in Ol’ Bank. Having had no prior contact with the BCE community, it was naturally expected that I would spend some time on initiating relationships with community members to lay the foundations for successful data collection. This part of the fieldwork proved lengthy but necessary. Eventually, I
succeeded in showing that no harm of any kind was meant to the community. Building trust with the community required a high degree of sensitivity as well as patience and perseverance. Despite these reservations and difficulties, many of the community members warmed to me with time once they understood my true motivations for being there.

BCE speakers are very reluctant to speak their vernacular in the presence of outsiders. They immediately switch to Spanish as soon as they are made aware of non-BCE speakers in the vicinity. This is also the situation that was encountered by Herzfeld (1983a: 32). This situation was what first attracted me to the BCE speech community on a personal trip to the region, however, this behavioural pattern proved challenging in terms of collecting data. BCE speakers consider their vernacular a form of ‘broken’ English (see 3.4.1). This contradicts somewhat the status of BCE held by some of its (largely male) speakers as covertly prestigious, as they become aware of the attraction it holds for international tourists (see 3.9). At the same time, these very speakers see little advantage in speaking to someone who is there purely for research reasons, as was my case. Regarding this juxtaposition of conflicting attitudes, the general conclusion is that, on the one hand, BCE members (particularly male) hold their language in esteem in terms of the cultural and economic power it possesses, in addition to its overall appeal as far as tourists’ views are concerned (so that teaching tourists a few words here and there is perceived by them to work to their advantage), whilst on the other hand, from a purely linguistic perspective BCE speakers consider their vernacular a ‘broken’ or ‘bad’ version of English (something to be embarrassed about).

As a researcher wishing to gain an in-depth understanding of BCE, I found myself in a unique position in comparison to other outsiders, insofar as I was neither a tourist nor expat. The perception of the BCE community appeared to be that I would potentially be critical of their language, not least because it was known to them early on that I was born and raised in England and thus might make unwarranted or undesirable comparisons between the two varieties. The community initially appeared to view me with suspicion,
believing me to be profiting financially from insider knowledge of the language, especially at a time when outsiders are so intrigued to learn more about it.

Almost all the linguistic examples presented in this thesis come from female speakers, despite male speakers being asked. Since the intention of the field trip was not to conduct a quantitative sociolinguistic study (see 1.1), the ramifications of this are minor. All female speakers were paid for any contribution they made towards recordings and/or transcriptions, and they were able to benefit financially at a time when it is male members of the community who appear to profit predominantly (although not exclusively) from tourism. However, whilst male speakers were reluctant to be recorded, some of them were very helpful in offering information about the BCE community. Every speaker who agreed to be recorded received a copy of the recording in the form of a CD.

4.2.4 Data collection

The data on which this study is based is both naturalistic and elicited. The data are representative of the age range of BCE adult speakers, the youngest in the data being 19 and the oldest, 87. Ol’ Bank is referred to as a ‘town’, although the geographical area itself is very small with only one main path running through it. There are four distinct neighbourhoods in Ol’ Bank, known by residents as Out Yonda, Doun di Kriik, Midl Bank, and Op Shalé (with the latter located at the top of the path running up the hill). There are some identifiable social differences between them, albeit small. Since data collection was a collaborative endeavour with BCE community members, plans for recordings changed and developed in negotiation with them. My key team consisted of three consultants who were paid to assist with recordings as well as transcriptions.

With respect to the naturalistic data, there are 24 recordings of natural conversation that are relied on for this study, each one lasting approximately one hour. It became apparent very early on that my presence during such recordings was not conducive to the authentic and natural speech of BCE speakers. With the consent of speakers, I made the decision to leave two (occasionally three) speakers who knew each other well to converse with each
other on their own. This method proved successful and was achieved by setting up the recording equipment in advance at a time agreed with the speakers, subsequently leaving them to their own devices. The speakers felt relaxed and free to discuss whatever they wished, all of which kept the Observer’s Paradox (Labov 1971) to an absolute minimum.

The elicited data consists of two types, the first consisting of narrations of a picture book entitled ‘Frog, where are you?’ by Mayer (1969). These recordings take place in the presence of two BCE speakers, one of whom is always present. The second type consists of elicited data involving a variety of methods. These include grammaticality judgements of sample sentences based on Aceto’s elicited data (see 4.2.1), which themselves are based on Winford (1993). They also include translations into BCE from a Spanish prompt. The sentences are taken from a questionnaire in English designed by Bettina Migge (used in Winford and Migge 2007), kindly provided by Migge herself via personal communication. The data questionnaire used in both Winford (1993) and Winford & Migge (2007), is in turn based on that developed by Dahl (1985). Another method I used was to present constructions that are structurally similar, inviting speakers to discuss differences in meaning. Natural conversations between me and BCE speakers also took place during such recordings, which contribute to informing the analyses on tense-aspect-modality in BCE (see 1.2.1).
5 Chapter five: Grammatical background

5.1 Introduction

As mentioned in (1.4), the aim of chapter 5 is to familiarise the reader with some basic grammatical details of the BCE clause types, in order to provide enough context for the ensuing discussions on tense-aspect-modality. Topics of core relevance that are covered here are the temporal interpretation of the unmarked verb (5.2), the copula domain (5.3.1), namely, ascriptive clauses (5.3.1.1), equative clauses (5.3.1.2), and locative clauses (5.3.1.3), conditional clauses (and the distinction between real and unreal conditionals) (5.4), and negation (5.5). Further topics are available in a sketch grammar at https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI604663 (see 4.2.2 for further information).

BCE is an isolating language with little inflection or derivational morphology. The basic BCE clause follows the word order of subject-verb-object. The semantics of verb + object with respect to lexical aspect is touched upon in (6.2.2). BCE has little inflectional morphology. In TMA combinations (see 1.3.2), epistemic modals always appear first, followed by tense markers, non-epistemic modals, and aspect markers. Main verbs do not generally have conjugated forms, the exception being the copula which has three forms. Iz (see 5.3.1.1 and 5.3.1.2) and woz (7.5.4) are distinguishable based on tense. Bii, as mentioned in (1.3), surfaces in combination with TMA markers (see example (75) in 6.4.3.1.2 for past habitual yuustu + bii). These forms can also be found in progressive constructions (see 6.4.1; also example (121) in 7.6.4.1). There is no morphological infinitival verb form in BCE.

5.2 Temporal interpretation of the unmarked verb

The unmarked verb in BCE has a temporal interpretation motivated by lexical aspect (6.2.2). Dynamic verbs receive a simple past interpretation and stative verbs a simple present interpretation (see 6.2.2 for a definition of stativity/dynamicity). Winford (2006: 33) emphasises the effect of discourse context in this respect, where if the verb is dynamic
then it will be interpreted as past in the absence of any other clue, since this is the common-sense reading of an unanalysed dynamic situation (see also Smith and Erbaugh 2005). Stative verbs, in contrast, are inherently durative, and the default reading of an unmarked stative in the absence of any other clue is that it has present time reference. The distinction between past and present is illustrated in (1) and (2), respectively.

(1) Yo klin di hous bifua, nuo?
    2.SG clean DEF house before NEG
You cleaned the house before, didn’t you?
(11-18:56n2012)

(2) Speaker 1
    Taak! Wat yo waan taak bout fos?
    talk Q 2.SG want talk PREP first
Talk! What do you want to talk about first?
(04-16:55n2012)

    Speaker 2
    Mi no nuo.
    1.SG NEG know
I don’t know!
(04-1:19n2012)

In BCE, stative verbs in past situations require obligatory marking in the form of di, as exemplified in (3) (see 7.5.1.1). Here, unmarked dynamic verb bourn ‘burn’ and phrasal verb tek out ‘take out’ also receive a past reading, with the presence of temporal adverb bifuoa ‘before’ unambiguously indicating past time reference:

(3) Ai di gat plenti muoa ai kian tel yuu nansi stori, but
    1SG PST got plenty more 1.SG MOD tell 2.SG Anansi Story CONJ
    bifuoa ai tek dem out, bourn dem op.
before 1.SG take DEM out burn DEM up.

I had plenty more Anansi Stories I could have told you, but earlier I took them out (and) burned them.

(16-11:86nr2012)

Winford (2006: 32) states it is possible for both types of predicate to have present or past reference in Caribbean English Creoles (see 3.2 for a definition), if the wider discourse context allows it. Unmarked dynamic verbs with a simple present interpretation are unusual but not non-existent, as observed in (4).

(4) Speaker 1
[anon.] gwain work tudie?
[anon.] go work today
Is [anon.] going to work today?

Speaker 2
No, im tek di die.
EXC 3.SG take DEF day
No, he 's taking the day off.

(13-2:23n2012)

Nevertheless, the regular pattern as far as dynamic verbs in present contexts is concerned, is that where the reference time is Speech Time (S) (see 7.2) such verbs take progressive marking (variants de or -in), as in (5) (see also 6.4.1):

(5) Di waata bubl-in op.
DEF water bubble-PROG up
The water is bubbling up.

(17a-19:47e2012)

Otherwise, the reading that is usually acquired in present contexts where the dynamic verbs remains unmarked, is habitual, as observed in (6) (see 7.4.1 for further examples):
(6) A guo hier, a guo dier.
1.SG go here 1.SG go there
I go here, I go there.
(15-18:56nr2012)

Nevertheless, there are a few instances of what appears to be use of the **historical present**, as illustrated in (7). Indeed, Mufwene (1984: 218-9; cited in Hackert 2008: 68) claims that one of the interpretations of the unmarked verb in Jamaican Creole (JC) and Guyanese Creole, is “dramatic use”. The historical present is used to recount past situations in the present with the purpose of making the content more animated (see also Andersen 1999: 364). Of course, in the case of dynamic verbs it should in principle prove difficult to differentiate between historical present and past, since the default interpretation of the unmarked dynamic verb is past (see also Patrick 1999: 183-4). In (7), however, inherently past verb form *sed* (see 7.5.3) ‘said’ and its unmarked variant *se* are both uttered in the same sentence, the indication of which is that *se* most likely has a reading akin to historical present (see further below for examples of unmarked statives with historical present interpretations):

(7) Yie, an hi kom bai [anon.] an hi sed tu [anon.], an
EXC CONJ 3.SG come PREP [anon.] CONJ 3.SG say.PST PREP [anon.] CONJ
hi se, “Gim bak di tin”. Go tiif pipl tin-z. An wen
3.SG say give back DEF thing go steal people thing-PL CONJ CONJ
im don, im kom bak wen di pipl dem houlin. Bot
3.SG finish 3.SG come back CONJ DEF people 3.PL crying CONJ
mii hier im gaan buokas an...
1.SG hear 3.SG go.PST Bocas CONJ
Yeh, and he came to [anon.] and he said to [anon.], and he said, “Give back the things”.
He went and stole people’s things. And when he was finished, he came back when the people, they were crying. But I heard he went to Bocas and...
(09-20:42n2012)
Two further attestations of an unmarked dynamic verb with its default reading of past time reference are, (8) and (9). In (8), staat (‘start’) shifts the focus of the process of iit ‘eat’ to its inception phase (see also 6.2.2):

(8) Mieri staat iit siem taim.
    Mary  start  eat same time
    Mary started eating straight away.
    (015-18:56e2012)

In (9), speaker 1 asks her niece what her sister (niece’s mother) used to prepare for Christmas dinner:

(9) Speaker 1
    An we mi sista du?
    CONJ. Q 1.SG.POSS sister do
    And what did my sister do?
    Speaker 2
    Mama stof miit.
    Mama stuff meat
    Mum stuffed meat.
    Speaker 1
    An die biek it?
    CONJ 3.PL bake 3.SG
    And they baked it?
    (11-13:60n2012)
    Speaker 2
    No, dem biek dem pat ruoz, dem miit. Dem kuk; de pat ruoz som an
    EXC 3.PL bake PL pot roast PL meat 3.PL. cook 3.PL pot roast some CON
    dem frai som. An bail i yaampi, dem yuuka, dem yam.
    3.PL fry some CONJ boil DEF yaampi PL yuuka PL yam
No, they baked the pot roasts, the meat. They cooked; they pot roasted some and they fried some. And boiled the yampi, yuccas, yams.

(11-18:56n2012)

In BCE, if the order of two clauses in a sentence match the temporal sequence of past situations, dynamic verbs remain unmarked to signal pluperfect (see 7.5.1.3 for a definition and explanation), as illustrated in (10). Here, the presence of adverb *afta* ‘after’ helps also to indicate that the situation involving main verb *gaan* (inherently past ‘go’) (7.5.2) took place before the situation involving *kom* ‘come’ (see (41) in 7.5.2 for a similar example):

(10)  
\[
\text{Di sii kom bak haad. an } \text{afta it } \text{gaan it } \text{kom bak} \\
\text{DET sea come back hard CONJ after 3.SG go.PST 3.SG come back} \\
\text{sluo. slow} \\
\text{The sea went back forcefully. And after it had gone, it came back slowly.} \\
\]

(02a-25:59nr2012)

Instances of the unmarked statives denoting past are infrequent in the BCE data, since (as mentioned above) the usual pattern is for statives to be marked by past *di*. Winford (1993) and Hackert (2004) attest that in JC and Urban Bahamian Creole, respectively, the unmarked stative can also signal past. Certainly, there is some evidence for this in BCE where the temporal frame of the immediate discourse context has already been established as past. In (11) and (12), past habitual *yuustu* (6.4.3.1.2) occurs in the context preceding stative verbs *hav* ‘have’ and *laik* ‘like’, respectively. In both instances the stative verb follows overt past marking, or more precisely, in (12), it is embedded within a clause where the main verb is overtly marked for tense:

(11)  
\[
\text{An wi } \text{yuustu go wid peeso an kwaaata an hai kerosin.} \\
\text{CONJ 1.PL HAB.PST go PREP peso CONJ quarter CONJ buy kerosene.} \\
\text{Onli lam; no } \text{hav kiangu an } \text{notin.} \\
\]
Only lamp NEG have candle CONJ nothing
And we used to go with a peso (Panamanian dollar) and quarter to buy kerosene.
Only lamps; didn’t have candles or anything.
(14-14:50n2012)

(12) *Wel, ai *yuüstu* hier yu sie yu no laik krismas.*

DM 1.SG HAB.PST hear 2.SG say 2.SG NEG like Christmas
Well, I used to hear you saying you do not like Christmas.
(11-13:60n2012)

In (13), *stie shuoa* ‘stay still’ is not marked, but the temporal frame has been well established by the time this stative verb phrase appears. Again, overt past marking precedes the verb in question, here, past copula *wo* (see 7.5.4) and *gaan* (7.5.2). This example is scrutinised further in (7.5.4.1.1):

(13) *Mista [anon.] wo wi granfaada, so im ron gaan don*
Mister [anon.] COP.PST 1.PL.POSS grandfather so 3.SG run go.PST down
*stied nou an tink se shi wo drap fi shuut(?).* An stairs now CONJ think CONJ. 3.SG COP.PST dead PREP [unknown] CONJ
*shi stie shuoa don pan di Gron laik shi wo ded, an*
3.SG stay sure down PREP DEF ground like 3.SG COP.PST dead CONJ
*im gaan don, de baal, an wi afa staat laaf*
3.SG go.PST down PROG bawl CONJ 1.PL MOD start laugh
*afa im.*
PREP 3.SG
Mister [anon.] was our grandfather, so he then went running downstairs and
thought she had fallen for/to [unknown]. And she stayed still on the ground as if
she were dead, and he went down, crying, and we had to start laughing at him.
(04-22:21n2012)
The distinction between simple present and historical present (see above) should be clearer in the case of statives. In (14) and (15), despite the temporal frame having been established as past in the sentential context, main verb *waan* ‘want’ and ascriptive predicate *ful* ‘full’ are not marked for past by *di* (7.5.1). However, in both instances they occur after an unmarked dynamic verb, *baal* ‘cry’ in (14) and *gi* ‘give’ in (15), the default reading of which is past:

(14)  {anon.} *baal, yu sii; im waan im milk.*

[anon] bawl DM 3.SG want 3.SG.POSS milk
[anon.] cried/cries, you see; he wants his milk.
(13-9:46n2012)

In (15), incidentally, dynamic verb *baal* ‘cry’ is marked for present progressive (*de*) (6.4.1), but progressive constructions are anyway rarely marked for past (see 7.5.4.2):

(15)  *Mi gi im som koko milk, but, laik stil i no ful*

1.SG give 3.SG some cocoa milk CONJ DM still 3.SG NEG full
*im beli; stil de baal.*
3.SG.POSS belly still PROG bawl
I gave/give him some cocoa milk, but, like, still his stomach is not full; still crying.
(13-9:46n2012)

A final example of a stative verb with its default reading of present tense, is (16):

(16)  *Ai laik sing plenti*

1.SG like sing plenty
like singing a lot
(17a-19:47e2012)

Examples of unmarked dynamic verbs in future contexts are very infrequent in the data. However, if the surrounding discourse is clearly future then this allows for the
absence of future marking. Future contexts in BCE are usually marked via relative/prospective aspect markers \textit{gwain} or \textit{waan} (see 7.6), or absolute future \textit{wi} (7.6.4).

In (17), the speaker is planning what will happen on Christmas Day. Here, there are two main verbs to consider, \textit{get} ‘get’ and \textit{wietin} ‘waiting’, the latter a progressive form (see 6.4.1.1.3) (see 7.6.4 for a discussion on future progressive contexts):

(17) \textit{An in di ivn taim ai get redi an mai kozin,}
CONJ PREP DEF evening time 1.SG get ready CONJ 1.SG.POSS cousin
\[anon., wiet-in an wi.\]
[anon.] wait-PROG PREP 1.PL
And in the evening, I will get ready, and my cousin, [anon.] will be waiting for us.
(14-19:47n2012)

In (18), the speaker is envisioning how Christmas Day will be for her:

(18) \textit{Ai fil laik Gad spier mai laif krismos mornin, an wiek op}
1.SG feel CONJ God spare 1.SG.POSS life Christmas morning CONJ wake up
an sii wat ai put on fi kuk.
CONJ see Q 1.SG put on COMP cook.
I feel like God will spare my life on Christmas morning, and I’ll wake up and see what to cook.
(14-19:47 n2012)

In (19), the speaker is making plans for the looming eclipse, which the BCE community has predicted to take place shortly:

(19) \textit{Wen di taim kom, ai bai a baks a kandel.}
CONJ DEF time come 1.SG. buy INDEF box PREP candle
When the times comes, I’ll buy a box of candles.
(08-16:55n2012)
Further interpretations of the unmarked verb are present habitual (7.4.1), perfect (7.4.2), and the protasis of real conditionals (5.4.1.1.1). Certainly, in all interpretations of the unmarked verb the sentential context inevitably plays an important role.

5.3 Simple clauses

5.3.1 The copula domain

In this section, ascriptive clauses, equative clauses, and locative clauses are analysed. Ascriptive clauses (5.3.1.1) are found unmarked or marked by *iz* and *de*, with a distinct meaning assigned to the three forms in such contexts. Equative clauses (5.3.1.2) take obligatory marking in the form of *iz*. Locative copula *de* (5.3.1.3) is an obligatory marker, but *iz* marks interrogative locative clauses. The copula domain in past contexts is analysed in (7.5.4.1). Nonetheless, the forms *iz* and *de* are not constrained to these semantic contexts, for example, *iz* marks progressive aspect for present tense (albeit infrequently since progressive constructions tense to be unmarked for tense) (see 6.4.1.1.3.1), and *de* frequently combines with verbs to mark progressive aspect (see 6.4.1.1.2).

5.3.1.1 Ascriptive clauses

Adjectives in BCE not only modify nouns, in which case they precede the noun, but also have an ascriptive function, an example of the latter being (20), which notably has no copula (see further below). In (20), a property of the subject is predicated, in this case, *styuupid* ‘stupid’. Cross-linguistically, there is no particular tendency for either the inclusion or exclusion of the copula in ascriptive predicative clauses (Schachter and Shopen 2007: 13). Prototypical adjectives are those denoting the most stable qualities, e.g., colour, shape, size, texture, smell or taste (Givon 1984: 55). They hold an intermediate position between nouns, which denote temporally stable entities, and verbs, which denote temporally unstable situations (Frawley 1992: 439) (see 7.5.1.4 for further information).

(20) Som piipl *styuupid.*

Some people stupid
Some people are stupid.

(15-18:56e2012)

**Proper inclusion** may also ascribe a property to the subject, e.g., *He is a teacher*. An example in BCE is (21), marked by past copula *woz* (no present contexts expressing this type of ascriptive clause appear in the BCE naturalistic data):

(21) *Dem se Uol Bank woz a adbentis plies; eribadi yuustu*

3.PL say Ol’ Bank COP.PST INDF Adventist place everybody HAB.PST

Adventist

They say that Old Bank was an Adventist place; everybody used to be an Adventist.

(07a-12:42n2012)

Property concepts, i.e., names of inherent properties (colour, size, speed, etc.) can be contrasted with result states, which are names of states that result from processes of change. A **resultative** “denotes a state that was brought about by some action in the past” (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 63). Resultatives are very close semantically to perfect of result constructions (see 7.4.2), the distinction between *The door is closed/The door has closed*, where the former expresses a state, the latter, a past action (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 63). Resultatives tend to be restricted to telic verbs that by their very nature involve some type of change, whereas perfects tend to be formed from any verb (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 70). Despite this relationship between perfect and resultative, there are many languages in which only one or the other type occurs, or in which both types are expressed by different morphemes (de Haan 2011: 458).

In Jamaican Creole (JC), the insertion of copulas *iz* and *woz* in ascriptive clauses is a mesolectal feature (see 2.2 for definition of ‘mesolect’) (Patrick 2007: 139), with the unmarked predicate representing the basilectal. Ascriptive predicates in past contexts in JC are marked for past by mesolectal did. JC *iz* and *woz* are infrequently found in ascriptive
clauses (Patrick 2008: 625). More generally, ascriptive clauses in JC are predominantly found unmarked (Patrick 2007: 139). Normally, the ascriptive being the norm. In Guyanese Creole (GC), de is a marker of temporary or current duration in combination with ascriptive predicates (Winford 1993: 173). Like BCE de, GC de is a highly productive marker, combining with a wide range of ascriptive predicates to express states that are temporary or subject to change (Winford 1993: 175). In JC, ascriptive predicates are negated by no (Patrick 2008: 625).

Ascriptive clauses in BCE occur with or without a copula, the form of which it takes being either iz or de. However, these copula forms each have their own unique function, contrasts with the unmarked clause. The evidence remains inconclusive as to which of the adjectives that are attested as ascriptive predicates also appear in attributive function within the noun phrase. Certainly, adjectives such as bad ‘bad’, liki ‘little’, smaal ‘small’, big ‘big’, yung ‘young’ (amongst others), are found in both functions. Ascriptive clauses marked for past are discussed under di (7.5.1.4) and wo (7.5.4.1.1).

The unmarked ascriptive clause is illustrated in (22), (23), (24):

(22) Speaker 1

Di muo yo drink di muo swiit-a i get.
DEF more 2.SG drink DEF more sweet-CMPR 3.SG get
The more you drink, the sweeter it gets.
(11-18:56n20120)

Speaker 2

Yie, i swiit.
EXC 3.SG sweet
Yes, it was sweet. [reference to alcohol that used to be drunk]
(11-1066n2012)

(23) Dem indian griidi.
Indian greedy
Those Indians [BCE reference to indigenous community] are greedy.
(13-9:46n2012)

(24)  
\[Wel\ aal \ a \ dem \ ded-out\ nou.\]
DM aal PREP 3.PL dead-out now
Well, all of them are dead now.
(01b-4:77nr2012)

Unmarked adjectives in ascriptive function are negated via individual negator \textit{no}\n(5.5.1.1), as in (25) and (26):

(25)  
\textbf{Speaker 1}

\textit{Hou di artis dem? Dem get out de an dem no shiem. Arait den di}
Q DEF artist PL 3.PL get out there CONJ 3.PL NEG shame alright then DEF
\textit{artis ken daans.}
artist MOD dance
How are the artists? They got out there and they are not ashamed. Alright then, the
artists can dance.
(12-17:64n2012)

\textbf{Speaker 2}

\textit{Wai wii mus? Kiaan daans. Dem no iizi at aal [anon.]. Dem ken stie de.}
Q 1.PL MOD MOD dance 3.PL NEG easy at all [anon.] 3.PL MOD stay there
Why must we? (We) can’t dance. They are not easy at all, [anon.]. They can stay
there!
(12-05:40n2012)

(26)  
\textbf{Speaker 1}

\textit{An di tuod infron di likl buoi.}
CONJ DEF toad PREP DEF little boy
And the toad is in front of the little boy.

Speaker 2

No, i no a tuod. I a rat kom out a di huo.
ECX 3.SG NEG INDF toad 3.SG INDF rat come out PREP DEF hole
No, it’s not a toad, it’s a rat that came out.
(06a-16:55p2012)

Speaker 1

Wid di likl buoi deso agen.
PREP DEF little boy over.there again
With the little boy over there again.
(06a-03:48p2012)

Copula iz occurs with high frequency in ascriptive clauses but has a unique function that differs to its unmarked counterpart. Here, iz functions very much like past di (7.5.1) in its counter-presuppositional function (7.5.1.2), contradicting either an explicit proposition or an assumption/implication that has just been made. The obvious distinction between iz and di is that the former marks present situations, and the latter, past situations. However, the distinction does not stop there. Whereas iz functions as a copula in ascriptive clauses, di marks dynamic verbs (see also 5.2). Subsequently, where di is found with ascriptive predicates, it does not serve to signal counter-presupposition but rather to identify the predicate in question as a time-unstable property (see 7.5.1.4). In turn, past copula wo marks time-stable properties (see 7.5.4.1.1). A temporary property in present tense contexts is identified via the copula function of de (see below).

In (27), speaker 1 is conversing with me (speaker 2) as we take a short break from our elicitation session. In response to what she tells me, I question whether the sea in Ol’ Bank was rough earlier on in the day, and speaker 1 wishes to counter my assumption that the sea is not often rough, by stressing that the sea is rough all the time. The speaker in question achieves this by using iz:
(27) Speaker 1
[anon.] sed dis maanin wen di sii kom an den it rait truu
[anon.] say.PST DEM morning CONJ DEF sea come CONJ then 3.SG rain PREP
di kichin.
DEF kitchen
[anon.] said this morning when the sea came, and then it (went) right through the
county.

Speaker 2
Really? You mean the rain or-?

Speaker 1
Di sii. Di sii.
DEF sea DEF sea
The sea. The sea.

Speaker 2
So, the sea was rough today?

Speaker 1
Di sii iz rof. Evri die wi hav rof. Lang tiam a no sii it
DEF sea COP rough every day 3.PL have rough long time 1.SG NEG see 3.SG
rof suo.
rough so
The sea is rough. Every day it is rough. I haven’t seen it so rough for a long time.
(15-18:56nr2012)

In (28), the speakers are discussing their respective children’s fashion trends. When
speaker 1 uses direct speech to state what her son had said to her, she uses iz to illustrate
the attempt by her son to counter any assumption that she might have about being
fashionable or up to date:

(28) Speaker 1
Die hed gat in som chap. Buoi, ai duon nuo dem.PL tin
3.PL.POSS head get PREP some chop DM 1.SG NEG know PL thing dem sii an tibi. Enitin dem sii an tibi, dem praktis it. 3.PL see PREP television anything 3.PL see PREP television 3.PL practise 3.SG Their head has some hair style [lit. chop]. Boy, I don’t know those things they see on TV. Everything they see on TV, they practise.

Speaker 2
An no mek sens yo tel dem “No”.
CONJ NEG make sense 2.SG tell 3.PL EXC And it doesn’t make sense to tell them “No”.
(08-16:55n2012)

Speaker 1
No bikaa dem no de pie wi no main. Hou wi out a stencil!
3.PL.POSS young boy PL tel 1.SG mum 2.SG COP clean PREP PREP style No, because they’re not paying attention. How we are out of style! My young boys tell me, “Mum, you are totally unfashionable!”
(08-08:46n2012)

In (29), the speaker is reminiscing about an alcoholic drink that used to be drunk by some of the now older members of the BCE speech community. As the discourse progresses it becomes clear that her two older interlocutors, a married couple, did not partake in this activity. Later they also enquire about the colour of the drink in question. It is unclear whether for religious reasons, they might not drink or at least drink very little. The purpose of iz in (29) seems to be principally to stress the sweetness of the drink, since her interlocutors are not familiar with it. Thus, the presence of iz serves to counter any idea that the drink in question was like any other alcoholic drink. Incidentally, adjective swiit in ascriptive predicate function in (22) remains unmarked since no counter-presupposition of any kind is expressed:
(29) *Ai memba wen wi yuustu-, wen di buot dem kom fam*
   1.SG remember CONJ 3.PL HAB.PST CONJ DEF boat PL come PREP
   Colón. [anon.] an dem tek af tuu gialan or somtin, trii gialan.
   colón [anon.] CONJ AP take off two gallon CONJ something three gallon
   Somtain im tek af op tu fuor gialan a kalifornian ponsh.
   sometimes 3.SG take off PREP PREP four gallon PREP Californian punch
   Dem ting *iz* swiit, [anon.]. Jiizus!
   DEM.PL thing COP sweet [anon.] DM
   I remember when we used to-, when the boats came from Colón. And they would
   offload two gallons or something, three gallons. Sometimes they offloaded up to
   four gallons of Californian punch. Those things are sweet. Jesus!
   (11-18:56n2012)

   In (30), the speaker’s opinion contrasts with her sister’s, the presence of *iz* helping the
   speaker to make clear that her sister counters her own explicit proposition that the water is
   in fact not cold:

(30) *Mai sista biliiv di waata iz kuol but nat mii.*
    1.SG.POSS sister believe DEF water COP cold CONJ NEG 1SG
    My sister believes the water is cold, but not me.
    (20-19:47e2012)

   Finally, in (31) speaker 2 wishes to cancel any doubt that there should be anything to
   be embarrassed about speaker 1 dancing in front of the television cameras:

(31) **Speaker 1**
    *Mi no de plie dem ting bout. Laad. Ashiem. Shiem fi wat?*
    1.SG NEG PROG play PL thing PREP EXC Ashamed shame PREP Q
    I’m not messing with things. Lord! Ashamed? Ashamed of what?
    **Speaker 2**
What was it for shame?  
Q 1.PL COP PREP shame PREP
What are we to be embarrassed about?

Speaker 1
Wi duon shiem. Rait den. Wel gud.
1.PL NEG.HAB shame right then well good
We’re never embarrassed. Right then. Well good.
(12-05:40n2012)

Speaker 2
Bout dier an kom an tivii. An a liki exibizhan iz wel
PREP there CONJ come PREP television CONJ INDF little exhibition COP well
gud.
good
Around that time, it came on TV. And a little showing-off is well good.
(12-17:64n2012)

Whereas permanent properties are marked by zero copula, de marks a temporary
property, as in (32) and (33). Where de is absent, the interpretation of the ascriptive
predicate is temporal persistence, but with de, a situational or transient state. Thus, the
distinction in meaning between unmarked ascriptive predicates (and those occurring with
iz) and de, mirrors to a great extent the meaning of past copula wo and past marker di,
which are found with time-stable ascriptive predicates (see 7.5.4.1.1) and time-unstable
ascriptive predicates, respectively (see 7.5.1.4 for an indepth discussion of these
definitions).

(32) A ya de redi den!
1.SG already COP ready then
I am ready then! [Sp. ya ‘already’]  
(04-22:21n2012)
Well, he’s sitting down on a small bench.

In (34), two boys are standing in front of a gate that opens to a field and are observing a horse. One of the boys makes a comment on the behaviour of the horse at that moment in time, describing it as crazy:

Im de loco.

S/he is being/behaving crazy! [Sp. loco ‘crazy’]

In (35), the speaker is telling a story from her childhood and remembering that they were full of mud in the specific situation:

Wi no fain no mango so wi kom-in don an de ful a mod...

We did not find any mangos, so we were coming down and were full of mud...

The form de also functions as both a progressive marker (6.4.1.1.2) and a locative marker (5.3.1.3). After my consultant produced example (36), in which the situational or transient state of being ripe is expressed, I asked her if it could mean that the mangos are ripening, to which her response was (37). A change-of-state is not part of the meaning of *raip* ‘ripe’, which achieves this meaning via inchoative marking in the form of *tiurn* or *get*, which subsequently may take progressive marking, as in (37) (see 6.5.1.1 for an example with progressive *de + get*). Alternatively, to express the dynamic action in progress of ripening requires that the verb combines with particle *op* ‘up’ before subsequently being marked for progressive marking, i.e., *de raip op* (see 6.4.1.1.2 for an example):
(36)  Di mango dem de raip nou.
DEF mango PL COP ripe now
The mangos are ripe now.
(17a-19:47e2012)

CONJ PREP 3.PL INCH INCH ripe PL mango 3.PL INCH-PROG
Get-in raip?
INCH-PROG raip
And before they get, turn ripe, right? Mangos are turning ripe. Getting ripe.
(17a-19:47e2012)

In (38) and (39), the meaning of hat ‘hot is a transient state, encoded via de (and variant -in):

(38)  Di waata iz, hat-in. Di waata de hat.
DEF water COP hot-PROG DEF water COP hot
The water is heating up. The water is hot.
(17a-19:47e2012)

(39)  Rait nou di waata de hat.
Right now DEF water COP hot
Right now, the water is hot.
(17b-19:47e2012)

In (40), the combination of iz and nat (5.5.1.2) is attested to negate an ascriptive predicate:

(40)  Mai sista tink sie rait nou di waata iz nat kuol.
1.SG.POSS sister think COMP right now DEF water COP NEG cold
My sister thinks that right now the water is not cold.
(20-19:47e2012)

An ascriptive clause negated by no is example (71) in (5.5.1.1). No attestations of negated ascriptive clauses marked by de are found in the BCE data, however, in its function as a progressive marker, it is negated by no (see 6.4.1.1.2 for some examples).

5.3.1.2 Equative clauses
An equative clause is where the subject is coreferential with a noun phrase, and the relationship expressed between them is one of identity, e.g., He is my father (Payne 1997: 114) or Sally Smith is the head of this department (Dryer 2007: 233). Unmarked equative clauses are most commonly found across the world’s languages, where the subject and noun are juxtaposed with no intervening morph. In some languages, a copula element is obligatorily, in others it is optional (Stassen 2005). The copula itself may take the form of an affix, particle, or verb (Payne 1997: 114), and a so-called ‘pro-copula’ can also exist in the form of a demonstrative or personal pronoun (Stassen 2005). Other non-verbal means of marking the equative come in the form of originally-functioning ‘discourse-oriented’ markers, such as for topicalisation, backgrounding, and contrastive focus (Stassen 2005).

The most common cross-linguistic pattern is for the copula to remain absent in present temporal contexts but to appear in other temporal contexts. For example, Russian, shows a split present/past distinction in its use of the copula (Payne 1997: 115).

The situation in JC is that equative clauses are marked by a, which optionally combines with basilectal past ben or mesolectal past did (Patrick 2007: 139).

In BCE, the equative clause in present contexts is identified by copula iz, as in (41), (42), (43). The present copula is usually present in equative clauses. On the other hand, it is not unusual for a copula to be absent in ascriptive clauses (5.3.1.1) and locative clauses (5.3.1.3):
(41)  [anon.] nnuo [anon.] iz mai faada.  
[anon.] know [anon.] COP 2.SG.POSS father  
[anon.] knows [anon.] is my father.  
(15-18:56e2012)

(42)  An wen yo riid di baiburl, iz di ungus church di baiburl  
CONJ CONJ 2.SG read DEF bible COP DEF [unknown] church DEF bible talk  
PREP  
Taak about.  
Talk about  
And when you read the bible, it is the [unknown] church the bible talks about.  
(07a-16:55n2012)

(43)  An dis wan nou iz di siem likl buio nou tru im windo. Mosbi  
CONJ DEM one now COP DEF same little boy now PREP PREP window MOD  
luk-in fi di siem likl toad we get wie.  
look-in PREP DEF same little toad REL get away  
And this one now is the same little boy (looking) through the window. Must  
be looking for the same little toad that got away.  
(06b-03:48p2012)

A subjectless equative clause is illustrated in (44):

(44)  No lai [anon.], iz chuut.  
NEG lie [anon.] COP truth  
No lie, [anon], it’s the truth.  
(05-12:402012n)
Negated equative clauses are marked by *no* in present contexts, as in (45) (see 5.5.1.1 for an example without the copula). Equative clauses in past contexts are marked by past copula *wo* (see 7.5.4.1.2).

(45) *No iz gwari-gwari ai nuo.*
NEG COP Gwari-gwari 1.SG know
It’s not the Gwari-gwari that I know.
(15-18:56nr2012)

5.3.1.3 Locative clauses
Locative clauses identify the location of a subject. In BCE and other Atlantic creoles, the locative predicate shares the same form as the progressive (6.4.1.), i.e., *de*, and is assumed to derive historically from the adverbial demonstrative ‘there’ (Holm 2000: 119). Indeed, there is a universal semantic link between progressive and locative clauses (Payne 1997: 113), found also in Bambara and other Niger-Congo languages (Holm 2000: 181).

JC interrogative locative clauses are marked by *de* in the basilect and *iz* in the mesolect (Patrick 2007: 139).

Locative clauses in BCE are marked by *de* or *iz*, however, it is not unusual to find them unmarked. Past marking in locative clauses is optional (see 7.5.4.1.3). In (46) and (47), no copula is present, permissible since both speaker and listener have access to the same visual stimuli, in the form of a picture book:

(46) *Di daag in di beed wid him.*
DEF dog PREP DEF bed PREP 3.SG
The dog is in the bed with him.
(02a-25:59pr2012)

(47) *An di likl buoi in di sii.*
CONJ DEF little boy  PREP DEF sea
And the little boy is in the sea.
(02a-25:59pr2012)

In (48) and (49), the locative clauses contain *de*:

(48)  *Mieri de bai di skuul.* 
Mary COP PREP DEF school 
Mary is at school. 
(15-18:56e2012)

(49)  *Eriwie a tun a hier dem se “Yo de pan telebizhan!”*. 
Everywhere 1.SG turn 1.SG hear 3.PL say 2.SG COP PREP television 
Everywhere I turned I heard them saying, “You’re on the television!”.
(12-05:40n2012)

If a past temporal frame has been clearly established, past copula *wo* is not required, as in (50):

(50)  *Gial, ai se, “Wel shiennis gaan”, bikoz di telebizhan de pan* 
DM 1.SG say DM shamefulness go.PST CONJ DEF television COP PREP 
yo an ai aftu luk pan. Wat?! 
2.SG CONJ 1.SG MOD look PREP Q 
Girl, I said, “Well, the embarrassment has gone”, because the television was on you and I had to look at it. What?!
(12-05:40n2012)

BCE locative clauses may also be marked by *iz*, as illustrated in (51), (52) (53), all of which were uttered in my presence. This pattern of overlap between equatives and locatives is cross-linguistically attested (Stassen 2005).
Chiriqui is in Panama.

He heard some people say, “A fortune teller is on the land”.

He said, “Do not tell the giant I am here.”

(51) Chiriqui iz in panama.
      Chiriqui COP PREP Panama
      Chiriqui is in Panama.
      (15-18 :56nr2012)

(52) Im hier som piipu se, “A fachuuntela iz on di land”.
      3.SG hear some people say INDF fortune teller COP PREP DEF land
      He heard some people say, “A fortune teller is on the land”.
      (16-11:86fr2012)

(53) Im se, “Duon tel di jaint ai iz hier”.
      3.SG say NEG tell DEF giant 1.SG COP here
      He said, “Do not tell the giant I am here.”
      (16-11:86fr2012)

No negated locative predicates in present contexts are found in the BCE data but de in its progressive function is negated via no (see 6.4.1.1.2, also 7.5.4.1.3 for examples of negated past locative clauses).

Content interrogatives may be unmarked (54), or marked by iz which occurs clause-final, as in (55) and (56). This clause-type indicates what kind of information is being requested (Payne: 1997: 300). Cross-linguistically, the position of interrogative pronouns is typically sentence-initial (König & Siemund 2007: 301). Although no examples of de are found in this particular context in the BCE data, this cannot be ruled out since this particular function of de was not actively sought during fieldwork.

(54) Jaint aks di liedì an se, “We di eg?”.
      Giant ask DEF lady CONJ say Q DEF egg
      (The) gaint asked the lady and said, “Where is the egg?”
      (16-11:86fr2012)
(55)  

\[ \text{Wiet! Wie mai bag ız?} \]

Wait Q 1.SG.POSS bag COP

Wait! Where is my bag?

(14:18:56nr2012)

(56)  

\[ \text{We yu ız?} \]

Q 2.SG COP

Where are you?

(15-18:56e2012)

### 5.4 Conditional clauses

#### 5.4.1.1 Real versus unreal conditional sentences

A conditional sentence consists of two clauses, the **protasis** (if-clause) and the **apodosis** (main clause). According to Palmer (2007: 207), a considerable number of languages distinguish between **real** and **unreal** conditionals sentences. Equivalent terms are ‘hypothetical’ for the former type and ‘counterfactual’ for the latter type (1994) (see also 10.1.1). In both types of conditionals, the protasis expresses a hypothesised proposition, the condition necessary for the proposition in the apodosis to be possible, regardless of whether it is actualised or not. The semantic distinction between real and unreal conditionals is that the former leaves open the possibility of the situation taking place, whereas the latter indicates some doubt about the likelihood of the situation in the protasis (Palmer 2007: 207).

An example of a real conditional type in English is observed in *If John comes, Bill will leave*. The English unreal conditional can be further subdivided with respect to temporal context, firstly, present, e.g., *If John came, Bill would leave*, and, secondly, past, in *If John had come, Bill would have left* (Palmer 2007: 207-8). Comrie (1986: 88) appears reluctant to make such rigid notional distinctions between different conditional constructions,
preferring to talk of a continuum of different degrees of probability (or hypotheticality) expressed in the protasis rather than of clear-cut boundaries between a few conditional types. According to Comrie (1986: 88), this is exactly what different languages tend to do, the choice of form of the conditional construction “often being determined by subjective evaluation rather than by truth-conditional semantics”.

5.4.1.1.1 Real conditionals

The verb in the protasis (if-clause) of real conditionals in BCE remains unmarked, as in (57) and (58), which is consistent with the observation made by Winford (2001: 160) for Caribbean English Creoles more generally. Bybee et al. (1994: 274) note that future markers are not commonly found in subordinate clauses with future time reference, such as hypothetical if and when clauses, since such clauses do not make assertions about future time. The apodosis of real conditionals may remain unmarked or marked by absolute future wi (see 7.6.4 for marked examples).

(57)  But ai fiil laik if iivn kom i nat trii die-z.  
     CONJ 1.SG feel like CONJ even come 3.SG NEG three day-PL  
     But I feel like if it even comes, it won’t be for three days.  
     (08-16:55)

(58)  But entaaim i go buokas dem morder him dem gat som liki buoi set out  
     CONJ anytime 3.SG go Bocas 2.PL murder 3.SG 3.PL got some little boy set out fi him  
     PREP 3.Sg  
     But if anytime he should ever go to Bocas, they will murder him. They have most likely got some little boy ready waiting for him.  
     (10-17:64n2012)

The protasis of real conditionals is negated via no (see 5.5.1.1 for an example).
5.4.1.1.2 Unreal conditionals

Palmer (2007: 207) observes that cross-linguistically “the most striking and most widespread use of past tense for unreality is in conditional sentences” (see also Iatridou 2000). Indeed, past marker *di* (7.5.1) is found in the protasis of unreal conditionals in BCE. The expansion of *di* from simple clauses to the protasis of conditional sentences results in the neutralisation of the stative/dynamic distinction (see 5.2). With respect to the copula domain, the protasis of unreal conditionals is not marked by *di* but past copula *wo*, as in (61).

Whereas the apodosis is unmarked in (59), it may also be marked by *wud(a)* (10.2.1.1), as in (60):

(59) *Ef a di gat moni a ren an bai a gialan a gias.*
    CONJ 1.SG PST got money 1.SG run CONJ buy INDF gallon PREP gas
    If I had money, I (would) run and buy a gallon of petrol.
    (06a-03:48n2012)

(60) *If ai di gat ten yie-z yunga, yu wuda hier.*
    CONJ 1.SG PST got ten year-PL younger 2.SG MOD hear
    If I were ten years younger, you would hear [about the women]!
    (06v-28:00n2012)

In (61), the protasis contains an equative predicate (5.3.1.2) marked by copula *wo*:

(61) *If ai wo im mada, ai wuda biit im.*
    CONJ 1.SG COP.PST 3.SG mother 1.SG MOD beat 3.SG
    If I were his/her mother, I would spank him.
    (19a-19:47e2012)
The protasis of unreal conditionals is negated via *neva* (see also 6.4.3.1.2.1), as illustrated in (62):

(62)  *If ai neva sii da pikin, ai wuda kil him.*

CONJ 1.SG NEG see DEM child 1.SG MOD kill 3.SG
 If I hadn’t seen that child, I would’ve killed him/her.

(19a-19:47e2012)

5.5 Negation

Cross-linguistically, markers of negation typically take the form of free morphs, which sometimes appear in pairs but may also include verbal affixation or even special negative auxiliary verbs (Kroeger 2005: 213). There are two key types of negator in BCE: independent negators, described in 5.5.1 of this chapter, and a negated TMA marker in the form of *neva* (see 6.4.3.1.2.1 and various subsections of 7.5). The relationship between tense-aspect-modality and negation (see 5.5) has been included in this description of BCE but is not intended to be a fully systematic exploration. Rather, it explores the different meanings and functions of *neva* (6.4.3.1.2.1) and *duon* (see 6.4.3.1.1.1 and 5.5.1.3), since their combinations are unexpected from the point of view of full compositionality. For example, a negated past habitual reading (‘not generally-speaking’) with dynamic and stative verbs is not achieved by combining an individual negator with past habitual marker *yuustu* (6.4.3.1.2.1) but via *neva*. *Duon* appears to have two functions, one of them an independent negator (5.5.1) and the other a negated TMA marker like *neva* but in negated present habitual contexts. Individual negators *no* (5.5.1.1) and *nat* (5.5.1.2) are also discussed here. This section restricts itself to the negation of verb phrases and ascriptive, equative, and locative predicates (see 5.3). In Table 5.1, the negated contexts listed are those that are supported by evidence in the BCE data, however, there are a few gaps in the data, and these are addressed at relevant points throughout the thesis.
Table 5.1 Independent negators in BCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent negators</th>
<th>Functions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **No** (see 5.5.1.1) | Negates unmarked verbs (dynamic and stative)  
|                      | Negates equative clauses and ascriptive clauses  
|                      | Negates imperative  
|                      | Negates progressive *de*  
|                      | Negates relative/prospective aspect variants *gwain* and *waan*  
|                      | Combines with past *di* to negate individual stative situations in the past/individual dynamic situations for pluperfect |
| **Nat** (see 5.5.1.2) | Negates non-epistemic necessity *afu*  
|                      | Negates the verb phrase marked for non-epistemic necessity by *beta*  
|                      | Negates copulz *iz* in ascriptive clauses |
| **Duon** (see 5.5.1.3) | Negates dynamic and stative verbs to mean ‘not generally-speaking’  
|                      | Acrolectal variant of *no* is restricted contexts |

5.5.1 Independent negators

5.5.1.1 no

In JC it is claimed that *no* is a basilectal negator (Patrick 2007: 136). Although *no* is the general negator, *nat* is sometimes found (see 5.5.1.2), most notably before the mesolectal progressive construction *V*-*in* without a copula (Patrick 2007: 136-7) (see also 6.4.1.1.3 and 6.4.1.1.3.1).

In BCE the variation observed in the individual negators may be correlated to both sociolinguistic and/or semantic factors. The most frequent negator that accompanies unmarked predicates is *no*. It occurs in simple present contexts such as with stative verb *nuo* ‘know’ (63) and dynamic verb *juok* ‘joke’ (64). It is also found in gnomic contexts.
(65) (see also 6.4.3.1.1), future contexts (66) (see 7.6), present perfect contexts (67) (68) (see 7.4.2), and single dynamic situations in the past (69) (70) (see 5.2).

(63) \textit{Ai no n\oe\ wa a waan du wi dem.}

1.SG NEG know Q 1.SG PRPASP do PREP 3.PL

I don’t know what I will do with them.

(13-9:46n2012)

(64) \textit{Mi no juok.}

1.SG NEG joke

I’m not joking

(12-05:40n2012)

(65) \textit{Gad no gi oba.}

God NEG give over

God does not give up.

(07-12:42n2012)

(66) \textit{But miebi shi no kom. Wi kian go rait deso an paas CONJ maybe 3.SG NEG come 1.PL MOD go right over there CONJ pass wi krismos.}

1.PL.POSS Christmas

But she might not come, (then) we can go right over there [across the way] and spend out Christmas.

(13-2:23n2012)

(67) \textit{Mi no don hier yet.}

1.SG NEG finish here yet

I am not finished here yet.

(15-18:56np2012)
(68) No, mi no sii kalifornian ponch agen.
EXC 1.SG NEG see Californian Punch again
No, I’ve not seen Californian Punch again
(11-18:56n2012)

The phenomenon of negative concord is identifiable in (69) and (70) (see 5.5.2):

(69) Wi no fain no mango so wi kom-in don an de ful a mod...
1.PL NEG find NEG mango so 1.PL come-PROG down CONJ COP full of mud
We did not find any mangos, so we were coming down and were full of mud...
(04-01:19n2012)

(70) Ai wo de pan da, yie. Mi wo de rait de; a no
1.SG COP.PST COP PREP DEM EXC 1.SG COP.PST COP right there 1.SG NEG
mis non!
miss nothing
I was on that [the television], yeah. I was right there; I didn’t miss anything!
(12-05:40n2012)

Ascriptive predicates, as in (71) (see 5.3.1.1 for further examples), and equative predicates, as in (72), are also negated via no (see also 5.3.1.2 for an example):

(71) Laik, i no ful. Im belii stil de baal.
DM 3.SG NEG full 3.SG belly still PROG cry
Like, she was not full, her belly was still crying.
(13-9:46n2012)

(72) Jaan no mi faada.
John NEG 1.SG.POSS father
John is not my father.
Unlike in many languages, negated imperative clauses in BCE do not require a special prohibitive morpheme or prohibitive form of the verb, but rather employ the general negator no as in (73):

(73)  
No go bied tumara bikaa di waata waan tuu kuol.

NEG go bathe tomorrow CONJ DEF water PRPASP too cold
Don’t go and bathe tomorrow because the water will be too cold

(20-19:47e2012)

A further function of no is to negate the protasis of real conditionals (5.4.1.1.1), as illustrated in (74):

(74)  
If yuu no bai nou, yuu waan pie muo nex wiik.

CONJ 2.SG NEG buy now 2.SG PRPASP pay mor next week
If you don’t buy (it) now, you’ll pay more next week.

(19a-19:47e2012)

Negated progressive constructions are also marked by no (75) (see 6.4.1), as is relative/prospective aspect waan (76) (7.6.2.2). Again, negative concord is involved (see 5.5.2):

(75)  
Ai no de bai no kurtin.

1.SG NEG COP buy NEG curtain
I am not buying any curtains.

(13-9:46n2012)

(76)  
Ai no waan duu notin. Ai gwain wourk an fon wourk ai

1.SG NEG PRSP do nothing 1.SG go.PROG work CONJ PREP work 1.SG
no nou wat ai waan du.
NEG know Q 1.SG PRSP do
I’m not going to do anything. I’m going to work and after work I don’t know what I’m going to do.
(14-14:50n2012)

5.5.1.2 nat
There are two contexts in which nat emerges, both in the modal domain. Firstly, nat negates necessity modal afu (and phonetic variants) in non-epistemic contexts, as in (77) (further examples and discussion can be found in 9.3.2.2). Secondly, nat negates the verb phrase marked by beta, a modal of non-epistemic necessity, as in (78) (see 9.3.2.3). There is thus a difference in the syntactic position of nat between (77) and (78), where nat precedes afu but follows beta:

(77) *Im mada nat haftu wori bikaa shi nat nuo.*
3.SG.POSS mother NEG MOD worry CONJ 3.SG NEG know
His mother needn’t worry because she doesn’t know.
(19c-19:47e2012)

(78) *Yu beta nat taak tu mii so.*
2.SG better NEG talk PREP 1.SG so
You had better not talk to me like that.
(19a-19:47e2012)

5.5.1.3 duon
One negator in BCE appears to function as both an independent negator and a TMA marker. The latter type expresses ‘not generally-speaking’ in present tense contexts, discussed under habituality (see 6.4.3.1.1.1), as in (79):

(79) *Wi duon put op kurtin.*
1.PL NEG put up curtain
Generally-speaking, we don’t hang up curtains.
(11-13:60n2012)

Examples of individual negator *duon* are illustrated in (80) and (81):

(80)  \[anon.] im duon sii di rat
[anon.] 3.SG NEG see DEF rat
[anon.] doesn’t see the rat.
(02b-25:59p2012)

(81)  Di likl buoi wek op. An him daag an dem duon sii di frag
DEF little boy wake up CONJ 3.SG.POSS dog CONJ 3.PL NEG see DEF frog
in di bakl.
PREP DEF bottle
The little boy wakes up. And he and his dog, they don’t see the frog in the bottle.
(03-16:55p2012)

There is some evidence that individual negator *duon* competes with *no* (5.5.1.1.) and that the variation correlates to sociolinguistic factors, namely, the formality of the situation (which can be subjective). In (82), speaker one and speaker 2 negate the verb phrase that contains the same stative verb *waan* ‘want’, with *duon* and *no*, respectively. There is an age discrepancy of 23 years between the two speakers, but both live on the same side of town. There seems to be some evidence suggesting that the surrounding linguistic choices surrounding (and including *duon*), represent speakers’ attempts at approximating English. For example, *duon* seems to be found whenever progressive variant -*in* (6.4.1.1.3) is selected instead *de* (6.4.1.1.2), or verbal complement *tu* instead of *fi* (see, for example, discussions in 7.6.3 and 9.3.2.4):

(82)  **Speaker 1**
    Ai waan lak mai hous. Ai duon waan nobadi hier.
1. SG PRPASP lock 1. SG.POSS house 1. SG NEG want nobody here
I’m going to lock my house. I don’t want anybody here.
(13-09:46n2012)

Speaker 2

Miself, ai guo an iit wi [anan.]. A no waan nobadi kom hier
1. SG.REF1. SG go CONJ eat PREP [anon.] 1. SG NEG want nobody come here
kaa wen dem kom, dem doz ñam up yo ting an doz taak
CONJ CONJ 3. PL come 3. PL HAB eat up 2. SG.POSS thing CONJ HAB talk
yo afta.
2. SG PREP
Myself, I’ll go and eat with [anon.]. I don’t want anybody coming here because
when they come, they always eat your things and always talk to you afterwards.
(13-02:23n2012)

The expression ‘don’t know’ appears frequently in the data, and it is negated by either
no, as in (83), and sometimes duon (84). The evidence remains inconclusive as to whether
this variation is restricted to stative verbs, also observed in (82) above:

(83) Ai no nuo wa a waan du wi dem.
1. SG NEG know Q 1. SG PRPASP do PREP 3. PL
I don’t know what I am going to do with them.
(13-9:46n2012)

(84) Ai duon nou huu waan bii di priicha far di anibersario.
1. SG NEG know Q PRPASP COP DEF preacher PREP DEF anniversary
I don’t know, who’s going to be the preacher for the anniversary.
(07a-12:42n2012)

In (85), the speaker is talking to me, and duont replaces duon, the difference in
pronunciation indicating yet a further attempt to approximate standard English:
(85) **Bot im duont mek dem men dem hier.**
CONJ 3.SG NEG make DEM men PL hear
But he doesn’t let the men hear.
(16-11:86fr2012)

Finally, in (86) and (87), both **duon** and **no** appear in close proximity to each other, uttered by the same speaker. Here, the difference seems to be one of semantics, where **duon** expressing ‘not generally-speaking’ (see 6.4.3.1.1.1 and example (79) above) and **no** is functioning as an individual negator. In this respect, there would be nothing unusual about the presence of both negators in (86) and (87):

(86) **A duon juok wid it. Ai no plie, buoi.**
1.SG NEG joke PREP 3.SG 1.SG NEG play EXC
I don’t joke about (generally-speaking). I’m not (right now) playing, boy.
(12-05:40n2012)

(87) **Gad duon kandem wii wen wi tink. Wat man luk pan Gaad no luk**
God NEG condemn 1.PL CONJ 1.PL think Q man look PREP God NEG look
*pan. God no gi oba.*
PREP God NEG give PREP
God doesn’t (generally-speaking) condemn us when we think. What man looks at
God is not looking at. God doesn’t give up.
(07a-12:42n2012)

5.5.2 **Negative concord**

The phenomenon of negative concord is common in the world’s languages. It is claimed that negative concord in JC is a variable feature (Patrick 2007: 137). In BCE, there also appears to be no regular pattern with respect to the presence or absence of negative concord. Whether negative concord is a strategy that BCE speakers use to emphasise the negation remains an area for future research.
In (88), negative concord is absent, with single negation on the verb phrase only:

(88) No, mi no sii kalifornian ponch agen.

EXC 1.SG NEG see Kalifornian Punch again
No, I’ve not seen Californian Punch since.
(11-18:56n2012)

In (89), negative concord is present, with both the verb and its noun phrase complement negated separately by no:

(89) Kaa a no gat no moni.

CONJ 1.SG NEG got NEG money
Because I do not have any money.
(13-9:46n2012)

In (90), stative verb hav ‘have’ is marked by duon (6.4.3.1.1.1) for a ‘not generally-speaking’ meaning, and the noun phrase complement takes the form of negated indefinite pronoun enitin ‘anything’:

(90) Ai duon hav enitin du-in

1.SG NEG have anything do-PROG
I do not have anything to do.
(17a-19:47nr2012)

In (91), stative verb gat ‘got’ is marked by neva, a TMA marker that encodes both negation and past. Here, the semantics of neva is ‘not generally-speaking’ (see 6.4.3.1.2.1 for similar examples; see also 7.5 for a list of other contexts in which neva is found).

(91) Ai memba wen wi neva gat no lait.

1.SG remember CONJ 1.PL NEG.PST got NEG light
I remember when we didn’t have any light.

(11a-18:56n2012)
6 Chapter six: Aspect in BCE

6.1 Introduction

Chapter 6 examines aspect in BCE and begins with a discussion of theoretical issues and terminology. This covers both viewpoint aspect (6.2.1) and lexical aspect (6.2.2), the latter which identifies and defines the different ‘situation types’ relevant to the analysis of aspect in BCE. It is worth repeating the statement that was made in (1.1), that the term grammatical marker in this chapter (and generally throughout the thesis) is used principally for any morpheme that is found in preverbal position (and not permitting any intervening constituent), with the exception of progressive verbal suffix -in (6.4.1.1.3). A brief overview of the aspect markers in BCE is presented in (6.3), after which criteria for determining the stative/dynamic distinction in BCE is addressed (6.3.1). The remaining chapter is split into two, the first part presenting an analysis of the morphemes that mark viewpoint aspect (6.2.1), and the second part focussing on the morphemes that change lexical aspect (6.5). That is, the aspectual morphemes in BCE are not at the same level of grammar. Those that change the viewpoint aspect are in one layer with those that change the lexical aspect in another.

6.2 Theoretical and terminological issues

6.2.1 Viewpoint aspect

Viewpoint aspect involves the distinction between perfective and imperfective, which is expressed via a language’s morphology. Perfective aspect views a state of affairs as a single whole (Comrie 1976: 16) with initial and final points (Smith 1991: 6). The perfective places emphasis on ‘complete’, not necessarily ‘completed’ situations: all parts – beginning, middle, and end, are presented as a single whole (Comrie 1976: 18). Unlike the imperfective, the perfective does not distinguish between the various separate phases that might be involved in a situation (Comrie 1976: 16). Imperfective aspect focuses on
one phase only of a situation; it is the internal structure of the phase that is of significance here (Comrie 1976: 16; see also 25).

6.2.2 Lexical aspect and ‘situation type’

The most basic distinction of inherent aspect of a verb is between dynamicity and stativity, specifically, whether the verb phrase involves some sort of change (Hovav 2008:16; see also Dowty 1979). As Kearns (2011: 156) points out, it is the predicate under a particular verb phrase (or verb constellation) description rather than the verb itself which has relevance here. A state, e.g., *I know the answer*, is distinguishable by its inherent lack of internal temporal structure (Tenny 1994: 5). It is atelic with no natural boundaries (Kearns 2011: 156) and continues unless something happens to change the state (Comrie 1976: 49). Stative situations are thus inherently uniform, whereas dynamic situations are heterogeneous and internally structured (Frawley 1992: 146). A dynamic verb, e.g., *run*, involves change, consisting of different phases but the situation represents a single action which is more likely to have already taken place (Holm 1988: 151). Cross-linguistically, it is uncommon for stative verbs to have forms with perfective meaning, and in instances where this does occur, the resulting meaning is restricted to referring to a state with its inception and termination (Comrie 1976: 50). States do not typically unfold over time, they have no internal dynamics, making them more stable in time than dynamic verbs (Frawley 1992: 147). Dynamic verbs and their constellations express distinct nuances of meaning and can be categorised into various situation types.

Other terms in the literature that are synonymous with situation type include lexical aspect, aspectual class, and Aktionsart. Situation types can change with the addition of arguments and adverbials that are present in the clause or sentence (Smith 1991: xvi), so that *cut the rope* and *cut at the rope* (Levin 1993: 41-41; cited in Beavers 2013: 695) or *He drank beer/He drank a beer* (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 99) express distinct situation types (see further below for more detailed explanations). This thesis recognises the following situation types: state; activity; accomplishment; achievement; semelfactive.
The first four are based on the definitions of Vendler (1967) and Smith (1991), the latter on Smith (1991).

A state is static and non-dynamic, involving either the location of a participant (*a book being on the table*), the state or condition of a participant (*Maria being tired*), or an internal experience of a participant (*Fred liking Alice*) (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 83). An activity is a dynamic situation in which a participant does something (*the ball rolling*) (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 83). Further examples include *stroll in the park, laugh, and think about* (Smith 1991: 44).

An accomplishment is a process involving change which takes place over time, e.g., a change in location (*a book falling to the floor*), a change in state or condition (*clothes drying*), or a change in the internal experience of a participant (*Tanisha learning Swahili*) (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 83). An accomplishment consists of a process and an outcome, or a change of state, the change being the completion of the process: “The internal stages of an accomplishment are successive, and differ from each other because they represent advances toward the final point” (Smith 1991: 49-50). Further examples include *build a bridge, walk to school, repair a radio, and drink a glass of wine* (Smith 1991: 44). Van Valin (2015: 716) distinguishes between accomplishments such as *freeze* and *dry* or ‘active’ accomplishments such as *devour* or *run to the store*. ‘Scalar verbs’ is also a term used in the literature; they lexically specify change along a scale in a particular direction (Hovav 2008:17), of which there are three kinds. Property scales denote a change of state, e.g., *lengthen, open, widen*; path scales are another type of scalar verb, e.g., *descend, enter, come, go*, as are volume/extent scales, e.g., *read, eat, build*. The latter type of scalar verbs are also known as ‘incremental theme verbs’ (Hovav 2008: 17), which are distinct from the other types in so far as the aspectual meaning is not inherent in the verb itself but arises with the addition of a direct object (see also McNally and Kennedy 2008: 156). Count nouns may influence the interpretation of lexical aspect, e.g., *Pat is eating a plum/plums*, where the singular noun leads to a bounded or telic situation (Hay, Kennedy et al. 1999: 102). Likewise, prepositional phases such as *Joe is running to the shop* (Pulman
1997: 300; see also Vendler 1967: 101). A direct object does not always signal an incremental theme verb: *Eat the sandwich* differs to *push the wagon*, in so far as the direct object in *push* is not affected incrementally (Hovav 2008:25).

An **achievement** is a situation that can happen instantly (*a building blowing up*) (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 83). Other examples include *leave, break, reach the top, and recognise* (Smith 1991: 58). Both accomplishments and achievements involve a **change of state**. A key difference between these two situation types, however, is that accomplishments have an entailment (and non-detachability) relation between process and outcome. If the outcome of an accomplishment is reached, it follows that the process occurred (but not vice versa): *If John built a cabin last summer, then John was building a cabin last summer* (Smith 1991: 50). The entailment pattern of achievements is such that their change-of-state is conceptualised as a situation that is detachable from an associated process. Achievements express a two-point scale: The fact that *Mary won the race* is not an entailment of *Mary was winning the race*, since she may have pulled ahead at the last moment (Smith 1991: 60). And this is where scalar verbs (see above) differ from achievements, in that the former involve a multi-point scale: There is no change of state in *We ascended the stairs*, but simply a change of degree/value (see Hovav 2008:19-20).

Finally, achievements and **semelfactives** are similar in that the situation is understood as taking place instantaneously (Beavers 2013: 682) (although this is not universally assumed). Nevertheless, they differ in so far as not only does the semelfactive have an iterative reading but involves no outcome or result (Smith 1991:57). In English, semelfactives can be formally encoded for progressive (see 6.3), e.g. *John is knocking on the door* (Bardovi-Harlig 2012: 485).

Smith (1991: 6) categorises the five situation types discussed above according to the temporal properties of **dynamism**, **durativity**, and **telicity**. A **non-durative** situation is ‘instantaneous’, the term ‘punctual’ reserved for describing perfective viewpoint (6.2.1) (Smith 1991: 104). **Telicity** has to do with whether a situation type has a natural endpoint
consisting of a goal or outcome (Smith 1991: 6), which fits the description of accomplishments and achievements (see above). The features of the situation types are the following: [+/- static] [+/- durative] [+/- telic] (Smith 1991: 30). According to Smith (1991: 30), a semelfactive is comprised of the following features: [-static], [- durative], [-telic]. Smith (1991: 56) observes that semelfactives are often subject to a shift in situation type, so that John coughed for 5 minutes is reinterpreted as an activity. However, Beavers (2013: 693) characterises semelfactives as telic on the basis that repetition of a situation does not itself qualify a semelfactive as being atelic, which is the view taken in this thesis.

Tests are available for determining the situation type of a verb phrase, the objective of such tests being to uncover co-occurrence patterns in order to ascertain which situation type a predicate belongs to (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 93-4; see also Dowty 1979). These tests are intended to be applicable across languages, although they are not exhaustive insofar as languages may offer opportunities for further tests for determining situation type, with the aim of isolating one or more semantic features (Van Valin 1997: 93): Naturally, the progressive aspect test can only be applied to languages that possess a progressive marker, likewise, the temporal adverbial test (quickly/slowly) presupposes that the language in question has them, that is, that speakers talk about intervals of time. Other tests include co-occurrence with manner adverbs, vigorously/actively or adverbials, for an hour (duration)/ in an hour (completive) (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 94). Five diagnostics for English are also provided by Frawley, which, in addition to the progressive (extension), include the pseudo cleft (What X did was Y)/What happened? tests (unitization) and imperative/adverbs, e.g., carefully and deliberately (execution) (Frawley 1992: 149). Importantly, Frawley (1992: 155) observes that meaning is gradient, therefore, not all three characteristics (extension, unitization, execution) have to be present or absent for a situation to be defined as stative or dynamic. Languages sometimes differ in how they view a change-of-state situation, for example, ‘to die’ is an achievement in Mandarin but an accomplishment in English. Consequently, English permits co-occurrence with ‘quickly’, e.g., He died quickly (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 106). Likewise, based on the same test, 'go' and 'come' in Japanese behave like achievements but in English,
accalishments (Van Valin and LaPolla 1997: 106). Language-specific tests are also available. One of the best tests in English for identifying a stative verb is to ascertain whether it receives a present tense reading in the simple present (see also 7.2).

Finally, a group of phrasal verbs in English shift the focus of the predicate that follows to the preliminary, beginning, middle, or end stage, resulting in a narrowed point of view, e.g. continue, keep on, start, try, attempt, on the verge of, stop, finish, go on, begin, cease (Smith 1991: 75-9; see also 47). This causes the situation type of the following verb phrase to shift, since the respective stages expressed by such verbs are themselves either telic, atelic, durative, or instantaneous (Smith 1991: 76). Verbs such as continue emphasise the internal stages of a situation, and verbs such as start focus on the preliminary stages, both, however, producing atelic sentences (Smith 1991: 47; 79). In contrast, Mary stopped laughing describes a telic situation (Smith 1991: 77). In these cases, the start or end of a state is dynamic since something occurs to bring about the change into or out of the state (Comrie 1976: 50). Verbs such as finish combine well with accomplishments on the basis that accomplishments involve a natural endpoint after a period of successive stages, e.g., John finished cooking dinner, whereas verbs such as cease and stop express the termination of an activity bringing about a situation type shift from activity to achievement, e.g., Mary stopped laughing (see Smith 1991: 77).

6.3 Overview of aspect markers in BCE

As stated in (6.1), a distinction is made in this chapter between morphemes that mark viewpoint aspect (see 6.2.1) and those that change lexical aspect (see 6.2.2). Progressive variants de and -in (see 6.4.1) mark grammatical aspect, as do the habitual markers which taking the form of present doz (6.4.3.1.1) and past yuustu (6.4.3.1.2). The combination of stie + de (6.4.2) marks continuative aspect. Negator duon (6.4.3.1.1.1) and past negator neva (6.4.3.1.2.1) receive a ‘not generally-speaking’ reading when they co-occur with dynamic verbs and statives (and are discussed under habituality). BCE wud (6.4.3.1.3) expresses past propensity and is also discussed under habituality. Grammatical morphemes
in BCE that change lexical aspect include completive don (6.5.2), inchoative go, get, kom, tiurn (see 6.5.1), and iterative stodi (6.5.3).

At the beginning of the main sections, data is included from other Caribbean English Creole (CEC) varieties as background to the BCE data, in order to prepare the reader somewhat and enable them to make some cross-creole comparisons. Where possible, comparisons are made with Jamaican Creole (JC), since a motivation for this thesis is to highlight similarities/differences between JC and BCE.

6.3.1 The stative/dynamic distinction in BCE

As explained in (5.2), lexical aspect (6.2.2) determines whether the default interpretation of a verb is simple present or simple past. Dynamic verbs receive a simple past reading and stative verbs, a simple present interpretation. It is the interaction of the ‘default’ lexical aspect of the verb with interpretations arising from combinations with, for example, count and non-count nouns (Hay, Kennedy et al. 1999: 128), TMA markers etc., that determine the stativity of any given situation. Additionally, Patrick (1999:173) observes that ‘local discourse context’ plays a role, so that English stative verb have, as in to have their own horse, can also have a dynamic interpretation, e.g., to have an argument.

In BCE, the main way that lexical aspect is determined is to observe whether any given verb readily co-occurs with di to mark simple past (see 7.5.1.1 for a description and examples of di in this function). Since past marking is obligatory with statives, this is an accurate diagnostic for determining stativity. Although dynamic verbs may also be marked by di, the meaning is not simple past, since unmarked dynamic verbs by default have a past interpretation (see 7.5.1.2 and 7.5.1.3 for the meaning of di with dynamic verbs).

It is not the case thus that TMA markers are constrained to either dynamic or stative verbs. In fact, only completive don (6.5.2) is restricted to co-occurring with dynamic verbs, more specifically, accomplishments (see 6.2.2). The semantics of the TMA can alter slightly, however, depending on whether it occurs with a dynamic or stative verb. For
example, the BCE progressive markers *de* and *-in*, which marks viewpoint aspect (6.2.1), encode a continuous process with dynamic verbs but statives as situational/temporary (see 6.4.1.1.2 and 6.4.1.1.3). Likewise, habitual *doz* (6.4.3.1.1), which also marks viewpoint aspect, marks dynamic verbs for re-occurring situations but statives for a ‘generally-speaking’ reading. *Stodi* (6.5.3), which changes lexical aspect, remains the most consistent in meaning, insofar as it marks accomplishments and achievements for iterativity, and when it combines with a stative verb, its interpretation is a repeated entry into a state.

### 6.4 Interaction of verbs with viewpoint aspect

#### 6.4.1 Progressive

6.4.1.1 Definition

De Haan (2011: 451) describes the progressive as a grammatical category that marks an action in progress; Comrie (1976: 35) observes the interplay between progressive meaning and dynamic meaning. However, rules that predict which verbs may be marked by the progressive are always language specific. For example, verbs of perception such as ‘see’ and ‘hear’ do not generally combine with the progressive in English, in contrast to Portuguese where these combinations are perfectly acceptable (Comrie 1976: 35).

Achievements (see 6.2.2) in English that have a plural argument acquire an iterative reading when they are marked for progressive, e.g., *They are popping the balloons*. The progressive form in some Romance languages, for example, Sardinian, no longer contains progressive as part of its meaning but encodes the simple present (Delia Bentley pers. comm., 11 June 2019).

Bybee & Dahl (1989: 77) observe that progressive aspect “shows a very strong tendency to have periphrastic rather than inflectional expression.” Across languages, progressives have a tendency to develop into imperfectives, and the lexical source for the progressive is often a locative marker (Comrie 1976: 98). Indeed, the locative marker in BCE (see 5.3.1.3) is the same form as one of the progressive variants, *de* (6.4.1.1.2). De
Haan (2011: 451; see also Comrie 1967: 35) explains that although the progressive is sometimes considered an imperfective, there are enough differences to warrant an analysis of the two as separate aspects: Progressives, for example, may combine with tense markers, whereas this option is more restricted for imperfectives.

Nevertheless, the English progressive has “an unusually wide range” of uses compared to other languages (Comrie 1976: 32). For example, the stative verb understand readily combines with the progressive, e.g., *I’m understanding more about quantum physics as each day goes by*, where the progressive form of the verb indicates the change in the degree of understanding taking place (Comrie 1976: 36). Stative verb *live* also accepts progressive marking, so that *I am living at 6 Railways Cuttings* refers to a more temporary situation than *I live at 6 Railway Cuttings*, which, as Comrie (1976: 37) suggests, is a more or less permanent situation. A final example is stative *be*, e.g., *Fred is silly*, which acquires a meaning akin to *Fred is acting in a silly manner* when it combines with the progressive (Comrie 1976: 36).

Descriptions of the progressive in JC mention variants in the form of *a, da, de, and -in*. Preverbal *d(a)* and *de* are considered ‘rural’ (or basilectal) and are characteristic of Western Jamaica, whereas verbal suffix *-in* is heard in mesolectal speech (Patrick 2007: 130). Aceto (2002: 232-33) claims that *de* is highly restricted in Jamaica and that *(d)a* is the preferred basilectal form. Verbal suffix *-in* is neither mentioned by Farquharson (2013: 85) nor Winford (2001: 170). Habitual meaning in JC is occasionally expressed by progressive *a*, but no recent cases of habitual *dalde* are reported in such contexts (Patrick 2007: 131). In contrast, habitual contexts in BCE are never marked by the progressive, but by present habitual *doz* (see 6.4.3.1.1). In Nicaraguan Creole (NC), progressive variant *-in* occurs far more frequently than *de* (Bartens 2013a: 119), which is not the case in BCE. Only *de* is found in San Andres Creole (SA) (Bartens 2013b: 108) and Belizean Creole (BelC) (Escure 2013: 95). Providence Island Creole (PI) has both *de* and *-in* (Bartens 2013b: 108). In BelC, progressive aspect is encoded via *di* (not *de*) (Winford 2006: 36). In Urban Bahamian Creole (BahCE), remnants of a preverbal progressive are reportedly
found in the form of a and de (dar, dare, dere), as well as isolated occurrences of a + V-ing (Hackert 2004: 72). Otherwise, the progressive in BahCE is encoded via is/was + V-ing, the copula forms being generally invariable in person and number except among more acrolectal speakers. Whereas was usually occurs in the past, iz is often absent in present contexts (Hackert 2004: 72). Barbuda Creole (Aceto 2002: 232-33) marks the progressive with preverbal variant forms a and de, or the progressive construction a + V-in. Dynamic verbs in Vincentian Creole are encoded via a or de (Prescod 2013: 74). The progressive in Carriacou (Kephart 2000: 91) and Trinidad Creole is marked by verbal suffix -in, the latter of which permits the marking of perception verbs too (see 6.4.1) (Muhleisen 2013: 65).

BCE progressive variants take the form of preverbal de (6.4.1.1.2) and verbal suffix -in (6.4.1.1.3), with only one attestation of progressive a in the BCE (naturalistic) data (see example (3) below). Suffix -in is the only post-verbal marking in the tense-aspect-modality system of BCE. As mentioned above, the progressive changes the viewpoint aspect in BCE, focusing on one phase only of a situation (see 6.2.1). The progressive marks activities and the process component of accomplishments (see 6.2.2) as actions in progress, obligatorily marked in BCE. Achievements in English also accept progressive marking, e.g., He’s slowly realising what’s happening, expressing entry into a state (Comrie 1976: 20). There is also evidence in BCE of achievements marked by de.

The progressive expresses ongoing dynamic activities at the time of reference, as illustrated in (1) and (2):

(1) A die, man, a de plie. A de swin pan a kaad tu di
    1.SG man  1.SG PROG play 1.SG PROG swing PREP INDF cord PREP DEF
    bak a di hous...
    back PREP DEF house
    I was there, man, I was playing. I was swinging on a rope at the back of the house...
    (04-1:19n2012)
(2) Di likl biou tek him out an hug-in him up.

DEF little boy take 3.SG out CONJ hug-PROG 3.SG up

The little boy takes him out and is hugging him.

(03-16:55p2012)

In the BCE data, progressive variant a only appears once, as illustrated in (3). Interestingly, the same speaker marks the same Spanish verb, grabar ‘record’, with de in (4):

(3) Go an dis said, man, gat di uman a grabar!

Go PREP DEM side DM got DEF woman PROG record

Go to this side, man, we’ve got the woman recording! [Sp. grabar ‘to record’]

(15-18:56np2012)

(4) Luk, dat uman de grabar!

Look DEM women PROG record

Look, that woman is recording! [Sp. grabar ‘to record’]

(18-015:56n2012)

Although no quantitative analysis of de and -in was conducted for this thesis, de occurs with higher frequency in the BCE data. Nonetheless, -in is not infrequent. Aceto (1995: 553, 1996a: 55, 1998: 40) observes that de and -in are used in free variation in BCE. According to Aceto (1998: 40), BCE speakers are well aware that -in may be attached to any verb in order to denote progressive aspect. Speakers are also able to produce syntactically parallel minimal pairs that contrast the two markers: yu mada kaalin unu and yu mada de kaal unu ‘Your mother is calling you’, with no meaning difference assigned to the contrast. Examples in the BCE data also support Aceto’s claim that de and -in are used to some extent in free variation appear (see below). There is also evidence, however, to suggest that -in is the choice variant in cases where BCE speakers are attempting to accommodate to English (again, see below). Nevertheless, the existent variation in
progressive marking in BCE need not be the result of any recent change/contact with English. Rather, the variation might have been present much earlier due to the socio-history (see 3.6) and demographics (see 3.7) of the BCE speech community.

Evidence for free variation between de and -in is found in (5), (6), (8), (9), (10), and (11). These examples illustrate how attestations of the same verb form are marked by both variants in the same sentence by the same speaker. This is illustrated by the verbs, kaal ‘call’ (5), tek ‘take’ (6), (7) luk ‘look’ (8), haid ‘hide’ (9), and tel ‘tel’ (10), (11).

In (5), progressive -in combines with epistemic necessity encoded in mosi (8.5.1); mosi also combines with de (see 8.5.1.1 for an example):

(5) _Mosi kaal-in sombodi. Im hav in han bai im mout. Nou_ 
MOD call-PROG somebody 3.SG have PREP hand PREP 3.SG.POSS mouth now 
_mosi di tuod doun die an di likl buoi de kaal im._ 
MOD DEF toad down there CONJ DEF little boy PROG call 3.SG 
He must be calling somebody. He has his hand by his mouth. Now it must be the toad down there, and the little boy is calling it. 
(06b-03:48p2012)

(6) _Im no de tek nuotis se di frag de get wet._ 
3.SG NEG PROG take notice CONJ DEF frog PROG get wet 
He’s not taking notice that the frog is getting wet. 
(07b-12:42p2012)

(7) _A duon tink him tek-in nuotis se di bii nes oba im_ 
1.SG NEG think 3.SG take-PROG notice CONJ DEF bee nest PREP 3.SG.POSS hed. 
head 
I don’t think he’s taking notice that the bee’s nest is over his head.
Wel, im de sit doun pan a smaal bench wid a daag.

Well 3.SG COP sit down PREP INDF small bench PREP INDF dog

luk-in pan a tuad ina botl. A pupi de luk doun ina

look-PROG PREP INDF toad PREP bottle INDF puppy PROG look down PREP
di bokl wi di tuad.

DEF bottle PREP DEF toad

Well, he is sat down on a bench with a dog, looking at a toad in a bottle. A puppy is looking down into the bottle with the toad.

(07b-12:42p2012)

Nou i luk laik di bii dem pik up di daag wel gud. An im

Now 3.SG look CONJ DEF bee PL pick up DEF dog well good CONJ 3.SG

haid-in, im de haid.

hide-PROG 3.SG PROG hide.

Now it looks like the bees are really catching up with the dog. And it’s hiding.

(07b-12:42p2012)

Aim tel-in yuu.

1.SG tell-PROG 2.SG

I am telling you.

(012-17:64n2012)

A de tel yu, duon giv a gud pliet a notin.

1.SG PROG tell 2.SG NEG give INDF good plate PREP nothing

I’m telling you, it doesn’t provide a good plate of nothing.

(012-17:64n2012)
In (12), the same verb, \textit{wach} ‘watch’, is marked by contrasting variants by different speakers:

(12) Speaker 1

\begin{verbatim}
Ya luk, dem wach-in yo aal oba, yo nuo.
\end{verbatim}

2.SG look 3.PL watch-PROG 2.SG all over, DM

You look, they’re watching you all over, you know. [Sp. ya ‘already’].
(12-17:64n2012)

Speaker 2

\begin{verbatim}
Aal ouba dem de wach mi, an a aftu luk pan dem tin.
\end{verbatim}

All over 3.PL PROG watch 1.SG CONJ 1.SG MOD look PREP DEM.PL thing

All over they were watching me, and I had to look at those things [cameras].
(12-05:40n2012)

In (13) and (14), the speaker is conversing with me, in fact, telling me a made-up story since he can’t remember any Anansi stories. He uses the same variant -\textit{in} consistently throughout the recording. It appears to be the more formal variant, appearing especially whenever I am being spoken to. There is also evidence of progressive constructions containing -\textit{in} that are marked by copula \textit{iz}, to mark the progressive overtly for present tense, as in \textit{iz V-in} (see 6.4.1.1.3):

(13) \begin{verbatim}
An him wach-in di ailan an di mada wach-in di ship.
\end{verbatim}

CONJ 3.SG watch-PROG DEF island CONJ DEF mother watch-PROG DEF ship

And he was watching the island and his mother was watching the ship.
(16-11:86fr2012)

(14) \begin{verbatim}
Jak waak-in roun an waak-in roun, an im hier som piipu
\end{verbatim}

Jack walk-PROG round CONJ walk-PROG round CONJ 3.SG hear some people

\begin{verbatim}
see a faachuun tela iz on di Land.
\end{verbatim}

see INDF fortune teller COP PREP DEF land
Jack was walking round and walking round, and he heard some people say that a fortune teller was on land.

(16-11:86fr2012)

Anecdotal evidence of stylistic considerations is evident in (15). The speaker of (15) is conversing with another BCE speaker (16), when her phone rings. She attempts to speak to the caller using the -in variant (15) but nobody answers. Subsequently, she turns to her interlocutor to say something to that effect, using de (16). A speculative analysis is that (15) is a set phrase that BCE speakers rely on for answering the phone.

(15)  *Hallo, huu spiik-in?*
Hello Q speak-PROG
Hello, who is speaking?
(09-6:87n2012)

(16)  *Nuobadi de taak.*
Nobody PROG talk
Nobody is talking.
(009-6:87n2012)

Finally, double progressive marking is also a phenomenon in BCE, albeit infrequent. Both (17) and (18) support the argument that speakers use de and -in interchangeably. In (17), main verb *ron* ‘run’ is marked by de and -in. In (18), *gwain,* which is a phonetically-reduced progressive form of *go-in* (see 6.4.1.1.1), co-occurs with preverbal de. Incidentally, the second attestation of *gwain* in (18) combines with copula wo to mark it for past:

(17)  *An di daag run, gwain, an aal di flai dem mosi de ron-in*
CONJ DEF dog run go.PROG CONJ all DEF fly PL MOD PROG ron-PROG
doun. *Mosi fi pik im di bii o di was.*
down MOD COMP pick 3.SG DEF bee CONJ DEF wasp
And the dog runs, going, and all the flies must be running down. Must be as a result of stinging him, the bees or the wasps.
(06a-03:48p2012)

(18) **Speaker 1**

*Bot  hou di  daag him  get fi  get chuo?*
CONJ Q  DEF dog  3.SG get COMP get throw
But how did the dog get thrown off?

**Speaker 2**

*Bika im  de  gwain  ahed.*
CONJ 3.SG PROG go.PROG ahead
Because it is/was going ahead.
(07a16:55p2012)

**Speaker 1**

*Aa  him  woz  gwain  ahed, okie.*
DM 3.SG COP.PST go.PROG ahead DM
Ah, it was going ahead, okay.
(07a12:42p2012)

6.4.1.1.1 *gwain* & *komin*

The high-frequency motion verbs resist the preverbal progressive variant *de* (6.4.1.1.2), found only in combination with verbal suffix variant *-in* (6.4.1.1.3), in the form of *komin* and *gwain*, which is a phonetically-reduced form of *go-in* (see 1.2.2 for information on grammaticalisation).

Examples of *gwain* include (19) and (20), which is negated in (21) by *no* (5.5.1.1):

(19) *Wich buot gwain  out  tu  sii deso?*

Q  boat go.PROG PREP PREP sea over.there
Which boat is going out to sea over there?
(13-9:46n2012)

(20)  Ai  gwain  doun deso  monde.
1.SG go.PROG  down over.there Monday
I’m going down there on Monday.
(13-09:46n2012)

(21)  Ai  no  gwain  no  bush.
1.SG NEG go.PROG NEG bush
I am not going into the jungle.
(10-17:64n2012)

There is also an attestation of *gwain* in the naturalistic data, uttered by a BCE speaker to a friend passing by his veranda, as in (22):

(22)  We  yo  gwain,  [anon.]?
Q 2.SG go.PROG
Where are you going, [anon.]?
(16-27:55n2012)

Progressive *komin* is illustrated in (23) and (24):

(23)  Speaker 1
An  children  afu  heng  op  dem  saks.
CONJ children MOD hang up PL  socks
And children had to hang up socks.
Speaker 2
Ka  santa  kom-in  tunait.
CONJ santa come-PROG tonight
Because Santa is coming tonight.
(11-10:66n2012)

(24) An janiweri kom-in; hier dem waan riez.
CONJ January come-PROG hear 3.PL want raise
And January is coming; hear they want to raise [the prices].
(12-17:64n2012)

6.4.1.1.1.1 Past

The evidence for gwain and komin appears to be that past marking is obligatory in combination with the progressive. Past copula wo combines with komin, as illustrated in (25) and (26) (see also 10.2.2.4.1):

(25) Yestidie ai si Mieri woz komin uol bank.
Yesterday 1.SG see Mary COP.PST come-PROG Ol’ Bank
Yesterday I saw Mary coming into Old Bank.
(17a-19:47e2012)

As evidenced in (26), when the temporal framework has been established as past, in this case overtly by wo in the preceding clause, then gwain may remain unmarked:

(26) Im tiif di hen an di jaiant woz kom-in an di wie,
3.SG steal DEF hen CONJ DEF giant COP.PST come-PROG CONJ DEF way
An wen i go-in wi di hen hala, “Master, master!”.
CONJ CONJ 3.SG go-PROG PREP DEF hen holler master master
He stole the hen and the giant was coming along the way, and when he was going the hen shouted, “Master, Master!”.
(16-11:86fr2012)
6.4.1.2 de

De is the progressive variant that occurs most frequently in the BCE naturalistic data. De frequently co-occurs with dynamic verbs to encode progressive aspect, namely, activities, accomplishments, and achievements (see 6.2.2). Incremental theme verbs (again, see 6.2.2) are not attested in the BCE naturalistic data (and this was not actively sought during fieldwork).

In (27) and (28), de combines with activities:

(27) Yie bot mi no de bai no muo. Ya!
   EXC CONJ 1.SG NEG PROG buy NEG more EXC
   Yes, but I’m not buying anymore. That’s it! [Sp. ya ‘already’, but used here as an exclamation]
   (06a-03:48n2012)

(28) Ka dem de sel dem bier tuu chiip.
   CONJ 3.PL PROG sell PL beer too cheap
   Because they’re selling beers too cheaply.
   (13-2:23n2012)

In, (29) and (30), de combines with achievements. In (29), de receives an iterative reading, which is a cross-linguistic effect of such stutation types when marked for progressive aspect (see 6.2.2):

(29) Di pikni-ni de sik op evri minit, man.
   DEF child-DIM PROG sick up every minute, EXC
   The child is being sick every minute, man.
   (15-18:56e2012)

In (30), the interpretation of de is entry into a state:
(30) *Di mango de raip op.*
DEF mango PROG ripe up
The mango is ripening up.
(15-18:56n2012)

In (31), the clause in which *de* is found is functioning as a complement clause of causative *gat* `got`:

(31) *An den nou, dem gat me de shuo di tuu difrens ting.*
CONJ then now 3.PL got 1.SG PROG show DEF two different thing
And then now, they have me showing the two different things.
(12-5:40n2012)

A subordinate clause containing *de* is illustrated in (32):

(32) *Dem tek out me de daans, me aluon.*
3.PL take out 1.SG PROG dance 1.SG alone
They picked me out, dancing, me alone.
(12-17:64n2012)

Negated progressive constructions are encoded by negator *no* (5.5.1.1):

(33) *Mi no de kiip notin ka mi waan bil mai ruum.*
1.SG NEG PROG keep nothing CONJ 1.SG want build 1.SG.POSS room
I am not keeping anything because I want to build my room.
(13-02:23n2012)

*BCE* *de* can be used with less time-stable ascriptive predicates (see 5.3.1.1) and also has a locative use (see 5.3.1.3). Thus, there is clearly some compatibility with stativity. Although the phenomenon of *de* in combination with stative verb is not recurrent in the BCE naturalistic data, one example is attested in the form of *gat* `get`, as illustrated in (34):
Here, the speaker explains that she is unable to buy any curtains due to a current lack of funds, as a result of saving up to make changes to her house in the New Year. The speaker is not wishing to imply that this state holds forever but that it is situational/temporary.

Finally, verbs marked for progressive aspect are often found unmarked for past tense, as in (35) and (36), which is also the case for -in (6.4.1.1.3):

(35) An dat de grabar yo wan taim, rait de?
    CONJ DEM PROG record 2.SG one time right there
    And that was recording you once, right there? [Sp. grabar ’to record’]
    (06a-03:48n2012)

(36) An wi de ron, wi hier som krokodail an wi de ron. An
    CONJ 1.PL PROG run 1.PL hear some crocodile CONJ 1.PL PROG run
    CONJ shi de ron fi paas mi an shi drap in a huol.
    3.SG PROG run COMP pass 1.SG CONJ 3.SG drop PREP INDF hole
    And we were running, we heard some crocodiles and we were running. And she was running past me, and she fell in a hole.
    (04-1:19n2012)

6.4.1.1.3 -in

As mentioned in (6.4.1.1), verbal suffix -in occurs slightly less frequently than de (6.4.1.1.2) and seems to serves as the more formal/acrolectal variant in cases where a speaker deems the situation to be such (see also 2.2).
Just like progresive variant de, -in combines with activities, as in (37):

(37) Wi afu sie wot di likl buoi du-in?
1.PL MOD say Q DEF little boy do-PROG
Do we have to say what the little boy is doing?
(06a-03:48p2012)

Progressive -in marks verbs in complement clauses, as in (38) and (39), the latter a speech verb complement:

(38) Kaa dem nuo yuu beg-in.
CONJ 3.PL know 2.SG beg-PROG
Because they know you are begging.
(14-19:472012)

(39) Evri taim de kom ai se mi fut hurt-in mi.
Every time 3.PL come 1.SG say 1.SG.Poss foot hurt-PROG 1.SG
Every time they come I say my foot is hurting me.
(05-6:87n2012)

In (40) and (41), there is evidence that nominalised verbs are formed by both marking the verb with -in and modifying it with an article, more precisely in these examples, the indefinite article:

(40) Aal huu mek propaganda get a pie-in.
All Q make propaganda get INDF pay-PROG
Everyone who appears in an advertisement receives a payment.
(12-17:64n2012)

(41) Krismos wi tek far a visit-in dier.
Christmas 1.PL take PREP INDF visit-PROG there
At Christmas we’ll make a visit there.

(14-19:47n2012)

Just as in the case of progressive variant *de*, stative verbs may also be marked by *-in*, as illustrated in (42). The progressive marking on *liv* ‘live’, once again, emphasises the temporal nature of the situation, much in the same way as English *living* (see 6.4.1):

(42) *Neks die maanin wen im luk dier wo liki tiela. Im se, “Yu stil liv-in?”.*

The next morning when he looked there was the little tailor. He said, “Are you still living?”.

(16-11:86fr2012)

Like *de*, verbs marked for progressive aspect are often found unmarked for past tense:

(43) *An tuu men kom shuoan sed dem shuerch-in far a farchuun teta.*

And two men came ashore and said they were searching for a fortune teller.

(16-11:86fr2012)

6.4.1.1.3.1 *iz*

In the JC mesolect, *-in* appears unmarked or with invariant *iz* and *woz* in present and past contexts, respectively, and with inflected forms of *be* found in the upper mesolect (Patrick 2007: 130). Nevertheless, as explained in (3.4.3), the sociolinguistic situation of the JC speech community compared to that of the BCE community is quite different. In BCE, *iz* occasionally forms part of a progressive construction with verbal suffix *-in*, as in (44).
Progressive constructions are also occasionally marked by *wo* for an overt past tense reading (see 7.5.4.2), and the evidence in both cases is that BCE speakers are approximating English as a result of being recorded (see also 6.4.1.1).

In (44), the speaker is telling me one of his own stories. It demonstrates that BCE speakers have access to this acrolectal progressive construction, and in this case, he not only uses the verbal suffix *-in* rather than *de* but also marks it overtly for present tense via *iz*:

(44)  An im tel im mada a ship iz kom-*in*, an im
CONJ 3.SG tell 3.SG mother INDF ship COP come-PROG CONJ 3.SG
gwain an get a wouk.
gwain.PROG CONJ get INDF work
And he told his mother a ship is coming, and he is going to get a job.
(16-11:86fr2012)

In (45), both verbs in the progressive are marked by *-in*. The first appears on its own, whereas the second appears as an acrolectal progressive construction, combining with *iz*. The speaker here is acting as my consultant and is reading a picture book story with a fellow speaker:

(45)  Rrait di frag in di bakl an di daag, laik, him trai-*in* tu
Right DEF frog PREP DEF bottle CONJ DEF dog DM 3.SG try-PROG COMP
get out di frag but di likl buoi iz luk-*in*.
get out DEF frog CONJ DEF little boy COP look-PROG
Right, the frog is in the bottle, like, it’s trying to get out and the frog is looking.
(03-16:55p2012)

The following excerpt in (46) illustrates the inconsistent pattern of progressive marking between the absence and presence of the copula with *-in*. Here, *luk* ‘look’ is marked by *-in* but also by *iz + V-*in*. Furthermore, verbal complementiser *tu*, not *fi*, is identifiable,
whereas in (47), de and fi appear. In BCE, tu represents the acrolect and fi, the basilect. The speaker of (46) as well (45) also uses duon elsewhere in the same recording rather than no (see discussion in 5.5.1.3). There is also an attestation of luk tu + verb to mean prospective aspect (see 7.6.3):


look-PROG PREP DEF hole

The little boy has taken him out and is hugging him. (The) little boy is calling, whistling, and the dog is jumping off. Some bees are flying. There’s a tree with a hole. (The) little boy is calling, must be to see if the frog is in there. He has gone and he is looking in a hole and the dog is barking at the bees. When he was looking in the hole, a rat came out, and he is frightened. He is looking. The dog is about to jump on the bees. And the dog is jumping on to the tree and the rat is looking. The boy gets on the tree and is looking in the hole.
Di daag de trai fi jump an di nes.
DEF dog PROG try COMP jump CONJ DEF nest
The dog is trying to jump on the nest.

6.4.2 Continuative stie de

In BCE, stie + progressive de (6.4.1.1.2) encodes the continuative aspect, equivalent in meaning to ‘keep V-ing’, appearing to share the same function as African American English (AAE) steady (see 6.5.3). The verb ‘stay’ is actually a typical source for the progressive cross-linguistically (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 128-9). BCE stie typically marks activities (see 6.2.2), which are obligatorily marked for progressive.

In (48), stie de marks main verb luk ‘look’ for continuative aspect (6.3):

 Ai sii eribadi de luk pan mi, jus stie de luk pan dem
1.SG see everybody PROG look PREP 1.SG just CONT PROG look PREP 3.PL

 too CONJ 1SG NEG PST notice 3.PL 1SG NEG PROG look PREP face
I saw everybody looking at me, just continued looking at them too because I hadn’t
noticed them. I wasn’t looking at face(s).

According to Bybee et al. (1994: 127), continuative aspect includes the progressive in its meaning, i.e., that a dynamic situation is ongoing, with the additional meaning that the agent of the action is deliberately keeping the action going. Typical lexical sources for continuatives are ‘all’, ‘plural’ ‘sit’, ‘remain’, ‘live’, and ‘go’. ‘All’ and ‘plural’ are also sources for iteratives (again, see 6.5.3), whereas the remaining sources are typical of progressives. Bybee et al. (1994: 165) also observe that such formal continuative marking
may develop directly from auxiliaries whose meaning is either equivalent to ‘keep on’ or from adverbs such as ‘often’. However, in the case of BCE, it is a combination of stie + de that encodes the continuative, as stie on its own does not encode progressive aspect in its meaning.

In (49), grammatical borrowing from Spanish has occurred, where siige (from seguir ‘continue’) has replaced stie. Here, siige exemplifies the replication of linguistic ‘matter’ from Spanish (Matras 2009: 236) (see also concluding remarks in 11.3). Both siige and stie combine with progressive marking on the verb, however, the type of marking differs between the two examples, de in (48) and -in in (49). Whether this distinction in progressive marking correlates to the language in which the verb is expressed remains inconclusive:

(49) But yu kiaan ansa, yo afu siige adapt-in.
    CONJ. 2.SG MOD answer 2SG. MOD CONT adapt-PROG
    But you cannot just answer, you’ve got to continue improvising.
    (13-2:23n2012)

6.4.3 Habituality

6.4.3.1 Definition
Habituals typically describe a repeated situation characteristic of an extended period of time:

Sentences with habitual aspectual meaning refer not to a sequence of situations recurring at intervals, but rather to a habit, a characteristic situation that holds at all times (Comrie 1985:39).

De Haan (2011: 452) states that languages may make a distinction between past and present habituality. Carlson (2012: 835) observes that if a language has an imperfective form but no grammatical marker to code habitual aspect, the imperfective will almost
certainly express that meaning alongside the progressive. According to De Haan (2011: 452), cross-linguistically it is not uncommon to find a special form for either present or past habituality, in which case the other tense is encoded via another grammatical form. The habitual changes viewpoint aspect (6.2.1), marking a regular pattern of repetitive phases, thus a habit of some kind. With dynamic verbs, the habitual encodes a characteristically re-occurring situation.

Present habitual in BCE is encoded via doz (6.4.3.1.1), which is found across the CECs (see 3.2). It is attested in NC (Bartens 2002: 119), SA, and PI (Bartens 2013b: 108). A habitual marker in the form of stodi is attested in SA and PI (Bartens 2009: 310), as well as NC (Koskinen 2007: 51; cited in Bartens 2009: 309-10). BCE stodi marks iterativity (see 6.5.3). NC stodi marks both present and past contexts, although it also has a ‘mesolectal’ present habitual in the form of doz (Bartens 2013a). Bartens (2009: 310) considers doz an acrolectal marker, typical of CECs such as Barbadian (BC), Bahamian, and Virgin Islands CE. As in BCE, doz is also restricted to present contexts in intermediate CECs (again, see 3.2) such as BC and Trinidadian, and urban Guyanese Creole (GC) (Winford 2006: 39).

Doz is attested in BelC (Escure 2013), although Winford (2006: 39) claims its use is relatively rare in this variety and that it is restricted to past habitual contexts. Escure (2013: 95) claims that wuda is the past habitual marker of BelC. In BCE, both yuustu (6.4.3.1.2), and wud (6.4.3.1.3) are found in past habitual contexts, albeit the latter with a more specific meaning of past propensity. As mentioned in (6.4.3.1), JC has no present habitual marker, the notion of habituality in present contexts being conveyed by the progressive marker (Farquharson 2013: 85). In this case, the discourse context and surrounding linguistic material help speakers to arrive at the correct interpretation. Winford (2006: 39) remarks that it is interesting that the use of doz has not been attested for JC, despite its close affinity with BelC. This marker was most likely introduced into BelC by Afro-Antillean immigrants from the Eastern Caribbean (see also 3.2, 3.5 and 3.6), its restriction to past habituality somethings of a peculiarity (Winford 2006: 39-40). This would also explain its presence in the speech of BCE speakers, many of whom came (or have family
who came) from Barbados (see 3.7 for demographics). The form *doz* is also not present in Limon Creole, an English Creole spoken in Costa Rica (see 3.2), (Herzfeld 1983: 30). Finally, BCE shares a structurally similar past habitual form, *yuustu*, with BelC, JC (Winford 2001: 170), NC (Bartens 2013a: 119), as well as SA and PI (Bartens 2013b: 108). Neither JC nor Limon Creole, the latter spoken in neighbouring Costa Rica, has a TMA marker dedicated to present habituality (Herzfeld 1983: 30). It is claimed that *doz* entered BCE through BC, since this is where the second largest group of Afro-Antilleans (see 3.5; also 3.5.1) who immigrated to Panama came from (see 3.7 for demographics) (Herzfeld 1983: 30).

Whilst present habitual is encoded by *doz* in BCE, past habitual contexts are identifiable by the presence of *yuustu* (6.4.3.1.2). When *doz* and *yuustu* mark stative verbs, the resulting meaning is ‘generally-speaking’. Present habitual contexts can also be expressed by the unmarked verb, often where temporal adverbials of frequency are present in the clause (7.4.1). BCE *wud* (6.4.3.1.3) expresses past propensity and is included in this section on habituality.

6.4.3.1.1 *doz*

BCE *doz* marks dynamic verbs for habituality, expressing a characteristically re-occurring situation, as illustrated in (50):

(50)  

\[ {\text{Fren } \textit{doz} \textit{ bai fish an tin-z.} } \]  

Friend HAB buy fish CONJ thing-PL  
Friends often buy fish and things.  
(01b-4:77nr2012)

*Doz* combines with progressive *de* (6.4.1.1.2), as in (51), in which case *doz* is the outer marker so that viewpoint marker *doz* has scope over *de*:

(51)  

\[ {\text{Ina wi langwij, } \textit{doz de taak so.} } \]
In our language, usually talking like this.
(06a-03:48p2012)

The crucial distinction between doz and stodi (6.5.3), is that doz describes a dynamic situation that is necessarily typical or characteristic of any agent, as in (52), (53), (54), (55), whereas iterative stodi simply stresses the ongoing nature of a dynamic situation on several occasions. Activities and accomplishments (see 6.2.2) are found in the BCE data co-occurring with doz. However, achievements in such contexts were not actively pursued during fieldwork. However, Comrie (1976: 30) makes the following observation:

Any situation that can be protracted sufficiently in time, or that can be iterated a sufficient number of times over a long enough period, and this means, in effect, almost any situation, can be expressed as a habitual.

In (52) and (53), doz co-occurs with activities. In (54) and (55), doz co-occurs with accomplishments, although in (54), it is unclear whether the process or endpoint is in focus:

(52)  An wi gat dem daag wa mek tuu moc nais an doz
CONJ 1.PL got PL dog REL make too much noise CONJ HAB
mad-in eribadi, mad-in di nieba dem an eritin.
mad-PROG everybody mad-PROG DEF neighbour PL CONJ everything
And we’ve got dogs that make too much noise and are regularly annoying everybody, annoying the neighbours and everyone.
(04-22:21n2012)

(53)  Ai sii [anon.] doz du dat fa krismas, bail bred kien.
1.SG see [anon.] HAB do DEM PREP Christmas boil bread cane
I see [anon.] always doing that for Christmas, boiling ‘bred kien’ [a starchy root vegetable]
(11-13:60n2012)

(54) *But ai doz riid mai baiburl.*
CONJ 1.SG HAB read my bible
But I regularly read my bible.
(07a-12:55n2012)

In (55), the speaker is referring to the BCE Christmas tradition of providing an open house to any member of the community. Here, the outcome of the activity is expressed via *ñam up* ‘eat up’:

(55) A no waan nobadi kom hier kaaa wen dem kom dem doz ñam up
1.SG NEG want nobody come hear CONJ CONJ 3.PL come 3.PL HAB eat up
yo ting an doz taak yo afa.
2.SG.POSS thing CONJ HAB talk 2.SG after
I do not want anybody coming here because when they come, they always eat up your things and always talk to you afterwards.
(13-2:24n2012)

When *doz* co-occurs with stative verbs, the meaning is less to do with frequency and one of ‘generally-speaking’, as in (56), (57), (58):

(56) *Yie bukaa fors, wi wo de tink tu mek inbitieshan, but*
EXC CONJ first 1.PL COP.PST PROG think COMP make invitation CONJ
wen yo mek inbitieshan laik pipurl doz fiil laik foni yie.
CONJ 2.Sg make invitation DM people HAB feel DM funny EXC
Yeh, because at first, we were thinking about making invitations, but when you make invitations, like, people, generally-speaking, feel, like, uncomfortable.
(07a-16:55n2012)
(57) \textit{Wii doz laik selebriet eritin.}

1.PL HAB like celebrate everything
Generally-speaking, we like to celebrate everything.
(07a-16:55n2012)

(58) \textit{Aal di taim di waata doz hat bu nou i get kuol.}

All DEF time DEF water HAB hot CONJ now 3.SG get cold
The water, generally-speaking, is always hot but now it gets cold.
(20-19:47e2012)

\textit{Doz} also readily combines with non-epistemic necessity \textit{afu} (9.3.2.2), as illustrated in (59). The speaker reassures her interlocutor that the end times currently predicted by some members of the BCE community need not be feared, suggesting they just put their faith in God:

(59) \textit{Notin waan hapin fi kil, but wi doz afu get fiet}

Nothing PRPASP happen COMP kill CONJ 1.PL HAB MOD have faith
\textit{an nuo an se, “Wel”}. CONJ know CONJ say well
Nothing is going to happen to kill us, but, generally-speaking, we’ve just got to have faith and know, and say, “Well”.
(08-16:55n2012)

According to Dahl (1985: 99), the habitual may (but need not) express gnomic/generic sentences of the kind ‘Cats meow’. Here, the generic cases should be considered a secondary use of the habitual category, although in fact the habitual and generic uses are believed to be equally well established, an example of which is (60). Such sentences “describe the typical behaviour or characteristic properties of a species, a kind, or an individual”. An overt and unequivocal TMA marker for encoding generic sentences is
believed to be rare (Dahl 1985: 99). Most frequently, such sentences appear cross-linguistically in the simple present (7.2) (Dahl 1985: 100):

(60) *Ka abeja africana doz liv into dis kain a bii nes.*

CONJ bee African HAB live PREP DEM kind PREP bee nest

Because African bees live in this kind of bee’s nest.

[Sp. *abeja* ‘bee’; *Africana* ‘African’]

(07b-12:42p2012)

6.4.3.1.1.1 *duon*

In JC, the form *duon(t)* is attested, which is described as a negated imperfective negator of the JC mesolectal (Patrick 2007: 137). JC *duon(t)* is not restricted to habitual or psychic state verbs, indeed, JC has no present habitual marker unlike BCE (see 6.4.3.1). JC *duon(t)* is also found in negative imperatives and generally occurs more frequently than JC *nat*. JC *duon(t)* is ‘tense neutral’ (Patrick 2007: 137).

In BCE, when both stative and dynamic verbs are encoded via *duon*, the meaning that arises is ‘not generally-speaking’, as illustrated in (61), (62), (63), (64), (65). This TMA marker is not tense neutral (like in JC) and is restricted to present situations (see discussion on past negator *neva* in 6.4.3.1.2.1). Finally, in contrast to the equivalent form in JC, *duon* does not appear to function as a negative tag on declaratives of either polarity (Patrick 2007: 137):

(61) *Ai duon sleep and ai kiaan sliip dee niida.*

1.SG NEG sleep CONJ 1.SG MOD.NEG sleep day neither

I don’t, generally-speaking, sleep [at night] and I can’t sleep during the day either.

(17-010:64n2012)

(62) *Yie, no lai, mi tel em somtaim a waan go church, but ai duon*  

EXC NEG lie 1.SG tell 3.PL sometime 1.SG want go church CONJ 1.SG NEG
gat dres fi go church.
got dress COMP go church
Yeh, no lie, I tell them sometimes I want to go to church, but I don’t, generally-speaking, have a dress to go in.
(07a-16:55n2012)

(63) An wi duon get tu bai an di shop sel.
CONJ 1.PL NEG get COMP buy CONJ DEF shop sell
And, generally-speaking, we don’t have the possibility to buy (yuca) but the shop sells (it).
(01b-04:77nr2012)

(64) Di shop dem doz sel yuuka, an wi duon bai fam di shap.
DEF shop 3.PL HAB sell yuca CONJ 1.PL NEG buy PREP DEF shop
The shop, generally-speaking, regularly sells yuca, but we don’t buy from the shop.
(01b-4:77nr2012)

(65) Mi duon laik taak.
1.SG NEG like talk
I don’t, generally-speaking, like to talk.
(13-9:46n2012)

Ascriptive predicates also receive a ‘not generally-speaking’ interpretation when they co-occur with duon, as illustrated in (66) and (67):

(66) Mi gud in di die but in di nait mi duon gud.
1.SG good PREP DEF day CONJ PREP DEF night 1.SG NEG.HAB good
I’m alright during the day but during the night, generally-speaking, I’m not well.
(08-16:55n2012)
(67) Speaker 1

Mi no de plie dem ting bout. Laad! Ashiem. Shiem fi wat?

1.SG NEG PROG play PL thing PREP EXC ashamed PREP Q

I’m not messing about those things. Lord! Ashamed? Ashamed of what?

Speaker 2

Wat wi iz fi shiem fa?

Q 1.PL COP MOD shame PREP

What are we supposed to be embarrassed for?

(12-17:64n2012)

Speaker 1

Wi duon shiem. Rait den. Wel gud.

1.PL NEG.HAB shame right then well good

We don’t, generally-speaking, get embarrassed. Right then. Well good.

(12-05:40n2012)

6.4.3.1.2  yuustu

BCE has a past habitual form in yuustu. Again, like doz (6.4.3.1.1), the meaning of yuustu is ‘generally-speaking’ with stative verbs (in past contexts).

Dynamic verbs are encoded for past habituality in (68), (69), (70), (71):

(68) Dem yuustu biit mi plenti kaaz a yuustu bihieb bad.

3.PL HAB.PST beat 1.SG plenty CONJ 1.SG HAB.PST behave bad

They used to beat me a lot because I used to behave badly.

(04-01:19n2012)

(69) Wi yuustu plaant yuuka, plantin banana.

1.PL HAB.PST plant yuka plantain banana

We used to grow yucca, plantain.

(01b-4:77nr2012)
(70)  dat  miin  dat  [anon.]  yuustu  dronk  eribadi.
     DEM  mean  DEM  [anon.]  HAB.PST  drunk  everybody
     He was mean that. [anon.] used to make everybody drunk.
     (11-13:60n2012)

(71)  Dem  piipl  yuustu  taak  di  riil  guari-guari.
     DEM.PL  people  HAB.PST  talk  DEF  real  guari-guari
     Those people used to talk the real Guari-Guari.
     (15-18:56nr2012)

Stative verbs and ascriptive predicates that denote proper inclusion (see 5.3.1.1)
acquire a meaning akin to ’generally-speaking’, as in (72) and (73). In the case of
ascriptive aspects that denote stable qualities (again, see 5.3.1.1), the meaning describes a
characteristic property, as in (74) and (75):

(72)  Wen  shi  wo  likl,  shi  yuustu  laik  sing  aal  di  taim.
     CONJ  3.SG  COP.PST  little  3.SG  HAB.PST  like  sing  all  DEF  time
     When she was little, she used to like to sing all the time.
     (17a19:47e2012)

(73)  Dem  se  Uol  Bank  woz  a  adventis  plies,  eribadi  yuustu  adventis.
     3.PL  say  ol’  bank  COP.PST  INDF  adventist  place  everybody  HAB.PST  adventist
     They say that Old Bank was an Adventist place, everybody used to be, generally-
speaking, an Adventist.
     (07a-12:42n2012)

(74)  Di  waata  yuustu  hat  an  i  get  kuol  nou.
     DEF  water  HAB.PST  hot  CONJ  3.SG  get  cold  now
     The water, generally-speaking, used to be hot, but it gets cold now.
As mentioned in (1.3), copula **bii** is triggered in the presence of TMA markers. Although the copula is not required when **yuustu** co-occurs with ascriptive predicates, as exemplified in (73) and (74), it is in the case of (75) since **red an porpul** ‘red and purple’ is elided. Two further copulas are identifiable in (75), namely, **woz** (7.5.4.1.1) and **iz** (5.3.1.1):

(75) **Speaker 1**

*Out a wan gialan ya mek tuu bika dat ting wo sorop.*
Out of one gallon 2.SG make two CONJ DEM ting COP.PST syrup
Out of one gallon you made two because that thing was (like) syrup.

**Speaker 2**

*Dat iz red o wait?*
DEM COP red CONJ white
Is that red or white?

(11-13:60n2012)

**Speaker 1**

*Red an porpul i yuustu bii.*
Red CONJ purple 3.SG HAB.PST COP
Red and purple it (characteristically) used to be.

(11-18:56n2012)

6.4.3.1.2.1 **neva**

Mirroring the patter of **duon** (see 6.4.3.1.1.1), when dynamic and stative verbs are marked by **neva**, the interpretation is ‘not generally-speaking’ but in past temporal contexts.

Examples of dynamic verbs marked by **neva** are illustrated in (76), (77), (78), (79):

(76) *Laas yier a neva gaan no biesbal. A se a no gwain*
Last year I didn’t go to any baseball (games). I said I wasn’t going to any [lit. none].

(12-05:40n2012)

(77) **But, wel, wi neva sii notin laik dat bifuoa.**

CONJ DM 1.PL NEG.PST see nothing PREP DEM before

But, well, we’d never see anything like that before.

(08-16:55n2012)

(78) **Ai neva sii dem stail bifuoa. Optu dis muanin a tel-in**

1.SG NEG.PST see DEM.PL style before PREP DEM morning 1.Sg tell-PROG

[anon.], a se fos taim, wi no sii dem kain a fuulish tin unu

[anon.] 1.SG say first time 1.PL NEG see dem.PL kind PREP foolish thing 2.PL
gat ina unu hed. We kain a tin i dat nou?!

got PREP 2.PL.POSS head Q kind PREP thing 3.SG DEM now

I’ve never seen that fashion before. Even this morning I was telling [anon.], I said at first, we didn’t see those sorts of foolish things you lot have got in your heads!

What sort of thing is that now?!

(08-16:55n2012)

(79) **But ai neva biliib into dem tin-z.**

CONJ 1.SG NEG.PST believe PREP DEM.PL thing-PL

But I didn’t believe in those things.

(08-08:46n2012)

Stative verbs are marked by neva, as in (80) and (81), and ascriptive predicates, as in (82) (see also 5.3.1.1):
1. SG COP.PST nasty 1. SG NEG.PST like comb 1. SG.Poss hair
I was terrible (when I was a child). I did not like having my hair combed.
(04-01:19n2012)

DEM.PL now time much NEG.PST have plenty big motor
Now, those times many (people) didn’t have many big motors.
(02a-16:55nr2012)

1. PL NEG.PST COP.PST INDF church 1. PL COP.PST just INDF little group
We were not a church; we were just a little group.
(07a-12:42n2012)

TMA marker neva is not constrained to the meaning of ’not generally-speaking’ in past contexts (see 7.5 for further information on the interaction of tense and negation). Neva, for example, negates locative predicates for negated simple past (see 7.5.4.1), dynamic verbs for negated counter-presupposition (see 7.5.1.2), and both dynamic verbs and statives in the protasis of unreal conditionals (5.4.1.1.2).

6.4.3.1.3 wud

There is evidence in the BCE data that wud is the past tense form of wi (7.6.4), the latter an absolute future marker. The main meaning of wi is propensity, and one of the meanings of wud (see also 10.2.1.1) is past propensity, as in (83) and (84). The semantic distinction between past propensity and past habituality is nuanced (see 6.4.3), the former emphasising an inclination or natural tendency to behave in a particular way. Although the meaning of past propensity was not actively pursued during fieldwork, this semantic context is found in the naturalistic data for both wi (unmarked for past) and wud. That is, if the temporal frame has been clearly established, wi is accepted by BCE speakers (again,
see 7.6.4). Although *wud* (in contrast to *wuda*) may also have a counterfactual reading, its frequency is low. More data is required, but the distribution of *wud/wuda* may well correlate with the difference in meaning between past propensity and counterfactuality.

In (83), both *wud* and past habitual *yuustu* (6.4.3.1.2) appear:

(83)  *Hie yuustu hav a lat a patwa piipl fios. Somtaim wi sie*

Here HAB.PST have INDF lot PREP patwa people first sometime 1.PL say

*something an mai mam wud sie...*

There used to be a lot of patois-speaking people here at first. Sometimes we would say something, and my mum would say...

(15-18:56nr2012)

In (84), the speaker is recalling a baseball event she went to with friends, at which they were asked if they would be willing to be filmed. Despite not being paid for it, she remembers they asked for some money:

(84)  *An dem wud iivn se, “wel, waan fiftiin dala. Dem waan luk pan wii*

CONJ 3.PL MOD even say well want fifteen dollar 3.PL want look PREP 1.PL

*an gi wi iich wan a wi”.*

CONJ give 1.PL each one PREP 1.PL

And they would even say, “Well, (we) want fifteen dollars. They want to film us, then give us, each one of us”.

(12-5:40n2012)

In 0, the speaker is recalling what some of her children used to say to her little boy:

(85)  *Laik, som a mai-s kid-z wud sie tu mai likl buoi,*

DM some PREP 1.SG.POSS-PL kid-PL MOD say PREP 1.SG.POSS little boy

*wud sie tu [anon], him smuok-in an im waan [anon.] mek*
MOD say PREP [anon.] 3.SG smoke-PROG CONJ 3.SG want [anon.] make [anon.] go an smuok an him sie [anon.], “[anon.], rich op!”.
[anon.] go CONJ smoke CONJ 3.SG say [anon.] [anon.] reach up
Like, some of my kids would say to my little boy, would say to [anon.], (say) he (one of the boys) is smoking and he wants [anon.] to make [anon.] smoke, and he says to [anon.], “[anon.], come here!”.
(17a-10:47nr2012)

(86), the meaning of wud is not past propensity. At the same time, it is difficult to claim that the clause in which wud occurs is part of a conditional sentence (again, see 10.2.1.1). It could be that some sort of remote possibility is being expressed here:

(86)  Laik, ai wuda smok-in wid yu wan, an...
DM 1.SG MOD smoke-PROG PREP 2.SG one CONJ
Like, (say) I were smoking one [a joint] with you, and....
(17a-19:47nr2012)

English would may mark ‘futurity’, e.g., *Only a few months later their love would change to hate* (Huddleston 2002: 197). This meaning of wud is unattested for in the BCE data, since it was not actively pursued during elicitation sessions. This use of English would is distinct from a non-actualised future-in-the-past interpretation (10.2.2.4), since actualisation is entailed (Huddleston 2002: 198). Finally, wuda is claimed to be the past habitual marker of BelC (Escure 2013: 95).

### 6.5 Interaction of verbs with lexical aspect

#### 6.5.1 Inchoative

In some languages, the notion of change-of-state is encoded grammatically, for example, in Latin it is marked inflectionally (Lehmann 1999: 45). Inchoative markers in JC are get, kom and tiurn (go is a prospective aspect marker) (Winford 1993: 187). In JC, when the
progressive marker combines with some stative predicates it produces an inchoative reading (Farquharson 2013: 86). The inchoative markers in BCE are go and get (6.5.1.1), and less frequently, kom and tiurn (6.5.1.1.1) (see discussion on lexical aspect in 6.2.2). In BCE, go does not encode prospective aspect, which is instead encoded via gwain (see 7.6.2.1.2).

6.5.1.1 go & get
Inchoative markers go and get combine with ascriptive predicates, as illustrated in (87), (88), (89). Go and get encode the change leading to the state, therefore, when they combine with property concepts such as qualities, the resulting interpretation is a dynamic predicate (see 6.2.2; see also 5.3.1.1 for the distinction between properties involving proper inclusion and those involving qualities). In turn, inchoative aspect may co-occur with progressive aspect (6.4.1), as in (90).

(87)  Mek eritin go bad.
Make everything INCH bad
[It] ruins everything.
(10-15:19n2012)

(88)  Di pikni get sik plenti.
DEF child INCH sik plenty
The child gets sick a lot.
(00-26:21e2012)

(89)  Di skai get red evri iivnin.
DEF sky INCH red every evening
The sky gets red every evening.
(00-26:21e2012)
When inchoative *get* combines with progressive marking, the gradual process of the change is emphasised. In (90), (91), (92), (93), progressive marking appears in the form of *de* (6.4.1.2), and in (94) by *-in* (6.4.1.3):

(90)  *Di waata di kuol but i de get hat.*
DEF water PST cold CONJ 3.SG PROG INCH hot
The water was cold, but it’s becoming hot.
(17a-19:47e2012)

(91)  *An den nou, di tin de get haad nou. An bekaaz a wat?*
CONJ then now DEF thing PROG INCH hard now CONJ CONJ PREP Q
And so now, things are starting to get hard now. And because of what?
(12-17:64n2012)

(92)  *Dem de get raip.*
3.PL PROG INCH ripe
They are getting ripe.
(17a-19:47e2012)

(93)  *Di skai de get red.*
DEF sky PROG INCH red
The sky is getting red.
(19c-19:47e2012)

(94)  *Di mango dem get-in raip.*
DEF mango 3.PL INCH-PROG ripe
The mangos are getting ripe.
(17a-19:47e2012)

*Go* has its own progressive form, *gwain* (6.4.1.1.1), as illustrated in (95):
(95) Skai gwain red dis iivnin.
Sky PRPASP red DEM evening
The sky is turning red this evening.
(15-21:64e2012)

Relative/prospective aspect waan (7.6.2.2) in (96) encodes prediction in its semantics. The semantics of relative/prospective variant gwain (7.6.2.1.2) is intention rather than prediction, thus when it co-occurs with ascriptive predicates it encodes inchoative aspect, as in (95) (see 7.6.2 for the distinction in meaning between relative/prospective variants waan and gwain):

(96) Di skai waan red dis iivnin.
DEF sky PRPASP red DEM evening
The sky will be red this evening
(17a-19:47e2012)

6.5.1.1.1 Kom & tiurn

There is evidence that kom ‘come’ (97) and tiurn ‘turn’ (98) may also function as inchoative markers in BCE:

(97) Nex die wen Jak gaan di biin-z sprou, an Jak wach-in
Next day CONJ Jack go.PST DEF bean-PL sprout CONJ Jack watch-PROG
di biin-z. An im grou dem til de gaan, kom big.
DEF bean-PL CONJ 3.SG grow DEM.PL PREP 3.PL go.PST INCH big
The next day when Jack went (to the) the bean sprouts, and Jack was watching the beans. And he grew them until they went, got big.
(16-11:86fr2012)

(98) An vor dem get, tiurn raip? Dem mango dem tiurn-in,
CONJ before 3.PL INCH INCH ripe 3.PL mango 3.PL INCH-PROG
get-in    raip.
INCH-PROG ripe

And before they get, turn ripe? The mangos are turning ripe, getting ripe.
(17a-19:47e2012)

6.5.2 Complete don

Cross-linguistically, the completive signals that a situation has been carried out thoroughly and completely (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 57). Based on cross-linguistic surveys of the completive, lexical sources from which the completive arises tend to be dynamic verbs related to action or movement, e.g., ‘finish’, ‘(put) into’, ‘be lost’, ‘be all gone’, ‘dry in sun’, ‘go’, and ‘put’, in addition to directionals (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 59). Completive markers that have as their source a lexical verb meaning ‘finish’ have the potential to develop into perfects (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 61) (see 7.4.2).

TMA marker *don* is a form that is attested across the CECS (see 3.2) to mark completive aspect, but in distinct ways. Included in the semantics of *don* in JC (Durrleman 2000: 217) and BelC (Winford 2006: 44) is ‘finish’, in which case it functions as a main verb, but also ‘completive’ and ‘already’. The completive meaning in JC arises with accomplishments (see 6.2.2) (Durrleman 2000: 217). According to Winford (1993: 48), JC *don* may also encode ‘finish altogether’, combining with activities, e.g., ‘smoke’, to mean ‘stop smoking altogether’. JC *don* is also found in a post-VP configuration, subsequently losing its ‘already’ meaning (Durrleman 2000: 217). Whereas in BahCE (Hackert 2004: 83-84) and BelC (Winford 2006: 44), the ‘already’ sense of *don* combines with dynamic verbs in addition to stative verbs as well as ascriptive predicates (specifically physical properties such as ‘ripe’ and ‘dead’) (5.3.1.1), equative predicates (5.3.1.2), and locative predicates (5.3.1.3), it is constrained to co-occurring with dynamic verbs and physical properties in JC, to mark a change-of-state (Winford 1993: 187-88).

In Guyanese Creole, preverbal *don* (in contrast to its VP-final counterpart) places no restrictions on the type of ascriptive predicate it appears with (Winford 1993: 52),
occurring with ascriptive predicates such as ‘tall’; also combining with locative and equative predicates. Winford (2000: 433) observes that completive aspect in all the Surinamese Creoles is marked with a verb phrase final kaba (formally similar to a main verb ‘finish’), which is compatible with both stative and dynamic situations (see also Winford 2006: 102, Winford and Migge 2007: 84-85, Borges, Muysken et al. 2017: 328). In Sranan Creole, kaba expresses the sense of ‘already’ and functions in ways quite similar to the perfect (Winford 2000: 433), believed to have reached an advanced stage of semantic development, having been generalised to all types of predicate (Winford 2000: 435). Finally, in African American English (AAE) a phonetic realisation of don combines with a verb in the -ed form; it is unstressed and there is no corresponding emphatic form, and is distinguishable from ‘done’, the past participle form of the verb ‘do’ (Green 2002: 60). AAE don not only signals that a situation has ended, but also expresses perfect of result, existential perfect, and perfect in a recent past (see 7.4.2 for definitions and examples of the perfect in BCE) (Green 2002: 61). AAE don combines with ‘remote’ past marker bin, although the difference in meaning between don bin and the equivalent without don is not entirely clear, the speculation being that the addition of don emphasises the resultant state (2002: 67).

In BCE, don first of all functions as a main verb meaning ‘finish’ that takes a verb complement, signalling that the natural endpoint of the process leading up to the outcome has been reached (Smith 1991: 49-50). In this respect, don marks a change in lexical aspect (see 6.2.2). Activities, on the other hand, do not finish, but cease or stop (again, see 6.2.2).

As a main verb, don functions as an intransitive verb, as in (99), (100), (101), or as a transitive verb with an noun phrase object, as in 0:

(99) Fan laas nait a de kliin. A kiaan don.
PREP last night 1.SG PROG clean. 1.SG MOD finish
I have been cleaning since last night. I cannot finish!
(13-9:46n2012)
(100) **Wen wi gwain ** _don _hier?
Q 1.PL go.PROG finish here
When are we going to be finished here?
(06a-03:48n2012)

(101) **Notin trai notin don.**
Nothing try nothing finish
Nothing ventured, nothing gained
(07a-12:42n2012)

(102) **If yu di don yua skuul, yuu wuda get a wuerk nou.**
CONJ 2.SG PST finish 2.SG.POSS school 2.SG MOD get INDF work now
If you had finished your schooling, you would have a job by now.
(19a-19:47e2012)

As a grammatical marker, _don _emphasises the outcome of a process as being completed, and thus is restricted to co-occurring with accomplishments. On this basis then, _don _does not readily combine with progressive marking (see 6.4.1). In (103), (104), (105), (106), _don _combines with a verb complement:

(103) **Dem don drink di waata aredi.**
3.PL COMPL drink DEF water already
They have finished drinking the water already.
(00-26:21e20120)

(104) **Ya wi don chop di graas.**
EXCL 1.PL COM chop DEF grass
We have finished cutting the grass already. [Sp. _ya _‘already’ but used as an exclamation here]
(105) *Di daag don iit da laang taim.*
DEF dog COMPL eat DEM long time
The dog finished eating that a long time ago.
(15-18:56e2012)

(106) *Jaan di waan don iit but i neva gat no taim.*
John PST want COMPL eat CONJ 3.SG NEG got NEG time
John was going to finish eating but he didn’t have time.
(17a-19:47e2012)

In (107), the activity is talking on the phone, the natural endpoint in this case being when the speaker hangs up:

(107) *Ya yu don taak shu di fon?*
EXC 2.SG COMPL talk PREP DEF phone
Have you finished talking on the phone? [Sp. *ya* ‘already’ but used as an exclamation here]
(00-26:21n2012)

An accomplishment reading is also signalled by *don* with motion verbs, as in (108) and (109), where *don* marks the completion of movement in a certain direction away from the speaker, or deictic centre (see also Fleischman 1982). The speakers of (108) and (109), respectively, were asked to judge the grammaticality of these sentences, that is, *don + gaan* does not appear in the naturalistic BCE data. Since *gaan* does not always combine with *don* (see 7.5.2 for a discussion of *gaan* with examples), indeed most often it does not, more research is required to determine what the difference in meaning is between *gaan* on its own in combination with *don*:
(108) *Shi don gaan ingland, buio!*
3.SG COMPL go.PST England EXC
She’s gone to England, boy!
(15-18:56e2012)

(109) *Shi don lef.*
3.SG COMPL leave
She has left
(17a-019:47e2012)

These examples of *don* are not exhaustive, and more research is required to ascertain whether *don* may mark any type of accomplishment as completed, e.g., ‘cool’ or ‘melt’ (again, see 6.2.2 for more information on such scalar verbs). BCE consultants do not accept the combination of *don* with ascriptive predicates to encode a change-of-state or to mean ‘already’: Firstly, BCE consultants prefer *ton* (see 6.5.1.1.1), e.g., *im ton a big man nou* ‘He has become a big man now’, and secondly, ‘already’ is expressed via *aredi* in BCE (see examples in 7.4.2.1).

6.5.3 Iterative stodi

The form *stodi* is attested in NC (Koskinen 2007: 51; cited in Bartens 2009: 309-10), BelC (Escure 2013), SA, and PI (Bartens 2009: 310), to encode habituality (see 6.4.3), with present habitual *doz* (6.4.3.1.1) also attested in NC (Bartens 2002: 119), SA, and PI (Bartens 2013b: 108). In BCE *doz* and *stodi* have distinct functions (see below). The phonetic realisation of *stodi* in AAE (*steady*) always precedes a progressive verb form (Green 2002: 71). It also combines with activities (see 6.2.2) and is used to convey the meaning that the situation is intense, consistent, or continuous (see also Baugh 1984: 3, 5). AAE *steady* combines with activities and does not usually precede stative predicates such as ‘have’, ‘own’, and ‘know’ (Green 2002: 71).
Similar to BCE *stie + de* (6.4.2), *stodi* is equivalent in meaning to ‘keep V-ing’, the subtle difference being that the former encodes continuative aspect and the latter, iterative aspect. BCE *stodi* marks dynamic situations (see 6.2.2) which are repeated over several occasions, however, unlike the habitual (6.4.3), not characteristically regular occurrences. *Stodi* marks a phase of less characteristic repetitions, which may take place over a very short time period, as in (110) (which further distinguishes it from the meaning of *doz*) or over an extended time period, as in (111). Cross-linguistically, repeated dynamic situations that occur over a very short time period may be expressed in languages via lexical aspect and/or individual grammatical markers that specifically encode this notion (see also Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 160-64):

(110) *An im gaan an du som wourk in di bak, an in stodi*

CONJ 3.SG go.PST CONJ do some work PREP DEF back CONJ 3.SG ITER

*kom out an wach it.*

come out CONJ watch 3.SG

And so he went to do some work in the back, and kept coming out and watching it.

(16-11:86fr2012)

(111) *Dem stodi hav teremoto.*

3.PL ITER have earthquake

They keep having earthquakes (in Haiti). [Sp. *teremoto* ‘earthquake’]

(17b-19:47nr2012)

The lexical aspect of the verbs that combine with *stodi* in (110) and (111) are not themselves iterative in nature. In (110), the situation expressed by phrasal verb *kom out* ‘come out’ is not a habit or characteristic of any kind of the character in the story, but refers rather to repeated action on a one-off occasion. Here, the character in the story repeatedly keeps coming out of his house to watch a ship out at sea that appears to be nearing the shore. In (111), the default lexical aspect of *hav* ‘have’, a state, changes to
acquire a dynamic interpretation, receiving an iterative reading over an indefinite time period, more specifically a repeated entry into a state.

Although BCE continuative stie de is constrained to marking activities by the very fact that it combines with verbs marked for progressive aspect, stodi by its very nature is more likely to mark accomplishments and achievements, which in turn explains why stodi does not combine with progressive aspect. In contrast, habitual doz combines with activities, accomplishments, and achievements, and states.

6.6 Concluding remarks

In Table 6.1, the preverbal markers are listed. As stated in (1.1 and 6.1), the term ‘grammatical marker’ in this thesis is used principally for any morpheme that is found in preverbal position, except, of course, progressive verbal suffix variant -in (6.4.1.1.3). As far as the semantic domain of aspect is concerned, a distinction is made between morphemes that mark viewpoint aspect and those that change lexical aspect.

Viewpoint aspect in BCE is encoded via progressive variants de and -in (see 6.4.1). These variants most frequently mark activities to encode an ongoing dynamic situation. Where occasionally stative verbs are found with progressive marking, the resulting interpretation is a temporary situation. The combination of stie + de (6.4.2) encodes continuative aspect. Habitual doz (6.4.3.1.1) and its past counterpart yuustu (6.4.3.1.2) mark viewpoint aspect. Dynamic verbs marked for the habitual denote re-occurring situations, however, the acquired meaning for statives is more akin to ‘generally-speaking’. Negator duon (6.4.3.1.1.1) and past negator neva (6.4.3.1.2.1) mean ‘not generally-speaking’ with both stative and dynamic verbs. Past propensity is encoded via wud (6.4.3.1.3), with some evidence that a general distinction in semantics exists between wud and wuda (see 10.2.1.1). Markers that change lexical aspect include completive don (6.5.2), inchoative go, get, kom, tiurn (see 6.5.1), and iterative stodi (6.5.3).
Relating back to the typological generalisations, the combination *stie + de* stands out in so far as it doesn’t quite fit a typological description. As explained in (6.4.2), continuative aspect cross-linguistically includes the progressive in its meaning, i.e., that a dynamic situation is ongoing, with the additional meaning that the agent of the action is deliberately keeping the action going. Sources for such markers are suggested by Bybee *et al.* (1994: 127) (again, see 6.5.3). However, in the case of BCE it is a combination of *stie + de* that encodes the continuative, as *stie* on its own does not encode progressive aspect in its meaning.

*Table 6.1 Aspect markers in BCE*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMA marker</th>
<th>Viewpoint aspect</th>
<th>Changes lexical aspect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>de</em></td>
<td>Progressive aspect preverbal variant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>V-in</em></td>
<td>Progressive aspect verbal suffix variant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>stie + de/-in</em></td>
<td>Continuative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>doz</em></td>
<td>Habitual (readily combines with progressive aspect; re-occurring situations with dynamic verbs/&quot;generally-speaking&quot; meaning with states, i.e., stative verbs and ascriptive predicates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>yuustu</strong></td>
<td>Past habitual (past re-occurring situations with dynamic verbs/'generally-speaking’ meaning with states, i.e., stative verbs and ascriptive predicates)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>duon</strong></td>
<td>Means ‘not generally-speaking’ with dynamic verbs and states, i.e., stative verbs and ascriptive predicates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>neva</strong></td>
<td>Means ‘not generally-speaking’ in past contexts with dynamic verbs, stative verbs, and ascriptive predicates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wud</strong></td>
<td>Past propensity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>get</strong></td>
<td>Inchoative (combines with progressive aspect)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>go</strong></td>
<td>Inchoative (combines with progressive aspect, taking the form of <em>gwain</em>)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kom</strong></td>
<td>Inchoative (combines with progressive aspect)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>tiurn</strong></td>
<td>Inchoative (combines with progressive aspect)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>don</strong></td>
<td>Completive (with accomplishments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stodi</td>
<td>Iterative (with achievements and accomplishments)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 Chapter seven: Tense markers in BCE

7.1 Introduction

Chapter 7 is on tense and begins with a discussion of theoretical issues and terminology (7.2), after which a brief overview of BCE tense markers is presented (7.3). The chapter is subsequently divided into three sections: temporal uses of the unmarked verb (7.4), past tense (7.5), and the future domain (7.6).

7.2 Theoretical and terminological issues

Tense is the linguistic representation of time (de Haan 2011: 52-53), encoded by either affixes, auxiliaries, or particles (Kroeger 2005: 147). Temporal adverbs/adverbials serve as an alternative to grammatical tense. However, even where grammatical tense is present, the meaning can at times be rather abstract so that temporal adverbials serve a useful purpose. Comrie (1999: 363) describes tense as the following:

Tense is a grammatical category referring to the location of situations in time; it is the basic grammatical category which, together with lexical and other indications of temporal ordering, enables the hearer to reconstruct the chronological relations among the situations described in a text and between them and the speech situation.

In order to begin identifying the function(s) of tense marking in languages, it is useful to think of time as being conceptualised (and subsequently marked) by speakers based on three distinct reference points on a linear time line (Reichenbach 1947). The most obvious of these is the moment of speech, which acts as a deictic centre against which other temporal situations can be located (Comrie 1985: 36). This represents the most basic of deictic temporal systems and is referred to as the absolute tense. The first reference point then is Speech Time (S), that is, the moment of speech. The situation itself can occur either at (S) or some other temporal reference point. This then introduces the second reference point, Event Time (E), which is the time at which the situation takes place. The simple
tenses (present, future, past) can be understood in terms of (S) and (E) (Stowell 2012: 186). Future tense is thus the mirror image of past in so far as the relevant situation is located in the opposite temporal direction (Comrie 1985: 43). The English present perfect (see also 7.4.2) indicates that (E) began earlier than (S), but that the result of the situation still holds some relevance at (S).

The third point is Reference Time (R) which is the time against which (E) is evaluated (see also de Haan 2011: 446). This is necessary in order to describe relative tense, which relates to a reference point other than (S), so that tense marking is used to locate the time of one situation (E) relative to another situation (R), rather than in relation to (S) (Kroeger 2005: 151). Here the reference point (R) will be dictated by the context. English non-finite verb forms characteristically have relative time reference (Comrie 1985: 151). Relative tenses in many languages are less likely to be marked with affixes than absolute tenses (de Haan 2011: 449). A combined absolute-relative tense involves a reference point being established relative to the present moment (S) and a situation then located in time (E) relative to that reference point (R) (Comrie 1985: 125). The future perfect and the pluperfect in English include (R): The future perfect signals that (R) follows (E), which in turn follows (S), and the past perfect, that (E) precedes (R), which precedes (S).

Making cross-linguistic comparisons of tense provides some indication as to which semantic domains of time are particularly conceptually salient in the minds of speakers (Comrie 1999: 364). The distinction between past, present, and future is a common feature of languages (Payne 1997: 236), although the direct encoding of three tenses is not particularly common (Chung and Timberlake 1985: 204). The present tense is usually the default tense, the unmarked or zero form (Bybee 1985: 155). The idea that present tense is simultaneous with (S) holds in most cases, with slight deviations arising in cases where the present tense is used to describe generics (see also 6.4.3.1.1), immediate futures, and narratives in the past, i.e., ‘historical present’ (see also 5.2) (Bybee 1985: 155).
A more frequent case of tense distinction is made between past and non-past; for example, in Finnish the future is not marked (Comrie 1999:365). Another frequent tense system features a distinction between future and non-future (Chung and Timberlake 1985:204; Payne 1997:236). Tense systems can be prospective, retrospective, or neither, depending on whether they extend the function of the present to either future or past (Ultan 1978:88). In many languages a formal distinction between future and present is not made (Comrie 1985:44). A two-way opposition of present versus non-present is extremely rare. Future tenses tend to be expressed less frequently by bound morphology (i.e., they are more periphrastic in nature) than either present or past (Ultan 1978:89-90). Although some languages make many tense distinctions (up to five), there are never more distinctions made in the future than in the past (Payne 1997:236). Comrie (1999:367) claims that a seven-way distinction is not unheard of. The most common of further distinctions in the past separates ‘today’ from ‘before today’, that is, hodiernal from pre-hodiernal (Comrie 1985:87), which is the case in Spanish, Catalan, and Occitan (Dahl 1985:125). Another typical cut-off point is that between ‘recently’ and ‘not recently’. For languages with more distinctions in the past, a common cut-off point is between ‘yesterday’ and ‘before yesterday’, that is, hesternal and pre-hesternal. Also common is the distinction between ‘a few days ago’ and ‘more than a few days ago’ (Comrie 1985:87-88).

There is no unanimous agreement in the literature as to whether the semantics of future time relates to tense or modality. It is not the intention of this thesis to explore this ongoing debate, albeit a very interesting one. Situations in the future logically express uncertainty and thus inevitably carry modal overtones. Any potential situation naturally involves varying degrees of possibility insofar as a future situation may be considered as relatively certain, merely possible, conceivable but likely, and so forth (Chung and Timberlake 1985:243). However, the future in English makes predictions about situations in the future (as well as general statements about the future; see 7.6), whereas the modals make reference to alternative worlds (Comrie 1985:44) (see 9.2). Thus, it will rain tomorrow expresses a definite statement about a situation predicted to hold subsequent to the present moment; its truth can be tested at that future time by seeing whether it does indeed rain or not. In
contrast, *it may rain tomorrow* makes a claim about a possible world in which it rains tomorrow; the truth value of this statement cannot be assessed by observing whether it does in fact rain or not, since epistemic *may* here is compatible with both the presence or absence of rain (Comrie 1985: 44).

Finally, Bybee, Perkins *et al.* (1994: 243) observe that it is not uncommon for a language to have more than one grammatical marker which has future as a use:

[…] Such apparent duplication may be viewed as a consequence of the independent developments of grams from distinct sources and from similar sources […] Range-of-use differences are attributable to one or more of the following: specialisation of future uses; the presence of retained earlier non-future uses; and the presence of late-developing non-future uses.

### 7.3 Overview of tense markers in BCE

Tense in BCE is either marked by preverbal markers or marked periphrastically, except for a few verbs which have a suppletive past tense form, e.g., *gaan* (7.5.2) and a few others (see 7.5.3). The temporal interpretation of the unmarked verb related to the dynamic/stative distinction of the unmarked verb is discussed in (5.2). Temporal uses of the unmarked verb include the present habitual (7.4.1) and the perfect (7.4.2). There are three past markers in BCE, *di* (7.5.1), *wo* (7.5.4), and *neva*. An overview of their respective functions is provided in (7.5).

Prospective aspect in BCE is encoded by *gwain* (7.6.2.1.2), *waan* (7.6.2.2.2), and *luk fi* (7.6.3), albeit with distinct semantics (see also 7.6.2). Rather than general prediction, which is encoded via *waan*, the main function of absolute future *wi* (7.6.4) is to mark propensity, and is most frequently found in the apodosis of real conditionals (see 5.4.1.1.1). A discussion on the distinction between future tense and prospective aspect is presented in (7.6.1). The formally corresponding negated counterpart of absolute future *wi* is *wuon* (7.6.5).
Data is also included from other Caribbean English Creole (CEC) varieties at the beginning of the main sections as background to the BCE data, and so that the reader is somewhat prepared and can make some cross-creole comparisons. Where possible, comparisons are made with Jamaican Creole (JC), since, as explained in (1.1), one motivation for this thesis is to show that BCE is not simply identical to JC.

7.4 Temporal uses of the unmarked verb

As mentioned in (6.4.3.1), JC and Limón Creole, the latter of which is spoken in neighbouring Costa Rica, does not have an aspectual marker dedicated to present habituality (Herzfeld 1983: 30). Farquharson (2013: 85) shows that an unmarked dynamic verb is ambiguous between a simple tense and a habitual reading. Hackert (2004: 70) observes that dependent on contextual information, the unmarked verb in Bahamian Creole (BahCE) may express habitual and generic situations, both present and past. In Belizean Creole (BelC), the unmarked verb can express habituals or generics (Winford 2006: 31). In the Eastern CECs (see 3.2), however, present habitual is conveyed by a distinct aspectual marker (again, see 6.4.3.1). Perfect categories can be expressed by the unmarked verb in BahCE (Hackert 2004: 103), as is the case in BelC and Sranan (Winford 2001: 160).

7.4.1 Present habitual

Sentences with a habitual aspectual meaning refer to a habit, a characteristic situation that holds at all times (Comrie 1985:39). Frawley (1992: 147) observes that dynamic verbs in the present tense tend to receive a habitual interpretation. In English, interpretation of a sentence as habitual is often heavily dependent on pragmatic factors, especially where adverbs of frequency are absent, e.g., Susan rode a bicycle last summer (Smith 1991: 87).

In JC, the situation is such that the habitual present is not overtly marked (Farquharson 2013: 85). In BCE, the habitual can be expressed via the unmarked verb, often in cases where a temporal adverbial of frequency is present in the clause. Habitual contexts are often formally marked in BCE via doz (6.4.3.1.1) and past yuustu (6.4.3.1.2).
A present habitual reading is available in (3), (1), (2):

(1) [anon.] du dat eri yier, an piipu kom an injai it an iit it.
    [anon.] do DEM every year CON people come CONJ enjoy 3.SG CONJ eat 3.SG
    [anon.] does that every year, and people come and enjoy it.
    (11-13:60n2012)

(2) Somtaim mi go buokas.
    Sometime 1.SG go Bocas
    Sometimes I go to Bocas.
    (09-6:87nr2012)

(3) Ai aalwiez tel [anon.] an dem, ai sie, “Ai hier [anon.] sie shi duo laik
    1.SG always tell [anon.] CONJ 3.PL 1.SG say 1.SG hear [anon.] say 3.SG NEG like
    krismas”.
    Christmas
    I always tell [anon.] and the others, I said, “I hear [anon.] said she doesn’t like
    Christmas”.
    (11-13:60n2012)

    If the sentential context is clear, an adverbial to indicate frequency is not necessary. In
(4), a BCE consultant corrects me after having made the mistake of substituting BCE fan
for English from:

(4) Wii nat iivn sie “fram”. “Ai gwain fan di hous” or “Ai guo
    1.PL NEG even say PREP 1.SG go.PROG PREP DEF house CONJ 1.SG go
    wie fan di hous”.
    away PREP DEF house
    We don’t even say “fram”. “I go from the house” or “I go away from the house”.
    (15-18:56nr2012)
7.4.2 Perfect

The perfect marks a past situation as relevant at a later point in time, most typically the moment of speech (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 67). Cross-linguistically, the present perfect is treated as distinct from the past and future perfect. In English, for example, the present perfect is not compatible with specific time references but general ones such as today, e.g., I have seen Fred today (de Haan 2011: 456). Other languages, however, do permit the co-occurrence of the present perfect and specific time references. Some languages mark the present perfect but not the other tenses, and vice versa. And yet other languages formally mark all three (present perfect, past perfect, future perfect), albeit each one differently (de Haan 2011: 456). The perfect is common but unstable, often developing over time into a general past tense (Lindstedt 2000: 366 cited in Ritz 2012: 882, Ritz and Engel 2008, Ritz 2010) (see also 7.2). Resultative constructions (see 5.3.1.1) develop into perfects, and lexical generalisation ensues. This is because the shift represents a change in emphasis: whereas resultatives focus on the state which is the result of a previous event, the perfect focuses on the event itself which leads to the extension to non-resultatives (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 70). Finally, perfects tend to be expressed periphrastically (Bybee and Dahl 1989: 67).

There are four semantic subcategories of the perfect: perfect of result, existential perfect, universal perfect, and perfect in a recent past. The perfect of result (7.4.2.1), existential perfect (7.4.2.2), and universal perfect (7.4.2.3) are discussed here.

There are no examples in the BCE data that express the perfect in a recent past. This perfect type is used to express temporal closeness between the moment of speech and the situation, e.g., The football manager has just been told he will not be appointed next season (see Dahl 1985: 132, Kiparsky 2002: 1, Ritz 2012: 883). The degree of recentness required for speakers to make use of the perfect for the purpose of reporting varies from language to language (Comrie 1976: 60). Since broadcast media is conducted entirely in Spanish, BCE data in this genre does not exist (see 3.10.1).
The unmarked dynamic verb in BCE has a perfect of result or existential perfect interpretation. There is thus no formal distinction between perfect and past (see 5.2), the relevant interpretation reached by relying on the surrounding sentential context and/or presence of temporal adverbials. Universal perfect differs somewhat from the other perfect types in BCE. It is the unmarked stative that receives a universal perfect interpretation, with dynamic verbs marked for progressive acquiring such a reading.

7.4.2.1 Perfect of result

The perfect of result is often viewed as the prototypical perfect (Moens 1987, Moens and Steedman 1988). The perfect of result signals that the effects of a past situation hold at the time of utterance. A prior action has resulted in a state (Smith 1991: 149); a change-of-state meaning is inherent in situations marked by the perfect (Ritz 2012: 903). In Dean has arrived the focus is on the result (or consequence) of Dean arriving, that is, Dean is here now (Ritz 2012: 883).

Although adverb aredi ‘already’ is present in (5) and (6), it is not compulsory, as seen in (7). Michaelis (1992: 321) observes that English already does not simply imitate the semantic features of the perfect, the meaning of English already often serving to indicate the premature or unexpected nature of the situation in reaction to content in the immediate discourse.

(5) [anon.], yuu duu dat aredi?
   [anon.] 2.SG do DEM already
   [anaon.], have you done that already?
   (15-21:64e2012)

(6) Mieri riid da siem buk aredi.
   Mary read DEM same book already
   Mary has read the same book already.
   (15-21:64e2012)
7.4.2.2 Existential perfect

The existential perfect involves a situation that has occurred at least once in an interval starting in the past but continuing up to the present moment, e.g., *I have been to Thailand three times* (Ritz 2012: 883; see also Comrie 1976: 58). The defining distinguishable feature that distinguishes the existential perfect from the perfect of result is that the focus of the former is on the occurrence and/or experience of the prior situation rather than the situation itself (Smith 1991: 149). There is thus a gradual relaxation of current relevance in the strictest of senses (Dahl 2000: 391; cited in Ritz 2012: 883, 903). The existential perfect can have its own distinct marking in many languages (de Haan 2011: 457). Interestingly, some languages can possess an existential perfect morpheme but no general perfect morpheme (de Haan 2011: 457). English makes no systematic distinction between the existential perfect and the perfect of result (see 7.4.2.1), although a semantic distinction is easily identifiable. Nevertheless, formal evidence of the contrast is observed in the difference between *Bill has been to America* and *Bill has gone to America* (Comrie 1976: 59), the former of which expresses the existential perfect, and the latter the perfect of result.

Typical adverbials in BCE that accompany unmarked verbs with an existential perfect reading include *eva* 'ever' (8), *uptu nou* 'up to now' (9), and *so long* 'so long' (10):

(8) *Yu eva sii di piicha av a yuunikarn?*

2.SG ever see DEF picture PREP INDF unicorn

Have you ever seen a picture of a unicorn?

(16-11:86nr2012)
(9) \textit{Wen diiz tin kom out nou ai, laik, surpraiz. Up tu nou ai duon hier}  

\begin{verbatim}
CONJ DEM thing come out now 1.SG DM surprise up PREP now 1.Sg NEG hear
di nuotis.
\end{verbatim}

DEF news

When this thing [news about the eclipse] came out, I was, like, surprised. I’ve never never listened to the news. [Sp. noticias ‘news’]

(08-07:58n2012)

(10) \textit{But so long ai no tel nansi stuori, ai farget plenti a paat.}  

\begin{verbatim}
CONJ so long 1.SG NEG tell Anansi story 1.SG forget plenty INDF part
But it has been so long since I have told an Anansi story, I have forgotten many a part.
\end{verbatim}

(16-11:86nr2012)

7.4.2.3 Universal perfect

The universal perfect describes a situation that began in the past but continues into the present. However, unlike in the case of the perfect of result (7.4.2.1), the situation expressed by the universal perfect is not relevant at speech time (see also 7.2). The universal perfect denotes a state holding throughout an interval; there is a sense that the situation began earlier, e.g., \textit{Matilda has lived in Sydney for two years}. Many languages (French, Russian, German) express the universal perfect via the present tense (again, see 7.2). (de Haan 2011: 457). Indeed it is more typical \textit{not} to express the universal perfect via special marking (Comrie 1976: 60).

Although the universal perfect in BCE, like the perfect of result and existential perfect (7.4.2.2) is still expressed via the unmarked verb, TMA marking appears in the case of dynamic verbs. An otherwise progressive form (see 6.4.1) can have a universal perfect interpretation, equivalent to the perfect progressive in English.
A temporal adverbial is present in both (11) and (12), indicating the length of time of the situation which continues into the present. In (11), the adverbial expresses the number of years, whereas in (12) *fan laas nait* ‘since last night’ specifically indicates the temporal onset of the situation:

(11)  *Ai  gat nain yier-z  liv hier, so gwain  ten.*

1.SG got nine year-PL live here  so GO.PROG ten

I have been living here for nine years, so going on ten.

(07a-12:42n2012)

(12)  *Fan laas nait a de kliin. A kiaan don.*

I have been cleaning since last night. I cannot finish!

(13-9:46n2012)

### 7.5 Past markers

With respect to the grammatical expression of past, the situation in JC is that in the basilect there is only one past marker, *ben*, which has dual functionality: It is a past copula and a past marker for dynamic verbs (Patrick 1999: 194-96). In mesolectal JC on the other hand, *did* is the general past marker and nominal clauses remain unmarked, infrequently occurring with *iz* and *woz* (Patrick 2007: 139). Evidently, BCE *wo* and JC *ben* originate in different forms of English *be*, namely, simple past *was* and past participle *been*, respectively.

Western CECs more generally (3.2), like JC, share two past markers, one in the form of some variant of basilectal *ben* and one in the form of *did*, the mesolectal equivalent. These past forms correlate first and foremost with social differences within their respective speech communities (Patrick 2007: 129; Bartens 2013a: 119; Bartens 2013b: 108; Muhleisen 2013: 65; Prescod 2013: 74; Hackert 2013: 113 ). In Limon creole, spoken in neighbouring Costa Rica, only *did* is attested (Herzfeld 1983: 28) In BelC, again, only one variant of *bin (mi)* is available (Winford 2001: 170). *Neva* is attested in JC as a past
negator, but it has a functionally equivalent marker in the form of no ben, which consists of a separate negator plus the basilectal past marker (see also discussion in 7.5) (Patrick 2008: 620).

A summary of the main past marking strategy in BCE is presented here. A key difference between BCE and other related Creoles is that BCE past forms di and wo are accessible to all speakers within the BCE speech community, that is, they have distinct functions and are not to be correlated to the post-creole continuum (2.2). Unmarked stative verbs are obligatorily marked by di for past (see 7.5.1), and unmarked dynamic verbs are marked by di for counter-presupposition (see 7.5.1.2), with some evidence to suggest that di marks dynamic verbs for pluperfect (see 7.5.1.3). The distinction between stativity and dynamicity is neutralised in the protasis of unreal conditionals, which is always marked for past by di (5.4.1.1.2). Wo combines with both dynamic and stative verbs to mark progressive aspect for past, albeit infrequently (7.5.4.2). Wo also functions as a past copula in ascriptive, equative, and locative clauses (see 7.5.4.1). An overlap of function is observable of wo and di is observable in the marking of ascriptive predicates, insofar as time-stable properties co-occur with wo and time-stable properties with di. There is an allomorph of di in BCE in the form of did which appears to surface mostly in elicited examples, with the occasional attestation in natural discourse. Nonetheless, there does not appear to be a specific context (linguistic or otherwise) in which only the form did is found.

Neva is a past negator in BCE, found with both dynamic verbs and statives. With ascriptive predicates, neva means ’not generally-speaking’ (see 6.4.3.1.2.1 for examples). It co-occurs with equative and locative clauses to mark negated simple past (see 7.5.4.1 for examples). Neva also marks dynamic verbs for negated counter-presupposition (see 7.5.1.2 for an example). It is also found in the protasis of unreal conditionals, negating both dynamic and stative verbs (see 5.4.1.1.2 for examples). Finally, neva negates modal afu (see 8.5.2 for an example in a non-epistemic context).
7.5.1  **di**

7.5.1.1 Stative verbs & simple past

In BCE, *di* is a past marker that obligatorily combines with stative verbs to signal simple past. Unless an overt past marker of some kind occurs earlier in a previous clause, stative verbs are not found unmarked (see 5.2 and further below).

The tense system that is signalled by *di* in simple past contexts is **absolute** (7.2): Speech Time (S) is the reference point for a situation taking place at Event Time (E), as in (13).

(13) *Ai di gat mai piscina rait in front pan mi.*
1.SG PST got 1.SG.POSS swimming.pool right PREP front PREP 1.SG
I had my swimming pool right in front of me. [Sp. *piscina* ‘swimming pool’]
(08-16:55n2012)

Further examples of stative verbs marked by *di* are illustrated in (14), (15), (16), (17):

(14) *Dem man did laik warapo.*
DEM.PL men PST like warapo
The men liked guarapo [an alcoholic drink].
(11-18:56n2012)

(15) *Luk, dem piipu di gat a stail.*
Look dem.PL people PST got INDG style
Look, those people had a sense of fashion.
(15-18:56n2012)

(16) *Den kom fram Haiti wen dem di hav di ting in Haiti.*
3.PL come PREP Haiti CONJ 3.PL PST have DEF thing in Haiti
They came from Haiti when they had the thing [earthquake] in Haiti.
...bikaaz ai **di** nou di spanish fam mai piipl dem wo

CONJ 1.SG PST know DEF Spanish PREP 1.SG.POSS people 3.PL COP.PST

spanyad.

Spaniard

...because I knew Spanish from my people who were Spaniards.

In (18), since the speaker is no longer a child the temporal context must be past, nonetheless, a stative verb in the second clause is still marked by **did**. Certainly, there is no overt past marking in the first clause, and as stated further above, it is usually only when past tense is overtly marked that stative verbs remain unmarked:

**Yie, bukaaz wen ai smaal, ai **did** nou som pipurl in **di** church.**

EXC CONJ  CONJ 1.Sg small  1.SG PST know some people PREP DEF church

Yeh, because when I was small, I knew some people in the church.

7.5.1.2 Dynamic verbs & counter-presupposition

There are many attestations of dynamic verbs marked by **di** with the meaning of counter-presupposition, which enables BCE speakers to contradict some immediately prior element of the interaction, such an element taking the form of an overstatement or an implication of some sort. This specific meaning of **di** can only be understood by taking the preceding discourse context into consideration, thus a researcher cannot expect to identify such a meaning in individual attestations of **di** occurring in isolated sentences. All the interpretations of counter-presupposition are found in the naturalistic BCE data. Before my field work trip, I was not aware of this meaning in any CECs, or how it might be expressed. Gussenhoven (2007: 96) discusses different types of counter-assertive focus by means of prosody, making a distinction between ‘corrective focus’ and ‘counter-
presuppositional focus’, describing the latter as a way to counter not an explicit proposition but an assumption or implication. This meaning is found in English stress do, e.g., I told you, he did come. It should be noted, however, that BCE di remains unstressed in this function, as is the case in its simple past function with statives. In its counter-presupposition function, di has scope over the whole proposition rather than just a constituent (a phenomenon known as Verum Focus) (Lohnstein 2016).

In (19), speaker 1 is recalling an earthquake which hit the region in 1991. She explains to me that they’d never seen anything like it before. Speaker 2 mentions something about being aware of a (previous) earthquake, but is interjected by speaker 1 who wishes to counter this implicit assumption made by speaker 2 that she might not have any knowledge of this previous event:

(19) Speaker 1
Wi neva sii notin laik dat bifuoa.
1.PL NEG.PST see nothing like DEM before
We’d never seen anything like that before.

Speaker 2
Ai nou dat iertkwiek... (unintelligible as speaker 1 interjects)
1.SG know DEM earthquake
I know that earthquake…
(02a-25:59nr2012)

Speaker 1
Ai di hier about di iertkwiek bikaaz a uol minister, laik, a
1.SG PST hear PREP DEF earthquake CONJ INDF old minister DM INDF minister woz dat tel mi about di iertkwiek. Laik, tiri yie-z minister COP.PST REL tell 1.SG PREP DEF earthquake DM thirty year-PL somtin abak him di tel mi about di iertkwiek.
sometime aback 3.SG PST tell 1.SG PREP DEF earthquake
I heard about the earthquake because an old minister, like, it was a minister who told me about the earthquake. Like, thirty years (ago) or something. He told me about the earthquake.

(02a-16:55nr2012)

In (20), speaker 2 believes that if he doesn’t make any reference to the fact that he has flatulence, speaker 1 will not notice. Thus, speaker 1 wishes to counter this implicit assumption, after which speaker 2 agrees with speaker 1, countering his original silence on the matter:

(20) Speaker 1
    Yo di faat!
    2.SG PST fart
    You’ve just farted!
    (06v-28:00n2012)

Speaker 2
    Ai di faat tuu!
    1.SG PST fart too
    I farted, yes!
    (06v-29:00n2012)

In (21), speaker 1 has explicitly stated to a Dutch tourist that the latter can’t understand him when he speaks BCE. Subsequently, a friend of speaker 1 (speaker 2) counters this explicit assertion when he realises that the Dutch man does indeed understand what has just been said:

(21) Speaker 1
    Yu kiaan kech mi?
    2.SG MOD.NEG catch me
    You can’t understand me?
    (06v-29:00n2012)
In (22), speaker 2 wishes to counter the presupposed idea that speaker 1 might not have given any milk to her child the evening before (as a result of the mother having run out of baby formula). Thus, speaker 2 queries speaker 1 by suggesting that even if the child was not fed with bought milk, the child must however have received her mother’s milk:

(22) Speaker 1


NEG tea [anon.] bawl DM [anon.] want 3.SG.POSS milk

Last night, Nayo was crying for milk. Last night. And [anon.] was (going) about his business. When [anon.] came (home), [anon.] was crying, she was crying. [anon.] said, “Give the baby something!” “No, [anon.]”, I said, “Who? I am not going to give her any tea.” [anon.] was crying, you see, [anon.]. Wanted her milk.

Speaker 2

Puo ting.

Poor thing

Poor thing.

Speaker 1

[anon.] rich hier liet.
[anon.] reach here late
[anon.] arrived here late.

**Speaker 2**

*But yo di gi ar som a yuor milk ina shi*

CONJ 2.SG PST give 3.SG some PREP 2.SG.POSS milk PREP 3.SG.POSS bakurl?
bottle
But you gave her some of your milk in her bottle?
(13-02:23n2012)

**Speaker 1**

*M i gi im som kokoa milk but laik i no ful im beli, stil*

1.SG give 3.SG some cocoa milk CONJ DM 3.SG NEG full 3.SG.POSS belly still
*de baal.*

PROG cry
I gave her some cocoa milk but as it was not full, her stomach, still crying.
(13-09:46n2012)

In (23), speaker 1 is the adult daughter of speaker 2, and is recounting the time she was recorded on television. The recording is still being transmitted, and speaker 1 is telling her mother that people continue to come up to her to say they’ve seen her on television. Speaker 2 mentions that she saw her daughter on television using the unmarked form of *si* ‘see’. However, since her daughter (speaker 1) isn’t formally acknowledging this fact, she later repeats this information, this time marking the verb for counter-presupposition to counter this lack of acknowledgment, also mentioning that she remembers them all being interviewed. However, speaker 1 is under the impression that she is supposed to remember all about the interview but wishes to counter this implicit assumption, and achieves this via the use of *di*:

(23) **Speaker 1**

*Aal ouba dem de wach mi, an a aftu luk pan dem tin.*
All over 3.PL PROG watch 1.SG CONJ 1.SG MOD look PREP dem.PL thing
A kudin shiem. Forget bout shiem, buoi!
1.SG MOD.NEG shame forget PREP shame DM
All over they were watching me, and I had to look at those things [cameras]. I couldn’t be embarrassed. Forget about embarrassment, boy!

Speaker 2
But da i so.
but DEM COP so
Exactly.

Speaker 1
Wen a rich huom, a hier eribadi de buoi
CONJ 1.SG reach home 1.SG hear everybody there DM
When I arrived home, I heard everybody was there, boy.

Speaker 2
[anon], a sii yuu!
[anon.] 1.SG see 2.SG
[anon.], I saw you!

Speaker 1
“A sii yuu, a sii yo!” Til rait nou dem gat mi pan telebishan.
1.SG see 2.SG 1.SG see 2 SG PREP right now 3.PL got 1.SG PREP television
“I saw you, I saw you!”. Up until now they’ve got me on the television.

Speaker 2
No truu.
No true
Not true.

Speaker 1
Yie, dem gat mi pan telebishan rait nou. Eriwie a tun a hier
EXC 3.PL got 1.SG PREP television right now everywhere 1.SG turn 1.SG hear
dem se “Yo de pan telebishan!”. 
3. Pl say 2. SG COP PREP television
Yeah, they’ve got me on the television right now. Everywhere I turn I hear them saying, “You were on the television!”
(12-05:40n2012)

Speaker 2
Biko wan taim tuu ai di sii yuu an di telebizhan. A lat av
CONJ one time too 1. SG PST see 2. PL PREP DEF television INDF lot PREP
unu. Yies, unu woz entrivistando, yu nou.
2. PL EXC 2. PL COP. PST interview-PROG DM
Because one time I saw you on the television. A lot of you all. Yes, you were all being interviewed, you know. [Sp. entrivistando ‘interviewing’]
(12-17: 64n2012)

Speaker 1
Ai duon iivn rimemba wat dem di aks mi!
1. SG NEG even remember Q 3. Pl PST ask 1. SG
I do not even remember what they asked me!
(12-05:40n2012)

In (24), speaker 1 remembers laughing at her friend who was also present when they were being filmed because nobody could see him (because he was hiding his face). Speaker 2 subsequently affirms this (as she was a bystander), and speaker 1 acknowledges this affirmation by indicating that indeed her mother is not lying and telling the truth. Her mother (speaker 2) is then eager to counter this presupposed idea that she could be lying, again, marking sii ‘see’ with di:

(24) Speaker 1
Yie, ai wo de an sit doun de.
EXC 1. SG COP. PST there CONJ sit down there
Yeah, I was there and sat down there.

Speaker 2
Kech aal a dem.
Catch all PREP 3.PL
Got all of them [the camera].

Speaker 1
Kech eritin an ai wo de laf afa [anon.]. Yo
Catch everything CONJ 1.SG COP.PST PROG laugh PREP [anon.] 2.SG
kudn sii [anon.]!
MOD.NEG see [anon.]
Got everything and I was laughing at [anon.]. You couldn’t see [anon.]!

Speaker 2
[anon.] de haid im fies!
[anon.] PROG hide 3.SG face
[anon.] was hiding his face!

Speaker 1
No lai [anon.], iz chuut.
NEG lie [anon.] COP truth
No lie, [anon.], it’s the truth.
(12-05:40n2012)

Speaker 2
Yie, ai di sii im [anon.] de haid im fies.
EXC 1.SG PST see 3.SG [anon.] PROG hide 3.SG.POSS face
Yes, I saw [anon.] hiding his face [in front of the camera].
(12-17:64n2012)

In (25), speaker 1 is suggesting that she’s not sure whether an eclipse brings coldness with it, and speaker 2 wishes to counter this uncertainty by reminding her about the eclipse that came in 1991, marking kom ‘come’ with di:

(25) Speaker 1
Yuu sii dat pan i nuotis?
2.SG see DEM PREP DEF news
Did you see that on the news? [Sp. noticias ‘news’]

Speaker 2
Mi hier it woz taak-in pan i nuotis.
1.SG hear 3.SG COP.PST talk-PROG PREP DEF news
I heard it being talked about on the news.

Speaker 1
So wat? Im kom-in wid a ekstra kuolnis bikaas chru no sun?
So Q 3.SG come-PROG PREP INDF extra coldness CONJ PREP no sun
So, what? It’s coming with an extra coldness because of no sun? [chru ‘through’]
(08-08:48n2012)

Speaker 2
A kuolnis. Laik, rimemba wen eklipe di kom? I kom wid a
INDF coldness DM remember CONJ eclipse PST come 3.SG come PREP INDF
kuolnis.
coldness
A coldness. Like, remember when the eclipse occurred? It came with a coldness.
(08-16:55n2012)

Finally, negated counter-presupposition is achieved via the combination neva di. It is
the only context in BCE where neva and di combine. In (26), speaker two counters her
own assumption that she wishes to paint her room, by stating that in fact this is not entirely
her wish since she needs to make repairs first:

(26) Speaker 1
Fi krisma, ai hav no tinkin rait nou.
PREP Christmas 1.SG have NEG think-PROG right now
For Christmas, I have no plans right now.
(08-08:46n2012)

Speaker 2
A waan pient mai ruum. But yu sii se ai neva di
1.SG want paint 1.SG.POSS room CONJ 2.SG see COMP 1.Sg NEG.PST PST
pient op outsaid bikaaz a waan ripier. So dat miek no sens ai wiest
paint up outside CONJ 1.SG want repair so DEM make NEG sense 1.SG waste
di pient.
DEF paint
I want to paint my room. But you see that I haven’t painted outside because I want
to repair. So that makes no sense as I’ll waste the paint.
(08-16:55n2012)

7.5.1.3 Dynamic verbs & pluperfect
The function of *di* as a pluperfect marker in BCE cannot be entirely ruled out for dynamic
verbs. The pluperfect is a semantic combination of past and perfect (Dahl 1985). It
expresses a past state resulting from prior action, an Event (E), relevant to some Reference
Time (R) in the past (see 7.2). Cross-linguistically, the pluperfect tends to have an
additional use as a remote past (Dahl 1985: 144).

Bickerton (1975; cited in Givon 1982: 119-121) claims that the past marker in creole
languages signals past with stative verbs and pluperfect with dynamic verbs. A past-
before-past marker is attested in (basilectal) JC (Farquharson 2013: 85) and San Andres
Creole (SA) (Bartens 2013b: 108). The Creoles of both Providence Island (PI) and
Nicaragua (NI) (as more acrolectal varieties) “are less likely to interpret dynamic verbs as
having past reference and, therefore, mark past tense more frequently than [SA], the latter
of which only resorts to pluperfect marking” (Bartens 2009: 308). Patrick (1999: 221)
claims that although such a merging of a highly specific past meaning (pluperfect) with a
more general one (simple past) might potentially be seen as resulting from decreolisation
(see 2.2), it is probably better understood as part of a broader process of
grammaticalisation. In this case the expansion of a specialised meaning into a more general
semantic category, typically with continuation of the former sense.
Further research is required in BCE before formulating any generalisations, especially as this temporal context rarely surfaces in the BCE naturalistic data. The predominant pattern in the BCE naturalistic data is for stative verbs to be marked for simple past by *di* (see 7.5.1.1 for examples) and dynamic verbs to be marked by *di* for a counter-presupposition reading (see 7.5.1.2 for definition and examples). Bickerton (1975: 53; cited in Patrick 1999: 181) observes that if two actions appear in sequence in a narrative, the verb denoting the first action does not need to be marked for past, but when the expected grammatical order is inverted, the past marker is required. Attestations of clauses in which *di* is attested with a pluperfect meaning in this section, albeit few, do all occur in the inverse order. And there is also evidence, at least as far as *gaan* is concerned, the inherently past form of ‘go’, (see below), that when the order of the clause matches the temporal sequencing of the respective situations, no past marking is required (see also example (10) in (5.2) and (41) in 7.5.2).

In (27), main verb *nuotis* ‘notice’ is either a dynamic situation marked for pluperfect by *di*, or equally, a stative situation with the meaning ‘be attentive to’. Additionally, *nuotis* is negated by *no* (5.5.1.1). On the basis that *neva* encodes dynamic and stative verbs for a ‘not generally-speaking’ interpretation (see 6.4.3.1.2.1), in addition to combining with *di* for a negated counter-presupposition reading (see example in 7.5.1.2), *no* is either negating an individual past situation - if the verb is treated by the speaker in question as stative, or a negated pluperfect situation if the verb is dynamic.

(27) A jus stie de luk pan dem tuu bikaaz mii no di nuotis dem.
1.SG just stay PROG look PREP 3.PL too CONJ 1.SG NEG PST notice 3.PL
I just stayed looking at those two because I hadn’t noticed them [the other people mentioned].
(12-5:40n2012)

In (28), dynamic verb *yuus* ’use’ appears with progressive marking in the form of verbal suffix -*in* (6.4.1.1.3), but in turn is marked by *di*. As explained in (7.5.4.2), the
progressive is seldom marked for past in BCE (achieved via past copula \textit{wo}). Nonetheless, the meaning of \textit{di} in (28) could be counter-presupposition. Here, the speaker is recalling all the special preparations she used to make for her family at Christmas, but then wishes to counter the idea that anybody was actually using the things she prepared for them:

(28) \textit{Wo mi tek-in out dem ting-z afla nuobodi di yuus-in}  
Q 1.SG take-PROG out DEM.PL ting-PL CONJ nobody PST use-PROG dem?  
DEM.PL  
What was I taking out those things for when nobody had been using them!  
(11-13:60n2012)

The other examples in the BCE data of main verbs marked by \textit{di} are high-frequency dynamic verbs of motion, namely, \textit{gaan}, mentioned briefly above (see 7.5.2 for more examples), as in (29), as well as \textit{kom} ‘come’, as in (30):

(29) \textit{Yie, ai sii ar. Shi di gaan reunion, man.}  
EXC 1.SG see 3.SG 3.SG PST go.PST meeting DM  
Yeah, I noticed her. She had gone to a meeting, man.  
[Sp. \textit{reunión} ‘meeting’]  
(16-27:00n2012)

Again, however, in (30) \textit{di} also functions as a marker of counter-presupposition. Here, the speakers are remembering an eclipse that occurred in 1991. They are both recalling that at that time they had never seen one before, but then speaker 1 recalls that uncles in the BCE community had in fact mentioned an eclipse prior to the one in 1991:

(30) \textit{Speaker 1}  
\textit{Dat wo funi, yie, bika wi neva sii it bifuoa, but ai}  
DEM COP.PST funny EXC CONJ 1.PL NEG.PL see 3.SG before CONJ 1.SG  
\textit{hier unkals dat yuustu taak bout it.}

That was strange because we hadn’t seen one before, but I heard uncles that used to talk about it.

Speaker 2

Yie, wi neva sii it bifua.

Yeah, we hadn’t seen one before.

(08-08:48n2012)

Speaker 1

Unkals dat tel wi bout it, laik, woz thierti yie-z bifua dem di

Uncles that told us about it, like, was thirty years prior they had seen an eclipse when he told me about it.

(08-16:55n2012)

7.5.1.4 Time-unstable ascriptive predicates

As mentioned elsewhere (5.3.1.1), ascriptive predicates include those that express proper inclusion, e.g., *He is a teacher*, where a specific entity is asserted to be among the class of items specified in the nominal predicate (Payne 1997: 114), in addition to ascribing a property to the referent of the subject. Semantic subtypes of property concepts include physical property, dimension, colour, age, value, human propensity, and speed (Dixon 1982: 15-20). Importantly, property concepts hold an intermediate position between nouns, which denote temporally-stable entities, and verbs, which denote temporally-unstable situations (Frawley 1992: 439). Sometimes, adjectives in ascriptive function behave as verbs, other times not. This characterisation of stable/unstable properties bears out in so far as *being noisy* is acceptable but *being long* is not: *Noisy* has the potential to be treated more like a verb because it is a property that is temporally sensitive and potentially under the control of an agent. On the other hand, the property of being long is normally
temporally stable and cannot be executed or carried out. This distinction between permanent states and situational/transient states correlates with the terms individual-level and stage-level, respectively (Gumiel-Molina, Moreno-Quiben et al. 2015).

Ascriptive predicates in past contexts are marked for past by either di or past copula wo. The variation observed here with respect to past marking is related to the concept of time stability (Givon 1984: 51-55). Whereas ascriptive predicates marked by di encode temporally-unstable properties, those marked by wo (or indeed remain unmarked) express temporally-stable properties (see 7.5.4.1.1). This is interesting since di is usually found with verbs, the distinction between verbs and other predicates being that the former do not require a copula of any sort (see, for example, 5.3, 7.5.1, 7.5.4.1.1). Although wo can mark progressive constructions for past, it is found infrequently in this semantic context (see 7.5.4.2; see also 7.5.5 for a discussion of exceptional cases of unmarked verbs with wo). To a great extent then, di and wo reflect the pattern observed in present contexts, whereby time-unstable properties in ascriptive predicate function co-occur with de, and time-stable properties are unmarked (or marked by copula iz with an additional semantic meaning of counter-presupposition) (see 5.3.1.1).

No tests were conducted in order to classify predicates as time-stable/temporary. Thus, it is not entirely clear whether such a classification of adjectives in ascriptive predicate function is predetermined so that BCE speakers are following a rule, or whether it depends on the discourse context and how the speaker views the status of the property concept in the situation being described. It is interesting, for example, that yung ‘young’ in (32) is marked by di, whereas likl ‘little’ in example of (49) in (7.5.4.1.1) appears with wo, where both ascriptive predicates describe the state of being a child at the time the respective situations took place.

In (31), the speaker states that the water is getting hot, and thus by implication the water’s prior coldness must be a temporary state, a condition which the speaker is able to mark overtly with di. However, the same property concept kuol ‘cold’ in ascriptive
predicate function appears in example (50) in (7.5.4.1.1), but here it co-occurs with past copula wo to denote a time-stable property.

(31)  

\[ \text{D} \text{i waata di kuol but i de get hat.} \]

DEF water PST cold CONJ 3.SG PROG INCH hot

The water was cold, but it’s becoming hot.

(17a-19:47e2012)

Despite the fact that Givon (1984: 55) suggests that young is a time-stable concept, in (32) this adjective is being treated as a temporary age stage in BCE:

(32)  

\[ \text{Y} \text{i} \text{es, bikaaz wen ai did yung ai hav mai fam.} \]

EXC CONJ CONJ 1.SG PST young 1.SG have 1.SG.POSS fam(ily)

Yes, because when I was young, I had my family.

(01b-4:77nr2012)

In (33), the speaker is not wishing to imply that then men in her community were by nature all mad (mad) but just every Christmas, since they would wear white trousers in the rain and mud:

(33)  

\[ \text{Krismas i rien i rien i rien i rien, an evri man ina} \]


white pant-PL bare foot CONJ DEM.PL pant-PL half up dem.PL people PST mad

An wen dem kom op an yo luk pan dem wait pan-s, dem CONJ CONJ 3.PL come up CONJ 2.SG look PREP DEM.PL white pants-PL 3.PL no wait agen!

no white again

At Christmas it rained and rained and rained and rained, and every man was wearing white trousers. Bare foot and their trousers half up. Those people were
mad! And when they came up [the hill] and you looked at their white trousers, they were not white anymore!
(15-18:56nr2012)

In (34), a speaker is recalling all the work they used to put into Christmas preparations and wondering why they used to be so stupid at this time of year. The speaker is not wishing to imply that they were stupid by nature:

(34) Wai wi di so chupid?
Q 1.PL PST so stupid
Why were we so stupid?
(11-13:60n2012)

Finally, in (35), the speaker wishes to make overtly clear that being sik ‘sick’ is not a permanent property of her child but was rather a temporary condition the day before:

(35) Yestidie mi pikni di sik, bu shi kudn gaan skuul.
Yesterday 1.SG.POSS child PST sick CONJ she MOD go.PST school
Yesterday my child was sick, and she couldn’t go to school.
(17a-19:47e2012)

The examples of non-referential ascriptive predicates (proper inclusion) that surface in the BCE data, albeit few, are marked by woz (see 5.3.1.1 for an example and 7.5.4.1.1 for a negated example). However, there should be no reason in principle why these properties should not have both temporary and permanent status too. Whether the pronunciation of woz in such contexts is of importance here remains inconclusive, wo being by far the most frequent pronunciation.
7.5.2 gaan

Gaan is an inherently past tense form, its origins in English past participle gone. This form occurs in all instances of past ‘go’ in the BCE data, although further tests are required to ascertain whether a past interpretation of g(u)o ‘go’ is achievable in the appropriate context (see 5.2 for the default reading of the unmarked verb). The use of gaan is illustrated in (36), (37), (38):

(36) Im no pieit no main. An im gaan an du som wourk in di
   3.SG NEG pay NEG mind CONJ 3.SG go.PST CONJ do some work PREP DEF bak.
   back
   He wasn’t paying attention and went to do some work in the back.
   (16-11:86fr2012)

(37) Di baa stil upon or shi lok op an gaan aredi?
   DEF bar still open CONJ 3.SG lock up CONJ go.PST already
   Is the bar still open or has she locked up and gone already?
   (16-27:55n2012)

(38) an di buoi gaan bak?
   CONJ DEF boy go.PST back
   And did the boy go back?
   (05-6:87n2012)

As mentioned previously (7.5.1.3), high frequency gaan is compatible with di for a pluperfect reading, as illustrated in (39) and (40) (see also 7.5.1.3 for an example):

(39) Yuu nou a did gaan chiriki fa vakieshion?
   2.SG know 1.SG PST go.PST Chiriki PREP vacation
Do you know that I went to Chiriquí on holiday? [Chiriquí is a town on the mainland]

(17a-19:47e2012)

(40) *Mi did gaan aredi. Mi woz in bed, mi neva de.*
1.SG PST go.PST already 1.SG COP.PST PREP bed 1.SG NEG.PST there
I’d gone already. I was in bed, I wasn’t there.
(15-18:56nr2012)

The combination of *di* and *gaan* is evidently not obligatory, as illustrated in (41), and this seems to support the statement made by Bickerton (1975: 53; cited in Patrick 1999: 181) that observes that if two actions appear in sequence in a narrative, the verb denoting the first action does not need to be marked for past (see example (10) in 5.2 for a similar example of *gaan*):

(41) *Jaan gaan du it aredi bifuoa mi kom bai di hous.*
John go.PST do 3.SG already before 1.SG come PREP DEF house
John had gone to do it already before I came to the house.
(17a-19:47e2012)

7.5.3 Use of inherently past verb forms

Heard infrequently in the BCE speech community are inherently past verb forms that compete with the unmarked verb (see 5.2). These are dynamic verbs not dissimilar to *gaan* (7.5.2). Nevertheless, whereas past *had* ‘had’ alternates with *di hav* and *di gat, hav* being a more acrolectal feature (see 2.2), *gaan* is the only means of expressing the past of *go* ‘go’. There are only very few instances of inherently past verb forms attested in the BCE naturalistic data, which besides *had* (42) include *kiem* ‘came’ (43), *sed* ‘said’ (44), *hid* ‘hid’ (45), and *did* ‘did’ (46), the latter of which is not to be confused with TMA marker *di* (7.5.1).
But girl, you had a good time!

In (43), *kiem* occurs in naturalistic data but in conversation with me, thus it is possible that the attestation of this variant is directly a result of my presence. Also note the presence of *died*, based on the English past tense dummy auxiliary ‘do’ plus ‘not’. Usually in such contexts, *no* (5.5.1.1) would appear:

(43) *Ai duon nou wai. Mai gransan liiv hier big a in panama*

1.SG NEG know Q 1.SG.POSS grandson leave here big CONJ PREP panana

*mansi bout ten ar fiftin yie-z an im kiem hier wan die an*

MOD PREP ten CONJ fifteen year-PL CONJ 3.SG come.PST here one day CONJ

1.SG NEG.PST know 3.SG

*ai didn nou im.*

I do not know why. My grandson left here as an adult and must have been in Panama for about fifteen or ten years, and he came back one day and I did not recognise him.

(16-11:86nr2012)

(44) *Ai sed dis maanin wen ai di waan waip-doun...*

1.SG say.PST DEM morning CONJ 1.SG PST PRPASP wipe down

And I said this morning when I was going to clean up...

(10-15:19n2012)

(45) *Uor dem hid it in di sii.*

CONJ 3.PL hide.PST 3.SG PREP DEF sea

Or they hid it in the sea.

(13-9:46n2012)
Again, a contrast can be observed between the productive past form *did* (46) and the unmarked variant *du* (47):

(46)  \[ Yuu \text{ no hier wat de } \text{ did } \text{ tu [anon.]}? \]
     2.SG NEG here COMP 3.PL do.PST PREP [anon.]

Have you not heard what they did to [anon.]?
     (10-15:19n2012)

(47)  \[ Dem di hav a lat a uol buk-s. Ai \text{ no nuo wich paat. Ai} \]
     3.PL PST HAVE INDF lot PREP old book-PL 1.SG NEG know Q part 1.SG
     get tuu a ting, but ai no nuo we ai \text{ du wi dem} get two PREP thing CONJ 1.SG NEG know COMP 1.SG do PREP DEM.PL
     Ai \text{ gat tuu much buk-s, man, insaid de.} Ai
     1.SG got too much book-PL DM inside there

     They had a lot of books. I don’t know where. I’ve got two of the things, but I don’t know what I did with them. I’ve got too many books, man, inside there.
     (16-11:86nr2012)

Whether these inherently past verb forms are new ways of encoding past time reference or have always been accessible to BCE speakers, remains unanswered. Certainly, these attestations are produced by speakers of varying ages. To speak of the unmarked verb form representing the basilect and the inherently past verb form the acrolect is most likely premature (again, see 2.2). Patrick (1999:227) observes that *go, have, do, said* are high-frequency verbs in English. They are also notably all irregular verbs forms, which is also true for *come* and *hide*.

The above suppletive past tense forms are not to be confused with verb forms that resemble English past tense forms but are in fact unmarked verbs in BCE, such as *lef* ‘leave’, *marid* ‘marry’ and *bruok* ‘break’
7.5.4 wo

7.5.4.1 The copula domain

7.5.4.1.1 Time-stable ascriptive predicates

Ascriptive predicates denoting property concepts (see 5.3.1.1) generally hold an intermediate position between nouns, which denote temporally stable entities, and verbs, which denote temporally unstable situations (Frawley 1992: 439). As observed in (7.5.1.4), when an adjective in ascriptive function is viewed by a BCE speaker as time-unstable, it is overtly marked as such via di. This past marker is usually reserved for verbs (see 7.5.1), the distinction between verbs and other predicates being that the former do not require a copula (see, for example, discussions in, 5.2, 5.3, 7.5.1, 7.5.4.1.1). In contrast, a property concept in ascriptive function which is considered more temporally stable is found with past copula wo (or remains unmarked), as in (48), (49), (50). In this respect, di and wo mirror the pattern observed in present contexts, whereby time-unstable properties in this syntactic function are marked by de, and time-stable properties remain unmarked or marked by copula iz with an additional semantic meaning of counter-presupposition (see 5.3.1.1). In (48), (49), (50), the ascriptive predicates are marked by wo. Nevertheless, where the time frame of past has been clearly established such predicates may remain unmarked, as illustrated in example (68) in (7.5.5) in which the property ded ‘dead’ is identifiable. What determines whether an adjective is classified as time stable/temporary is discussed briefly in (7.5.1.4).

In (48), the speaker in question no longer lives in Almirante but has now lived in Ol’ Bank, Bastimentos for decades (see map in 3.3). But at the time she lived in Almirante, life became very hard for her after the earthquake:

(48) Yies, in almirante i wo rof bikaaż mai hous faal doun.

EXC in Almirante 3.SG COP.PST rough CONJ 1.SG.POSS house fall down
Yes, in Almirante it was rough because my house collapsed.
(02a-16:55np2012)
In (49), the speaker treats *likí* ‘little’ as a temporally-stable property:

(49)  \textit{Wen shí woz likí shí neva waan go skuul}  
\textit{CONJ 3.SG COP.PST little 3.Sg NEG.PST want go school} 
\textit{When she was little she didn’t want to go to school.}  
\textit{(17a19:47e20122)}

As already observed in example (31) in (7.5.1.4), the speaker in question marks the property concept *kuol* ‘cold’ with *di* in order to capture its temporally-unstable quality. In contrast, *kuol* in (50) co-occurs with *woz*, enabling the speaker to contrast the statement made by her sister with her own claim. We do not know whether the sister claimed the coldness to be a time-stable or a time-unstable property (this example was in any case elicited), but what we do know is that the speaker of (50) chooses to make the contrast between her sister’s claim and her own claim more exagerated by signalling that her sister believes the water to be always too cold:

(50)  \textit{Mai sista tel mi yestidie sie di waata woz tuu kuol, bu}  
\textit{1.SG.POSS sister tell 1.SG yesterday COMP DEF water COP.PST too cold CONJ}  
\textit{ai fiil laik iz lai.}  
\textit{1.SG feel like COP lie}  
\textit{My sister told me yesterday that the water was too cold, but I feel like it’s a lie.}  
\textit{(20-19:47e2012)}

7.5.4.1.2  Equative clauses & simple past

Equative clauses in JC are marked optionally for past via *bin*/*ben* (see also 7.5). In the absence of past marking, the JC equative marker, *a* takes its temporal reference from the discourse context. Nevertheless, it is possible for *bin*/*ben* to occur on its own without the equative marker (Winford 1993: 161). In BCE, equative clauses in past contexts are obligatorily marked via past copula *wo*, as illustrated in (51), (52), (53), which reflects the behaviour of present copula *iz* (see 5.3.1.2):
(51) Dat wo di die di big-taim fai t brok.
DEM COP.PST DEF day DEF big-time fight break
That was the day the enormous fight broke out.
(04-01:19n2012)

(52) An a wo liv wi [anon.]. [anon.] wo mai hosba,
CONJ 1.SG COP.PST live PREP [anon.] [anon.] COP.PST 1.SG.POSS husband
But [anon.] neva gat no moni fi bai chiwi, so ai di waan
CONJ [anon.] NEG.PST got NEG money COMP buy kiwi so 1.SG PST want
liv wi Teri.
live PREP Teri
And I was living with [anon.]. [anon.] was my husband but [anon.] did not
have money to buy kiwis, so I wanted to live with Teri.
(04-01:19n2012)

(53) Mista [anon.] wo wi granfaada, so im ron gaan donstied
Mister [anon.] COP.PST 1.PL.POSS grandfather so 3.SG run go.PST down stairs
nou an tink se shi wo drap fi shuut (?).
Now CONJ think COMP 3.SG COP.PST drop PREP [unknown]
Mister [anon.] was our grandfather, so he ran downstairs and thought she had fallen
for/to [unknown].
(22-004:212012n)

7.5.4.1.3 Locative clauses & simple past
Past marking is not obligatory in BCE locative clauses, but if present, takes the form of past
copula wo. As discussed in (5.3.1.3), the locative marker de is not required when the
predicate clearly encodes a location, e.g., with place names. Thus, wo marks past locative
clauses both in the absence, (54), (55), and presence of de (56):

(54) ...an ai rimemba wen ai smaal, dem woz somwie lan bai
CONJ 1.SG remember CONJ 1.SG small 3.PL COP.PST somewhere long PREP di park.
DEF park
...and I remember when I was small, they were somewhere up by the park.
(07a-12:42n2012)

(55) Ai tink wan woz insaid dier.
1.SG think one COP.PST inside there
I think one [the book] was inside there [the house].
(16-11:86nr2012)

(56) Ai wo de pan da wan tuu! Yie, mi wo de rait de,
1.SG COP.PST COP PREP DEM one too EXC 1.SG COP.PST COP right there
a no mis non.
1.SG NEG miss none
I was on that one too [television broadcast]! Yeah, I was right there, I didn’t miss anything.
(12-5:40n2012)

Further research is required to determine how predicates are marked for locative when combined with past markers other than wo, e.g., past habitual yuustu (6.4.3.1.2).

In (57), woz encodes a past interrogative locative clause. Generally, the word-final voiced alveolar fricative is not pronounced in BCE, also confirmed by Snow (2013: 265). Present interrogative locative clauses are marked by iz (see 5.3.1.3):

(57) we yu woz wen di polis nuoak an di duoa
Q 2.SG COP.PST CONJ DEF police knock PREP DEF door
Where were you when the police knocked on the door?
(15-18:56e2012)
Negated past locative clauses are identified by the presence of *neva + de*, as illustrated in (58), (59), (60). Nevertheless, it is not the case that locative *de* is obligatory in such contexts, as illustrated in (58) and in (7.5.4.1.3):

(58) *Mi did gaan aredi. Mi woz in bed. Mi neva de.*
1.SG PST go.PST already 1.Sg COP.PST PREP bed 1.Sg NEG.PST there
I’d gone already. I was in bed, I wasn’t there.
(15-18:56nr2012)

Mister [anon.] and sons, [anon.], who still belongs to our church, who still goes to our church. And they were not from here, they were from Bocas.
(07a-12:42n2012)

(60) *Ai gaan luk fi [anon.] an [anon.] neva de dier.*
1.SG go.PST look PREP [anon.] CONJ [anon.] NEG.PST COP there
I went to look for [anon.] but [anon.] was not there.
(10-15:19n2012)

One instance of negated *woz* in the form of *wozn* (61) is attested in the naturalistic data, most likely an acrolectal feature for accommodating to English since I was present during this recording:

(61) *Ai wozn hier. Ai woz rante.*
1.SG COP.PST.NEG here 1.SG COP.PST ([Almi])rante
I wasn’t here. I was in Almirante
(02a-16:55nr2012)

7.5.4.2 Progressive
In BCE, the progressive is a semantic context that usually appears unmarked for past, the progressive markers themselves taking the form of preverbal *de* and verbal suffix *-in* (see 6.4.1). Occasionally, a progressive construction is overtly marked for past, in which case *wo* appears, as illustrated in (62), (63), (64), (65), (66), (67). There is some evidence that where a speaker chooses one progressive variant over the other, either in my presence or that of my BCE consultant, it is the result of style-shifting away from everyday speech. Indeed, what is interesting about these few examples containing *wo* is that progressive marking almost always takes the form of *-in*, except for (67).

In (62) and (63), the same speaker (acting as a researcher’s consultant) is conversing with another speaker and on the recording one of her children queries why she is talking in such a manner. In (63), the overtly past progressive construction contains a verbal complement in the form of variant *tu*, not *fi*, the former representing the more acrolectal (see also, for example, 7.6.3 and 9.3.2.4):

(62) **Speaker 1**

*Wat?*! *Yuu sii dat pan i nuotis?*

Q 2.SG see DEM PREP DEF news

What?! Did you see that on the news? [Sp. *noticias* ‘news’]

(08-08:46n2012)

**Speaker 2**

*M hier dem *woz* taak-*in* pan i nuotis.*

1.SG hear 3.PL COP.PST talk-PROG PREP DEF news

I heard them talking on the news.

(08-16:55n2012)
(63) Mi wo plan-in tu bai rashian.
   1.SG COP.PST plan-PROG COMP buy ration
   I was planning to buy rations
   (08-16:55n2012)

   In (64), the speaker is making up spontaneously. I am present throughout this recording and the speaker uses the -in variant consistently:

(64) Im se, “Yo rimemba wan maanin woz fiid-in im an i
   3.SG say 2.SG remember one morning COP.PST feed-PROG 3.SG CONJ DEF
   ring slip aaf di finga an im pik it op?”. 
   ring slip PREP DEF finger CONJ 3.Sg pick 3.SG up
   He said, “You remember one morning you were feeding him [the turkey] and the ring slipped off the finger and he [the turkey] picked it up?”.
   (16-011:86fr2012)

   In (65), the speaker is conversing with me during an elicitation session about the difference in meaning between kuda (see 9.3.1.3 and 10.2.1.2) and shuda (see 10.2.2.1):

(65) Shi woz jos sluow-in wen shi kud gaan aredi.
   3.SG COP.PST just slow-PROG CONJ 3.SG MOD go.PST already
   She was just delaying when she could have gone already.
   (17a-19:47nr2012)

   At the beginning of the recording from which (66) is taken, the speaker is reminded by my consultant of my wish for natural speech. Shortly afterwards, the speaker uses the progressive construction woz V-in, then immediately substitutes de for -in without any prompt:

(66) Mai hap-is taim in laif wa paas, woz wen mai
   1.SG.POSS happy-SUP time PREP life REL pass COP.PST CONJ 1.SG.POSS
In (67), the speaker selects de over -in, but nonetheless overtly marks the progressive for past:

(67) Yie, bukaa fors, wi wo de tink tu mek inbitieshan but wen
EXC CONJ first 1.PL COP.PST PROG think COMP make invitation CONJ CONJ
yo mek inbitieshan laik pipurl doz fiil laik foni, yie.
2.SG make invitation DM people HAB feel DM funny EXC
Yeh, because at first, we were thinking about making invitations but when you do so, like, people tend to feel a bit uncomfortable, yeah.
(07b-12:42n2012)

7.5.5 Other uses of wo

This section explores the potential meaning of wo outside of progressive constructions (see 7.5.4.2) and its function as a past copula in ascriptive, equative, and locative clauses (see 7.5.4.1). In particular, this section seeks to ascertain whether wo may function as a TMA marker to encode either simple past (see 7.2 for a definition) or pluperfect (see 7.5.1.3 for a definition), furthermore, to determine whether the stative/dynamic distinction (see 5.2) that directly affects the occurrence of di (see also 7.5.1.1) and its meaning, plays any role with respect to wo. As mentioned in (7.5.1.3), there is some evidence in the data to suggest that with dynamic verbs, as well as having the meaning of counter-presupposition (7.5.1.2) it can signal the pluperfect in cases where two situations do not appear in the expected iconic order in a narrative.
There are five attestations of dynamic verbs marked by wo in the BCE data that was analysed for the purposes of this thesis. They encode both simple past and pluperfect. Importantly, they are taken from naturalistic data and uttered by the two youngest speakers in the BCE data who are 19 and 21. Dynamic bihibeb ‘behave’ (68), dynamic drap fall’ (68), and stative liv ‘live’ (71), are marked for simple past, with dynamic gaan (69) (see 7.5.2) and dynamic hapin ‘happen’ (70) marked for pluperfect. Furthermore, in (69) the iconic pattern of mirroring the sequential order of the past situations occurs, that is, wo gaan is not signalling a “disruption of temporal order” (Singler 1990: 213; cited in Patrick 1999: 181), which is indeed the case for wo hapin in (70). The example sentences are presented below, with a closing remark at the end.

(68) Speaker 1
Yo yuustu bihibeb bad.
You used to behave badly.

(04-16:55n2012)

Speaker 2
Wen ai wo liki ai wo bihibeb bad. A wo nasi. A
When I was little, I behaved badly. I was nasty.

CONJ 1.SG COP.PST little 1.SG COP.PST behave bad 1.SG COP.PST nasty 1.SG neva laik kuom mi hir, so a die mi mada grab di
NEG.PST like comb 1.SG.POSS hair so DEM day 1.SG.POSS mother grab DEF

ziza-z an chap it af klii, laik a man.
scissor-PL CONJ chop 3.SG PREP clean like INDF man

When I was little, I behaved badly. I was nasty. I didn’t like combing my hair, so

one day my mother grabbed the scissors and cut it off completely, like a man.

Speaker 3
An yo ak bout hou yo wo drap afa di step an [anon.] ran
When you asked how you used to drop a piece of step at [anon.] run

CONJ 2.SG ask PREP Q 2.SG COP.PST drop PREP DEF step CONJ [anon.] run

gaan donstierd.
go.PST downstairs
And ask about how you fell down the stairs and [anon.] went running downstairs. (04-22:21n2012)

Speaker 2
*Tink a ded!*
Think 1.SG dead
Thought I was dead!
(04-01a:19n2012)

Speaker 3
[anon.] *wo wi granfaada, so im ron gaan donstied nou an* [anon.] COP.PST 1.PL grandfather so 3.SG run go.PST downstairs now CONJ
tink se shi wo drap fi shuut(?). An shi stie shuo think COMP 3.SG COP.PST drop PREP [unknown] CONJ 3.Sg stay sure
don pan di Gron laik shi wo ded, an im gaan don down PREP DEF ground like 3.SG COP.PST dead CONJ 3.SG go.PST down
de baal, an wi afa staat laaf afa im! PROG bawl CONJ 1.PL MOD start laugh PREP 3.SG

[Anon.] was our grandfather, so he ran downstairs and thought she had fallen for/to [unknown]. And she stayed still on the ground as if she were dead and he went down crying, and we had to start laughing at him!
(04-22:21n2012)

As to be expected, the noun *granfaada* ‘grandfather’ in (68) combines with *wo*, as is obligatory in BCE in equative clauses (7.5.4.1.2). Ascriptive predicates *liki* ‘little’ and *nasi* ‘nasty’ are found very early on in the narrative, in fact they occur in the first sentence that begins the narrative proper. They are marked by *wo* as time-stable predicates before the temporal frame has been clearly established (see 7.5.4.1.1.). Ascriptive *ded*, also a time-stable predicate, occurs twice, the first attestation is unmarked, the other marked. It seems that even where past tense is acknowledged between interlocutors, it is not the case that dropping the copula is compulsory.
The excerpt in (69) follows on from (68). The narrative of the speakers’ childhood years continues but with a new story. Here, *gaan* (+ verb phrase) is marked by *wo* to signal the pluperfect:

(69) [anon.], ai rimemba tuu a taim wen a woz liki, an a [anon.] 1.SG remember too INDF time CONJ 1.Sg COP.PST little CONJ 1.SG wo gaan pik mango wid [anon.] an [anon.]. An wen wi COP.PST go.PST pick mango PREP [anon.] CONJ [anon.] CONJ CONJ 1.PL gaan dan de, wi ful di buot oba-ful, an wen wi kom-in go.PST down there 1.PL full DEF boat over-full CONJ CONJ 1.PL come-PROG bak di bout ton oba.

Back DEF boat turn over
[anon.], I remember a time too when I was little, and I had gone to pick mangos with [anon.] and [anon.]. And when we went down there, we over-filled the boat [lit. filled the boat overfull], and when we were coming back the boat overturned [lit. turn over].

(04-22:21n2012)

In (70) the same story told in (69) continues, only at a slightly later point. Here, *hapin* is marked for pluperfect. However, *fraitin* ‘frightened’ is marked by *wo* despite it representing a time-unstable property, which is usually reserved for marking time-stable predicates (see 7.5.4.1.1). Here too, these youngest speakers appear to be rewriting the grammatical rules:

(70) An wi kom huom da die bakaa wi wo *fraitin*, but notin CONJ 1.PL come home DEM day CONJ 1.PL COP.PST frighten CONJ nothing wo *hapin* an wi get fi kom huom bak.
COP.PST happen CONJ 1.PL get COMP come home back
And we came home that day because we were frightened, but nothing (had) happened, and we got to come back home.
In (71), a new story begins immediately after a previous one. As to be expected, *hosban* ‘husband’ combines with *wo*, which is obligatorily required in BCE for marking past equative clauses (7.5.4.1.2). Ascriptive *liki* ‘little’ is unmarked despite it occurring at the beginning of a new narrative, although by this time it is clear to all during the recording that the stories being told relate to their childhood. As already discussed, dynamic *liv* ‘live’ is marked for simple past by *wo*, which goes against the usual pattern of remaining unmarked (see 5.2). *Liv* is also marked by *di waan*, the combination of which (past and relative/prospective aspect) results in a future-in-the-past interpretation (see 10.2.2.4):

(71)  
**Speaker 1**

An yo rimemba tuu wen yo *liki* an [anon.] dem yuustu *liv*  
CONJ 2.SG remember too CONJ 2.SG little CONJ [anon.] 3.PL HAB.PST live  
don *di* kriik?  
down DEF creek  
And you remember when you were little and [anon.] and the others used to live  
Down the Creek?

**Speaker 2**

*de* plie hous.  
1.SG PROG play house  
I was playing house.

**Speaker 1**

An [anon.] o [anon.] pelt a machete ova yuu.  
CONJ [anon.] CONJ [anon.] pelt INDF machetet PREP 2.SG  
And [anon.] or [anon.] hurled a machete at you.

(04-22:21n2012)

**Speaker 2**

An a *wo* *liv* wi [anon.]. [anon.] *wo* mai *hosba*,  
CONJ 1.SG COP.PST live PREP [anon.] [anon.] COP.PST 1.SG.POSS husband
But [anon.] neva got no moni fi bai chiwi, so ai di waan
CONJ [anon.] NEG.PST got NEG money COMP buy kiwi so 1.SG PST want
liv wi Teri.
live PREP Teri
And I lived with [anon.]. [anon.] was my husband but [anon.] did not have
money to buy kiwis, so I was going to live with [anon.].
(04-01:19n2012)

To summarise, one generalisation to make regarding the attestations of wo in the
examples presented in this section is that it is often the case that they are found in close
vicinity of the past copula use of wo in ascriptive and equative clauses. A further
generalisation to make is that the speakers of these attestations of wo are the youngest in
the BCE data. Since stative verbs are otherwise indiscriminately found with di to signal
simple past contexts (see 7.5.1.1), it is interesting that stative liv ‘live’ (71) should be
marked by wo, not di. A further observation is that although dynamic verbs remain
unmarked for simple past in BCE (see 5.2), dynamic verbs bihieb ‘behave’ (68) and drap
fall’ (68) are not only marked for simple past but marked by wo, not di. And although
examples of di are found in the data marking the pluperfect only when the temporal order
is not reflected in the sequential order of the clauses describing the respective situations
(again, see 7.5.1.3), this is true for wo + gaan in (69) but not for wo + hapin in (70).

There is not enough evidence to make sweeping generalisations here, nevertheless, it
would certainly be worth investigating whether these attestations that go against the usual
grammatical pattern in BCE are the beginnings of language change. The evidence for a
pluperfect meaning for di is minimal but not non-existent (see 7.5.1.1 and 7.5.1.2), and a
mere tentative suggestion at this stage is that these youngest speakers are treating wo as a
general past marker and, therefore, suitable in any kind of past context (see also 11.2 and
11.3).
7.6 Future

7.6.1 The future domain: tense versus prospective aspect

The purpose of this section is to tease out the semantic distinction between future tense and prospective aspect, since the BCE markers that express the future domain divide into those that encode absolute future and those that encode relative/prospective aspect. A theoretical description of tense including future tense is also found in (7.2).

The first distinction to make between future tense and prospective aspect is related to reference points. Future tense is an absolute tense, which takes Speech Time (S) as its deictic centre (Comrie 1985: 36), e.g., Bill will throw himself off the cliff (Comrie 1976: 64). The time at which the situation takes place is Event Time (E), which in the case of future tense is after (S). In contrast, prospective aspect marks a situation as relative to some future situation, e.g., Bill is going to throw himself off the cliff (Comrie 1976: 64). Relative tense takes a reference point other than (S), so that the situation in question (E) occurs relative to another situation (R), rather than in relation to (S) (Kroeger 2005: 151).

A second distinction between future tense and prospective aspect is that the latter is found in both present and past contexts, e.g., Bill was going to throw himself off the cliff (Comrie 1985: 95). Leech (1971: 57) observes that the usual interpretation of going to marked by past tense is that fulfilment did not take place. Non-fulfilment of a present propensity to a future situation equates to a future-in-the-past meaning, the result of the situation being blocked by intervening factors (see 10.2.2.4).

A third distinction between future tense and prospective aspect is a distinction between prediction and intention, (Comrie 1976: 64-65), although both these notions could equally be claimed to pertain to the domain of modality (see 7.2). Nevertheless, while it is true that prediction and intention might to some extent be viewed as typical meanings for will and going to, respectively, they are not the only ones. (1990: 138). Although prediction is a core meaning of English will, e.g., It will be lovely to see you (1983: 179), Palmer (1990:
observes that predicting future situations is not the main function of *will*, and that in the vast majority of cases *will* involves some element of conditionality or refers to situations that are planned, envisaged, hoped for, expected, or confirmed. Indeed, Tyler & Jan (2017: 414) consider scheduled situations an important meaning of *will*, e.g., *The conference will take place this coming March*. English *going to* does not necessarily encode intention as part of its meaning, for example, *I am going to be sick* describes an involuntary situation. Nicolle (1997) observes that sentiments other than prior intention include imminence, assumption, and inevitability.

A fourth distinction between future tense and prospective aspect is that the latter expresses a present propensity to a future situation (a state), which by its nature defines it as more immediate than situations marked for future tense. Despite a tendency for situations in prospective aspect to express imminence, this is not an exclusive component meaning, e.g., *I’m going to be a policeman when I grow up* (Leech 1971: 56).

The literature on English *will* and *going to* is extensive, as well as on futurates, for example, use of the present progressive and simple present in future contexts (see examples (17), (18), (19) in (5.2), which show the unmarked verb expressing future contexts). The semantics of *will* and *going to* are often discussed in terms of the original semantics of their respective sources, rather than on their functional differences.

Across the CECs, there are two distinct markers for expressing future contexts (Winford 1996: 315). Prospective aspect is attested in the forms *go* and *gwain* in JC, BelC, rural Guyanese Creole (GC), and other Eastern CEC varieties (see 3.2). A geographical variant in JC is *de go*, which, as discussed in (6.4.1.1.1), is not a combination found in BCE. NC shares the same form and function as BCE *gwain* (Bartens 2013a: 119), as does SA and PI (Bartens 2013b: 108). In Sranan, prospective aspect is encoded via *e go*. The intermediate Eastern CECs typically encode prospective aspect via *goin tolan*, e.g., Bajan Creole (BC), Trinidadian Creole (TC), and Urban GC. The function and form of absolute future marker *wil(l)* is found in JC (Farquharson 2013: 85) and NC (Bartens 2013a: 119),
along with SA and PI (Bartens 2013b: 108). In BelC, absolute future is encoded via *wa* (from *waan* ‘want’), a form which encodes prospective aspect in BCE (see 7.6.2.2 and below). In basilectal Eastern CECs (see 3.2), the absolute future marker is *golo*, whilst in TC it is *go*, and in urban GC and BC, it is *gon*. Although prospective aspect *gwain* contrasts with *wi* in the CECs, reference to the semantics of propensity is not made in the literature for *wi*, nor are descriptions available that indicate the typical contexts in which this marker is found.

The future domain is predominantly marked in BCE, where a distinction is made between absolute future and prospective aspect. Absolute future markers take the form of *wi* (7.6.4) and negated *wuon* (7.6.5), with prospective aspect being marked via *gwain* (7.6.2.1), *waan* (7.6.2.2), and *luk fi* (7.6.3). Evidently, there are similarities between BCE and English in the expression of future, not least in the fact that *gwain, wi, wuon* have their origins in *going (to), will, won’t*, respectively.

Variants *gwain* and *waan* are analysed as aspect markers because they are compatible with past tense markers *di* and *wo* (see 10.2.2.4 for a discussion on future-in-the-past), although more data is required for *luk fi*). The semantic difference between *gwain* and *waan* is that the former is constrained to intention, whereas *waan* encodes intention, prediction, and willingness. The main function of *wi* is to mark propensity and is most frequently found in the apodosis of real conditionals (see 5.4.1.1.1). The stative/dynamic distinction that arises in past contexts does not play a role with respect to the markers discussed in this section on the future domain.

Finally, the motivation for describing prospective aspect in this chapter on tense as opposed to the chapter on aspect, is that traditionally this function is analysed under descriptions of tense in CECs.
7.6.2 Introduction to gwain & waan

The relative/prospective aspect markers, gwain (7.6.2.1.2) and waan (7.6.2.2.2), are illustrated in (72) and (73), respectively. As previously mentioned (7.6.1), these variants differ from absolute future wi (7.6.4) insofar as they readily combine with past marking for a future-in-the-past reading (see 10.2.2.4). There is no evidence that gwain and waan combine with any other TMA markers.

(72) Wi gwain taak bout riil uoldin die-z taim nauo?
1.PL PRSP talk PREP real olden’ day-PL time now
Are we going to talk about former times?
(14-19:47n2012)

(73) Dem pikni haftu stodi naou bika ef dem no stodi, den kiaan
PL child MOD study now CONJ CONJ 3.PL NEG study 3.PL MOD.NEG
liv. dem waan ded fi hongri.
live 3.PL PRSP die PREP hungry
The children must study now because if they don’t study, they can’t survive.
They’re going to die of hunger.
(14-19:47n2012)

The sources for prospective gwain and waan originate in main verbs, a verb of motion in the case of gwain (see 7.6.2.1.1) and a verb of desire in the case of waan (see 7.6.2.1.1). Indeed, cross-linguistically the overwhelming majority of lexical sources for future markers are movement verb constructions (‘go’, ‘come’, ‘become’) and sources of desire and obligation (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 253). Bybee, Perkins & et al. (1994: 243) observe that markers of futurity may retain their respective non-future uses believed to be remnants of earlier stages along the development pathways leading to future. This is a case of layering, where over time meanings tend to become weakened during the process of grammaticalisation but during the initial stages there is a shift in meaning, not a loss (see
1.2.2 for more information). At the very beginning of the process, nevertheless, a lexical item will retain its meaning, existing alongside the newly developed one. As lexical material becomes more grammatical it undergoes functional and structural changes.

As explained in (1.1), this study is a synchronic description of tense-aspect-modality, and since BCE is an oral language any diachronic analysis would not be possible anyway. It is unknown when the grammaticalisation process behind the change in function of waan took place, since unlike gwain and wi, waan has no equivalent in English since English want does not function in this context. An alternative explanation for waan has been proposed by Aceto (1998: 39), who puts forward the idea that phonological reduction has taken place, from gwain > gowain > gwain > wain to wa(a)n. Thus, the etymology of the future form waan is not entirely clear. BeIC marker wa is assumed to be derived from waa (‘want’) (Winford 2006: 27) and marks ‘general future’ (Escure 2013: 95), claimed to alternate with gwain, which Winford (2006: 28) analyses as a ‘prospective (more immediate) future’ (see 7.6.1).

**Waam** occurs in the naturalistic data far more frequently than gwain, which is perhaps not surprising on the basis that it can mean intention, prediction, and volition, whereas gwain appears to be predominantly restricted to an intentional sense. However, there is an attestation of gwain marked by di (7.5.1) for past by an older speaker (example (29) in 10.2.2.4), which has a future-in-the-past reading that is not one of intention but prediction. Furthermore, there is anecdotal evidence in the form of conversations with BCE speakers during elicitation session, that older speakers generally prefer gwain over waan. Aceto (1998: 39) observes that the frequency of gwain is well more than double the frequency of waan. Thus, an area of future research would be a quantitative sociolinguistic study to ascertain how frequent each marker occurs and what social factors might be involved (possibly age) (see also concluding remarks in 11.2).

Finally, the main meaning of absolute future wi (7.6.4) is propensity, found most frequently in the apodosis of real conditionals. Although more data is needed, the situation
appears to be that prediction is more likely to be encoded via \textit{waan} than \textit{wi}, and that \textit{waan} covers more meanings than \textit{gwain}.

7.6.2.1 \textit{gwain}

7.6.2.1.1 Main verb

In BCE, \textit{go} is a main verb expressing motion towards a goal. It has a progressive form in \textit{gwain} (6.4.1.1.1) and a past form in \textit{gaan} (7.5.2). \textit{Go}, \textit{gwain}, and \textit{gaan} may take a verb phrase complement expressing some type of purpose or intention, where included in the meaning is a component of a preparation phase (see alsoWinford 1993: 236-7), which is illustrated in (74). However, in the case of ascriptive predicates, the interpretation is inchoative aspect (see 6.5.1 for examples).

(74) \textit{If iz iivnin, go bai banana an tuu eg, yu anastan?}
\hspace{1cm} CONJ COP evening go buy banana CONJ two egg 2.SG understand
\hspace{1cm} In the evenings, (I’ll) go and buy banana and two eggs, you understand?
\hspace{1cm} (10-17:64n2012)

The two functions of \textit{go} are most evidently seen in (75), where \textit{gwain} combines with \textit{go} + verb phrase complement, to encode prospective aspect (see 7.6.2.1.2), followed by lexical morpheme, \textit{go}:

(75) \textit{Jaan gwain go marid nex wiik.}
\hspace{1cm} John go.PROG go marry next week
\hspace{1cm} John is going to go (and) marry next week.
\hspace{1cm} (17a-19:47e2012)

7.6.2.1.2 Grammatical function

Hopper & Traugott (2003: 97) assert that English \textit{be going to} expresses present orientation and a goal-directed plan which reflects its progressive and directional origins. Thus, the original purposive meaning continues to constrain uses of \textit{be going to} \textit{gonna} as the future
of intention, plan, or schedule (Hopper and Traugott 2003: 3). This seems to be the case with respect to BCE gwain, where a sense of general prediction is encoded by waan (see 7.6.2.2.2).

Examples of gwain are illustrated in (76) and (77):

(76)  
Mi  gwain hang op mai  kurtin.
1.SG PRSP  hang  up 1.Sg.POSS curtain
I am going to hang up my curtains.
(009-06:87n2012)

(77)  
Haaf a  mi  kingdom iz  yuaz an  mai  yong-is
Half  PREP 1.SG.POSS kingdom COP yours CONJ 1.SG.POSS young-SUP
data  yo  gwain  get fo  dat.
daughter 2.SG  PRSP get PREP DEM
Half of my kingdom is yours and my youngest daughter you are going to get for that.
(016-11:86fr2012)

Negated prospective aspect encoded via gwain combines with negator no (5.5.1.1), as illustrated in (78):

(78)  
[anon.]  se, “Gi  di  biebi somting”. “No”, [anon.]”, a  se, “Huu? Mi
[anon.] say  give  DEF  baby  something  EXC  [anon]  1.SG  say  Q  1.SG
no  gwain  go  gi  im  no  tii”.
NEG PRSP  go  give 3.SG  NEG  tea
[anon.]  said, “Give the baby something”. “No, [anon.]”, I said, “Who? I’m not going to go and give him any tea”.
(13-9:46n2012)

A metaphorical use of gwain for pragmatic effect is observable in (79):
(79) Ai se, “Lisin, if dat iz mai tow, hou a no gwain
1.SG say listen CONJ DEM COP 1.SG.POSS town Q 1.SG NEG PRSP
nuo di girl?”.  
know DEF girl
I said, “Listen, if that is my town, how am I not going to know the girl?”.
(12-17:64n2012)

7.6.2.2 waan
7.6.2.2.1 Main verb

A desiderative meaning is present in main verb waan. Its semantics expresses both ‘want’ and ‘need’. It co-occurs with noun phrases as complements and non-finite clauses. Waan also has a variant in want.

Waan + noun phrase complement is illustrated in (80) and (81), and waant + noun phrase complement in (82):

(80) Mi waan a paat dem gat, de daans.
1.SG want INDF part 3.PL got PROG dance
I want a share of [the money] that they got, (me) dancing.
(12-05:40n2012)

(81) Da pikni waan plenti lov.
DEM child want plety love
That child needs a lot of love
(19-19:47e2012)

(82) Yuu kian tel ar se yuu waant it.
2.SG MOD tell 3.SG COMP 2.SG want 3.SG
You can tell her that you want it.
(09-6:87np2012)
Waan + non-finite complement clause is observable in (83) and (84):

(83)  *Mi jos waan kaal it aaf an sie nyuu yier yu kian kaal mi.*
   1.SG just want call 3.SG off CONJ say New Year 2.SG MOD call 1.SG
   I just want to call it [Christmas] off and say in the New Year you can call me.
   (19-20:24n2012)

(84)  *Taak wat yo waan taak bout fos.*
   Talk Q 2.SG want talk about first
   Talk about what you want to talk about first.
   (04-16:55n2012)

The complement clause may also have a subject, as in (85):

(85)  *Im se, “Nou, Ai waan yo tel mi we aal douz trinket-s aar”.*
   3.SG say now 1.SG want 2.PL tell 1.SG Q all DEM.PL trinket-PL are
   He said, “Now, I want you to tell me where all the trinkets are”.
   (16-11:86fr2012)

In (86) and (87), *waant* is attested, the latter in a past context. Although the evidence remains inconclusive, it is possible that *waant* is less likely with a reduced (subjectless) complement:

(86)  *An im aks wi ef wi waant im pik op di mango dem.*
   CONJ 3.SG ask 1.PL CONJ 1.PL want 3.SG pick up DEF mango PL
   And he asked us if we wanted him to pick up the mangos.
   (04-22:21n2012)

(87)  *Ai duon nuo wat mai children dem tink-in bikaaz dem*
   1.SG NEG know Q 1.SG.POSS children 3.PL think-PROG CONJ 3.PL.POSS
   big sista di waant dem go spen krismos wi dem, but dem se dem
Want spend Christmas DEM side 
I do not know what my children are thinking because my older sister wanted them to go and spend Christmas with them, but they said they want to spend Christmas over here. 
(14-19:47n2012)

7.6.2.2.2 Grammatical function 
There are two functions of waan that co-exist in BCE, a main verb of desire/need (see 7.6.2.2.1) and a TMA marker encoding prospective aspect (see 7.6.1). Of the two main verb variant waan and want, the latter does not appear in the BCE data in the function of a prospective aspect marker. The bridging context between main verb and TMA marker is evident in (88) and (89):

(88) Mi no gwain bai nobody hous. Ai waan wok bai di restoraan. 
1.SG NEG go.PRG PREP nobody house 1.SG PRSP work PREP DEF restaurant 
I’m not going to anybody’s house. I’m going to work at the restaurant. 
(13-09:46n2012)

(89) Ai no nou wot him waan du. 
1.Sg NEG know Q 3.SG PRSP do 
I do not know what he’s going to do. 
(14-14;50n2012)

In (90), again, the meaning of waan is somewhat ambiguous between a main verb and a marker of prospective aspect. Negative concord (see 5.5.1.1) features in (90), where the noun phrase complement of the verb phrase takes the form of negated indefinite pronoun notin (‘nothing’):
(90) *Ai no waan duu notin. Ai gwain wourk an fon wourk ai no*  
1.Sg NEG PRSP do nothing 1.SG go.PST work CONJ PREP work 1.SG NEG  
nou wat ai waan du.  
know COMP 1.SG PRSP do  
I’m not going to do anything. I’m going to work and after work I do not know what  
I’m going to do.  
(14-14:50n2012)

Bybee, Perkins *et al.* (1994: 255) observe that markers of futurity from desire will have  
nuances of willingness at some stage of their development, claiming that English *will* still  
conveys this sense in certain contexts, e.g. *I’m sure he’ll help you if you ask* (Hopper and  
of so-called ‘desire futures’: desire-willingness-intention-prediction.

Based on the BCE data at hand, general prediction appears to be encoded by  
prospective aspect *waan*, and not absolute future *wi*. As mentioned in (7.6.4), the principal  
meaning of *wi* is propensity, and is consistently found in the apodosis of real conditionals  
(see also 5.4.1.1). Since *waan* encodes willingness, intention, and prediction, it shows  
more functionality than prospective aspect *gwain* (7.6.2.1.2), which is constrained to the  
meaning of intention and not prediction.

In (91), a sense of willingness (or volition) is, arguably, present, a meaning that doesn’t  
appear to be present in *wi* (see also 8.2.2 in which the expression of volition is likened to  
boulomaic modality) or *gwain*. This meaning of willingness in *waan* is illustrative of  
layering, that is, an older meaning persists alongside newer meanings (see 7.6.2 and 1.2.2).  
If it is indeed the case that *waan*, as illustrated in (91), may not be substituted by *gwain*,  
the conclusion would be that the original salient meaning of *waan* has not yet undergone  
bleaching (again, see 1.2.2):

(91) *If yuu bihiev yuself, ai waan mek yuu guo bai di riva.*
CONJ 2.SG behave 2.SG.REFL 1.SG PRSP let 2.SG go PREP DEF river
If you behave well, I’ll let you go to the river.
(19-19:47e2012)

The meaning of intention is observable in (92), (93), (94):

(92)  *Mek a sii if shi waan kaal mi.*
Let 1.SG see CONJ 3.SG PRSP call 1.SG
Let’s see if she will call me.
(13-2:23n2012)

(93)  *So, laik, hou it de rien tudie tuu, ai dout im waan kom.*
So DM Q 3.SG PROG rain today too 1.SG doubt 3.SG PRSP come
So, like, as it is raining today too, I doubt he’s going to come.
(13-9:46n2012)

(94)  *Taak enitin an ai waan ansa!*
Talk anything CONJ 1.SG PRSP answer
Say anything and I will answer!
(13-2:23n2012)

In (95), (96), (97), any desiderative sense of *waan* has been bleached and its meaning is one of prediction. In (95), it is not usual for someone to wish to be ugly, and in (96) and (97) the subjects are inanimate:

(95)  *Di pikni waan ugli.*
DEF child PRSP ugly
The child’s going to be ugly.
(00-26:21e2012)
(96)  
I waan rien tumara.
3.SG PRSP rain tomorrow
It’s going to rain tomorrow.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(97)  
Di skai waan red dis iivnin.
DEF sky PRSP red DEM evening
The sky will be red this evening
(17a-19:47e2012)

Further examples of waan to mean prediction are illustrated in (98), (99), (100):

(98)  
Ai duon nou huu waan bii di priicha far di anibersario, but
1.SG NEG KNOW Q PRSP be DEF preacher PREP DEF anniversary CONJ
ai fiil laik wi waan paas a gud taim.
1.SG feel like 1.PL PRSP pass INSF good time
I do not know who’s going to be the preacher for the anniversary, but I feel like
we’re going to have a good time.
(07a-12:422012)

(99)  
Dem pikni haftu stodi naou bika ef dem no stodi den kiaan liv. Dem
waan ded fi hongri.
PRSP dead PREP hunger
The children must study now because if they don’t study, they can’t survive.
They’ll die of hunger.
(14-19:47n2012)

(100)  
If yuu nuo bai nou, yuu waan pie muo nex wiik.
CONJ 2.SG NEG buy now 2.SG PRSP pay more next week
If you don’t buy now, you’ll to pay more next week.
(19a-19:47e2012)

Negated prospective aspect is encoded via negator no (5.5.1.1). The meaning of waan in (101) is negated prediction, and intention in (102) and (103):

(101) Miebi dem no waan get no tuoris tudie ka luk hou di die luk.
Maybe 3.PL NEG PRSP get NEG tourist today CONJ look Q DEF day look
Maybe they’re not going to get any tourists today because look how the day looks.
(13-9:46n2012)

(102) But efi it rien, luk so ogli im no waan kom, ai tink, ka
CONJ CONJ 3.SG rain look so ugly 3.SG NEG PRSP come, 1.SG think CONJ
yesudie it rien an im no kom.
yesterday 3.SG rain CONJ 3.SG NEG come
But if it rains, it looks so awful I don’t think he’s going to come, I think, because yesterday it rained, and he didn’t come.
(13-9:46n2012)

(103) So, wi se wi no waan mek inbitieshan, wi waan rait op a
So 1.PL say.PST 1.PL NEG PRSP make invitation 1.PL PRSP write up INDF
piepa an inbait eribadi.
paper CONJ invite everybody
So, we said we’re not going to make invitations, we’re design a poster and invite everybody.
(07a-12:42n2012)

7.6.3 luk fi

Comrie (1976: 64) claims that from a cross-linguistic perspective, many languages do not necessarily overtly express prospective aspect by grammatical means, but instead have
constructions with immediate time reference such as *be about to* and *be on the point of* (Comrie 1985: 95). African American English (AAE) shares an equivalent meaning encoded via *finna* and variants *fixina, fixna,* and *fitna* (Green 2002: 70-71). Other varieties of English are claimed to have a similar marker in the form of *fixing to* (Bailey, Wikle et al. 1991). AAE *finna* co-occurs with past copula *was* as well as habitual *be* (Green 2002: 70).

BCE has a periphrastic construction in the form of *luk fi,* derived from main verb *luk* ‘look’ and verbal complement *fi.* The semantics of this construction is intentional imminence, as illustrated in (105) and (106), as well as imminence without intention, i.e., prediction, as illustrated in (104).

(104) *Mi sii pipl drap rait doun die an luk fi droun ded. Sii waata*  
1.SG see people drop right down there CONJ look COMP drown dead sea water bad.  
bad  
I have seen people falling right down there and about to drown. Sea water is bad.  
(08-16:55n2012)

*Luk fi* readily co-occurs with the progressive, which in BCE is encoded by variants *de* (105) or *-in* (106) (see 6.4.1.1). Most likely as a result of talking to me, the speaker in (106) substitutes verbal complement *tu* for basilectal variant *fi,* also choosing to use the *-in* to mark the progressive (again, see 6.4.1.1). The evidence here suggests that when accommodation to English takes place, *tu* and *-in* are preferred over *fi* and *de,* respectively (see example (46) in 6.4.1.3.1 for a further example of *lukin tu* + verb):

(105) *Jaan de luk fi go rait.*  
John PROG look COMP go write  
John is about to write.  
(00-26:47e2012)
(106) \textit{Jak luk-in tu go huom.} \\
Jack look-PROG COMP go home \\
Jack was about to go home. \\
(16-11:86fr2012)

The evidence for BCE remains inconclusive as to whether the agent of the clause is constrained by \textit{luk fi} to animate subjects, e.g., \textit{the book is about to fall off the shelf} (see also Narrog 2012: 281). Likewise, it is currently unknown whether \textit{luk fi} is compatible with past marking for marking past temporal contexts. In (104), the tense is unascertainable, nonetheless, the main clause appears to have past tense interpretation. Prospective aspect markers \textit{gwain} and \textit{waan} accept past marking in the form of \textit{di} to mark future-in-the-past (10.2.2.4). Furthermore, the evidence remains inconclusive as to whether \textit{luk fi} combines with habitual \textit{doz} (6.4.3.1.1). Finally, it is unclear if the verb marked by \textit{luk fi} is constrained to agentive verbs or whether a sentence such as ‘The book is about to fall off the shelf’ has an equivalent translation in BCE. Thus, the evidence remains inconclusive as to whether the semantics of \textit{luk fi} has been bleached to the extent that it includes both animate and inanimate subjects, in addition to agentive and non-agentive verbs, (see 1.2.2 for definitions of ‘bleaching’).

7.6.4 \textit{wi}

As mentioned previously (7.6.1), future tense is an absolute tense encoded via phonetic variants \textit{wi} and \textit{wil}. The deictic nature of \textit{wi} prevents it from combining with past tense markers, which is not the case for relative/prospective markers \textit{gwain} and \textit{waan} (see 7.6.2 and also 10.2.2.4 for examples of past \textit{di + gwain/waan} to express future-in-the-past).

The function of \textit{wi} in a simple clause is illustrated in (107) and (108), in which main verbs \textit{go} ‘go’ and copula \textit{bii} ‘be’, respectively, are marked for absolute future tense:

(107) \textit{Miebi ai wi go bai mai family in changuinola. Ai no}
MOD 1.SG FUT go PREP 1.SG.POSS family PREP Changuinola 1.SG NEG

nuo wat ai waa du.

know Q 1.SG PRSP do

Maybe I’ll go to my family in Changuinola [for Christmas]. I don’t know what I’m going to do.
(14-19:47n2012)

(108) Yies, an komparteet fuud wid eribadi, an dat wil bii riili nais.
EXC CONJ share food PREP everybody CONJ DEM FUT COP really nice
Yes, and share food with everybody, and that will be (really) nice.
[Sp. *compartir* ‘share’]
(07a-12:42n2012)

The progressive (6.4.1) may also express future contexts, as is the case in English (see 7.6.1 ). In (109), progressive marking takes the form of verbal suffix *-in*, and in (110), preverbal *de*. In (109) plans are being made for Christmas, and in (110) a story is being told to me by a BCE speaker, in which an announcement is being made by a king in a story about what will happen in the future. The situation, importantly, does not apply at the time of the king’s utterance:

(109) An in di iiivn taim, ai get redi an mai kozin, [anon.],
CONJ PREP DEF evening time 1.SG get ready CONJ 1.SG.POSS cousin [anon.]
wait-*in* an wi.
wait-PROG PREP 1.PL
And in the evening, I will get ready and my cousin, [anon.], will be waiting for us.
(14-19:47n2012)

(110) An onli wan jaiant de ker mai daata.
CONJ only one giant PROG carry 1.SG.POSS daughter
And only one giant will be taking my daughter.
(16-11:86fr2012)

In addition to the typical function of English *will* as a future marker, epistemic undertones are stronger in (111):

(111) That **will** be the postman.

(Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 97)

This function of English *will* enables the speaker to express their confidence in the truth of the proposition being expressed, paraphrased as, ‘I (confidently) predict that it is the case that...’, and can be contrasted with English epistemic *must* in so far as the speaker’s confidence is not based on a process of logical inference, but instead on common sense or on repeated experience (Coates 1983: 177). Indeed, Bybee et al. (1994: 240) claim that epistemic necessity (see 8.2.3 and 8.5) may derive from a future.

The idea of predictability as opposed to pure prediction is also available in BCE. Propensity is an inclination or natural tendency to behave in a particular way. Propensity (given certain conditions) seems to be the primary function of BCE *wi*, hence its occurrence in conditional sentences which introduce a condition for a propensity (see below). Based on this analysis, subjective prediction is thus encoded by *waan* (7.6.2.2.2), not *wi*.

Past propensity in English is encoded via *would*, e.g., *Whenever he heard her coming, he would quickly put out his pipe* (Huddleston 2002: 197). Past propensity in BCE is encoded via *wud* (see 6.4.3.1.3). Nevertheless, if the past temporal frame has been clearly established at the time of utterance, then *wi* may appear as unmarked for tense, as in (112) and (113). This differs to the situation in English where future *will* does not appear in this specific context:

(112) *Nou an agen im **wi** bai a drink.*
Now CONJ again 3.SG FUT buy INDF drink
Now and again he would buy a drink.
(09-6:87n2012)

(113) An evri maanin in get up in tel im mada im wi laik
CONJ every morning 3.SG get up 3.SG tell 3.SG.POSS mother 3.SG FUT like
tu go out an get a wourk.
COMP go out CONJ get INDF work
And every morning he got up and told his mother he would like to go out and get a job.
(16-11:86pr2012)

As mentioned above, a particularly common environment for BCE wi is the apodosis of real conditional sentences (see 5.4.1.1 for a definition), which is also the case for English will (see discussion in 7.6.1). As Bybee et al. (1994: 274) note, apodoses are prime environments for future markers. Since it is unknown at the time of utterance whether the relevant condition(s) will be met, wi encodes the potentiality or prediction of the condition for the propensity introduced in the protasis.

It is possible to express the apodosis of a real conditional without future tense marking, as illustrated in (114). Usually, however, it is marked by wi, as evidenced in (115), (116), (117), (118):

(114) Miebi wen yo luk dem get.
MOD CONJ 2.SG look 3.PL get
Maybe if you look (for them), you’ll get (them).
(13-9:46n2012)

Both if (115), (116), and wen (117), (118), are conjunctions found in the protasis of real conditionals in BCE:
(115) *If*  

\[ shi \text{ get di moni, } shi \, wi \, go \, huom. \]  
CONJ 3.SG get DEF money 3.SG FUT go home  
If she gets the money, she will be able to go home.  
(19b-19:47e2012)

(116) *if*  

\[ yu \text{ go bai di duor } yu \, wi \, sii \, a \, liki \, piis \]  
CONJ 2.SG go PREP DEF door 2.SG FUT see INDF little piece  
If you go to the door, you will see a little piece.  
(09-06:87n2012)

(117) *An*  

\[ wen \, yo \, troburl \, dem \, an \, lik \, doun \, dem \, nes, \, dem \, wil \, iit \]  
CONJ CONJ 2.SG trouble DEM.PL CONJ lick down DEM.PL nest 3.PL FUT eat yo.  
2.SG  
And when you disturb them [bees] and knock down their nest, they will eat you!  
(07b-12:42n2012)

(118) *Wen*  

\[ shi \, redi, \, shi \, wi \, go \, an \, sii \, i \, an \, [anon.] \, wi \, tel \, ar \, liki \]  
CONJ 3.SG ready 3.SG FUT go CONJ see 3.SG CONJ [anon.] FUT tell 3.SG little  
muor about di histori fan di church.  
more PREP DEF history PREP DEF church  
When she is ready, she will go and see it and [anon.] will tell her a little more about the history of the church.  
(07a-12:42n2012)

There are some uses of English *will* that are not applicable to BCE *wi*, and further research of the potential functions of *wi* is necessary. One such use is to express the future perfect, e.g., *by next Wednesday I’ll have moved into the new house* (Leech 1971: 52-53). The perfect of result (7.4.2.1) is not marked in BCE, and (119) indicates that future perfect contexts are not marked by *wi*. Possibly, there is no direct way to express future perfect
and/or the combination of *wi* + *don* is not permissible, both observations of which need confirming. Here, *don* (6.5.2) marks the completion of the process of washing clothes (see 6.2.2 for further examples of *don*):

(119) *Ai fiil laik Mieri don wash dem kluoz fon ieet o klak.*

1.SG feel like Mary COMP wash DEM.PL clothes PREP eight o’clock

I believe that Mary will have washed the clothes by 8 o’clock.

(020-19:47e2012)

A more formal use of English *will* is found in spoken commentary, e.g., *The fanfare will now sound*, or in instructions, e.g., *Mrs Dodgson will walk on my right* (Palmer 1990: 142). Since BCE is a vernacular, with Spanish the language of choice for formal domains (see 3.10), this function of *wi* is less likely in BCE.

Another use of English *will*, and, incidentally, *going to*, serves a pragmatic purpose, for commands, e.g., *You will finish your homework* (Coates 1983: 183) and *You’re going to turn that caravan around and head back out of here* (Coates 1983: 203). Such translations were not elicited during fieldwork.

7.6.4.1 TMA combinations with *wi*
Whereas relative/prospective aspect variants *gwain* (7.6.2.1) and *waan* (7.6.2.2) readily combines with past markers *di* and *wo* for a future-in-the-past interpretation (see 10.2.2.4), *wi* does not (7.6). *Wi*, however, does co-occur with modal *aftu* (9.3.2.2), to express future non-epistemic necessity, as in (120). Here, the function of *wi* is to mark the apodosis of a real conditional (see 7.6.4) for future tense:

(120) *If shi waan mi fi pie shi gud, shi wil aftu wuerk haad.*

CONJ 3.SG want 1.SG COMP pay 3.SG good 3.SG FUT MOD work  hard

If she wants me to pay her well, she will have to keep working hard.

(19a-19:47e2012)
Progressive aspect in future contexts is usually found unmarked in BCE (see 7.6.4). In (121), however, not only is progressive marking (-in) found on the verb torn ‘turn’ but wil co-occurs with bii (see 5.1) before the verb. One of the speakers is my consultant and it is possible that the presence of will represents the speaker’s attempt to approximate English, and as in the case for the past progressive which is very occasionally overtly marked for past (see 7.5.4.2), As explained in (1.3), bii is triggered in the presence of a TMA marker:

(121)  Speaker 1

\[\text{Di } \text{baibl taak about } \text{di } \text{nait wil} \text{ bii torn-in die an } \text{di } \text{die wil bii} \]
DEF bible talk  PREP DEF night FUT be turn-PROG day CONJ DEF day FUT be
torn-in nait. But i neva taak about chrii die trii nait.
turn-PROG night CONJ 3.SG NEG.PST talk  PREP three day three night
The bible talks about night turning day and day turning night. But it didn’t talk
about three days and three nights.

Speaker2

\[\text{Yie, i no giv no taim.}\]
EXC 3.SG NEG give NEG time
Yeah, there’s no time mentioned.

(08-08:46n2012)

Speaker 1

\[\text{Bikaa wen } \text{di } \text{eklipse de } \text{kom, only wan auar nat iivn auar.}\]
CONJ CONJ DEF eclipse  PROG come only one hour NEG even hour
Because when the eclipse is coming, only one hour’s (warning), not even an hour.

(08-16:55n2012)

English will also combines with be able to (Palmer 1990: 150), however, the evidence remains inconclusive as to whether wi co-occurs with BCE iebl (fi) (‘able to’), which is the case for modal wuda (see 10.2.1.1.1).
7.6.5  *wuon*

The formally negated counterpart of *wi* (7.6.4) is *wuon*, as illustrated in (122):

(122) *Miebi* i  *wuon*  get notin  *grabar*  bika  mi  no  nuo  wat  fi
MOD 3.SG  FUT.NEG  get  nothing  record  CONJ  1.SG  NEG  know  COMP  COMP
say
It might not record anything because I don’t know what to say!
[Sp. *grabar* ‘record’]
(11-10:66n2012)

According to Coates (1983: 176), English *won’t* (*will not*) nearly always expresses willingness. The semantic nuance of willingness is potentially available in *waan* (see 7.6.2.2.2). In (122), however, the subject of the clause is inanimate, and any sense of willingness is not present. Here then, the semantics of *wuon* is prediction.

There is not enough data to make any conclusive analysis about the constraints of *wuon* with respect to meaning. Certainly, negated future contexts are also negated by *no gwain* and *no waan*, but in prospective aspect contexts (see 7.6.2.1.2 and 7.6.2.2.2, respectively). *No gwain* is constrained to a meaning of negated intention, whereas both intention and prediction is encoded in *no waan*. There seems to some overlap between *gwain*, *waan*, and *wi* in negated contexts.

7.7  Concluding remarks

The tense markers and their functions are summarised in Table 7.1. As mentioned in (5.2), the present/past distinction interpretation of the unmarked verb is the default, motivated by lexical aspect. With unmarked stative verbs, the semantics of *di* is simple past (see 7.5.1), but with unmarked dynamic verbs it signals counter-presupposition (see 7.5.1.2). There is some evidence to indicate that past perfect is also a meaning of *di* when it co-occurs with dynamic verbs (see 7.5.1.3). Nevertheless, the dynamic/stative distinction is neutralised.
when the protasis of unreal conditionals are marked by \textit{di} (see 5.4.1.1.2). \textit{Wo} marks progressive constructions for past (7.5.4.2). In addition, \textit{wo} functions as a past copula in ascriptive, equative, and locative clauses (see 7.5.4.1), although there is an overlap of function between \textit{wo} and \textit{di} insofar as time-stable properties co-occur with \textit{wo} but time-stable properties with \textit{di}.

With respect to the expression of negated past, there is a marker in the form of \textit{neva} that covers this semantic domain. \textit{Neva} marks dynamic verbs, stative verbs, and ascriptive predicates to mean 'not generally-speaking' (see 6.4.3.1.2.1 for examples). It co-occurs with equative and locative clauses to mark negated simple past (see 7.5.4.1 for examples), and dynamic verbs for negated counter-presupposition, (see 7.5.1.2 for an example). \textit{Neva} is found in the protasis of unreal conditionals where the dynamic/stative distinction is neutralised (see 5.4.1.1.2 for examples). Additionally, it negates modal \textit{afu} (see 8.5.2 for an example in a non-epistemic context). In contrast, the combination \textit{no} (5.5.1.1) + \textit{di} negates individual stative situations in the past (see 7.5.1.3 for discussion). Since unmarked dynamic verbs have a default reading of simple past (see 5.2), they are negated by \textit{no}.

\textit{Gwain} (7.6.2.1.2), \textit{waan} (7.6.2.2.2), and \textit{luk fi} (7.6.3) are prospective aspect variants, expressing distinct semantics. \textit{Gwain} is constrained to the meaning of intention. \textit{Waan} and \textit{luk fi} encode intention and prediction, with an additional meaning of willingness for \textit{waan}. The main function of absolute future \textit{wi} (7.6.4) is to mark propensitvity and is frequently found in the apodosis of real conditionals (see 5.4.1.1.1). The formally corresponding negated counterpart of \textit{wi} is is \textit{wuon} (see 7.6.5 for further information).

Relating back to the typological generalisations, the semantics of past \textit{di} to mean counter-presupposition with dynamic verbs can be identified as a new factor in the literature on CECs and also more widely. Gussenhoven (2007: 96) discusses different types of counter-assertive focus by means of prosody, making a distinction between ‘corrective focus’ and ‘counter-presuppositional focus’, describing the latter as a way to counter \textit{not} an explicit proposition, \textit{but} an assumption or implication. However, the
presence of a grammatical marker with this function/semantics does not appear to be attested elsewhere.

**Table 7.1 Tense markers in BCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMA marker</th>
<th>Past</th>
<th>Future</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TMA marker</strong></td>
<td>Dynamic verb</td>
<td>Stative verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>di</strong></td>
<td>Past counter-presupposition; Past perfect; marks the protasis of unreal conditionals (present &amp; past)</td>
<td>Simple past; marks the protasis of unreal conditionals (present &amp; past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>wo</strong></td>
<td>Marks progressive aspect for past</td>
<td>Marks situational/temporary situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>neva</strong></td>
<td>Means ‘not generally-speaking’ (see 6.4.3.1.2.1)</td>
<td>Means ‘not generally-speaking’ (see 6.4.3.1.2.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>neva + di</strong></td>
<td>Negates counter-presupposition</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>no + di</strong></td>
<td>Negated past-before-past</td>
<td>Negates individual situations in the past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no) gwain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective aspect: intention (combines with past <em>di</em> for a future-in-the-past reading but <em>wo gwain bii</em> + ascriptive predicate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(no) waan</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective aspect: intention; prediction; willingness (combines with past <em>di</em> for a future-in-the-past reading but <em>wo waan</em> + ascriptive predicate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>luk fi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Prospective aspect: intention; prediction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wi(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Absolute future: propensity; often found in apodosis of real conditionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wuon</td>
<td></td>
<td>Negates absolute future</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8 Chapter eight: Epistemic modality in BCE

8.1 Introduction

Chapter 8 analyses the expression of epistemic modality beginning with a discussion of theoretical issues and terminology (8.2). The perspective taken in this thesis is that grammatical marking of future is an expression of tense, not modality (see 7.2 for a justification). Nonetheless, it is not the case that markers of modality do not have the capacity to express future situations. An overview of the modals in BCE that are found in the domain of epistemic domain is presented in (8.3), after which the chapter is divided into two sections, the first on epistemic possibility (8.4) and the second on epistemic necessity (8.5). Much of the terminology and definitions described in this chapter are also relevant to the analysis of non-epistemic modality (chapter 9).

8.2 Theoretical and terminological issues

The absence of a modal in any given language signals that a proposition relates to the actual world as it is at the time of utterance. Conversely, the presence of a modal indicates that alternative possible worlds are of relevance. The domain of modality may be divided into two key semantic areas: epistemic and non-epistemic modality. An epistemic modal conveys what may or must be the case in our world, given everything we know already. It concerns the speaker’s attitude towards the situation or the speaker’s commitment to the probability that the situation is true (Payne 1997: 233-234). A non-epistemic modal conveys what can or must happen, given circumstances of a certain kind which in turn are facts of a certain kind (Kratzer 1981: 52). It expresses obligations and capabilities of a participant. Epistemic modality is thus concerned with speaker knowledge, which by its very nature is incomplete. Non-epistemic modality, on the other hand, is concerned with current circumstances that are known to the speaker at time of speech. Non-epistemic modality involves more complex nuances of meaning than epistemic modality, and can be divided into participant-internal modality (9.2.1) or participant-external modality (9.2.2) (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998).
The subdomains of epistemic and non-epistemic modality can be further divided in terms of the force of the proposition, namely into necessity and possibility (Chung and Timberlake 1985: 246). The choice between necessity and possibility in the case of epistemic modality relates to the extent to which a speaker is willing to commit to the truth of the proposition. With respect to non-epistemic modality, by considering the circumstances or knowledge that is available to a speaker at the time of utterance, the number of potential worlds can be restricted by selecting a modal to represent the most appropriate. Cross-linguistically, it is not always the case that a distinction is made between necessity and possibility. An example of the distinction in English between epistemic necessity and epistemic possibility is ‘Mary must have arrived by now’ versus ‘Mary may have arrived by now’, the former of which expresses a force reflecting an increased likelihood of the proposition being true (see 8.2.1 for finer distinctions that relation to the strength of the force).

There is a difference between grammatical and semantic/notional categories of tense-aspect-modality. Modality in the wider sense of the term is expressed in both (1) and (2), the difference being that (1) contains a grammatical marker, modal auxiliary must, whereas no modal auxiliary is present in (2) (although it still ‘marks’ the imperative). Both sentences express non-epistemic necessity and (1) elicits a teleological reading (see 9.2.2.1), namely, in order to reach one’s goal of getting to the station, bus 66 is the only option available (see Fintel and Iatridou 2005). This notion is nonetheless still captured in (2), expressed in the form of an anankastic conditional:

(1) To get to the station you must take bus 66.
(2) If you want to get to the station, take bus 66.

8.2.1 Weak and strong modality

As already explained (8.2), not all languages make a distinction in the force of modality, that is, between necessity and possibility. However, where applicable the possibility of quantifying over potential worlds enables the speaker to restrict or expand the number of
such worlds, so that a proposition reflects the level of certainty being expressed. The terms ‘strong’ and weak’ are cross-linguistically more relevant to the domain of necessity. This further distinction enables the speaker to decrease the strength of force being expressed in the domain of necessity. English modal auxiliaries should and must encode weak and strong necessity, respectively, the distinction of which is that the former reflects a higher number of potential worlds than the latter. Thus, a speaker of English has the linguistic means available to adjust the level of certainty surrounding the proposition, so that the circumstances or knowledge applicable or available to the speaker at time of speech is more accurately reflected. This phenomenon applies equally to epistemic and non-epistemic modality. Furthermore, the presence of modal markers in languages for expressing distinctions in modal strength can result in further nuances of meaning more generally, for example, advisability (see, for example, beta in 9.3.2.3 or shuda in 10.2.2.1).

8.2.2 Semantic map

The analysis of the BCE modals presented in this chapter relies on the terms and definitions provided by van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) in their semantic map (see Figure 8.1), in addition to some definitions and notes provided by Narrog (2012).

The semantic map is a representation of relevant diachronic and synchronic connections between modals from a cross-linguistic perspective. It serves as a convenient reference for identifying language specific semantic and grammatical categories. The semantic map anchors grammatical markers of modality around two key semantic domains, epistemic and non-epistemic modality. Non-epistemic modality involves a division between participant-internal and participant-external modality, with deontic modality a subcategory of the latter. The semantic map contrasts the dimensions of possibility with necessity across all the modal subtypes.
### Figure 8.1 Modality types in van der Auwera & Plungian (1998: 82)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibility</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-epistemic possibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-internal possibility (Dynamic possibility, Ability, Capacity)</td>
<td>Participant-external possibility</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-deontic possibility</td>
<td>Deontic possibility (Permission)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-internal necessity (Need)</td>
<td>Non-deontic necessity</td>
<td>Deontic necessity (Obligation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-external necessity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-epistemic necessity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Necessity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The boundaries between the semantic categories and sub-categories made available in the semantic map are not always clear-cut, which explains how and why a general path of semantic change exists cross-linguistically. The tendency is for grammatical markers of non-epistemic modality (chapter 9) to develop into markers with epistemic meaning (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 87). This phenomenon does not automatically result in the loss of original meaning(s) (see 1.2.2 for a definition of ‘semantic bleaching’). The interpretation of English *must* in (3) is non-epistemic, whereas in (4) it is epistemic:

(3) You **must** finish it now.
(4) They **must** be finished by now.
Furthermore, van der Auwera & Plungian (1998: 100) observe that the paths of possibility and necessity can yield the same result, that is, a possibility meaning may turn into one of necessity and vice versa. In this instance, readings may, again, be vague.

The semantic map does not include volition. The term *boulomaic* modality is also used in reference to the semantics of volition/intention (Narrog 2012: 9), which is rarely differentiated into necessity and possibility. This use of boulomaic modality in English future will is believed to be marginal and often characterised as weak necessity (Narrog 2012: 9). Reference to volition is made in (7.6.2.2.2) in the discussion of relative/prospective *waan*.

Also not included in the semantic map is non-inferential evidentiality, although, ‘inferential’ evidentiality is included. This latter type of evidentiality identifies evidence based on reasoning, and can be considered an overlap category between evidentiality and epistemic modality (particularly necessity) on the basis that they are both concerned with “the certainty of a judgment relative to other judgments” (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 85-6). Despite evidentiality not being formally marked in BCE, modal markers cross-linguistically often function as both a modal and evidential, in which case the choice of label is arbitrary. In Japanese, for example, grammaticalised ‘indirect’ evidential markers “overlap heavily with the expression of epistemic modality” (Narrog 2012: 11).

### 8.2.3 Epistemic modality

Epistemic modality is concerned with the speaker’s assessment of the likelihood of realisation of the content of a proposition; it expresses the speaker’s attitude towards the truth value of a statement. Any evaluative assessment made is based on the information available to the speaker at the time, which is always context dependent. The unmarked case in this semantic domain indicates a speaker’s total commitment to the truth of the proposition (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 179). Nevertheless, other linguistic devices do exist cross-linguistically to express a hesitancy to commit to the content of a proposition, for example, main verbs expressing attitude, intention, obligation (Declerck 2011: 28; see
also Kratzer 2012: 28-30, 55; Chung & Timberlake 1985: 242), in addition to prosody. A marker of epistemic modality signals a non-committal stance to the truth of the proposition from the standpoint of the speaker. Such markers have scope over the entire proposition, such that in combinations of TMA markers in BCE it those that express epistemic modality which are consistently positioned before all others (see 1.3.2 for further detail). Therefore, epistemic modals take a higher position in the clause than do non-epistemic modals.

A necessity modal clause cannot correlate with total commitment, since a non-modal clause conveys higher certainty. The assumption made in (5) is that Mary’s arrival is merely a possibility, whereas in (6) the likelihood is much stronger (inferred certainty). In turn, (7) conveys a weaker strength of necessity than (6) (see 8.2.1 for definitions of ‘weak’ and ‘strong’):

(5) Mary may have arrived by now.
(6) Mary must have arrived by now.
(7) Mary should have arrived by now.

Reference to a potential past situation in English requires the addition of perfect aspect, in this case, have (Narrog 2012: 8), as illustrated in (10) and (5). Epistemic modality may also refer to both present and future situations, as in (8) and (9), respectively.

(8) Spiderman may already be dead.
(9) (With so many tough battles ahead), Spiderman may not survive next week.
(10) (Since we haven’t seen him for months now), Spiderman may have already died last year.

8.3 Overview of epistemic modality in BCE

As mentioned in (8.2.2) on the discussion of the semantic map, cross-linguistically it is common for markers of non-epistemic modality to develop into markers of epistemic modality (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 87). Furthermore, epistemic senses tend to
develop first with statives and progressives (Winford 2000: 94). Thus, it is interesting that in the semantic domain of epistemic modality, some of the modals that are found in non-epistemic contexts in BCE are restricted to co-occurring with copula bii (see 1.3 and 5.1). With the exception of adverb mos(i) (8.5.1 and 9.3.2.1), the available evidence suggests that in the epistemic domain, kian (8.4.3 and 9.3.1.1), kiaan (8.4.4 and 9.3.1.2) kuda (8.4.5 and 9.3.1.3), and afu (8.5.2 and 9.3.2.2) are constrained to utterance initial position and only appear in combination with bii + noun phrases or adjectives in ascriptive predicate function. Here, the remainder of the clause following the modal + bii is a predicate predicking on an impersonal subject: It can be p. Miebi (8.4.1) and infrequent maitbi (8.4.2) are not found in non-epistemic contexts, and thus can be claimed to be markers of epistemic modality in the strictest of senses. Mos(i), on the other hand, combines with other stative verbs and dynamic verbs, in addition to being flexible in terms of syntactic position within the clause. Kuda is the formal past counterpart of kian, encoding epistemic possibility, and kiaan is the formal negated counterpart of kian. Kuda is negated by combining with TMA marker neva, in the order kuda neva (8.4.5.1; see 6.4.3.1.2.1, 7.5.1.2, and 7.5.4.1 for examples of neva in non-modal contexts).

Data is also included from other Caribbean English Creole (CEC) varieties (see 3.2) at the beginning of the main sections in this chapter as background to the BCE data, and so that the reader is somewhat prepared and can make some cross-creole comparisons. Where possible, comparisons are made with Jamaican Creole (JC), since, as explained in (1.1), one motivation for this thesis is to show that BCE is not identical to JC.

Some of the elicited examples in this chapter are taken from a modality questionnaire courtesy of Bettina Migge (see also Winford and Migge 2007).
8.4 Possibility

8.4.1 miebi

In JC, the form kyan is reserved for the domain of non-epistemic possibility (at least in affirmative contexts) (Winford 1993: 75), with preverbal mie encoding epistemic possibility (Winford 1993: 75). Epistemic modal adverbs such as probl and meebi are claimed to be generally infrequent in CECs, but “are gradually working their way through the mesolect and into the basilect” (Winford 1993: 74). Since the BCE speech community is small on a scale with JC (see 3.4.3), terms such as ‘basilect’ and ‘mesolect’ are much less applicable to BCE (see 2.2 for a definition of these terms).

In BCE, the semantic space of epistemic possibility is predominantly occupied by miebi, as illustrated in (11). It is by far the most frequent modal for expressing epistemic modality, certainly in the naturalistic data (see below), furthermore, it does not express non-epistemic modality (see chapter 9):

(11) Miebii Jaan de huom.
   MOD John PROG home
   Maybe John is at home now.
   (19a-19:47e2012)

There appears to be a case for categorising miebi as an adverb as it occurs in various positions within the clause. In this respect, the function of miebi is much like mosi (see 8.5.1 and 9.3.2.1). Indeed, Payne (1997: 69) observes that adverbs are characterised by their distribution, typically representing the most unrestricted ‘parts of speech’. The behaviour of miebi contrasts with other markers of epistemic possibility, which appear to be restricted to co-occurring with nouns phrases and adjectives in an ascriptive predicate function (see, for example, 8.4.4). There are no attestations of miebi in past contexts, a context in which adverb mos(i) is often found (see 8.5.1 for examples). Likewise, there are no examples in the data of miebi followed by, or preceded immediately by another TMA
marker, which, again, contrasting with the behaviour of mos(i) (see 8.5.1.1). Nonetheless, it could be the case that this absence is due to a gap in the data and certainly requires further exploration.

In (12), the temporal context is future in which miebi is found. Here, this adverb is situated between the subject and verb, whereas in (13) and (14) it occurs before the subject:

(12)  
\[ Ai \text{ miebi go tunait bai yua, if ai hav taim. } \]
\[ 1.\text{SG MOD go tonight PREP yours CONJ 1.\text{SG have time}} \]
\[ \text{I may go to yours tonight, if I have time.} \]
\[ (19\text{a-19:47e2012}) \]

(13)  
\[ \text{Miebi Jaan guo panama neks wiik. } \]
\[ \text{MOD John go Panama next week } \]
\[ \text{John may go to Panama next week} \]
\[ (19\text{a-19:47e2012}) \]

(14)  
\[ Yie, \text{ miebi a bai a torki tuu.} \]
\[ \text{EXC MOD 1.\text{SG buy INDF turkey too} } \]
\[ \text{Yeh, maybe I’ll buy a turkey too.} \]
\[ (13-2:34n2012) \]

Adverb miebi may occur in the absence of an overt verb in the clause, as illustrated in (15):

(15)  
\[ \text{Speaker 1} \]
\[ Huu yu waan get bil di ruum fi yu? \]
\[ Q \quad 2.\text{SG want get build DEF room PREP 2.\text{SG} } \]
\[ \text{Who will you get to build the room for you?} \]
\[ (13-9:36n2012) \]
Speaker 2

Felix *miebi, ef im no chaaj mi tuu dier.*

Felix MOD CONJ.3.SG NEG charge1.SG too dear

Felix maybe, if he does not charge me too much.

(13-2:23n2012)

As mentioned above, no simple past contexts occur in the naturalistic data with *miebi*, and this specific context was elicited only by asking for a grammaticality judgements of *kud(a) + bii* (8.4.5).

Real and unreal conditionals (see 5.4.1.1 for the distinction) are represented that contain *miebi* are illustrated in (16) and (17), respectively. Here, *miebi* has scope over the whole conditional construction. In (16), *miebi* is found at the beginning of the clause before conjunction *wen* ‘if’:

(16) *Miebi wen yo luk, dem get.*

MOD CONJ 2.SG look 3.PL get

Maybe if you look, they get.

(13-9:46n2012)

(17) *If ai did nuo shi woz hiaa, miebii ai wud gaan*

CONJ 1.SG PST know 3.SG COP.PST here MOD 1.SG MOD go.PST

an/ﬁ luk ﬁ ar.

CONJ/COMP look PREP 3.SG

If I had known she was here, maybe I would’ve gone to see her.

(19a-19:47e2012)

*Miebi* also appears in clauses with negated verb phrases to express [possible [not P]] (Palmer 1995: 456), as in (18) and (19). *Kiaan* (8.4.4), on the other hand, expresses [not possible [P]]:
(18) But miebi shi no kom, wi kian go rait deso an paas
CONJ MOD 3.SG NEG come 1.PL MOD go right over there CONJ pass
wi krimos.
1.PL.POSS Christmas
But maybe she won’t come, we can go right over there and spend our Christmas.
(013-2:23n2012)

(19) Luk, luk, dem gwain nou. Musi gwain go go luk tuor nou. Miebi dem
Look look 3.PL GO.PROG now MOD go.PROG go go look tour now MOD 3.PL
no waan get no tuoris tudie ka luk hou di die luk.
NEG PRSP get NEG tourst today CONJ look Q DEF day look
Look, look, they’re going now [out to sea]. Must be going to find some
opportunities for tours now. Maybe they’re not going to get any tourists today
because look what the weather’s like.
(13-2:23n2012)

8.4.2 maitbi

Winford (1993: 82) concedes that maita is most likely a recent importation in JC, allegedly
having been acquired by basilectal speakers as an unanalysable whole from English might have. It is claimed that Guyanese Creole (GC) speakers reject the form maita on the basis
that it is representative of English, not Creole (Winford 1993: 83). In JC, the forms mie and
mait are found in both epistemic and non-epistemic contexts (Christie 1991: 234), (see also
8.4.1). Christie (1991: 224) claims that maitn is a negated form of JC mait. English might,
according to Coates (1983: 146-7), is no longer restricted to functioning as the tentative or
unreal form of may, that is, might and may are usually interchangeable.

The modal form maitbi is attested in the BCE data to express epistemic possibility.
Nevertheless, it is an infrequent form and most likely an acrolectal feature (see 2.2 for
definition of ‘acrolect’): Evidence for this comes from (20) and (21), both speakers of
whom appear quite conscious of the fact that they’re being recorded, suggesting that stylistic shift/approximation to English is taking place:

(20) **Maitbi wi fren kom fram panama.**
MOD 1.PL friend come PREP Panama
It might be the case that our friends visit from Panama
(14-14:50n2012)

(21) **Maitbi som piipl wud sie ‘shuda don’**.
MOD some people MOD say MOD finish
It might be the case that some people would say ‘shuda don’ [‘should have finished’].
(19c-19:47en2012)

In (20) and (21), **maitbi** is found in pre-subject position. The evidence for whether **maitbi** is found before verbs remains inconclusive. Whether the forms **mie** (**miebi**) and **mait** (**maitbi**) were ever found in non-epistemic contexts in BCE is not known (see 8.5.1 for a discussion on the grammaticalisation of **mosi**). As mentioned in (8.2.2), non-epistemic modals tend to develop into markers of epistemic modality (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 87).

8.4.3 **kian**

In Sranan (SN), epistemic possibility in is encoded via **kan** with the addition of copula **de**, as in **a ken de** (where **de** is a copula), or also via adverb **kande** (Winford 2000: 94). It is the only means of expressing epistemic possibility in SN. It is believed to be in the early stages of grammaticalisation (see 1.2.2), constrained to stative verbs and progressives. The main function of SN **kan** is to express participant-external possibility (see 9.2.1). There is no evidence that the other SN modal expressions of ability in the form of **man** and **mag** are developing epistemic senses (Winford 2000: 94).
BCE modal *kian* is found in non-epistemic contexts (see 9.3.1.1) and epistemic contexts, likewise its past form *kuda* (see 8.4.5 and 9.3.1.3). *Kian* appears to be in the early stages of grammaticalisation with respect to the expression of epistemic modality, since it is constrained to utterance initial position and to combining with copula *bii* (see 1.3 and 5.1). Indeed, Winford (2000: 94) claims that epistemic senses tend to develop first with statives (and progressives). In (22), the remainder of the clause following *kian bii* is a predicate predicated on an impersonal subject: It can be p. Example (22) is an equative clause (see 5.3.1.2), since the subject is coreferential with a (referential) predicate and the relationship expressed between them is one of identity (Payne 1997: 114):

(22)  
*Kian  bii Jan.*
MOD be John
It could be John.
(00-26:21e2012)

Nevertheless, the modal that surfaces most frequently in BCE to encode epistemic possibility is *miebi* (8.4.1). Example (22) was given to me without prompt in response to being asked to judge the acceptability of *kud bii Jaan* ‘It could be John’ (8.4.5). Therefore, *kian* should perhaps not be considered the natural choice of form for expressing epistemic possibility in BCE, not least because it never appears in the naturalistic data.

An example of negated *kiaan* followed by *bii* and a noun appearing as an overt subject followed by a verb phrase, is found in (8.4.4).

### 8.4.4 kiaan

*Kiaan* is the formal and semantic counterpart of *kian* (8.4.3), which in epistemic contexts expresses the sentiment [not possible [P]]. This meaning in turn is logically equivalent to [necessary [not P]] (see 8.5.1 for an example). In (23) and (24), *kiaan* co-occurs with copula *bii* and in turn an adjective in an ascriptive predicate function (see 5.3.1.1). In (24), the remainder of the clause following *kian + bii* is a predicate predicking on an impersonal...
subject: It can be p. However, in (24), an overt subject occurs before kiaan. In (25), a verb phrase follows the noun.

(23) **Kiaan** bii notin gud dem gwain a plant. Afu bii di rang.
MOD. NEG be nothing good 3.PL go.PROG CONJ plant MOD be DEF wrong
It can’t be no good them going to plant. It must be wrong.
(14-19:47n2012)

(24) *Im kiaan* bii so fuul fi laas agen.
3.SG MOD.NEG be so fool COMP loose.PST again
He cannot be so stupid as to be lost again.
(19a-19:47e2012)

In (25) and (26), the difference is one of focus. When confronted with (26), BCE consultants agree to the felicitousness of *mosi kudan*, the meaning of which is [necessary [not (able to) P]], contrasting with *kiaan bii* in (25) to mean [not possible [ P]]. Thus, in contrast to English, which does not distinguish formally between [necessary [not (able to) P]] and [not possible [P]] (relying on can’t in both cases), BCE appears to have two formal means for marking this subtle semantic distinction.

(25) **Kiaan** bii Jaan iit di kiek.
MOD.NEG be John eat DEF cake
John couldn’t HAVE EATEN THE CAKE/It can’t be the case that John ate the cake.
(20-19:47e2012)

(26) *Jan mosi kudan* iit it.
John MOD MOD.NEG eat 3.SG
It couldn’t have been JOHN who ate it it.
(00-26:21e2012)
8.4.5 kud(a)

*Kud(a)* is the overtly past counterpart to *kian* (8.4.3). Like *kian*, it is restricted to combining with copula *bii* followed by a noun, as illustrated in (27) and (28). In (27), the remainder of the clause following *kud(a) bii* is a predicate predicking on an impersonal subject: It could be p. *Kud bii* is followed by a noun in both (27) and (28), however, in (28) the noun is followed by a verb phrase.

(27) **Kud bii Jaan.**

MOD.PST be John

It could be John.

(00-26:21e2012)

(19c-19:47e2012)

(28) **Kuda bii Mieri tief di moni.**

MOD.PST be Mary steal DEF money

It could have been Mary who took the money. [tief ‘steal/theif’]

(20-19:47e2012)

8.4.5.1 kuda neva

*Kuda* (8.4.5) is negated by combining with TMA marker *neva*, which incorporates both negation and past epistemic possibility in its semantics, as illustrated in (29) (see 6.4.3.1.2.1, 7.5.1.2, and 7.5.4.1 for examples of *neva* in non-modal contexts). Here, the modal is both formally and semantically negated, the result of which is that [not possible [P]] is the interpretation. This, in turn, is logically equivalent to [necessary [not P]] (Palmer 1995: 456). Example in (29) was given to me after being asked to provide a grammaticality judgement of *di kiaan*, that is, past *di* (7.5.1) + *kiaan* (8.4.4). As in the case of *kian, kiaan*, and *kuda*, negated *kuda neva* is constrained to utterance initial position followed by copula
bii. In (29), the remainder of the clause following kian neva + bii is a predicate predicking on an impersonal subject: It can be p. Here, a verb phrase follows the noun Mieri ‘Mary’:

(29) Kuda neva bii Mieri tek di moni.
MOD.PST NEG.PST be Mary take DEF money
It couldn’t have been Mary.
(20-19:47e2012)

8.5 Necessity

Epistemic necessity in BCE contrasts significantly with non-epistemic necessity (9.3.2), insofar as it distinguishes formally fewer strengths and nuances of necessity (see 8.2.1). Expressions of epistemic necessity in BCE are identifiable by the presence of phonetic variants mosi, musi, mosbi, and mos (hereafter mosi), in addition to afu (9.3.2.2). In all cases, they combine with copula bii (see 1.3, also 5.1). Like epistemic possibility miebi (8.4.1), the syntactic distribution of mosi has the status of an adverb. Afu is also restricted to co-occurring with copula bii. However, afu does not function as an adverb, instead being constrained to utterance initial position and to marking noun phrases.

Although JC has form ‘shuda’ which encodes epistemic weak necessity (Winford 1993: 83), BCE shuda is only found in past non-epistemic contexts (see 10.2.2.1 for a discussion of shuda).

8.5.1 mos(i)

Epistemic necessity behaves differently to non-epistemic modality (see chapter 9), insofar as the former is encoded by far fewer modals. In the BCE data, although the form mosi consistently co-occurs with nouns and prepositions in the non-epistemic domain, and mos with dynamic verbs (see 9.3.2.1), in the epistemic domain the choice between mos or mosbi seems to be arbitrary. In (30) and (31), stative verbs nuo ‘know’ and gat ‘got’ are
marked by mos and mosi, respectively. The realisation of these variants is the result of a grammaticalisation process (see below):

(30) Dem mos nuo wat ai miin fi se.
3.PL MOD know COMP 1.SG mean COMP say
They must know what I’m trying to say.
(14-19:47n2012)

(31) Di tuoad mosbi gat niem.
DEF toad MOS got name
The frog must have a name
(08-8: 46pr2012)

Mosi functions as an adverb much like miebi (8.4.1), the latter of which expresses modal possibility. Payne (1997: 69) observes that adverbs are characterised by their distribution, typically representing the most unrestricted ‘parts of speech’. This is indeed the case for mosi, which shows flexibility in terms of its syntactic position and its ability to co-occur with both statives (other than copula bii) and dynamic verbs. Mosi combines with, for example, the function of de as both a locative copula and progressive marker (see below and 8.5.1.1, respectively). On the other hand, kian (8.4.3), kiaan (8.4.4), and kuda (8.4.5) are constrained to co-occurring with copula bii (see 1.3 and 5.1) and utterance initially.

The most frequent phonetic variants of mosi that are attested in the BCE data are musi and mosi. Mos and mosi are far less frequent. Mosi is a phonologically-reduced attestation of mosbi, which itself has been phonologically reduced from mos + copula bii via a process of grammaticalisation (see 1.2.2). This supports the claim that mosi is more grammaticalised than modals expressing epistemic possibility such as kian, kiaan, and kuda.
In (32), *musi* occurs in clause-initial position followed by a noun phrase, intervened by adverb *bout* ‘about’:

(32)  
\[ A \text{ no } n\text{uo, } musi \text{ bout fiftiin a } dem. \]

1.SG NEG know MOD about fifteen PREP 3.PL
I do not know, there must be about fifteen of them.

(13-9:46n2012)

In (33), *mosi* occurs clause initially and is followed by preposition *fi* ‘for’:

(33)  
\[ An \text{ di daag run, gwain, an } aal \text{ di flai dem mosi de } ron-in \]
CONJ DEF dog run go.PROG CONJ all DEF fly PL MOD PROG ron-PROG
down. Mosi fi pik im di bii o di was.
down MOD COMP pick 3.SG DEF bee CONJ DEF wasp
And the dog runs, going, and all the flies must be running down. Must be as a result
of stinging him, the bees or the wasps.

(06a-03:48p2012)

In (34), contrastive focus is provided by the prosody, which permits the speaker to clarify that the person in question is returning tomorrow and not any other day:

(34)  
\[ Mosi \text{ tumaro im kom-in bak. } \]
MOD tomorrow 3.SG come-PROG back
It must be tomorrow he/she is coming back.

(15-21:56e20129)

*Mosi* combines with a noun phrase, *di daag* ‘the dog’, in equative predicate function in (35) (see 5.3.1.2). In (36), *mosi* co-occurs with a noun phrase, *a nait oul* ‘a night owl’ in ascriptive predicate function, here denoting proper inclusion (see 5.3.1.1). In (37), *musi* occurs with adjective *drunk* ‘drunk’ in ascriptive function:
(35) *An dis wan nou musi di daag. Di likl buio de hog op di daag.*
CONJ DEM one now MOD DEF dog DEF little boy PROG dog up DEF dog
And this one must be the dog. The little boy is hugging the dog.
(06a-03:48p2012)

(36) *An a boird kom out pan im. mosi a nait oul dat.*
CONJ INDF bird come out PREP 3.SG MOD INDF night owl DEM
And a bird has come out on upon him. Must be a night owl that.
(06a-03:48p2012)

(37) *dem musi drunk an gwain huom.*
3.PL MOD drunk CONJ go.PROG home
They must be drunk and going home.
(13-2:23n2012)

In (38), *mosi* co-occurs with copula *de* in a locative clause (see 5.3.1.3):

(38) *Jan mosi de huom nou.*
John MOD PROG home now
John must be at home now.
(19a-19:47e2012)

Since *don* (6.5.2) encodes completion and *gaan* (7.5.2) is an inherently past verb form, past markers such as *di* (7.5.1) and copula *wo* (7.5.4) are not required in (39) and (40), respectively (see 8.5.1.1 for TMA combinations):

(39) *Dem pikni mosi don iit dem kiek.*
DEM.PL children MOD COMP eat DEM cake
The children must have eaten the cake
(19a-19:47e2012)
(40) **Jan mosi gaan sliip aredi bikaa him hous no ga no lai.**
John MOD go.PST sleep already CONJ 3.SG.POSS house NEG got NEG light
John must have gone to bed already because there’s no light on in the house.
(19a-19:47e2012)

*Mosi* is found in negated contexts to mean [necessary [not P]] (Palmer 1995: 456), as illustrated in (41). This is logically equivalent to [not possible [P]] which is itself expressed by *kiaan* (8.4.4). In (41), *mosi* is found in pre-subject position:

(41) **Shuor, dem gat rum! Bot wen dem kom, mosi dem no waan di rum.**
Sure, they have rum! But when they came, they must not have wanted the rum (that we have).
(11-18:56n2012)

8.5.1.1 TMA combinations
As mentioned in (1.3.2), up to three TMA combinations are permissible in BCE, with epistemic modality having the widest scope. In (42), *mos* combines with *kian* the latter expressing ability (see 9.3.1.1). English *must* is obligatorily followed by *able to* in order to express the sentiment expressed in (42), whereas the BCE form *iebl fi* ‘able to’ (see 10.2.1.1.1) does not combine with *mosi*. In (43), the meaning is the same as in (42) except in a past temporal context (see 8.4.5):

(42) **Jon mos kian iit nou.**
John MOD MOD eat now
John must be able to eat now.
(20-19:47e2012)

(43) **Jon mos kuda iit dat.**
John MOD MOD eat DEM
John must have been able to eat that.

(Mosi readily combines with verbs that are marked by progressive verbal suffix -in
(6.4.1.1.3), as illustrated in (44) and (45):

(44) I mosi kom-in bak tumara ar wat?
3.SG MOD come-PROG back tomorrow CONJ Q
He/she must be coming tomorrow or what?
(17a-19-47e2012)

(45) Ai no shuoa bu ai tink dem mosbi/mosi slip-in nou.
1.SG NEG sure CONJ 1.SG think 3.PL MOD sleep-PROG now
I’m not sure but I think they must be sleeping now.
(19a-19-47nr/e2012)

In (46), preverbal progressive variant de (6.4.1.1.2) may also combine with mosi:

(46) An im rich op pan dis rak tap nuo an mosi de kaal di
CONJ 3.SG reach up PREP DEM rock top now CONJ MOD PROG call DEF
daag.
dog
And he has reached the top of the rock top now and must be calling the dog.
(06b-03:48p2012)

In (47), mosi combines with progressive de is marked for past by wo, the progressive
generally seldom marked for past (see 7.5.4.2). As illustrated in (48) and (49), wo can
combines with either locative de (5.3.1.3) or modal necessity afu in a non-epistemic
context (see 9.3.2.2):
(47) Shi mosi wo de sliip.
3.SG MOD COP.PST PROG sleep
She must have been sleeping
(00-26:21e2012)

(48) Dem mosi wo de up bai [anon.].
3.PL MOD COP.PST there PREP PREP [anon.] 
They must have been up there at [anon.’s].
(13-9:46n2012)

(49) Jaan mosi wo/di hafu kom.
John MOD COP.PST/PST MOD come
John must have had to come.
(00-26:21e2012)
(020-19:47e2012)

In (50), musi combines with relative/prospective aspect gwain (7.6.2.1.2), which in turn is followed by main verb go ‘go’ and a complement clause (see also 7.6.2.1.1):

(50) [anon.] dem gwain. Luk, luk, luk, dem gwain! Musi gwain go luk tuor
[anon.] 3.PL go.PROG look look look 3.PL go.PROG MOD go.PROG go look tour
now.
now.
[anon.] and the others are going. Look, look, look, they are going! Must be going to
go (and) look for some (boat) tours now.
(13-9:46n2012)

8.5.2 afu

Afu, like mos(i) (8.5.1), expresses epistemic necessity, the distinction being a nuance in semantics, whereby afu seems to encode a stronger strength of modality than mos(i). This
is supported by (51), where additional material signals the confidence and thus certainty of the speaker towards the truth value of the previous proposition with *mosi*:

(51)  *Da mosi Jan. Ai shuoa aftu bii him.*
Dem MOD John 1.SG sure MOD be 3.SG
That must be John, I’m sure of it.
(19a-19:47e2012)

*Afu*, like the possibility modal *kian* (8.4.3), is constrained to co-occurring with copula *bii* (see 1.3 and 5.1) and in clause-initial position. The remainder of the clause is a predicate predicking on an impersonal subject: It must be p. In (52), the copula is followed by a noun phrase, and in (53) and (54) it is followed by a noun and in turn a verb phrase. The evidence for whether *afu bii* also co-occurs with adjectives in ascriptive predicate function (see 8.4.4 for an example with *kiaan*) remains inconclusive:

(52)  *Kiaan bi notin gud dem gwain a plant. Afu bii di rang.*
MOD.NEG be nothing good 3.PL go.PROG CONJ plant MOD be DEF wrong
It can’t be anything good them going to plant. It’s got to be wrong.
(14-19:47n2012)

(53)  *Afu bii Jaan tek di moni bika ai nuo him iz a tiif/ MOD be John take DEF money CONJ 1.SG know 3.SG COP INDF thief/ im laik tiif.*
3.SG like steal
It must be John who took the money because I know he is a thief/he likes to steal.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(54)  *Afu bii Mieri tel Jien.*
MOD be Mary tell Jane
It must be Mary who told Jane
8.6 Concluding remarks

The semantic map of van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) presented in (8.2.2) is replicated in Figure 8.2. It illustrates the BCE modals that express the domain of epistemic possibility and necessity. Kian (8.4.3), kiaan (8.4.4), kuda (8.4.5.1), afu (8.5.2), and mos(i) (8.5.1) express both epistemic and non-epistemic modality (see also chapter 9). Kian, kiaan, kuda, and afu are constrained to co-occurring with bii (see 1.3 and 5.1) followed by a noun phrase or an adjective in ascriptive predicate function. The remainder of the clause that follows these modals is thus a copula followed by a predicate predating on an impersonal subject: It can be p. They are also constrained to utterance-initial position. On the other hand, mos(i), miebi (8.4.1) and (infrequent) maitbi (8.4.2) function as adverbs, the latter two not found in non-epistemic contexts. Kiaan encodes negated epistemic possibility, with kuda serving as its past tense form in combination with past negator neva (see 8.4.5.1).

Relating back to the typological generalisations, unlike in the case of the semantic domains of tense and aspect, the findings in the epistemic modal domain seem to confirm cross-linguistic generalisations. As mentioned in (8.2.2), cross-linguistically it is common for markers of non-epistemic modality to expand their semantics into the epistemic domain (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 87). Epistemic senses tend to develop first with statives and progressives (Winford 2000: 94), and this is reflected in the fact that many of the epistemic modals are found consistently with copual bii. With this in mind, miebi and mosi are more grammaticalised than the other modals since they readily co-occur with all kinds of dynamic verbs and statives, functioning as adverbs on the basis that they are found in a number of syntactic positions.
**Figure 8.2 Epistemic modality in BCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POSSIBILITY</th>
<th>EPISTEMIC POSSIBILITY</th>
<th>NON-DEONTIC POSSIBILITY</th>
<th>DEONTIC POSSIBILITY</th>
<th>NON-DEONTIC NECESSITY</th>
<th>DEONTIC NECESSITY</th>
<th>Epistemic necessity (Uncertainty)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant-internal possibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-external possibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>miebi (maïtbi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Dynamic possibility, Ability, Capacity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deontic possibility</td>
<td>Deontic possibility (Permission)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kian kiaan kuda (neva)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-internal necessity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-deontic necessity</td>
<td>Deontic necessity (Obligation)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Epistemic necessity (Probability)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Need)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participant-external necessity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mos(i) afu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-epistemic necessity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Necessity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9 Chapter nine: Non-epistemic modality in BCE

9.1 Introduction

This chapter on non-epistemic begins with a discussion of theoretical issues and terminology (9.2), followed by a discussion of two subdomains of participant-internal modality (9.2.1) and participant-external modality (9.2.2). Other semantic subdomains of non-epistemic modality that are mentioned are teleological (9.2.2.1) and preferential (9.2.2.2), and deontic modality (9.2.2.3). An overview of the BCE modals that express non-epistemic modality is provided in (9.3), with those encoding modal possibility described in (9.3.1) with the necessity modals presented in (9.3.2).

9.2 Theoretical and terminological issues

An obvious difference between epistemic (see 8.2.3) and non-epistemic modality is that the latter is not concerned with the speaker’s evaluation of the likelihood of realisation of the situation or event, but rather with obligations or capabilities of the participant in the situation described by the predicate. Non-epistemic modality is concerned with propositions that have not occurred at time of speech time (see 7.2), making them potential actualisations. Briefly, non-epistemic modality of the kind discussed in this chapter can be divided in to participant-internal modality (9.2.1) and participant-external modality (9.2.2) (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998), the distinction of which correlates to whether the conditioning factors are \textit{internal or external} to the relevant individual (Palmer 2001: 9).

The area of non-epistemic modality is much more complex than epistemic modality in terms of semantic distinctions and strengths. The number of modals available in the semantic domain of non-epistemic modality is greater, and this reflects the wider range of distinct meanings. Non-epistemic modality covers meanings such as (cap)ability (9.2.1) and obligation/permission (9.2.2.3). External circumstances that make it possible for a situation to develop out of the actual world (not related to expressions of obligation/permission) are also included, as illustrated in (1) (9.2.2) (see, for example,
Kratzer 2012: 50), where SN *kan* expresses generally enabling conditions (Winford 2000: 80):

(1) yu no kan weri den bruku dati moro, den e dreigi yu
    You can’t wear those pants anymore; people will make fun of you.

Laws of nature and circumstances created by natural phenomena are also related to external circumstances, as illustrated in (2) and (3):

(2) Dogs can bite if provoked.
(3) You can cross the river now (since the floods have subsided).

The purpose of the following section is to provide descriptions of all the semantic subcategories of non-epistemic modality that will inform the description of BCE modality. However, this thesis chapter acknowledges that although natural languages differentiate modal expressions along semantic lines, it is often the case that they do not correspond to formal distinctions (Narrog 2012: 8).

### 9.2.1 Participant-internal modality

Participant-internal modality is concerned with the possibility or necessity *internal* to a participant engaged in the situation in question. According to van der Auwera (1998: 80), possibility and necessity relate to ability (capacity) and internal need, as observable in (4) and (5), respectively. The term ‘ability’ can express any learned/acquired or inherent ability, whether intellectual or physical:

(4) Mary can swim.
(5) One needs to eat to stay alive.

Narrog (2012: 9) claims that specialised modal expressions for encoding participant-internal necessity are rare: “Some types of modality are more naturally and commonly associated with possibility, and others, like […] preferential modality with necessity”
(Narrog 2012: 116). Indeed, there has never been a single expression for participant-internal necessity in the history of English: Although English need to and have to are modal expressions for encoding this specific modal domain, they do not serve any specialised function, since they do ‘double duty’ as expressions of deontic and other modalities (Narrog 2012: 10). In contrast, Mandarin Chinese differentiates nuances of meaning within the area of participant-internal possibility (Narrog 2012: 9).

Although, according to van der Auwera (1998: 80), Mary needs to leave now, if she is to catch her train expresses participant-internal necessity, the need, arguably, is not actually internal insofar as it arises only should someone actually want to catch a train. In this respect, teleological necessity (9.2.2.1) might be a more apt description for such an expression. The question that arises is whether a need must be ongoing to be included under the definition of participant-internal necessity or whether the need may also be situational.

9.2.2 Participant-external

Participant-external modality is not concerned with possibility/necessity internal to a participant engaged in any given situation, but rather concerns circumstances. It is related to situations external to a participant. In (6) and (7), it is the conditions surrounding bus 66 that determine whether getting to the station via bus 66 is a possibility or necessity, respectively. Thus, (6) indicates that there are alternative ways of getting to the station, with bus 66 representing one of these possible world scenarios. Whereas in (7), bus 66 would appear to be the only means of transport and, therefore, the only possible world (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 80):

(6) To get to the station you can take bus 66.
(7) To get to the station you have to take bus 66.
Like epistemic modality in English, the strength of the modal force of necessity can be weakened via *should* (8). However, the change results in a shift in meaning so that obligation becomes advice (9):

(8) To get to the station you **should** take buss 66.
(9) **To get to the station it is advisable for** you to take bus 66.

Narrog (2012: 117) claims that ‘circumstantial’ modality, aka participant-external modality, is an unnatural subcategory. This assertion is made on the basis that formal modal expressions across languages demonstrate a tendency to cluster with either deontic or participant-internal modality. Participant-external (circumstantial) possibility tends to cluster with participant-internal modality (Narrog 2012: 99). Narrog (2012: 10) asserts that this is most likely the result of circumstantial possibility with animate participants usually presupposing ability. In (10), “[a]rriving at a certain location within a certain amount of time also presupposes the ability to move at a certain speed” (Narrog 2012: 10):

(10) If you take the short cut through the alley, you can be there at least ten minutes earlier.

Teleological (9.2.2.1) and preferential (9.2.2.2) necessity tend to cluster with deontic necessity (Narrog 2012: 97):

In the area of necessity, it is not easy to find unequivocally and purely circumstantial contexts. Many potential examples […] can also be interpreted with respect to some obligation or to goals (Narrog 2012: 10).

9.2.2.1 Teleological modality
Teleological modality refers to a proposition marked as a necessity or possibility with respect to someone’s goals, as illustrated in (11) (adapted from Narrog 2012: 8):

(11) (Given your music tastes), you **must** listen to this album.
The subcategories of teleological modality and preferential modality (9.2.2.2) commonly share their expression with deontic modality, e.g., *must* and *should* in English: “This is probably due to the fact that they are pragmatically similar in being used in directives in performative use” (Narrog 2012: 11).

### 9.2.2.2 Preferential modality

According to Narrog (2012: 9), preferential modality (12) describes a proposition marked as a necessity or possibility with respect to someone’s preferences:

(12)  (In order to stay in shape), you **should** exercise at least 20 minutes a day.

Narrog (2012: 9, note 4) observes that modals of possibility associated with other meanings have the potential to express boulomaic possibility (see 8.2.2) in contexts such as (13):

(13)  Who wants to do the cooking tomorrow? – I **can** do it.

### 9.2.2.3 Deontic

Van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) assign the term ‘deontic’ to a subtype of participant-external modality (9.2.2) that specifically deals with external circumstances relating to the notion of granting or imposing something. Deontic modality expresses the speaker’s desire for a potential situation to be actualised. In (14), the speaker is granting permission to the addressee, but there is no expectation to act thereupon; the speaker is merely expressing a possibility. However, the force of the proposition in (15) is much stronger, and the expression of necessity here results in the imposition of an obligation imposed upon the addressee:

(14)  Mary **may** enter the room.

(15)  Mary **must** leave immediately.
The enabling or compelling circumstances are thus external to the participant. Such authority does not inevitably lie solely with the speaker, since some impersonal force such as a rule of law (16), or moral/social code (17) may also be the source of the imposition. The strength of force of the obligation imposed on a participant can be measured by making reference, once again, to the terms ‘strong’ and weak’ (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 187), in which case (16) is stronger than (17) (see 8.2.1):

(16) You **must** always stop at a red light when driving.
(17) You **should** not interrupt me when I am speaking.

### 9.3 Overview of non-epistemic modality in BCE

The semantic domain of non-epistemic possibility in BCE is expressed via **kian** (9.3.1.1), **kiaan** (9.3.1.2), **kuda** (9.3.1.3), and **kudn** (9.3.1.4). Modals found in contexts expressing non-epistemic necessity are **mos(i)** (9.3.2.1), **afu** (9.3.2.2), **beta** (9.3.2.3), **fi** (9.3.2.4), and **supuostu** (9.3.2.5). Although **kian**, **kiaan**, **kuda**, **mos(i)**, and **afu** overlap into the epistemic domain (see chapter 8), **kudn**, **beta**, **fi**, and **supuostu** are confined to the non-epistemic domain.

**Kian** is found in present contexts, its formally corresponding past counterpart taking the form of **kuda**. Participant-internal modality (9.2.1), non-deontic modality (9.2.2), and deontic modality (9.2.2.3) are all encoded via **kian**. The negated formally corresponding counterpart of **kian** is **kiaan**. Past modality possibility is expressed via **kuda**, although importantly it does not cover individual situations in the past, which is instead achieved via **kian**. Negated single past situations are encoded by **kudn**.

**Mos(i)**, **afu**, **beta**, **fi**, and **supuostu** all encode various strengths and nuances of non-epistemic necessity (see 8.2.1). **Mosi** and **afu** encode modal necessity, with some evidence that the latter expresses a stronger strength of necessity. Whereas **afu** is restricted to preverbal position, **mosi** functions as an adverb (see 8.5.1 for examples of **mosi** in epistemic contexts). **Beta** contains a sense of advisability in its meaning, restricted to a
deontic sense of modality. Weak necessity, specifically participant-external modality is expressed by variants \textit{fi} and \textit{supuostu}, their meaning akin to `expected future with an obligation flavour’. It remains unclear as to how preferential modality (see 9.2.2.2) is expressed in BCE.

Data is also included from other Caribbean English Creole (CEC) varieties at the beginning of the main sections as background to the BCE data, and so that the reader is somewhat prepared and can make some cross-creole comparisons. Where possible, comparisons are made with Jamaican Creole (JC), since, as explained in (1.1), one motivation for this thesis is to show how BCE is different/similar to JC and other CECs.

Some of the elicited examples in this chapter are taken from a modality questionnaire courtesy of Bettina Migge (see also Winford and Migge 2007).

9.3.1 Possibility

9.3.1.1 \textit{kiyan}

JC and Guyanese Creole (GC) have a modal similar in form and meaning to BCE \textit{kiyan} in \textit{kyan} (Winford 1993: 71). Sranan (SN) has no less than four unique forms for encoding non-epistemic possibility. \textit{Sabi} expresses ability requiring special knowledge. \textit{Man} expresses physically enabling conditions internal to the participant or imposed on the participant by forces beyond their control (e.g., physical laws, misfortune, or accident, injury, poverty etc.). \textit{Kan} expresses participant-external possibility and \textit{mag} expresses permission (Winford 2000: 76-7).

In BCE, non-epistemic possibility is marked by phonetic variants \textit{kiyan} and \textit{ken}. Their semantics extends across all subdomains of modal possibility: participant-internal possibility (9.2.1) and participant-external modality, namely, non-deontic possibility (9.2.2) and deontic possibility (9.2.2.3).
Kian expresses ability (participant-internal possibility) in a general sense. BCE does not distinguish between inherent and non-inherent ability, or indeed between physical and mental ability. Mental ability is expressed via kian in (18), and physical ability in (19), (20), (21), although the latter could be expressing an inherent or learned ability:

(18) Di pikni kian riid gud.
    DEF child MOD read well
    The child can read well.
    (19a-19:47nt/e2012)

(19) Di pikni strang; him kian swim faar as him kian.
    DEF child strong 3.SG MOD swim far as 3.SG MOD
    The child is strong; he/she can swim far [anywhere he/she wants].
    (19a-19:47nt/e2012)

(20) Im wel strang; him kian lif op wan hundrud kiil.
    3.SG well strong 3.SG MOD lift up one hundred kilo
    He is really child strong; he can lift one hundred kilos.
    (19a-19:47nt/e2012)

(21) Speaker 1
    Hou di artis dem? Dem get out de an dem no shiem. Arait den, di Q DEF artist PL 3.PL get out there CONJ 3.PL NEG shame alright then DEF artis ken daans!
    artist MOD dance
    What were the performers like? They got out there and were not embarrassed.
    Alright then, the performers can dance!
    (12-17:64n2012)

Speaker 2
    Wai wii mus. Kiaan daans! Dem no iizi at aal, [anon.]. Dem ken
Q 1.PL MOD MOD.NEG dance  3.PL NEG easy at all  [anon.]  3.PL MOD stie de!
stay there
Why must we? Can’t dance! They were not easy at all, [anon.]. They can stay there!
(12-05:40n2012)

Non-deontic possibility is encoded via kian/ken in (22) and (23):

(22) An naou wi kian tink fi duu dat.
    CONJ now  1.PL MOD think COMP do  DEM
    And now we can think about doing that.
    (14-19:47n2012)

In (23), the speaker recognises that circumstances beyond their control could lead to her premature death:

(23) So a waan pient it oba difren, fix it, an pient it oba difren
    DM 1.SG want paint 3.SG over different fix 3.SG CONJ paint 3.SG over different
    into novemma, if  a liv, bekaa ai ken ded.
    PREP November CONJ 1.SG live CONJ 1.SG MOD die
    So, I want to paint it over differently, fix it, and paint it over differently by November, if I live, because I could die.
    (13-9:46n2012)

Kian encodes deontic possibility, in which case permission is granted, as illustrated in (24), (25), (26), (27):

(24) Di man tel yuu dat yuu ken smuok fi yuu an sel di res
    DEF man tell 2.SG COMP 2.SG MOD smoke PREP 2.SG CONJ sell DEF rest
    an  brin bak fi  mii.
CONJ bring back PREP 1.SG
The man tells you that you can/may smoke yourself and sell the rest and bring it back to me.
(10-15:19n2012)

(25) *Yies, im kian stie bai mi tunait.*
EXC 3.SG MOD stay PREP 1.SG tonight
Yes, he can/may stay at mine tonight.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(26) *If yuu waan, yu kian go bai di riva wid yua frien dem.*
CONJ 2.SG want 2.SG MOD go PREP DEF river PREP 2.SG.POSS friend PL
If you want, you can/may go to the river with your friends.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(27) *Wi waan rait op a piepa an inbait eribadi. Mek eribadi ken go an injai wid wii. Yie, huu waan go ken go an paas a liki taim.*
CONJ 1.PL want write up INDF paper CONJ invite everybody make everybody MOD go an injai wid wii. Yie, huu waan go ken go an paas a liki taim.
We want to make a poster and invite everybody so that everybody can/may go and enjoy themselves with us. Yes, whoever wants to go can go and spend a little time (there).
(07a-12:42n2012)

Although SE *could* encodes past permission (Coates 1983: 110), this does not seem to be the case for BCE. A speech act that expresses permission communicated as a past situation is encoded via *kian*, not *kuda* (9.3.1.3), as illustrated in (28). Whether this analysis is also true outside reported speech contexts is unknown. As discussed in (5.2), the unmarked dynamic verb receives a past interpretation, but not statives. JC *kyan* is similar to BCE in this respect (Christie 1991: 231).
(28) **Laas nait mai mada tel mi ai kian go bukas aluon.**  
Last night 1.SG.POSS mother tell 1.SG 1.Sg MOD go Bocas alone  
Last night my mother told me I could go to Bocas alone.  
(19a-19:47e2012)

9.3.1.2 **kiaan**  
There are two ways of expressing negated modal possibility in JC, via *kyaan* as well as a combination of negator *na* + affirmative *kyan*, as in (29) (Winford 1993: 73). In GC, *na kyan* extends its meaning further to mean to free someone from a pre-existing obligation.

(29) **If a tumoch trobl fu yu, yu na kyan kom tunait.**  
If it’s too much trouble for you, you needn’t come tonight.  
(Winford 1993: 73)

In BCE, there is only one means of negating non-epistemic possibility, via *kiaan*. It is the negated counterpart of *kian* (9.3.1.1), both formally and semantically, to mean [not possible [P]] (Palmer 1995: 457). *Kiaan* expresses participant-internal possibility (9.2.1), non-deontic possibility (9.2.2), and deontic possibility (9.2.2.3).

Negated participant-internal possibility (ability) is observed in (30), (31), (32), (33), (34):

(30) **Da uman blain; shi kiaan sii mii.**  
DEM woman blind 3.SG MOD.NEG see 1.SG  
That woman is blind; she can’t see me.  
(19a-19:47e2012)

(31) **Wen ai woz likl, ai kuda run but nou ai kiaan run**  
CONJ 1.SG COP.PST little 1.SG MOD.PST run CONJ now 1.SG MOD.NEG run agen.
again
When I was young, I could run fast but now I can’t anymore.
(19a-19:47e2012)

Waraopo drunk 2.SG bad 2.SG MOD walk 3.PL get up def.PL knee double
Waropo [sugar cane juice] got you badly drunk. You can’t walk! They got up, the
knees wobbled.
(11-18:56n2012)

(33) Ai kiaan kom tunait bikaas ai fiil sik.
1.SG MOD.NEG come tonight CONJ 1.SG feel sick
I can’t come tonight because I feel sick.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(34) Ai duon sleep and ai kiaan sliip dee niida.
1.SG NEG sleep CONJ 1.SG MOD.NEG sleep day neither
I don’t sleep [at night] and I can’t sleep during the day either.
(17-010:64n2012)

Negated non-deontic possibility, which covers circumstances external to a participant,
is illustrated in (35) and (36):

(35) dat kiaan bai a gud plet a labsta fuud!
DEM MOD.NEG buy INDF good plate PREP lobster food
That (amount of money) can’t even buy a plate of lobster!
(12-17:64n2012)

(36) Ai no got no moni, so ai kiaan go bai di bierdee.
1.SG NEG got NEG money CONJ 1.SG MOD.NEG go PREP DEF birthday
I don’t have money, so I can’t go to the birthday (party).
(19a-19:47e2012)

Negated deontic possibility is expressed in (37) and (38), where permission is not granted to do something:

(37)  But yu kiaan taak Spanish!
CONJ 2.SG MOD.NEG talk Spanish
But you can’t talk Spanish!
(13-2:23n2012)

(38)  Wel, di buoi kiaan stie hier tunait.
DM DEF boy MOD.NEG stay here tonight
Well, the boy can’t stay here tonight.
(19-19:47e2012)

9.3.1.3 kuda
Winford (1993: 82) observes that epistemic kuda in JC is a recent importation from English (with which it has extensive contact). In the Surinamese Creoles, however, modal forms such as kuda and wuda (10.2.1.1) are absent (Winford 1996: 78). In GC, kyan extends its semantics into the epistemic domain, but this particular form is not attested in JC for expressing epistemic possibility (Winford 1993: 75). GC kyan + past bin evaluates an overtly past situation from a present perspective, in the order bin kyan, and is ambiguous in its reading between non-epistemic and epistemic modality (Winford 1993: 76).

In BCE, kuda is the formally corresponding past counterpart of kian (9.3.1.1). There are no attestations of kuda in the BCE data that encode individual situations in the past, albeit further investigation is required. Indeed, Coates (1983: 128) observes that English could does not refer to single situations in the past because if the possibility of the situation
was fulfilled then it is usually redundant to talk of the possibility. On the other hand, English be able to focuses dramatically on the situation in the past and emphasises its actualisation (Coates 1983: 128). Nevertheless, individual situations in the past encoding modal possibility do exist, although how its linguistic manifestation is encoded is not clear and remains an area for further research. lebl fi is a suppletive form of kian, which combines readily with modal wuda (see 10.2.1.1 for an example), but the evidence for whether past copula wo (7.5.4) combines with lebl fi remains inconclusive. As mentioned in (9.3.1.1), deontic possibility in past contexts appears to be encoded via kian, at least with respect to reported speech contexts. Kuda also has a past counterfactual interpretation (see 10.2.1.2).

Past participant-internal possibility is illustrated in (39):

(39) Wen ai woz likl ai kuda run faas, but nou ai kiaan
CONJ 1.SG COP.PST little 1.SG MOD.PST run fast CONJ now 1.SG MOD.NEG run agen.
run again
When I was young, I could run fast, but I can’t anymore.
(19a-19:47e2012)

When an indefinite pronoun is found in subject position, e.g., nobadi, then kuda expresses non-deontic possibility, as illustrated in (40). Here, the speakers are recalling a flood that happened in 2008. Modals kian and kudn (9.3.1.4) are also attested in (40). As mentioned above, kuda does not express individual situations in the past, but this distinction between single situations in the past and ongoing situations is cancelled with respect to kudn. Speculatively, an alternative expression to kudn would be kuda and an indefinite pronoun as subject:

(40) Speaker 1
Bikaaz di tweni turd nobadi kuda maach. Na, notin laik dat.
CONJ DEF twenty third nobody MOD.PST.NEG march EXC nothing like DEM 
Twenti turd iz vol bank die.
twenty third COP Old Bank Day 
Because the twenty-third nobody could march. Na, nothing like that. Twenty-third is Old Bank Day.

Speaker 2
Yies, so wi kian selebriet di die.
EXC DM 1.PL MOD celebrate DEF day 
Yes, so we can celebrate the day.
(2a-25:59np2012)

Speaker 1
So, wi den doz maach an dem tin, but wel, kudn
DM 1.PL then HAB march CONJ DEM.PL thing CONJ DM MOD.PST.NEG maach. Kudn duu notin.
march MOD.PST.NEG do nothing
So, we then march and those things, but well, couldn’t march. Couldn’t do anything.
(02a-16:55np2012)

9.3.1.4 kudn/kudin
In JC and GC, past participant-internal possibility (9.2.1) and participant-external possibility (see 9.2.2) is expressed via a combination of past marker bin and kyan (Winford 1993: 73). Such a combination in BCE, that is, past di (see 7.5) and kiaan (9.3.1.2) is rejected by BCE consultants. Kudn is the formally (and semantically) corresponding negated counterpart of past kuda (9.3.1.3), meaning [not possible [P]] (Palmer 1995: 457). However, unlike kuda, it may express individual past situations, so that the distinction between individual situations and ongoing situations is cancelled. Indeed, in English, the difference between could and was able to is neutralised in negated contexts (Coates 1983: 129) (see 10.2.1.1.1 for a discussion of English able to).
Examples of past negated participant-internal possibility include (41) and (42):

(41) *Shi kudn gaan skuul yestidee.*
3.SG MOD.PST.NEG go.PST school yesterday
She couldn’t go to school yesterday [she was unwell].
(20-19:47e2012)

(42) *Kudn get out him hed nou an likl buoi kaalin sii if him kaalin frag out.*
MOD.PST.NEG
Couldn’t get his head out and the little boy is trying to call the frog out [of a hole].
(03-16:55p2012)

Non-deontic possibility is expressed in (43), (44), (45), (46):

(43) *Dat taim, dem kudin bai rum, an aal dem no bai rum agen.*
DEM time 3.PL MOD.PST.NEG buy rum CONJ all DEM NEG buy rum again
At that time, they couldn’t buy rum, and all (of) them don’t buy rum anymore.
(11-13:60n2012)

(44) *A kudin shiem. Farget bout shiem!* 
1.SG MOD.PST.NEG shame forget PREP shame
I couldn’t allow myself to be embarrassed. Forget about embarrassment!
(12-5:40n2012)

(45) *So, wi den doz maach an dem tin, but wel, kudn*
DM 1.PL then HAB march CONJ DEM.PL thing CONJ DM MOD.PST.NEG
maach, kudn duu notin.
march MOD.PST.NEG do nothing
So, we then marched and those things, but well, we couldn’t march, we couldn’t do anything [because of the flood].
You couldn’t see him. He was hiding his face.

As illustrated in (47), *kudn* is not obligatory in negated past possibility contexts. Indeed, the unmarked dynamic verb more generally has a default reading of past, but not statives (see 5.2). Here, the speaker is recalling a time when her sister decided to dispose of some of his books that were given to him by a relative living in the US. Circumstances external to the participant were preventing the possibility of coping with the smoke (see 9.2.2):

When I was in here, I smelt the smoke, and when I did so I could not face it.

9.3.2 Necessity

The expression of non-epistemic necessity in BCE is more varied in contrast to epistemic necessity (8.5), particularly in terms of modal strength (see 8.2.1) and/or nuance of force (see 8.2). The markers to be discussed under non-epistemic necessity are *mos(i)* (9.3.2.1), *afu* (9.3.2.2), *beta* (9.3.2.3), *fi* (9.3.2.4), and *supuostu* (9.3.2.5). *Mosi* and *afu* encode modal necessity, with some evidence that the latter expresses a stronger strength of necessity. The syntactic distribution of *mos(i)* is that of an adverb, whereas *afu* is restricted to preverbal position. *Beta* contains a sense of advisability in its obligation meaning, restricted to a deontic sense of modality (see 9.2.2.3). Weak necessity is expressed by
preverbal variants (basilectal) *fi* and (acrolectal) *supuostu*, the meaning of which is akin to ‘expected future with an obligation flavour’ (see 9.2.2; also 2.2 for their terms ‘acrolect’ and ‘basilect’).

9.3.2.1 mos/mosi
In JC and GC, the form *mos* is compatible with future markers *go/wi*, and with imperfective *a* in GC (Winford 1993: 70). According to Winford (1993: 70), *mus* combines readily with past *ben* in the Surinamese Creoles, preserving its full deontic force. There is no evidence that such combinations are permissible with respect to BCE *mos(i)*. Christie (1991: 224) claims that JC *mos* has a negated counterpart, *mosn*. Whether it expresses [not necessary [P]] or [necessary [not P]] is not entirely clear (Palmer 1995: 457).

*Mos* and *mosi* encode strong. Based on the BCE data available data, *mos* marks dynamic verbs, as in (48) and (49), *mosi* combines with noun phrases (53) and prepositions (50), (54). Nonetheless, more evidence is required to make conclusive remarks about what lies behind the choice of each semantic variant. *Mos(i)* functions as an adverb in both non-epistemic and epistemic contexts (8.5.1), found in different syntactic positions within the clause. Payne (1997: 69) observes that adverbs are characterised by their distribution, typically representing the most unrestricted ‘parts of speech’. In (49), an adverbial *aal di taim* ‘all the time’ separates *mos* and main verb *rispek* ‘respect’, the usual case being that no constituent intervenes between a TMA marker and a main verb (see 1.1). In (52), *mosi* occurs with ellipsis of the verb. In (51), (53), (54), *mosi* is found utterance initially.

One consultant remarked that deontic *mos* in (48) could quite easily be replaced by *afu* (9.3.2.2) but would sound less forceful. Whether the use of *afu* over *mosi* in its performative function is a politeness strategy is a question for future research:

(48)  *Shi mos iit di kiek nuo.*
3.SG MOD eat DEF cake now
She must eat the cake now
Although English *must* serves more of a performative function than *have to*, paraphrased by ‘I order you to...’ (Coates 1983: 33), this does not apply to BCE, as illustrated, for example, in (49):

(49) $a$ *pikni mos aal di taim rispek dem pierent-s.*

INDF child MOD all DEF time respect PL parent-PL

A child must always respect parents.

(19a-19:47nr/e2012)

Internal need aka participant-internal necessity (9.2.1) is not attested in the BCE data, but this modal domain is in any case rarely expressed cross-linguistically. Nevertheless, there are attestations of *afu* (9.3.2.2) that express this semantics. Non-deontic necessity (9.2.2) is expressed in (50) and (51), and deontic necessity (9.2.2.3) in (48), (49), (52), (53), (54). As already discussed, participant-external modality relates to external circumstances, and deontic modality specifically expresses a speaker’s desire for a potential situation to be actualised:

(50) $so$ *hou moch *mosi fi di pient rante.* *Dat chip-a?*

DM Q much MOD PREP DEF paint (Almi)rante DEM cheap-CMPR

So how much has it got to cost for the paint in Almirante? That cheaper?

(06a-03:48n2012)

In (51), the speaker is suggesting to her interlocutor that they need to stock up on food, in preparation for the three-day eclipse predicted to occur later in the month:

(51) *Mosi a baks a biskit an juus, an tin yu hav in* 

MOD INDF box PREP biscuits CONJ juice CONJ thing 2.SG have PREP yo hous dem die-z.

2.SG.POSS house DEM.PL day-PL
There’s got to be a box of biscuits and juice, and things that you have in your house (during) those days.
(08-16:55n2012)

In (52), the speaker asks her mother why she was asked to dance at a baseball game she went to:

(52) *Wai mii mos. Kiaan daans!*
Q 1.SG MOD MOD.NEG dance
Why must I? Can’t dance!
(12-5:40n2012)

In (53), the speaker is acting as my consultant and is asked by another BCE speaker how long she is expected to talk for on the recording:

(53) *Mosi a oua.*
MOD INDF hour
It’s got to be an hour [the recording]
(06a-16:55n2012)

In (54), the speaker asks what she is obligated to talk about during the recording:

(54) *Bo wa wi waan taak nou, [anon.]. Mosi bout krismas den o wat?*
CONJ Q 1.PL PRSP talk now [anon.] MOD PREP Christmas then CONJ Q
But what are we going to talk about now, [anon.]? Has it got to be about Christmas, or what?
(06a-03:48n2012)

*Mos(i)* does not appear to combine with tense marking nor is it found in past contexts. *Afu,* on the other hand, readily combines with more than one TMA marker and is attested in the BCE data more frequently. Negated *mos* was not a form actively sought during
fieldwork, and therefore not evidence that such a form does not exist. Nonetheless, nat + afu is attested in the data to express [not necessary [P]] (see 9.3.2.2), as is beta + nat to express [necessary [not P]] (see 9.3.2.3).

9.3.2.2 afu

JC deontic modal mos expresses obligation and has a `semi-modal counterpart’ in ha(v) fu. Other so-called semi-modals in JC take the form of bong fu ‘bound to’ and blaij fu ‘obliged to’ These forms are not usually used for epistemic modality and are said to behave syntactically like main verbs (Winford 1993: 72). Other than afu, the other JC forms have no equivalent forms in BCE. Afu and its less frequent phonetic variants hafu, aftu, haftu encode strong necessity (obligation), albeit not quite as strong as mos (9.3.2.1). Afu is found in the BCE data expressing participant-internal necessity (9.2.1), non-deontic necessity (9.2.2), and deontic necessity (9.2.2.3).

Participant-internal necessity is related to internal need, which is expressed in (55) and (56):

(55) Aal wii aftu ii taim tu liv.
    All 1.PL MOD eat PREP time COMP live
    Everyone must eat in order to stay alive.
    (19a-19:47nr/e2012)

(56) Im aal di taim afu sun as im jas wiek op.
    3.SG all DEF time MOD eat soon as 3.SG just wake up
    He always needs to eat as soon as he just wakes up.
    (19b-19:47e2012)

Participant-external modality has to do with circumstances external to a participant. English have to conveys non-deontic necessity where there is no reference to any authority
or moral code, thus making the necessity more general (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 95). This analysis also seems applicable to *afu*, as illustrated in (57) and (58):

(57)  *Wen ai luk so much piipl, ai se, “Buoi”, ai se, “Wel, ai afu shuo wat ai nuoa”*. When I looked there were so many people, I said, “Boy”, I said, “Well, I have to show them what I can do”.

(12-5:40n2012)

(58)  **Speaker 1**

*Fors taim fi iit kad fish, yo haftu haid bikaas i smel strang.*

First time COMP eat cod fish 2.SG MOD  hide CONJ 3.SG smell strong

*An nou?*

CONJ now

At first in order to eat cod, you had to hide because it smelt strong. And now?

(14-14:50n2012)

**Speaker 2**

*Yu kian bai it tu iit it.*

2.SG MOD buy 3.SG COMP eat 3.SG

You can buy it to eat.

(14-19:47n2012)

As mentioned in (9.2.2.3), deontic modality is a subdomain of participant-external modality and relates to the notion of granting or imposing something. It expresses a speaker’s desire for a potential situation to be actualised, which is the case for *afu* in (59), (60), (61), (62):

(59)  *Yo afu inbent!*

2.Sg MOD invent

You’ve got to invent! [for the recording]

(13-2:23n2012)
(60)  You know you need to wash your hands before you eat.
(19-19:47e2012)

(61)  Speaker 1
But you have to be near, [anon.].
(04-22:21n2012)

Speaker 2
Yeah, you’ve got to be over here.
(04-16:55n2012)

(62)  Speaker 1
And mum used to make me become angry. Bake cake. Bake bread. I used to say, “Why the hell do I have to bake all those damn things, yeh?!”. 
(11-18:56n2012)

Speaker 2
All those things (we) have to make on Christmas Eve!
As mentioned in (5.5.1.2), afu is negated by nat, the modal itself being both formally and semantically negated, that is, [not necessary [P]] (Palmer 1995: 457):

(63)  \textit{Im mada nat haftu wori bikaa shi nat nuo.}

3.SG.POSS NEG MOD worry CONJ 3.SG NEG know

His mother needn’t worry because she doesn’t know.

(19c-19:47e2012)

In past temporal contexts, on the other hand, afu combines with past negator neva (see also 7.5 and 6.4.3.1.2.1), as illustrated in (64):

(64)  \textit{An, wel, dem giv out plenti tin. Ai neva hafu bai notin wi CONJ DM 3.PL give out plenty thing 1.SG NEG.PST MOD buy nothing PREP mai biebi dem taim.}

1.SG.POSS baby Dem.PL time

And, well, they gave out plenty of things. I didn’t have to buy anything (when I was) with my baby those times.

(02a-16:55n2012)

9.3.2.2.1 TMA combinations

BCE mos (9.3.2.1), like English must, cannot be marked for past in BCE, the result of which is that \textit{di afu} functions as the suppletive form. As (65) and (66) illustrate, past marking is not obligatory in BCE:

(65)  \textit{Mama se yu aftu, dem taim no kluoraks an dem ting, yo Mum say 2.SG MOD DEM.PL time NEG Clorax CONJ DEM.PL thing 2.SG afu bliich kluoz.}

MOD bleach clothes
Mum says you had to, at that time there was no Clorax and those things, so you had to bleach clothes.

(11-13:60n2012)

(66) *Bika wen wi liki wi *afu help mek kiek, wi *haftu help kliin hous.*

CONJ CONJ 1.PL little 1.[PL MOD help make 1.PL MOD help clean house

Because when we were little, we had to help make cake, we had to help clean the house.

(11-18:56n2012)

*Afu* combines with past *di* (7.5.1), as illustrated in (67) and (68):

(67) *Ai di haftu go an bai di shop dis marnin bikaa ai neva ga*

1.SG PST MOD go CONJ buy DEF shop DEM morning CONJ 1.SG NEG.PST got

*No milk.*

NEG milk

I had to go and buy at the shop this morning because I didn’t have any milk.

(19a-19:47nt/e2012)

(68) *Wen ai woz likl, ai di haftu kliin di hous.*

CONJ 1.SG COP.PST little 1.SG PST MOD clean DEF house

When I was little, I had to clean the house.

(19a-19:47e2012)

However, there is a contrast between (68) and then (69), where in the latter case the past marking takes the form of *woz* (see 7.5.4), not *di*. It was explained to the consultant before (68) was uttered that the speaker did not actually carry out the obligation imposed on them, and before (69) that the house was indeed cleaned. There is not enough evidence in the BCE data to make any conclusive remarks about a possible semantic distinction between *di afu* and *wo afu*, since the latter combination is the only attestation. It is
plausible that the speaker in question might have felt obligated in this instance to provide me with a different TMA marker after being given distinct contexts. Interestingly, another attestation of *wo* is observed in the previous clause in (69), which marks an ascriptive predicate for past (see 7.5.4.1.1), and this represents a re-occurring pattern by which the use of copula *wo* earlier on in the sentence often triggers the use of *wo* with main verbs (instead of *di* or the unmarked verb) (see 7.5.5 for a discussion):

(69) Wen shi wo a likl pikni in ar hous, shi woz

CONJ 3.SG COP.PST INDF little child PREP 1.PL.Poss house 3.SG COP.PST

*aftu* wuerk haad.

MOD work hard

When she was a little child in our house, she had to work hard at home.

(19b-19:47e2012)

*Afu* also combines with absolute future *wi* (7.6.4), as illustrated in (70), (71), (72):

(70) Wel, if im kom, ai wi *aftu* help im wid di paati a liki bit.

DM CONJ 3.SG come 1.SG FUT MOD help 3.SG PREP DEF party INDF little bit

Well, if he comes, I will have to help him with the party a little bit.

(14-14:50n2012)

(71) *Di* buoi *wi* *aftu* go skuul tumara.

DEF boy FUT MOD go school tomorrow

The boy will have to school tomorrow.

(19a-19:47nt/e2012)

(72) Wen shi sii mi, shi *wi* *haftu* taak tu mii.

CONJ 3.SG see 1.SG 3.SG FUT MOD talk PREP 1.SG

When she sees me, she will have to talk to me.

(19a-19:47e2012)
9.3.2.3 beta
According to Denison & Cort (2010: 350) English *better* is a necessity modal approaching an obligation sense, though it’s actual meaning is closer to advisability. This meaning is also encoded in BCE *beta*: “It includes the sense that action sought of the subject is not only normatively wished for but is also beneficial to the subject...” (Traugott 2002; cited in Denison & Cort 2010: 366). The meaning of BCE *beta*, like English *better*, extends beyond advice to directing the behaviour of others or announcing decisions about one’s own (Denison and Cort 2010: 368). Nevertheless, the syntactic position of deontic *beta* within the clause of *beta* is more flexible than English *better*, preceding both verbs and subjects. Thus, *beta* may also occur as the first constituent in the clause, as illustrated in (73), (74), (75). However, unlike *mosi* (9.3.2.1), *beta* does not have the status of an adverb since it is not found in any other positions within the clause.

(73)  
*Beta*  
MOD 2.SG go 3.SG
It’d be better if you go and do it.

(74)  
*Yuu beta* kom tunait if *yu waan yua moni.*
2.SG MOD come tonight CONJ 2.SG want 2.SG.POSS money
You’d better come tonight if you want your money.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(75)  
*Sins yuu kiaan pie fi* *yu fiud, yuu beta* go wash dem
CONJ 2.SG MOD.NEG pay PREP 2.SG.POSS food 2.SG MOD go wash DEM.PL
dishis.
dishes
Since you can’t pay for the meal, you’d better wash those dishes.
(19a-19:47e2012)

In (76), the temporal context is past:
In (77), the clause containing *beta* is a present counterfactual (see 10.1.1) equative clause (see (41)) containing *wuda* (10.2.1.1) followed by copula *bii* (see 1.3 and 5.1):

(77) Beta yuu wud bii di baas.
    MOD 2.SG MOD be DEF boss
    It’d be better if you were the boss.
    (19c-19:47e2012)

English *beta* is overwhelmingly associated with first and second person subjects, which seems to be the case in BCE. Denison & Cort (2010: 366) observe that the semantic-pragmatic traits pertaining to *better* such as speaker decision, specific occasion, and expectation of fulfilment, together associate themselves easily with the actual participants in the speech situation, namely first and second person: “[T]hey represent the most likely effective scope of a speaker’s advice/decision on some immediate event.” Reference to a third person can be made in English but such instances do not refer to specific occasions (Denison and Cort 2010: 350), illustrated in BCE in (78):

(78) Jan beta faind a uman bifuoa im get uol.
    John MOD find INDF woman before 3.SG get old
    John had better find a woman before he gets too old.
    (19a-19:47e2012)

*Beta* cannot itself be negated. It is rather the subsequent verb phrase that is negated, as observed in (79). Thus, in contrast to *afu* (9.3.2.2), it is the verb phrase that is semantically negated in the case of *beta*, that is, [necessary [not P]]:
(79)  Yu  beta  nat  taak  tu  mii  so.
2.SG MOD NEG talk  PREP 1.SG so
You’d better not talk to me like that.
(19a-19:47e2012)

9.3.2.4  fi
In JC and GC, the form (fi is attested, although fu is the more frequent variant, described as encoding weak obligation (Winford 1993: 69). BCE fi expresses weak necessity, specifically expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances, as illustrated in (80), (81), (82), (83). The semantics of fi expresses non-deontic necessity (80) and deontic necessity (81), (82) (83) (see 9.2.2.3). Fi is a basilectal variant form, with tu the acrolectal variant (see, for example, 7.6.3; see also 2.2 for the definition of the basilect/acrolect distinction). A possible source for the modal meaning of fi is arguably English to be in, for example, I am to sing the part of Gandhi. In such sentences, the meaning of to be is 'expected future with an obligation flavour’ (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 251).

(80)  Wat wi  iz  fi  shiem  fa?
Q  1.PL COP MOD shame for
What are we supposed to be embarrassed about?
(012-17:64n2012)

(81)  Dat-s  wai  ai  fi  tel  yuu...
DEM-COP Q  1.SG MOD tell 2.SG
That’s what I’m supposed to tell you...
(010-15:19n2012)

(82)  Shi  fi  kaal  mi  tudie.
3.SG MOD call  1.SG today
She’s supposed to call me today.
(013-o2:23n2012)
When \textit{fi} combines with past copula \textit{wo} (7.5.4), in the order \textit{wo fi}, the implication is that the situation did not occur (see 10.2.2.2).

9.3.2.5 supuostu

\textit{Supuostu}, like \textit{fi} (9.3.2.4), expresses expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances, as in (84). However, \textit{supuostu} is attested far less frequently in the naturalistic BCE data and functions as the acrolect variant, namely, when BCE speakers make attempts to approximate English. Indeed, English \textit{be supposed to} is a source for participant-external necessity (see 9.2.2) (Van der Auwera and Plungian 1998: 96):

(84) \textit{Dem supuostu giv yo som.}

3.PL MOD give 2.SG some

They are supposed to give you some.

(12-17:64n2012)

Like \textit{fi}, past \textit{wo} (7.5.4) readily combines with \textit{supuostu} to express a past situation (see 10.2.2.2).

In (85), main verb \textit{riich} ‘arrive’ is marked for progressive by variant -\textit{in} (see 6.4.1), which in turn is marked by \textit{supuostu}:

(85) \textit{Shi supuostu rich-in tumara.}

3.SG MOD reach-POG tomorrow

She is supposed to be arriving tomorrow.

(00-26:21e2012)
9.4 Concluding remarks

The semantic map presented in (8.2.2) by van der Auwera & Plungian (1998) is replicated in Figure 9.1. It illustrates the BCE modals that express the subdomains of non-epistemic modality in the BCE data, in this case, the distinction between possibility and necessity (see 8.2) as well as the distinction between participant internal (9.2.1) and external modality (9.2.2). Although the semantics of kian (9.3.1.1), kiaan (9.3.1.2), kuda (9.3.1.3), mos(i) (9.3.2.1), and afu (9.3.2.2) overlap with the epistemic domain (see chapter 8), kudn (9.3.1.4), beta (9.3.2.3), fi (9.3.2.4), and supuostu (9.3.2.5) are restricted to the non-epistemic domain. Kian and kuda mark present and past situations, respectively, in the subdomain of modal possibility. Kuda encodes past contexts, however, not individual situations in the past which seems to be achieved via kian. The formal negated counterparts of kian and kuda take the form of kiaan and kudn, respectively.

Mos(i), afu, beta, fi, and supuostu all encode various strengths (see 8.2.1) and nuances of non-epistemic necessity. Mosi, like epistemic miebi (8.4.1), is an adverb, with some evidence that it expresses a stronger strength of necessity than afu. Beta contains a sense of advisability in its meaning. Weak necessity is expressed by fi and supuostu, the meaning akin to 'expected future with an obligation flavour', the distinction being that fi is the frequent (and basilectal) variant. It remains unclear as to how preferential modality (see 9.2.2.2) is expressed in BCE.

Relating back to the typological generalisations, unlike in the case of the semantic domains of tense and aspect, the findings in the non-epistemic modal domain in BCE seem to confirm cross-linguistic generalisations.

Figure 9.1 Non-epistemic modality in BCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Possibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-epistemic possibility</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant-internal possibility (Dynamic possibility, Ability, Capacity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kian kiaan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kuda</strong> (not individual situations in the past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(di) afu</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10 Chapter ten: Past counterfactuality in BCE

10.1 Introduction

Chapter 10 examines the notion of past counterfactuality in BCE. As explained in (1.1), this chapter is not intended to be a fully systematic exploration of either counterfactuality or conditionals. The motivation for including past unreal conditionals (and past counterfactual expressions more generally) in this thesis originates in my finding that BCE deontic *shuda* (10.2.2.1) differs in both semantics and tense to the same form in Jamaican Creole (JC), the former restricted to a past counterfactual reading in the domain of non-epistemic modality (see 10.2). The form *shuda* in JC expresses epistemic modality and is found in present and past tense contexts, whereas BCE *shuda* is constrained to past non-epistemic contexts with a counterfactual interpretation (see 10.1.1). This chapter begins by defining the terms counterfactuality (10.1.1) and conversational implicature. As explained in (1.2), counterfactuality is a meaning that tends to arise cross-linguistically from a semanticisation of pragmatic information in contexts where a combination of TMA markers are present (Van linden and Verstraete 2008). A brief overview of the expression of past counterfactual in BCE is presented in (10.2), with additional data included from other Caribbean English Creoles (CECs) at the beginning of the section as background to the BCE data, to prepare the reader somewhat and to make some cross-creole comparisons. Where possible, comparisons are made with JC, since, as explained in (1.1), one motivation for this thesis is to show that BCE is different in particular from JC. The remaining chapter is divided into conditional constructions (10.2.1) and simple clauses (10.2.2).

10.1.1 Definition of counterfactuality

Counterfactuality is a meaning that can arise in both simple clauses and conditional constructions. In simple clauses, past marking is required, e.g., *I was going to do that yesterday*. Wishes also convey the notion of counterfactuality where past marking is present, e.g., *I wish he had been to Paris* (Lyons 1977). Likewise, there is past marking in
conditional sentences although not necessarily within the same clause (see 5.4.1.1.2 and 10.2.1.1). A counterfactual utterance commits the speaker, not to the truth but to the falsity of the proposition expressed by one or more of its constituent clauses (Lyons 1977: 795). Cross-linguistically, there are more ways to express past counterfactuality than present counterfactuality (see also 5.4.1.1), and this chapter presents the various ways that this notion may be expressed.

The first type of past counterfactual construction is the ‘canonical’ type which includes an if-clause (as exemplified in 5.4.1.1). The second type is a simple clause that does not contain an overt protasis but nonetheless has a relation with the first type in the sense that the proposition is made based on a non-overtly expressed condition, e.g., *The poor man would have been killed*. And the third type is *The police should have done something to prevent the killing*, a simple clause which is not based on a hypothetical proposition of any kind (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1867).

Cross-linguistically, a single ‘dedicated’ marker of past counterfactuality in simple clauses is rare (see 10.2.2.1 for *shuda*), and the types of constructions that yield a past counterfactual meaning in simple clauses frequently involve a combination of a modal element marking some type of potentiality, together with a past marker and/or an aspectual marker (perfect or perfective) (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1868-9). As Van linden & Verstraete (2008: 1882) observe, the crucial difference between a past counterfactual situation and a negated past situation is that the former always combines polarity reversal with another layer of meaning. The interpretation of (1) and (2) differs since opposite polarity reversals are involved (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1866). In (1), positive polarity expressed in the protasis results in a negated counterfactual reading insofar as the troops were *not* sent in, and consequently people were killed. In (2), the protasis is negated, that is, it has negative polarity which results in the interpretation that troops were indeed sent in and were thus able to prevent the killing.

(1) If they **had** acted and sent in enough police troops, says the report, the bloody
episode could have been prevented.

(2) If they hadn’t acted and sent in enough police troops, says the report, the bloody episode could not have been prevented.

The additional layer of meaning in a past counterfactual reading is the following: (ii) a situation was potential in some way, but (ii) in the end it did not take place. In a number of languages, a counterfactual simple construction is structurally different from the apodosis of a conditional counterfactual construction (Van Linden and Verstraete 2008: 1888), which indeed is the case in BCE. Nevertheless, they do tend to show a very similar distribution of marking patterns, with most counterfactual conditionals containing both a marker of both tense and modality (Lazard 2001; cited in Van Linden & Verstraete 2008: 1890). Indeed, this is the case in BCE. For example, in general counterfactual sentences the protasis of unreal conditionals is marked by past tense di (7.5.1) and the apodosis by modals wud(a) (10.2.1.1) or kuda (10.2.1.2) (see also Iatridou 2000). In simple clauses, TMA combinations include past wo and modal fi (10.2.2.2) or supuostu (10.2.2.3), in addition to past tense di and prospective aspect gwain (see 10.2.2.4).

The semantic status of the feature of polarity reversal (see above) in simple clauses is variable across languages. In many languages, it has become part of the basic meaning and is not cancellable. In other languages, the counterfactual interpretation that arises is cancellable; in such a case the simple clause has a basic compositional meaning and a counterfactual interpretation (Van Linden and Verstraete 2008: 1883). There is a discrepancy between the compositional semantics and the actual interpretation of a past counterfactual. Counterfactual constructions that are no longer cancellable start out with a counterfactual reading as a pragmatic implicature, which over time becomes semanticised if they are frequent and typical enough (Van Linden and Verstraete 2008: 1884). In past unreal conditionals, the proposition in the antecedent is cancellable, e.g., *If Jones had taken arsenic, he would have shown just exactly those symptoms which he does in fact show* (Anderson 1951).
With the exclusion of *shuda* (10.2.2.1), a ‘dedicated’ marker of counterfactuality, conversational implicature of non-actualisation can be arrived at with a combination of past + modal, or in the case of *di gwain* (10.2.2.4), past + prospective aspect (7.6.1). In these cases, it is not the compositional semantics of these constructions that gives rise to a counterfactual interpretation but conversational implicature. The modal or prospective aspect element marks a situation as potential rather than actual, either because the speaker regards it as desirable (deontic potentiality) or because the speaker intends to realise it (dynamic potentiality) (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1875). If a non-modal utterance is contrasted with a modal one, the former expresses a much stronger sense of certainty, with the latter encoding a weaker expression of potentiality. The Cooperative Principle (Grice 1975) consists of four rules that interlocutors abide by in order to be cooperative and efficient in communication, and it is the application of the Maxim of Quantity (that a speaker be as informative as required) (Wayne 2014) to the modalised version that implicates the negation of the unmodalised counterpart (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1878). A modal marker alone, however, does not express the notion of counterfactuality. Since the past is already known, a non-modal statement in the past is more certain than a projected situation at Speech Time (S) (see also 7.2). Thus, a non-modal structure in the past is epistemically stronger than a modal one encoding potentiality in the past (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1879). The application, again, of the Maxim of Quantity to a statement that expresses past potential implicates the non-actualisation of the non-modal situation in question (Van linden and Verstraete 2008: 1880).

The very essence of a conversational implicature is that the speaker implicates and the hearer infers (Horn 2006: 6). The need for implicature arises from the desire of the speaker to achieve goals beyond communication, goals such as maintaining good social relations, misleading without lying, style, and verbal efficiency (Wayne 2014). Furthermore, it is derived from the shared presumption that speaker and hearer are interacting rationally and cooperatively to reach their shared goal, namely, successful communication (Horn 2006: 6).
10.2 Overview of the expressions of past counterfactuality in BCE

JC, *shuda* marks present situations (as well as past) but is also found in the epistemic modal domain (Winford 1993: 83). In its deontic use, JC *shuda* encodes strong advisability or necessity, and in its epistemic use, strong probability. Interestingly, basilectal speakers of JC are increasingly differentiating between *shuda* and *shud*, to formally separate past contexts from present contexts, respectively (Winford 1993: 83). Christie (1991: 224) identifies the form JC *shudn* (the negated counterpart), although no information as to its function is given. No mention, however, of such a modal is made in Winford (1993). No attestations of *shudn* surface in the BCE data but this form was not actively elicited during fieldwork.

Winford (1993: 83; note 63) claims that non-epistemic *shuda* has more ‘truly basilectal counterparts’ in Guyanese creole (GC) *bin fu* and JC *ben fi* (‘past obligation’), the latter markers of which are comparable in form to BCE *wo fi* (10.2.2.2). However, according to Winford (1996: 316), Western CECs (see 3.2) have a preference for *shuda*. In BCE, both *wo fi* and *shuda* (10.2.2.1) have distinct semantics. The Eastern CECs also make a distinction between *bin fi* and *shuda*, the meanings said to correlate with ‘was/were supposed to’ and ‘ought to have’, respectively (Winford 1996: 316). The Surinamese Creoles, on the other hand, encode both weak and strong deontic necessity via past + *musu* (see 9.3.2.1 for an analysis of BCE deontic *mos*, which in any case is not marked for past).

The expression of general counterfactuality across CECs is achieved via two ways. The first is via a modal form *wuda* which marks the apodosis of unreal conditionals (see 5.4.1.1). This is the case for JC as well as intermediate CECs (see 3.2 for definition of ‘intermediate’) (Winford 1996: 317). This also applies to Nicaraguan Creole (Bartens 2013a: 119) and other Western CECs spoken on the Islands of San Andres and Providence Island (Bartens 2013b: 108). A second way of expressing past counterfactuality across CECs is via a combination of past *me* + future *wan*, which is observed in Belizean Creole, the form *wuda* encoding past habituality (Escure 2013: 95) (see also 6.4.3.1.3). The notion
of past counterfactuality is also expressed via past + future in Sranan and GC, in *ben salbo* (*ben o*) and *bin salbin go*, respectively (Winford 1996: 317). The protasis of unreal conditionals (5.4.1.1) consistently follows the same pattern in CECs (see 3.2), marked by past variants *bin/len* or *did*, corresponding to the so-called basilectal and intermediate varieties (see 2.2) (Winford 1996: 317).

In BCE, there is one TMA marker that can be claimed to be a dedicated marker of counterfactuality, which is *shuda* (10.2.2.1). It encodes past deontic weak necessity in simple clauses but does not entail that there was any previous command or expectation imposed on the participant. *Wud(a)* (10.2.1.1) and *kuda* (10.2.1.2) mark the apodosis of conditionals, the former predicting an outcome and the latter predicting a possible outcome. *Wudn* (10.2.1.1.2) is the negated counterpart of *wud(a)*. The meaning of basilectal *wo fi* (10.2.2.2) and acrolectal *wo supuostu* (10.2.2.3) is unactualised expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances (see 2.2 for the term ‘acrolect’). The TMA combination *di gwain* (10.2.2.4) is found in simple clauses and marks future-in-the-past situations for an interpretation akin to unactualised intention or prediction. With the exception of *shuda*, the past counterfactual interpretation of these past counterfactual expressions arises as a result of conversational implicature and not compositional semantics (see 10.1.1).

**10.2.1 Conditional constructions**

10.2.1.1 *wud(a)*

*Wud(a)* is not strictly a dedicated marker of counterfactuality insofar as it is also found in non-counterfactual contexts, namely, past propensity (see 6.4.3.1.3). *Wuda* and *wud* are phonetic variants of each other, although *wuda* is by far the most frequently heard in counterfactual contexts. Past propensity, on the other hand, is expressed via *wud* only. Although *wud(a)* is etymologically related to English *would have*, it is not restricted to past contexts.
In conditional sentences (see also 5.4.1.1.2), the meaning of \textit{wud(a)} is one of ‘general’ counterfactuality, general in the sense that it does not encode other modal nuances, like, for example, \textit{kuda} (10.2.1.2). In its counterfactual reading, the semantics of \textit{wuda} is not dissimilar to the TMA combination \textit{di + gwain/waan} (10.2.2.4), with a sense of prediction captured in both. Nevertheless, \textit{wuda} is constrained to the apodosis of unreal conditional sentences (see 5.4.1.1.2) even if it appears with an elided protasis, as illustrated in (4), whereas \textit{di gwain/waan} is constrained to simple clauses.

A counterfactual reading for conditional sentences containing \textit{wud(a)} arises from a combination of a past tense marker and a modal marker, albeit in separate clauses (see 10.1.1). Either past \textit{di} (7.5.1) or past negator \textit{nev} is found in the protasis. The evidence as to whether the proposition in the antecedent is cancellable remains inconclusive, as this was not tested in the field (see 10.1.1 for an English example where \textit{would have} appears in the apodosis).

Some of the elicited examples in this section and (10.2.1.1.2) are taken from a modality questionnaire courtesy of Bettina Migge (see also Winford and Migge 2007).

\textit{Wuda} encodes both present and past counterfactuality, contrasting with \textit{kuda} (10.2.1.2), \textit{shuda} (10.2.2.1), \textit{wo fi} (10.2.2.2), \textit{supuostu} (10.2.2.3), and \textit{di gwain} (10.2.2.4). In (3) and (4), the unreal conditional expresses a present context, with an elided protasis in (4):

(3) If \textit{ai di ga moni, ai wuda bai a car.}
CONJ 1.SG PST got money 1.SG MOD buy INDF car
If I had the money, I would buy a car.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(4) \textit{Yie, so wid afu paak up an sel. [wid ‘wi wud’]}
EXCL so 1.SG.MOD MOD pack up CONJ sel
Yeh, so we would have to set up [a stall] and sell (them).

(10-17:64n2012)

In (5), (6), (7), **wud(a)** occurs in the apodosis of past unreal conditionals:

(5) If **ai di nuo shi wo hia, miebii ai wud gaan**
CONJ 1.SG PST know 3.SG COP.PST here maybe 1.SG MOD go.PST
(an) **luk fi ar.**
CONJ look PREP 3.SG

If I had known she were here, maybe I would have gone and looked for her.

(19b-19:47e2012)

(6) If **ai did nuo shi di waan help, ai wuda help ar.**
CONJ 1.SG PST know 3.SG PST want help 1.SG MOD help 3.SG

If I had known she was needed help, I could have helped her.

(19a-19:47e2012)

(7) If **im di lisin tu mi aida sel it. [aida ‘ai wuda’]**
CONJ 3.SG PST listen PREP 1.SG 1.sg.MOD sel it

If he had listened to me, I would have sold it.

(09-6:87n2012)

**Wud(a)** combines with **bii**, a copula form that is triggered in the presence of other TMA markers (see 1.3), as illustrated in (8):

(8) **Beta yuu wud bii di baas.**
MOD 2.SG MOD COP DEF boss

It would be better if you were the boss.

(19c-19:47e2012)
Wud(a) combines with other TMA markers, for example, deontic modal afu (9.3.2.2), as in (9), in addition to progressive marking, which in (10), appears in the form of variant de (6.4.1.2). This shows that wuda has scope over non-epistemic modality as well as aspect, able to mark both domains for counterfactuality (see 1.3.2 for the order of TMA combinations in BCE):

(9) If shi did sii mi laas nait, shi wud haftu taak tu mii.
CONJ 3.SG PST see 1.SG last night 3.SG MOD MOD talk PREP 1.SG
If she had seen me last night, she would have had to talk to me.
(19a-19:47e2012)

(10) If him neva get sik yestide, him wuda de pient rait nou.
CONJ 3.SG NEG get sick yesterday 3.SG MOD PROG paint right now
If he hadn’t got sick yesterday, he would have been painting right now.
(19a-19:47e2012)

10.2.1.1 wuda iebl (fi)

JC has a form eebl (fu) which is similar to BCE iebl (fi), the infinitival complementiser fi being optional in BCE. The JC form may combine with a negator (Winford 1993: 71) but no discussion of its presence in past contexts is available. BCE iebl (fi) is a suppletive form of non-epistemic kian (9.3.1.1), and seems to be triggered in the presence of TMA markers to some extent like copula bii (see 1.3 and 5.1). Since the combination wuda (10.2.1.1) + kian is not permissible in BCE to express counterfactual possibility, the gap in this modal paradigm is filled by wuda + iebl (fi), which in (11) expresses past counterfactual participant-internal possibility (see 9.2.1):

(11) If i neva sik yestidie, I wuda iebl (fi) pient di hous.
CONJ 3.SG NEG sick yesterday 1.SG MOD able COMP paint DEF house
If he hadn’t got sick, he would’ve been able to pain the house yesterday.
(19a-19:47e2012)
More data is required to determine whether *iebl (fi)* also encodes non-deontic possibility (participant-external) (see 9.2.2). The difference in semantics between *wuda iebl fi* and *kuda* (10.2.1.2) is that the former makes a prediction in a counterfactual context in the domain of participant-internal/external possibility, whereas the latter expresses the counterfactual outcome as a possibility and is slightly less certain. The evidence for whether past copula *wo* (7.5.4) readily combines with *iebl fi* to encode past non-counterfactual possibility is inconclusive (see also 9.3.1.3).

10.2.1.1.2 wudn

**Wudn** (sometimes pronounced *wudin*) is the formally corresponding negated counterpart of *wud(a)* (10.2.1.1). It is found in the apodosis of conditional sentences, as in (13), (14), (15), where the protasis is elided in (15):

(13)  *If ai neva gat no moni, ai wudn gat no frien.*
    CONJ 1.SG NEG got NEG money 1.SG MOD.NEG got NEG friend
    If I didn’t have any money, I wouldn’t have any friends.
    (19a-19:47e2012)

(14)  *If ai neva sii him laas nait, ai wudn nuo him gaan out.*
    CONJ 1.SG NEG see 3.SG last night 1.SG MOD.NEG know 3.SG go.PST out
    If I hadn’t seen him last night, I wouldn’t have known he’d gone out.
    (19a-19:47e2012)

(15)  *But dis yier nou a wudin gaan; [anon.] dem miin fi se*
    CONJ DEM year now 1SG MOD.NEG go.PST [anon.] 3.PL mean COMP say
    a mus go.
    1.SG MOD go
    But this year I didn’t wouldn’t have gone [to any baseball matches on the
    mainland], but Kalito and the others said I had to go.
    (12-5:40n2012)
In contrast to *wud(a)*, *wudn* does not encode (negated) past propensity (see 6.4.3.1.3). Although *wud* appears to express a remote possibility outside of conditionals (see also 6.4.3.1.3 for an example), it is unclear whether this also applies to *wudn* (see also concluding remarks in 11.2).

English *would not* can express past volition of single situations, e.g., *I had no money on me, but he wouldn’t lend me any* (Huddleston 2002: 197), but this is a meaning that was not actively elicited nor found in the naturalistic data for BCE *wudn*. BCE *waan* has a dual function as a main verb of desire and a marker of prospective aspect (see 7.6.2.2.2).

10.2.1.2  *kuda*

*Kuda*, like *wud(a)* (10.2.1.1), is a TMA marker that has both a past and past counterfactual interpretation. In its counterfactual reading, the semantic distinction between *wud(a)* and *kuda* is that the former expresses a predicted outcome and *kuda*, a possible outcome, as illustrated in (16). In its non-counterfactual reading, *kuda* (9.3.1.3) encodes non-epistemic possibility and in restricted contexts, epistemic possibility (8.4.5). However, deontic possibility in BCE is expressed by *kian* (9.3.1.1), not the past form *kuda*. In this respect, unlike *shuda* (10.2.2.1), *kuda* is not a dedicated marker of counterfactuality. (Coates 1983: 120). In its non-counterfactual interpretation, *kuda* does not encode past individual situations. Its past counterfactual reading is equivalent to ‘It would have been possible for...but...not’ (Coates 1983: 121). The two meanings of *kuda* are disambiguated first and foremost by clause type. The counterfactual interpretation arises where *kuda* occurs in the apodosis of an unreal conditional (see 5.4 for the distinction between real and unreal conditionals). The evidence remains inconclusive as to whether *kuda* also expresses unreal conditionals in present contexts.

(16) *If wii di kech a fait, ai kuda biit op yuu.*
CONJ 1.PL PST catch INDF fight 1.SG MOD beat up 2.SG
*If we’d had a fight, I could have beaten you up*
(19a-19:47e2012)
The evidence for whether the proposition in the antecedent is cancellable in examples such as (16) remains inconclusive, as this was not tested for (see 10.1.1 for an English example where would have appears in the apodosis). As in the case for wuda (10.2.1.1), kuda may appear with an elided protasis (see below).

Participant-internal possibility features in (16), and participant-external in (17) and (18). In (17) and (18), the constructions are implied conditionals, for example, in (17), the hypothesised proposition is ‘if she hadn’t delayed…’, and in (18), ‘if he had wanted to…’:

(17) Shi woz jos sluow-in wen shi kud gaan aredi.
    3.SG COP.PST just slow-PROG CONJ 3.SG MOD go.PST already
    She was just delaying when she could have gone already.
    (17a-19:47nr/e2012)

(18) Im kuda go wi di moni bu im neva waan.
    3.SG MOD go PREP DEF money CONJ 3.SG NEG want
    He could have taken the money, but he didn’t want to. [i.e. he had the
    chance to]
    (19a-19:47e2012)

In cases where kuda is found in non-conditionals, as in (10.2.2), it seems to represent a straightforward case of hypothesis:

(19) Ai furget di dour uopn laas nait; enibadi kuda kom in.
    1.SG forget DEF door open last night anybody MOD come PREP
    I left the door open last night; anybody could have come in.
    (19a-19:47e2012)
10.2.2 Simple clauses

10.2.2.1 shuda

Shuda is a marker of counterfactuality with modal flavour. It encodes past deontic weak necessity (see 8.2.1 and 9.2.2.3) in simple clauses, with the modal strength varying somewhat depending on the context. The meaning of shuda does not entail that there was any previous command or expectation imposed on the participant, which differs from the meaning of JC shuda which is said to encode strong advisability or necessity previously imposed on the participant. In contrast to wuda (10.2.1.1), shuda is constrained to past temporal contexts. It is the only TMA marker in BCE that may be described as a dedicated marker of counterfactuality, such markers being rare cross-linguistically (see 10.1.1).

Admittedly, shuda has its origins in a combination of English should + have. The nearest approximation to deontic weak necessity that may be expressed in present contexts in BCE is beta (9.3.2.3).

In (20), (21), (22), the meaning of shuda is ‘advice in hindsight’, that is, what would have been advisable to do at the time. It is an expression of teleological necessity (see 9.2.2.1). In (23) and (24), the meaning is more akin to an unsaid moral obligation that the speaker believes the protagonist was under.

(20) Wai you spen aal yua moni? Yuu shuda siev som.
    Q 2.SG spend all 2.SG.POSS money 2.SG MOD save some
    Why did you spend all your money? You should’ve saved some.
    (19a-19:47e2012)

(21) Ai shuda fuul di tank wid gaas bu ai fuoget.
    1.SG MOD fill DEF tank PREP gas CONJ 1.SG forgot
    I should have filled the tank with petrol, but I forgot.
    (19a-19:47e2012)
Shuda ker da twenty dala an bai dier a rich pient den.
MOD carry DEM twenty dollar CONJ buy there INDF rich paint then
Should have taken that twenty dollars and bought there a good paint then.
(06a-03:48n2012)

Wel, di hel dem gat mii! Dem shuda pie me. Dem kiaan gat me
az propaganda, mek me az propaganda. Shuoa, dem shuda gi mi
CONJ propaganda make 1.SG CONJ propaganda shure 3.PL MOD give 1.SG
a komishan, dem no gi mi notin.
INDF commission 3.PL NEG give 1.SG nothing
Well, the hell they had any for me! They should’ve paid me. They can’t use
me an advertisement, use me as an advertisement. Of course, they should’ve given
me compensation, they did not give me anything.
(12-5:40n2012)

Mieri shuda don gaan aredi.
Mary MOD COMPL go.PST already
Mary should have gone already.
(20-19:47e2012)

10.2.2.2 wo fi
Fi (9.3.2.4) expresses unactualised expectation given stereotypical behaviour or
circumstances, as illustrated in (25) and (26). Without past marking, fi (9.3.2.4) leaves
open the possibility of the situation taking place, but in combination with past wo
the implication is that the situation did not take place. The stronger alternative to wo fi
in (25) and (26) would be the unmarked verb, since rich ‘arrive’ and gaan (7.5.2), respectively,
are dynamic verbs (see 5.1). As mentioned in (10.1.1), the application of the Maxim of
Quantity to the modalised version implicates the negation of the unmodalised counterpart.
The meaning of wo + fi is motivated not via compositional semantics but by the pragmatics
of conversational implicature. The evidence for whether the counterfactual interpretation is cancellable was not tested in the field. As mentioned in (9.3.2.4) and (7.6.3), \textit{fi} is the frequent form in BCE, with \textit{tu} serving as the acrolectal variant (see 10.2.2.3).

(25) \textit{Mieri wo fi riich tudie.}
Mary COP.PST MOD reach today
Mary was supposed to arrive today.
(19c-19:47e2012)
(00-26:21e2012)

(26) \textit{Mieri wo fi gaan aredi.}
Mary COP.PST MOD go.PST already
Mary was supposed to have gone already.
(19c-19:47e2012)

10.2.2.3 \textit{woz supuostu}
Like \textit{wo fi} (10.2.2.2), \textit{woz supuostu} encodes expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances in past contexts, as illustrated in (27) (see 9.3.2.5 for a description of acrolectal \textit{supuostu} in present contexts). Again, the counterfactual meaning is motivated not via compositional semantics, namely past + modal, but by the pragmatics of conversational implicature. The application of the Maxim of Quantity to the modalised version implicates the negation of the unmodalised counterpart (10.1.1), so that if the situation had been realised in (27), main verb \textit{kliin} ‘clean’ would be unmarked since this is the default reading for unmarked dynamic verbs (see 5.2). The evidence for whether the counterfactual interpretation is cancellable was not tested in the field.

(27) \textit{Ai nuo ai woz supuostu kliin di hous.}
1.SG know 1.SG COP.PST MOD clean DEF house
I know I was supposed to clean the house
(19a-19:47e2012)
10.2.2.4  

di gwain/di waan

When prospective aspect markers *gwain* (7.6.2.1.2) or *waan* (7.6.2.2.2) combine with past marking, the meaning is future-in-the-past (see 7.6.1 for a definition of prospective aspect). Although the semantics of *gwain* in its TMA function (7.6.2.1.2) is restricted to intention and *waan* (7.6.2.2.2), to both past intention and past prediction, this distinction seems to be cancelled when *gwain/waan* are marked for past by *di* (7.5.1). However, as stated in (7.6.2), there is some evidence to suggest that the choice between *gwain* and *waan* is correlated to sociolinguistic factors, namely, age, with older speakers favouring *gwain*.

In a future-in-the-past reading, a future situation is blocked by intervening factors. In the strictest of senses, *gwain* is not a modal since it encodes prospective aspect, nevertheless, it is found in future contexts and the debate continues in the literature as to whether future time relates to tense or modality (see 7.2). Similar to *wo fi* (10.2.2.2) and *wo supuostu* (10.2.2.3), the counterfactual interpretation that arises is motivated not via compositional semantics but via pragmatics. The application of the Maxim of Quantity to the modalised version implicates the negation of the unmodalised counterpart (10.1.1), so that conversational implicature rather than compositional semantics is involved here. The evidence for whether the counterfactual interpretation is cancellable was not tested in the field.

In (28), *di waan* encodes past intention. In addition, there is an attestation of *woz gwain bii*, its function here to make a prediction about the party being discussed. In the case of ascriptive predicates, they appear to be marked for past by *wo*, not *di* (see 10.2.2.4.2 for discussion):

(28)  

\[
\begin{align*}
Ai & \quad \textit{d\textipa{d} waan hav a bid paati, bu}t \quad ai & \quad \textit{get sick. Dat} \\
1.SG & \quad \text{PST PRSP have INDF big party} & \quad \text{CONJ} & \quad 1.SG \quad \text{get sick} & \quad \text{DEM} \\
\textit{woz} & \quad \textit{gwain bii} & \quad a & \quad \textit{gud paati}. \\
\text{COP.PST} & \quad \text{PRSP} & \quad \text{COP} & \quad \text{INDF} & \quad \text{good party} \\
\end{align*}
\]

I wanted to have a big party, but I got sick. That was going to be a good party.
In (29), the subject is animate but has no agency, thus the meaning of di gwain is imminence here with no overtone of intentionality. The age of the speaker is older than in (28) and (30):

Do you know who I was glad stopped drinking rum? I said [anon.]. I said, Thank God [anon.] has stopped drinking rum, because [anon.] was going to drown. (08-16:55n2012)

In (30), the subject is animate, and had the intention to carry out the action of cleaning:

(30) Ai së dis maanin wen ai di waan waip doun. Melva së, 1.SG say.PST DEM morning CONJ 1.SG PST PRSP wipe down. Melva say “Go Rante”.
go almirante
I said this morning I wanted to clean (but) Melva said, “Go to Almirante”. (10-15:19n2012)

In (31), there is no intention on behalf of an animate subject to cut themselves. The speaker proceeds to talk about other events, and it is not clear from the context whether a past counterfactual situation is involved here. If not, then the meaning of di waan is potentially compatible with a continuation ‘and actually someone did get hurt’, that is, the counterfactual reading maybe cancellable in this instance (see 10.1.1):

(31) An eri ivnin a go fail it an [anon.] se stap fail di ting, CONJ every evening 1.SG go file it CONJ [anon.] say stop file DEF thing
somebody PST PRSP get cut PREP 3.SG
And every evening I went to file it and [anon.] said stop filing the thing,
somebody was going to get cut on it”.
(04-1:19n2012)

Finally, there is an important semantic distinction between di *waan* + V and *di want* + V, the former being a grammatical maker (see above) and the latter a main verb of desire (see 7.6.2.2.1).

10.2.2.4.1 Main verb *kom* "come"

In BCE, *go* ‘go’ (in whatever form) and *kom* ‘come’ never combine, thus, a future-in-the-past reading is not achieved by *di gwain* + V, as is usually the case (10.2.2.4). There are several ways to express this notion in BCE for situations involving main verb *kom*, which are illustrated below.

One way of obtaining a future-in-the-past reading for *kom* is by placing a linkage marker, *an*, between *go* and *kom*, with *go* in turn marked for past by *wo* (7.5.4), as in (32):

(32) *Mieri woz go an kom tunait bu shi no ga no taim.*
Mary COP.PST go CONJ come tonight CONJ 3.SG NEG got NEG time
Mary was going to come tonight but she didn’t have any time.
(19c-19:47e2012)

The evidence as to whether the combination *di waan + kom* is permissible in BCE remains inconclusive, as this is not found in the naturalistic data and was not elicited in grammatical judgments. As already attested (10.2.2.4), *di waan* marks other dynamic verbs. In any case, an alternative future-in-the-past construction for *kom* is (33) where prospective aspect variant *waan* is permissible, in turn marked by past *wo*:
A further means of encoding future-in-the-past for *kom* is to combine it with past *di* (7.5.1), as illustrated in (34), where intonation on *di* is stressed. *Di* is otherwise not usually stressed in BCE (see 7.5). However, this is an isolated example and more data is required for a conclusive analysis. In a past progressive context, *kom* is usually encoded via a combination of *wo* + *komin* (see 6.4.1.1.1). As noted elsewhere in this thesis though, verbs *go* and *kom* appear to behave differently in BCE in terms of progressive marking (6.4.1.1.1), past progressive marking (6.4.1.1.1.1) and past marking (see 7.5.1.3 and 7.5.2).

(34)  *Mieri* di  komin  yestide  but  shi  no  kom.
      Mary  PST  come-PROG  yesterday  CONJ  3.SG  NEG  come
      Mary was supposed to come yesterday but she didn’t.
      (15-18:56e2012)

In (35), the clause in which past progressive *woz komin* occurs is an embedded one, a complement clause of *sed* ‘said’. A tentative analysis is thus that the interpretation of *woz komin* is literal in the sense that at the time the potential situation was uttered by Mary, every intention of coming was there:

(35)  *Mieri* sed  shi  woz  komin  tude  but  shi  no  kom.
      Mary  say.PST  3.SG  COP.PST  come-in  today  CONJ  3.SG  NEG  come
      Mary said she was coming today, but she didn’t.
      (15-18:56e2012)

Finally, *gwain fi kom* is a further alternative for marking a future-in-the-past situation, as illustrated in (36). In (37), the construction is overtly marked for past via *wo*. Modal *fi* (9.3.2.4) encodes ‘expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances’, with *gwain*

(33)  *Mieri* wo  waan kom.
      Mary  COP.PST  PRSP  come
      Mary was going to come.
      (00-26:21e2012)
fi a tautological construction in so far as gwain fi is no different in meaning to wo fi (10.2.2.2). Gwain fi (+ V) is not otherwise attested in the BCE data:

(36) \textit{Jaan gwain fi kom bak tumara.}
John PRSP COMP come back tomorrow
John is going to come back tomorrow

(15-18:56e20120)

(37) \textit{Jaan woz gwain fi kom bak yestide bu him no kom.}
John COP.PST PRSP COMP come back yesterday CONJ 3.SG NEG come
John was going to come back yesterday but he didn’t.

(19c-19:47e2012)

(00-26:21e2012)

10.2.2.4.2 woz gwain bii/woz waan

Future-in-the-past marking in the form of woz + gwain + bii + adjective and woz + waan + adjective is illustrated in (38) and (39), respectively. An attestation of woz gwain bii + noun phrase is example (28) in (10.2.2.4). A tentative analysis is that ascriptive predicates are always marked by wo gwain for a future-in-the-past reading, thus cancelling any temporal stable/unstable distinction that is observable in simple past contexts (see 7.5.1.4 and 7.5.4.1.1, respectively). There are no examples in the BCE data of equative predicates (5.3.1.2) and locative predicates (5.3.1.3) in future-in-the-past contexts.

(38) \textit{Mai sista tink di waata woz gwain bii kuol.}
1.SG.POSS sister think DEF water COP.PST PRSP COP cold
My sister thought the water was going to be cold.

(20-19:47e2012)

(39) \textit{Mai sista tink di waata woz waan kuol.}
1.SG.POSS sister think DEF water COP.PST PRSP cold
My sister thought the water was going to be cold
(20-19:47e2012)

10.3 Concluding remarks

Table 10.1 summarises the past counterfactual expressions discussed in this chapter. Most of these past counterfactual interpretations are motivated via pragmatics and not compositional semantics. It is the application of the Maxim of Quantity to the modalised version that implicates the negation of the unmodalised counterpart (10.1.1). It is conversational implicature rather than compositional semantics that is involved here.

\textit{Wud(a)} (10.2.1.1) encodes general counterfactuality in the apodosis of conditionals. \textit{Wud(a) iebl (fi)} (10.2.1.1.1) encodes counterfactual possibility and fills a gap in the modal paradigm, namely, counterfactual possibility since \textit{wuda kian} is not a permissible combination in BCE. \textit{Kuda} expresses both simple past and past counterfactuality in the domain of non-epistemic possibility (see 9.3.1.3 and 10.2.2.1, respectively). Whereas \textit{wud(a)} predicts an outcome, \textit{kuda} predicts a possible outcome. \textit{Wudn} (10.2.1.1.2) is the negated counterpart of \textit{wud(a)}. The meaning of \textit{wo fi} (10.2.2.2) and \textit{wo supuostu} (10.2.2.3) is unactualised expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances. The meaning of \textit{di gwain} is future-in-the-past, that is, unactualised intention or prediction.

\textit{Shuda} (10.2.2.1) encodes deontic weak necessity in simple clauses but does not entail that there was any previous command or expectation imposed on the participant, and, importantly, is constrained to past contexts. In this respect, the past counterfactual interpretation of \textit{shuda} is part of its semantics and appears in no other semantic context. That is, the past counterfactual reading of \textit{shuda} is not the result of conversational implicature.

Cross-linguistically, a single ‘dedicated’ marker of past counterfactuality in simple clauses is rare. Furthermore, the types of constructions that yield a past counterfactual meaning in simple clauses frequently involve a combination of a modal element marking some type of potentiality, together with a past marker and/or an aspectual marker (perfect
or perfective) (Van Linden and Verstraete 2008: 1868-9). Relating back to the typological
generalisations, in contrast to the semantic domains of tense and aspect, the findings in the
area of past counterfactual expressions in BCE seem to confirm cross-linguistic
generalisations. Having said this, although it is certainly the case that *shuda* functions as a
single marker found only in past contexts with a past counterfactual interpretation, it does
admittedly originate in a combination of English *should* + *have*.

Table 10.1 Past counterfactuality in BCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TMA markers</th>
<th>Non-epistemic modality</th>
<th>Past counterfactual interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>wud(a)</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, (present and past unreal conditionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wudn</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, (present and past unreal conditionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kuda</em></td>
<td>Yes, (not individual situations in the past)</td>
<td>Yes, (participant internal possibility and non-deontic possibility in past unreal conditionals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wud(a) iebl fi</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, (participant internal possibility, in any case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>shuda</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (deontic necessity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wo fi</em></td>
<td><em>(fi)</em></td>
<td>Yes (non-deontic necessity and deontic necessity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wo supuostu</em></td>
<td><em>(supuostu)</em></td>
<td>Yes (deontic necessity, in any case)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>di gwain/waan</em> + V</td>
<td></td>
<td>Future-in-the-past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wo gwain</em> + <em>bii</em> + P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>wo waan</em> + P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11 Chapter eleven: Conclusion

This chapter re-visits the main aim of this thesis and the motivations behind it (see 1.1), against the BCE data and various analyses. In (11.1), the analysis of the tense-aspect-modality system in BCE is considered in light of typological generalisations in the literature, to ascertain to what extent BCE confirms them. The motivation to put the tense-aspect-modality system of BCE into its linguistic and regional context is addressed, revealing that BCE is related to other Caribbean English Creoles (CECs) (see 3.2) whilst also differing from Jamaican Creole (JC) in particular. In (11.2), some areas for future research are highlighted within the domain of tense-aspect-modality in BCE, mainly relating to the issue of variation. Finally, as a further motivation for this thesis the status/degree of vitality of BCE is evaluated against the evidence that has been presented in this thesis (11.3)

11.1 Tense-Aspect-Modality in BCE

The main aim of this thesis has been to provide a synchronic grammatical description of tense-aspect-modality (see 1.2.1 and 1.3) of a lesser known English Creole, spoken in the Republic of Panama (see 3.3 for map). The analysis is informed by cross-linguistic descriptions of grammatical categories of tense-aspect-modality (see 1.2), and relies on both natural and elicited data. One outcome of this has been an audio and video digital documentation of BCE, now deposited with the Endangered Languages Archive (ELAR): https://elar.soas.ac.uk/Collection/MPI604663 (see 4.2.2).

This thesis has analysed the semantic categories of tense-aspect-modality in BCE, the TMA markers and their interactions with each other and lexical aspect, in addition to exploring the interpretations of the unmarked verb. This has been achieved primarily on the basis of cross-linguistic discussions of tense-aspect-modality subcategories from different theoretical angles. With respect to the typological generalisations made throughout this thesis, two observations have proven particularly interesting. The first observation is that the combination stie + de stands out in so far as it doesn’t quite fit a
typological description. As explained in (6.4.2), continuative aspect cross-linguistically includes the progressive in its meaning, i.e., that a dynamic situation is ongoing, with the additional meaning that the agent of the action is deliberately keeping the action going (Bybee, Perkins et al. 1994: 127). In BCE, rather than one source encoding continuative aspect, which appears to be the case cross-linguistically (again, see 6.4.2 for a list of potential linguistic sources), it is a combination of stie + de that serves this function. Neither stie nor de, the latter a progressive marker (6.4.1.1.2), expresses the meaning of continuative aspect on its own.

The second observation relating to typological generalisations is the expression of past counter-presupposition, which is identifiable as a new factor in the literature on CECs as well as more widely. This semantics becomes apparent when past marker di co-occurs with dynamic verbs (see 7.5.1.2) (see further below for a discussion of counter-presupposition in present situations). Gussenhoven (2007: 96) discusses different types of counter-assertive focus by means of prosody, making a distinction between ‘corrective focus’ and ‘counter-presuppositional focus’, describing the latter as a way to counter not an explicit proposition but an assumption or implication. However, BCE is unique in that it is able to express this meaning not by prosody but a grammatical marker in the form of di. These two observations made with respect to continuative aspect and past counter-presupposition on the basis of cross-linguistic discussions, challenge the idea that creole languages are simpler than non-creole languages, which has been one motivation for this thesis (see 1.1).

A further motivation of the thesis has been to highlight the linguistic uniqueness of BCE by placing it in its regional context, taking into consideration both the description of related CECS and the socio-history of the BCE community (see 3.6). As explained in (1.1), there appears to be a general trend amongst creolists pursuing fieldwork to avoid documenting and describing relatively small CEC populations. The ISO (International Organisation for Standardisation) classification code assigned to JC [jam] by Ethnologue (see 3.4.4) is shared with BCE. Since BCE receives no official identification other than as a general English Creole in Panama (which is the identification given both by UNESCO
and Ethnologue) (see 3.4.4), it is important that BCE is treated as a language in its own right. Indeed, the linguistic evidence presented in this thesis shows that it is not the case that BCE is the same JC. It is evident that BCE shares some similarities with JC but there are other Western CECs (see 3.2) that seem to have more linguistic commonalities with BCE, for example, Nicaraguan Creole (NC), San Andres Creole (SA), and Providence Island Creole (PI). There also appears to be some resemblances with Bajan Creole (BC), one of the so-called mesolectal Eastern CECs (again, see 3.2). These observations reflect well the socio-history of the BCE speech community (see also below).

Immigration of Afro-Antilleans (3.5.1) in Panama and neighbouring Costa Rica has predominantly taken place in the last 160 years or so. As mentioned in (3.6), Guerrón-Montero (2006: 211) suggests that the first Afro-Antilleans actually arrived in Bocas (see map in 3.3) as early as the C17th from Jamaica and Barbados. In any case, significant populations of English-speaking Afro-Antilleans arrived in the Bocas del Toro region in the early C19th from the islands of San Andrés and Providence. The construction of the Panamanian Railroad and the Panama Canal attracted migrants to Panama from Jamaica and Barbados. Most workers who were drawn to the United Fruit Company in the divisions of Bocas and Limón (Costa Rica) were from Jamaica, with significant numbers also coming from Barbados. Census statistics in the province of Bocas del Toro for the years 1950 and 1960 reveal the highest number of Afro-Antillean-born immigrants came from Jamaica, followed by Barbados (see 3.7 for more detailed demographics).

The linguistic picture is complex insofar as BCE shares forms with some CECs, functions with other CECs, in addition to having its own unique forms (see above). Both doz (6.4.3.1.1) and the unmarked verb (see 7.4.1) are options in BCE for expressing habitual aspect in present situations only. In JC, present habitual may only be expressed via the unmarked verb and occasionally via the progressive. Progressive aspect in BCE does not express the habitual. Limón Creole, which is spoken in neighbouring Costa Rica, also has no present habitual marker. On the other hand, Belizean Creole (BelC) encodes past habitual contexts via doz (but not present), albeit its occurrence being rare. It is believed
that *doz* entered BelC by Afro-Antillean immigrants from the Eastern Caribbean, its restriction to past habituality something of a peculiarity. It is claimed that BCE *doz* entered the language through BC, since this is where the second largest group of Afro-Antilleans (see 3.5; also 3.5.1) who immigrated to Panama came from (again, see 3.6). The habitual in the form of *doz* is also attested in NC, SA, and PI. The form *doz* is believed to be an acrolectal marker, typical of CECs such as BC, also restricted to present contexts. The form *stodi* in BCE changes the lexical aspect of verb phrases to express iterative situations (see 6.5.3). The form and function of *stodi* is not attested in the literature on JC, but is attested in NC, SA, PI, and BelC. The meaning, however, in these Creoles is distinct from BCE *stodi*, insofar as it marks viewpoint aspect, specifically, habituality (see also 6.4.3). In BCE, *stodi* and habitual *doz* have distinct functions despite both these forms being attested in NC, SA, and PI.

The analysis of tense-aspect-modality of BCE has in many ways shown that there are more differences than similarities with JC. A few more interesting ones are highlighted here. In JC, the insertion of present and past copulas in the form of *iz* and *woz*, respectively, is a mesolectal feature in ascriptive clauses, with the unmarked predicate representing the basilectal. BCE *iz*, on the other hand, has a specific semantic function in contrast to the unmarked ascriptive clause, which is to mark counter-presupposition in present situations (see above for counter-presupposition in past situations). Thus, *iz* is not an acrolectal feature in this context, although it is when it appears in present progressive constructions (see 6.4.1.3.1). Whereas *iz* and *woz* are infrequently found in JC ascriptive clauses, this is not the case for BCE where past copula *wo* is not an acrolectal feature but assigns the meaning of ‘temporally stable’ to the ascriptive predicate in question (see 7.5.4.1.1). In contrast, BCE past *di* marks such predicates as time-unstable (see 7.5.1.4). In cases where the temporal frame has been clearly established, a time-stable ascriptive predicate may remain unmarked.

Another difference in the copula domain is that whereas equative clauses in past situations in JC are marked by a combination of copula *a* + (optional) basilectal past *ben*
or mesolectal past \textit{did} (Patrick 2007: 139), in BCE they are marked solely by \textit{wo} (see 7.5.4.1.2). In BCE, \textit{iz} marks present contexts and \textit{wo}, marks past contexts, and these two copula forms may not combine. The other past marker in BCE, \textit{di} (7.5.1), is never found in the copula domain; it is restricted to marking main verbs and has different meanings depending on whether the verb is stative or dynamic (see 5.2 and 6.2.2). There is, nonetheless, the option for \textit{ben} to occur on its own in JC, that is, without the equative marker (Winford 1993: 161).

As explained in (7.5), there is only one past marker, \textit{ben}, in the JC basilect, which has dual functionality as a past copula \textit{and} a past marker for dynamic verbs. JC mesolectal \textit{did} is the general past marker and nominal clauses remain unmarked, infrequently marked by \textit{iz} or \textit{woz}. In fact, Western CECs more generally (3.2) share two past markers, one in the form of some variant of basilectal \textit{ben} in addition to mesolectal \textit{did}. That is, unlike in BCE, the presence of these two past forms in other related Creole varieties correlates with social differences.

The semantics of prospective aspect is encoded via \textit{gwain} in BCE (7.6.2.1), with \textit{go} a main verb of motion and an inchoative marker (6.5.1). In JC, \textit{go} and \textit{gwain} both encode prospective aspect, with only \textit{get}, \textit{tiurn} and \textit{kom} marking inchoative aspect (as they do in BCE) (again, see 6.5.1). The behaviour of BCE \textit{don}, which marks accomplishments for completion, differs from JC \textit{don} in terms of both its syntactic distribution and the type of verb/predicate it co-occurs with (see 6.5.2 for a full discussion).

In the modal domain, JC \textit{kyan} is constrained to the non-epistemic domain of possibility, with preverbal \textit{mie} constrained to expressing epistemic possibility. BCE \textit{kan} (9.3.1.1), in contrast, is found in both non-epistemic and epistemic domains, with adverb \textit{miebi} (8.4.1), (not \textit{mie}), constrained to expressing epistemic possibility. Additionally, there is only one marker in BCE for negating non-epistemic possibility, \textit{kiaan} (9.3.1.2), but two ways in JC, namely, negated \textit{kyaan} or a combination of negator \textit{na} + \textit{kyan} (see 9.3.1.2).
Finally, JC shuda is found in many more contexts than BCE shuda (10.2.2.1). The meaning of shuda in BCE does not entail that there was any previous command or expectation imposed on the participant, which differs from the meaning of JC shuda, which appears to encode strong advisability or necessity previously imposed on the participant. JC shuda expresses both present and past situations, but it is also found in the epistemic domain to express strong probability. BCE shuda is constrained to past contexts, resulting in a counterfactual interpretation. Winford (1993: 83; note 63) claims that JC non-epistemic shuda has a basilectal counterpart in JC ben + fi, although it is believed that Western CECs more generally have a preference for shuda. The Eastern CECs also make a distinction between bin + fi and shuda. BCE has access to both shuda and wo + fi (10.2.2.2) but the semantics of each differs, with fi encoding unactualised expectation given stereotypical behaviour or circumstances.

11.2 Areas for future research

This section highlights potential observations for future research areas in BCE that have been referenced throughout this thesis, many of which relate to variation within the tense-aspect-modal system. Some of the variation is the result of unstable variation, correlated, for example, to age, or stable variation, correlated, for example, with the formality of the situation or semantics. There are two quantitative studies that could be of potential interest. The first relates to relative/prospective aspect variants gwain (7.6.2.1) and waan (7.6.2.2). The second relates to past variants wo (7.5.4) and di (7.5.1). In both cases, age appears to be the determining social factor, with semantic change being involved (see 1.2.2 and also 7.6.2).

As mentioned in (7.6.2), relative/prospective aspect waan is attested in the BCE data more frequently than its variant gwain. The semantics waan includes intention, prediction (and volition), whereas gwain is predominantly restricted to an intentional sense. There is anecdotal evidence in the form of conversations with BCE that older speakers prefer gwain over waan. Additionally, Aceto (1998: 39) observes that the frequency of gwain is far
higher than *waan* when he made his field trip to the BCE community in the years 1994 and 1995 (see also 4.2.1). Thus, a quantitative study of the frequency of these two variants would be useful, correlating their use not only with age but semantic context to ascertain which variant is preferred for expressing the three meanings of intention, prediction, and willingness. It would also be worth investigating the meaning of willingness to determine whether it is constrained to being encoded by *waan*. If this were indeed the case, this would represent an example of layering (see 1.2.2), where the older meaning of *waan* persists alongside the meanings of intention and prediction (see 7.6.2.2.1 for a description of main verb *waan*).

As discussed in (7.5), there are two past markers in BCE with distinct functions, *wo* (7.5.4) and *di* (7.5.1). *Wo* is a past copula form and *di* marks stative verbs for simple past (see 7.5.1.1) and dynamic verbs for counter-presupposition (see 7.5.1.2), with some evidence that *di* may also function as a pluperfect marker (see 7.5.1.3). Nonetheless, there is evidence from the two youngest BCE speakers in the data (19 and 21 years) that the contexts in which *wo* is permissible is expanding. There is evidence that it marks main verbs, not only statives for a simple past reading but also dynamic verbs for both a simple past and pluperfect reading. These youngest speakers seem to be treating *wo* as a general past marker, not only to mark dynamic verbs when ordinarily they would remain unmarked for a simple past interpretation (see 5.2) but also to replace *di* for a simple past interpretation. Other Western CECs such as PI and NC are less likely to interpret dynamic verbs as having past reference, so that past tense is marked more frequently than SA, the latter of which only resorts to pluperfect marking (see 7.5.5) (Bartens 2009: 308). With reference to mesolectal JC, Patrick (1999: 221) states that a merging of a highly specific past meaning (pluperfect) with a more general one (simple past) does not have to be the result of decreolisation (see 2.2). Rather, this phenomenon is believed to be better understood as part of a broader process of grammaticalisation, in this case the expansion of a specialised meaning into a more general semantic category, typically with continuation of the former sense (see 1.2.2). Thus, this potential change in the function of *wo* need not
inevitably be the result of covert decolisation, whereby a creole form is retained but a change occurs in its function under what appears to be influence from the lexifier.

With respect to stable variation, one potential quantitative study would be to examine the social meaning of progressive variants *de* (6.4.1.1.2) and *-in* (6.4.1.1.3). In the BCE naturalistic data, preverbal *de* occurs more frequently than verbal suffix *-in*, and there is some evidence to suggest that BCE speakers use both variants freely, indeed even in the same sentence (see 6.4.1.1). At the same, there is evidence that the level of formality of the situation might play some role in the selection of variant, with *de* representing the less formal and *-in*, the more formal (again, see 6.4.1.1). It would be interesting to ascertain the frequency of each variant, taking into consideration the social domain and subject matter.

There is also evidence of variation in the area of negation in BCE, encoded by either *no* (5.5.1.1), *nat* (5.5.1.2), or *duon* (5.5.1.3). *Duon* has a ‘not generally speaking’ meaning (see 6.4.3.1.1.1) whilst at the same time there appears to be some overlap in function between *duon* and *no*, the latter an individual negator void of any extra semantics. The evidence remains inconclusive as to whether this variation only occurs in relation to stative verbs, furthermore, which ones. Whether negative concord (see 5.5.2) is a strategy that BCE speakers use to emphasise negation is also an area for future research. It would also be useful to confirm all the contexts in which *no* and *nat* appear, to determine, for example, whether it is indeed the case that *nat* is constrained to negating *afu* (9.3.2.2) and *beta* (9.3.2.3).

The data and analysis of *wuda* and *wud* (see 10.2.1.1 and 6.4.3.1.3) suggest that these phonetic variants may well correlate with differences in meaning, between past propensity and general counterfactuality (see also 10.1.1). *Wud(a)* is found in the apodosis of unreal conditionals (see 5.4) and has a present and past counterfactual interpretation. The form *wud* as opposed to *wuda* is found in two contexts: firstly, with the meaning ascribed to *wuda* above, and secondly, as the past tense form of absolute future *wi* (7.6.4). Absolute future *wi* encodes past propensity, an inclination or natural tendency to behave in a
particular way. The frequency of *wud* in conditionals appears to be low, and, therefore, it
would be useful to acquire a more accurate picture of the distribution of *wud* and *wuda*.

*Mosi* and *mosbi* are modals which express epistemic necessity (8.5.1) and non-
epistemic necessity (9.3.2.1). There is evidence that the variation observed here relates to
syntactic context. For example, in the non-epistemic domain the data shows that *mos(i)* co-
occurs with nouns and prepositions but *mos* with dynamic verbs. In the epistemic domain,
the variation appears to be arbitrary, most likely the result of this modal being constrained
to marking the stative verb *bii* (see 1.3 and 5.1). These observations are, however, made on
limited data, and it would be worth eliciting more data to investigating whether there is any
difference in the function of *mosi* and *mosbi*, particularly in the non-epistemic domain.

Although *iz* is the obligatory form for marking equative clauses in BCE (5.3.1.2),
variation is observed in locative clauses where both *iz* and *de* are found (see 5.3.1.2). Indeed,
overlap between equatives and locatives is attested cross-linguistically (Stassen
2005). Interrogative locative clauses, on the other hand, are found only marked by *iz* in the
BCE data. It would be interesting to find out if *iz* is obligatory in this specific context or
whether it occurs in free variation with *de*. Certainly, there appears to be no
basilectal/acrolectal distinction (see 2.2) between the use of *iz* and *de* in declarative
locative clauses, and in the copula domain more generally. In contrast, *iz* is a mesolectal
feature in JC locative clauses, with *de* representing the basilectal, and in the JC basilect *de*
is found in both declarative and interrogative clauses.

Finally, a systematic analysis of all permissible TMA combinations in BCE would
undoubtedly be valuable for completing the picture of tense-aspect-modality in BCE.

### 11.3 Status/degree of vitality

A further motivation for this thesis has been to ascertain to what extent BCE is an
endangered language. As mentioned in (3.4.2), UNESCO and Ethnologue acknowledge the
existence of a Creole English spoken in Panama. Both official bodies identify locations for
where Panamanian Creole English (PCE) is spoken as being Colón Island in Bocas del Toro province, Colón district in Colón province (not to be confused with Colón Island), and Rio Abajo in Panama City. Bastimentos Island itself is not mentioned, although it is situated in the province of Bocas del Toro (see 3.3). According to UNESCO, PCE is ‘definitely endangered’, based on the assumption that ‘children no longer learn the language as a mother tongue in the home’ (see 3.4.4). According to Ethnologue, its degree of vitality is ‘vigorous’ on the basis that ‘the language is used for face-to-face communication by all generations and the situation is sustainable’. Both official bodies agree, however, that PCE is restricted in use to the domains of a vernacular. Indeed, this is supported by the BCE data and my time in the field.

To draw conclusions regarding the degree of vitality of BCE with respect to the descriptions provided by UNESCO and Ethnologue is not an easy task. This is primarily because the BCE data presented in this thesis is representative of speakers aged between 19 and 87 years (see 4.2.4), and thus it is not possible to comment on speech interactions that involve speakers aged 18 and under. Linguistic data is thus necessary from younger BCE speakers interacting with each other as well as with adults aged 19 and over, particularly with parents at home. I will first examine BCE’s relationship with Spanish and then English, in order to gain a better overview of the status/degree of vitality of BCE. Generally, there is little evidence of direct influence from either Spanish or English on BCE.

To date, BCE continues to exist in a stable diglossic relationship with Spanish, the latter reserved for formal occasions and the former, for ordinary conversations with family and friends (see 3.10.1 for more information). Some anecdotal evidence from my time in the field indicates that some mothers are choosing to speak Spanish with their children (in a specific neighbourhood of Ol’ Bank) (see 4.2.4 for the names of the four neighbourhoods). On walking around Ol’ Bank, it appeared to me that children were potentially speaking a mixture of BCE and Spanish. As mentioned in (3.11), there is no evidence of code-switching on the recordings of BCE on which the description of tense-
aspect-modality presented in this thesis is based. Naturally, BCE speakers were aware of the purpose of the recordings and my wish for an ‘authentic’ version of the language, and this no doubt has to be taken into consideration. My observations from walking around Ol’ Bank (see 3.3) and listening to adult conversations supports the data in this respect. Any coding-switching that I occasionally heard was of the inter-sentential type (as opposed to intra-sentential) and seems to be predominantly reserved for those of Latin American, Chinese, or Ngäbere descent, whose main language would not be BCE.

More generally, Spanish has little impact on the grammatical structure and vocabulary of BCE as spoken by adults. A Spanish loanword for a relatively new concept is not unusual in the BCE data (see glosses of examples throughout the thesis, also 3.10 for more information). There is very little evidence of grammatical borrowing from Spanish, indeed the only examples in the BCE data are illustrated in (1) and (2):

(1) Biko wan taim tuu ai di sii yuu an di televisha, a lat
    CONJ one  time too 1.SG PST see 2.SG.OBJ PREP DET television  DET lot
    av unu. Yies, unu woz entrevist-ando, yu nuo, pik-in op.
    PREP 2.PL EXC 2.PL COP.PST interview-PROG DM    recording
    Because one time too I saw you on the television, a lot of you [plural]. Yes, you were interviewing, you know, recording [Sp. entrevistar ‘to interview’].
    (12-17:64n2012)

(2) But yu kiaan ansa, yo afu siige adapt-in.
    CONJ 2.SG MOD answer 2.SG MOD continue improvise-PROG
    But you cannot just answer, you’ve got to continue improvising [lit. adapting].
    (13-2:23n2012)

In both (1) and (2), the grammatical borrowing exemplified is replication of linguistic ‘matter’. Matras (2009: 236) distinguishes this type of replication from pattern replication. Whereas the former process involves borrowing from a source language to a
replica language, the latter involves a change in the function of linguistic material under the influence of a model language (see also 2.2 for the difference between conventional and covert decreolisation in Creole languages in relation to the lexifier). Replication of linguistic matter has taken place in (1), where the Spanish progressive verbal suffix -ando is substituted for the BCE verbal suffix -in (6.4.1.1.3). There are two progressive variants in BCE, the other taking the form of preverbal de (6.4.1.1.2) with evidence that it is the basilectal variant (see 6.4.1.1 and 2.2 for a definition of ‘basilect’). Progressive entrivist-ando ‘interviewing’ is marked for past by wo, which, again, appears to be an infrequent acrolectal feature of past progressive constructions (see 7.5.4.2). Although the verb in question is itself a lexical borrowing from Spanish, from entrivistar ‘to interview’, this is not what triggers the Spanish morphology, since, for example, Spanish grabar ‘record’ in (3) and (4) in (6.4.1.1) is marked for progressive by basilectal variants a and de, respectively. On listening to (1), the addressee and friends are the ones being interviewed rather than doing the interviewing. In (2), siige + progressive variant -in together encode continuative aspect (6.4.2), with siige a direct borrowing from Spanish seguir ‘continue’. Here, again, the replication of linguistic ‘matter’ from Spanish is exemplified (Matras 2009: 236). The usual means of encoding continuative aspect in BCE is via stie + progressive (preverbal de).

As mentioned in (3.11), Snow (see 2004: 115-116) finds no evidence of incipient shift to the official language of Spanish, mainly a result of the less intimate relationship BCE has with Spanish in ordinary everyday community life. As mentioned in (3.11), insight into the future status of BCE may be gained by observing the situation in Costa Rica, home to Limón Creole (LC) spoken by the Afro-Antillean community there. Both LC and BCE have no official status, with Spanish representing the prestige language. The influx of international tourists reaching the LC speech community on the Caribbean Coast began some 20 years prior to Bocas del Toro. Despite LC speakers being able to maintain their language for some time, today there are very few domains left in which the language spoken is exclusively LC, as younger generations are gradually assimilated to the national Costa Rican identity, both culturally and linguistically.
As already mentioned (1.1), Spanish is the main contact language of BCE, not English, with Spanish functioning as the working (and official) language of Panama. This is not to say that the BCE speech community has no contact with English, a result of the recent influx of international English-speaking tourists (see 3.8). In cases where a particular form or feature of a Creole language resembles its lexifier, the conclusion that is sometimes reached is that it represents a recent import/change (see 1.1). However, the fact that progressive verbal suffix variant -in (6.4.1.1.3) resembles English in form and function, is not necessarily evidence that this variant was introduced into the BCE language via the recent influx of international English-speaking tourists (see 3.8). Indeed, this variant is also attested by Aceto (1998: 40), and thus it is plausible that both progressive variants -in and de (6.4.1.1.2) have been spoken in Ol’ Bank for a very long time. Although the two variants occur frequently in the BCE data and represent a case of stable variation (see also 11.2), there is evidence that -in is the choice variant in situations where BCE speakers wish to approximate English (see 6.4.1.1 for evidence). Although Ol’ Bank is very small (see 3.7), it cannot be argued that no social stratification exists, since, as mentioned above, there are four distinct neighbourhoods in the town of Ol’ Bank. In this respect, infinitival complementiser variants fi and tu (see 1.1) behave in much the same way, with fi serving as the basilect (and more frequent) variant and tu, which resembles English to, the acrolectal variant. As mentioned in (1.1), there is a tendency in creole literature to automatically correlate any observed variation in a Creole to a post-creole continuum and the process of decreolisation (see 2.2 for definitions of these terms). However, in order to support such analyses evidence from diachronic data is necessary.

There is no doubt that the intense rise of tourism that has taken place in recent years in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago (see 3.8) has led to increased contact with English. It has prompted BCE speakers to choose some form of English over Spanish for conversing with tourists. BCE speakers are very reluctant to speak their vernacular in the presence of outsiders, and they will switch immediately to Spanish whenever a non-BCE speaker appears within hearing distance.
In conclusion, the three languages, BCE, English, and Spanish, continue very much as separate languages, with little evidence of code-switching between them. Whilst Spalding (2012) predicts that an inevitable outcome of the tourism boom in the Bocas del Toro Archipelago is the loss of BCE (see 3.8), Snow (2004: 116) claims that speakers are “developing [...] a source of self-regard, as a result of their language proving to be an economically viable alternative to Spanish in interactions with tourists”. In fact, Snow (2003: 8) predicts that this new sociolinguistic situation could potentially have a significant impact on language maintenance and language change. Data from BCE speakers aged 18 and under is required to make a more informed evaluation as to the status/degree of vitality of BCE. Certainly, there is some evidence of language change amongst the youngest BCE speakers in the data (see 7.5.5 and 11.2), but whether this is the result of influence from Spanish or English or the result of universal linguistic tendencies relating to grammaticalization (see also 1.2.2), remains to be seen.

Whether the impact of tourism in the immediate region will lead to the loss of BCE and to a shift to English or whether the importance of Spanish as the main contact language of BCE will begin to encroach in time on the BCE language, is unknown. As more and more people move in and out of Ol’ Bank, it is also possible that increased contact with one or both languages will lead to a new but stable variety of BCE.
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