

# **SUBSTRATAL REFLECTIONS: THE COMPLETIVE ASPECT AND THE DISTRIBUTIVE NUMERALS IN ISLE de FRANCE CREOLE**

Chris Corne  
(University of Auckland)

This paper examines briefly two areas of Isle de France Creole (IdeFC) semantax in the development of which substratal influence appears to have played an important role.<sup>1</sup> One of these areas is interesting, in that it has not received a great deal of attention to date, but it is not a particularly salient nor even controversial matter: the reduplicated numerals which I label "distributive" numerals. The other is of greater significance. It is the completive aspect marker. I have suggested elsewhere (1982:101) that this item may reflect a Bantu substratal influence, and this suggestion is elaborated upon here.

To speak of substratal influence presupposes at least two rather important things. First, that for an item to occur in a language it must necessarily have entered from some other language (or languages). Second, that one knows what languages were actually involved. The first presupposition is a dangerous one where Creole languages are concerned, as Bickerton (1981) has clearly shown,<sup>2</sup> although it is sometimes justified (see for example Baker's discussion on the status of etymological article agglutination in IdeFC, Baker 1982:784-805, 1983).<sup>3</sup> The second is not as simple as it seems, either. Whereas the Indian Ocean Creole languages have been blessed with rather detailed examination (for IdeFC, see Baker 1982a&b; for Reunionese, see Chaudenson 1974 and cf. Corne 1982, Baker 1982b), so that we can now reconstruct, with a fairly high degree of certainty, a picture of just what languages were present where and when and in what proportions, the same cannot be said of the Creole languages spoken in Africa, the Caribbean, or the American mainland (the "Atlantic" Creoles). There is a scholarly emphasis on West Africa (for example, Alleyne 1980, among others) which ignores almost entirely the millions of Bantu speakers from the Congo, Angola, and even Mozambique, who found themselves, in highly variable proportions from territory to territory and from time to time, working alongside people from Senegambia, from the Bight of Benin, etc.

(cf. Curtin 1969).<sup>4</sup>

For the purposes of this paper, the settlement history of Mauritius is all that need concern us, as the complete aspect marker does not differ significantly in behaviour or distribution in either Mauritian Creole (MC) or in the "daughter" languages spoken in Seychelles (SC) and Rodrigues (RoC), and as the distributive numerals occur only (on present information) in MC. In the earliest years of settlement (1721-1735), speakers of various West African languages, of Malagasy, of various Indian languages, and of French (no doubt in diverse guises) were all present in significant numbers. Baker (1982a:254) identifies three (groups of) West African languages which may well have been fairly widely used in Mauritius in this early period: Fon and other 'Kwa' languages, Wolof and possibly other "West Atlantic" languages. From 1736, East Africa became an increasingly important source of slaves, and the last third of the century saw an enormous majority of East African Bantu speakers among all arrivals in the island. In 1773-94, the ratio of East Africans to Malagasies was of the order of nine to one, and was still two to one in the period 1801-10 (Baker 1982b:49).

This period of massive numerical preponderance of Bantu speakers coincides with a crucial period in the emergence of MC. An earlier period of pidginisation (inadequate L2 learning by a majority of adults) and creolisation (L1 learning with variable input according to the individual's position in ethno-social space) must have been ending around 1774, when the number of locally born slaves exceeded for the first time the number of members of the French speaking "ruling class". The period of the rapid development of a homogeneous Creole language, the "jelling" of MC, must have been from about this time (ca. 1774) to around 1810, when an end was put to the regular introduction of foreign born slaves. For a detailed discussion of the sequence of events, including those in Seychelles and Rodrigues, see Baker (1982b:806-833, 845-859). After the abolition of slavery in 1835, Indian indentured labourers arrived, from the ports of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay, in enormous numbers: by 1861 the population of Mauritius had trebled, Indians and their locally born descendants accounting for some 62% of the total (Baker 1982b:52-53). Large scale Indian immigration decreased from about 1867.

## The Completive in IdeFC

Bickerton (1981:58-59) gives a brief outline of the tense-modality-aspect (TMA) systems of "typical" Creole languages: three preposed particles which, if they cooccur, occur in the order Anterior - Irrealis - Nonpunctual. The Anterior particle marks Past-before-Past with active predicates, Past with stative ones; the Irrealis marks contrary-to-fact and suppositional, including Futures and Conditionals; the Nonpunctual expresses, roughly, Progressive/Durative and Habitual/Iterative. IdeFC differs from this system in a number of respects (the Habitual/Iterative is unmarked, for example),<sup>5</sup> but the details do not concern us here. Suffice to say that there is evidence, both modern (v. Bickerton 1981:88-97 for a discussion) and not-so-modern (cf. the Anterior marking of the text from 1818 in Freycinet 1827:407-411, reproduced - albeit with a few typos - in Chaudenson 1981:100-102) which suggests that IdeFC has the typical system, but that this has been modified by various developments. Of these, the inclusion of the Completive in the Anterior-based system is undoubtedly the most far-reaching in its impact. The semantic consequences of this are discussed in some detail by Bickerton (1981:90-94). The most significant is the erosion of the Anterior-based system and a concomitant tilting towards a Past-based one. The Completive is not unknown in other Creole languages, but IdeFC is the only French-based Creole to have incorporated the Completive fully into its TMA system. Furthermore, the IdeFC Completive has a highly specific distribution quite unknown in any other Creole language. Bickerton (p. 94) expresses puzzlement as to why some Creole languages "have let loose their completives" while others have not. In the case of IdeFC, the answer appears to lie in the substratum languages, and especially Bantu.

In IdeFC, the particle *fin* and its variants *in*, *n*, and (archaic) *fini* represent the notion of completion. With active predicates, *fin* has a meaning which can be rather accurately translated by the English Perfect. MC also uses *fini* 'finish' and *fin fini* 'have finished' with active predicates; again, the English Perfect is often the appropriate translation.

- (1) (MC) *li fin koze sa sua la*  
s/he COMP speak DEM time DEF  
's/he has spoken this time'
- (2) (MC) *li fin fini lav en-de pies lèz*  
s/he COMP finish wash a.few piece clothing  
's/he has washed (finished washing) a few  
articles of clothing'

- (3) (MC) *zot ti fin fini fer fiâsay*  
 they PAS COMP finish make betrothal  
 'they had got engaged'

When the predicate head contains a lexical item whose conceptual definition includes the idea of possible modification over a given time span, such items may be referred to as processives (Corne 1980, 1982:36) or as non-durative statives (Corne 1977:61; cf. Bickerton 1975:35, 1981:307, n.8). Such processives require the use of *fin*;<sup>6</sup> the meaning is close to that of 'to have become'. Thus, in

- (4) (SC) *nu maze in pare komela*  
 our eat(s) COMP ready now  
 'our meal is ready now'

there is the idea of a meal which, not ready beforehand, has come to be so now. In

- (5) (SC) *i a n tro tar*  
 it FUT COMP too late  
 'it will be too late'

there is the idea of a state which will have become true at some prospective future moment (marked by *a*). Further examples:

- (6) (RoC) *misie la in biê kôtâ*  
 sir DEF COMP well content  
 'the gentleman is well satisfied'

- (7) (SC) *in ler pur nu vini*  
 COMP hour for we come  
 'it is time for us to come'

- (8) (MC) *ler li fin ase*  
 hour s/he COMP enough  
 'when s/he has had enough'

Statives, where the state is a "permanent" one (i.e. durative statives), do not require *fin*;

- (9) (MC) *lerua bet*  
 king stupid  
 'the king is stupid'

The Completive has another feature in IdeFC, and that is its combinability with other TMA markers (cf. sentences (3) and (5) above, and cf. also Waite 1981). Such combinability occurs in other Creole languages also, in Papia Kristang (Hancock 1973:26), in Krio (Hancock 1976:11), or in Guyanais-St-Laurent-du-Maroni (Corne 1971:89), for example. However, in others (Guyanese, Jamaican) the completive *don* does not combine with other TMA markers, while in yet others the completive remains outside of Aux (Tok Pisin, Papiamentu, Sranan). Since I know



very little about the history and substrata involved in these languages, I do not propose to comment at all on the question of combinability, which may well have nothing to do with substratal influence. Nor, for the same reason, shall I comment on the inclusion (or not, as the case may be) of a completive into Aux in these languages. The substratum hypothesis that I am about to advance for IdeFC does not mean that *all* substratal completives automatically cause Creole completives, nor the reverse, that a lack of completive in the substrate causes a similar lack in the Creole. It is possible that combinability of the completive in IdeFC is due to substratal influence, since the substrate languages principally involved have combinable completives, but it would be a tall order to prove this conclusively. But the inclusion of the completive in the IdeFC Aux is almost certainly ascribable to transmission from the substrate.

The behaviour of IdeFC processives is reminiscent of Bantu languages. For example, Shona has what Fortune (1955:271) refers to as "inchoative" verb stems "which include the idea of process or becoming in their meaning ... When these verbs are used with the formatives of the past tenses, they refer to present time, perfect aspect, it being implied that what is past is the antecedent process of reaching the state, and what is present is the state arrived at as a result of the process". This definition characterises perfectly the IdeFC use of *fin* with processive predicate heads. In the case of Shona processives, the perfect consists of the past concord marker + the verb stem:

- (10) (Shona) *nda-*            *-neta*  
           PAS.I        become.tired  
           'I am tired'

I give this Shona example not because speakers of the language are attested in Mauritius, but because Fortune's description is extremely revealing of the Bantu system. Compare now Makuwa and Swahili, where the surface concatenation of elements as well as the meaning parallel those of IdeFC:

- |                 |                        |                |
|-----------------|------------------------|----------------|
| (11a) (Makuwa)  | <i>ki- -ho- -chiya</i> | } 'I am tired' |
| (11b) (Swahili) | <i>ni- -me- -choka</i> |                |
| (11c) (IdeFC)   | <i>mo fin fatigue</i>  |                |
|                 | I    COMP become.tired |                |

- |                |                       |                        |
|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|
| (12a) (Makuwa) | <i>e- -khukulu</i>    | <i>e- -ho- -phweya</i> |
| (12b) (IdeFC)  | - <i>sez</i>          | - <i>fin kase</i>      |
|                | CLP thing.to.sit.on   | CNP COMP become.broken |
|                | 'the chair is broken' |                        |

This specific use of *fin* + processive is a highly visible and area-specific feature: it does not exist in any other Creole language at all.<sup>7</sup> Etymologically, *fin* derives in a perfectly regular way from French *finir (de)* 'to finish' + infinitive. The development of *fin(i)* in active predicates could therefore, plausibly enough, be ascribed to the French superstrate: the senses 'to finish doing' and 'completive' are after all almost identical in this context (cf. the MC use of *fin*, *fini*, *fin fini* in identical contexts with near-identical meaning).<sup>8</sup> But note that at least some Bantu languages also use a completive in active predicates. However, the Bantu model clearly provides semantic motivation for the use of *fin* with processives. This use cannot be seen as being in any way a natural development of any known variety of "French".<sup>9</sup> I suggest, on the contrary, that we can reply to Bickerton's question by claiming that it is because of the need to distinguish statives from processives, a distinction widespread in the substratal Bantu language, that IdeFC *fin* has become fully incorporated into the TMA system.<sup>10</sup>

Richardson (1963:10) suggests a Malagasy origin for the use of the completive in IdeFC. In Malagasy, verbs have three tenses (Present, Past, Future); the unmarked aspect of these is the durative/progressive. The preposed "particle" *efa* expresses the punctual completive. In the Future, *efa* marks the beginning of the process, and is generally translatable by an Immediate Future, 'on the point of':

- (13) (Malagasy) *efa h- -ivoaka iay* (Montagné 1931:38)  
 PUNC FUT go.out s/he  
 's/he is just about to leave'

In the Past, *efa* marks completion of the process, and indeed *efa* as a verbal base includes the domain of 'to finish':

- (14) (Mal.) *efa n- -amely aay aho* 'I have hit him/her'  
 PUNC PAS strike s/he I (cf. Malzac 1960:55)

In the Present, *efa* designates a point within the process, and is translatable by 'now':

- (15) (Mal.) *efa ma- -dio ny trano* 'the house is clean now'  
 PUNC PRES clean the house (Malzac 1960:56)

In the Present and the Past, then, there is undoubtedly a semantic similarity between the use of Malagasy *efa* and IdeFC *fin*. For descriptive statements of varying quality on Malagasy *efa*, see Dahl (1951:180-193), Domenichini-Ramiaramanana (1977:103-104), Malzac (1960:46-56), and Montagné (1931:31-48).

It appears then that Malagasy and Bantu coincide, at least partially, with respect to the completive.<sup>11</sup> A Malagasy role in the development of the use of *fin* cannot be rejected out of hand.

Rather, in semantactics as in the lexicon (cf. Baker's discussion of MC *lili* 'bed', 1982b:145-146), a given phenomenon in a Creole language may arise from multiple converging influences. However, it is the Bantu pattern which is predominant, in that the Bantu and the IdeFC patterns are exact parallels in one crucial respect: the processive/stative distinction and the specific role which the completive plays within that distinction. The following historical attestations are of some interest. The earliest attestations of preverbal TMA particles in Mauritius occur in four short extracts from court proceedings (Chaudenson 1981:77-78). The first of these, dated 1734, undoubtedly represents pre-Creole:

(16) (MC, 1734) *moy fini mourì* 'I am dead, done for'  
 I COMP die/died/dead

The remaining three are Creole:

(17) (MC, 1777) *toi va paye moi ça* 'you'll pay (me) for that'  
 you FUT pay me that

(18) (MC, 1779) *moy n'apa ètè batté ça · Blanc là*  
 I NEG PAS beat DEM European DEF  
 'I didn't hit that White man'

(19) (MC, 1784) *votre femme fini mort, moi tué ly*  
 your wife COMP dead I killed her  
 'your wife is dead, I killed her'

Along with other evidence, the TMA particles *va*, *ète*, and *fini* show that these sentences are Creole, not pidgin.<sup>12</sup> These attestations predate the earliest attestations noted by Baker (1982a:230). Their significance from the point of view of the present enterprise is that they show that the completive, in its now archaic form *fini*, has been around as long as the Anterior/Past marker (*ète*) or the Irrealis/Future marker *va*. The Progressive/Nonpunctual marker *apre*, (*a)pe*, is not attested until ca. 1850 (Chaudenson 1981:123). The 1734 pre-Creole sentence (16) may represent Malagasy influence; the 1784 Creole sentence (19) almost certainly reflects Bantu influence, coinciding as it does with the presence of huge numbers of East Africans in Mauritius, and the crucial period of the jelling of MC. Now the LBH would lead one to expect *ète*, *va* and *apre* (and perhaps combinations thereof, in that respective order), but not *fini*; I am therefore inclined to refer to the "inclusion", rather than the "introduction", of the completive in the IdeFC system, and to ascribe this predominantly to Bantu influence.

It seems to be the case that a given syntactic phenomenon need not have a unique source, although one source may be predominant. It can be accepted that the TMA system of IdeFC reflects, in varying ways and to various degrees, a number of

interlocking and overlapping influences: the influence of the bioprogram, modified by the fact that both Bantu and Malagasy agree largely on the role of the completive and speakers of these languages were present in massive numbers; meanwhile, the French superstrate plays a role, mainly insofar as the TMA particles are drawn from French morphemes having different functions but closely proximate meanings. Of course, in active predicates, the superstrate influence parallels that of the substrate: the order of elements in both IdeFC and in French is Subject - Tense - COMP - Verb (*il a fini de parler*, 'he has finished speaking', roughly equivalent to 'he has spoken'). The inclusion of *fin* in the TMA system has modified the bioprogram-generated Anterior-based system; that *fin* is included is due to substratal influences; the superstrate use of *finir de* + infinitive both provides a source for the morpheme *fin* and a reinforcement of the concept of 'completive' by occurring with active verbs.

#### The distributive numerals

In MC, but not in SC (I do not have data for RoC), there is a use, apparently unparalleled in any other Creole language, of a reduplicated numeral used adjectivally. The meaning is 'groups of persons/things':

- (20) (MC) *li don, en brok dilo kat-kat dimun*  
 s/he give a jug water four-four person  
 's/he gives one jug of water to/for each group of four people'<sup>14</sup>

Baissac (1880:90), noting this construction, gives Malagasy reduplication of numerals as the source or model for it.

Baissac gives a number of examples, including the following:

- (21) (MC) *mo a done cinque piasses énééne dounounde* (1880:21)  
 I FUT give five piastres one.one person  
 'I shall give five piastres to each person'

Malagasy has a procedure that is widespread in other languages. It consists essentially in the reduplication of a numeral used as a manner adverbial, but it is not at all certain that the MC construction illustrated by sentences (20) and (21) derives from the same procedure. In Malagasy, a reduplicated numeral is preceded by a particle *tsi-* (some dialects have *ki-*, cf. Dahl 1951:281-282) and is used as a manner adverbial:

- (22) (Malagasy) *mipetraha tsifolofolo* (Malzac 1960:32)  
 sit-down *tsi*-.ten.ten  
 'sit down ten by ten, in groups of ten'

Reduplication of numerals to produce manner adverbials occurs also in Bantu languages:

- (23) (Makuwa) o- -tthuke mi- -thale mi- -raru mi- -raru  
 thou tie CLP.PL bamboo CNP three CNP three  
 'tie the bamboo poles in threes'<sup>15</sup>

Cf. Fortune (1955:139-140) for Shona examples, Ashton (1947:317) for Swahili examples. Baudet (1981:113) cites Ewe, Twi, and Yoruba data to explain manner adverbials made up of reduplicated numerals in some Caribbean Creole languages.<sup>16</sup> Her Creole examples are:

- (24) (Haitian) yo vini dis dis  
 (25) (Jamaican) dem come ten ten (sic)  
 they came ten ten } 'they came ten by ten'

All of these examples seem to me to belong in the same semantic category as English manner adverbials such as *two by two*, *three by three* (which are of course perfectly idiomatic variants of *in twos*, *in threes*); cf. also French *un à un* 'one by one', *quatre à quatre* 'four by four', etc.<sup>17</sup>

Latin distributive numerals, which have special forms and which express 'so many each', 'so many at a time', 'in groups of so many', function semantactically in much the same way as the MC reduplicated numerals:

- (26) (Latin) *sēnīs hominibus dā singulum modium frūmentī*  
 six men give one measure grain  
 'give one measure of grain to every six people'

On the other hand, the Latin distributive numerals cannot by themselves translate the manner adverbials of English, French, Creole, Bantu, Malagasy, etc; they must be reduplicated:

- (27) (Latin) *terni et terni incēdēbant*  
 three and three they.were.marching  
 'they were marching in threes'

I therefore propose that the MC reduplicated numerals be referred to as distributive numerals, and that some other label, such as "collectives", be found for the manner adverbials consisting of reduplicated numerals.

After 1835, Indian languages, particularly Hindustani and related languages, began to have a perceptible impact on MC (cf. Baker 1982b:754-760), considerably more so than on SC or RoC. That this is so, is simply due to the fact that neither Seychelles nor Rodrigues received any significant numbers of people from India. This impact can be clearly seen in the lexicon, but also in the grammar. Baker (1982b:856, note) mentions



MC genitive constructions as an example:

- (28) (MC) *Zâ so lakaz*  
John his house  
'John's house'<sup>18</sup>

It seems rather likely that the MC distributive numerals are another case in point. The MC structure illustrated by sentences (20) and (21) above has a very close parallel Hindi, in Indian Bhojpuri, and in Mauritian Bhojpuri:

- (29) (Hindi) *chah-chah logõ ko ek borĩ cāval de do*  
six-six people to one bag rice give  
'give one bag of rice to every six people'<sup>19</sup>

- (30) (MBhoj) *chaw chaw janá ego sej par ttard ba*  
six six people one.CLASSIFIER chair on stand PROG  
'six people are standing on one chair!'

It would appear to be the case that in general, reduplication of numerals in Mauritian Bhojpuri is employed as a device to emphasize the unusual quantity, as in (30). Similarly in the Mauritian Bhojpuri equivalent of (20):

- (31) (MBhoj) *ek brok pāni chār chār janá ke dewatá*  
one jug water four four people to he.gives

the implication is that one jug is not a reasonable quantity for four people. (For a sketch of the relative positions of Hindi and Mauritian Bhojpuri in Mauritius, v. Barz 1980). If it is shown that the MC structure does not occur in RoC, this would be further support for the contention that Indo-Aryan languages are the direct source for it. Note also that Baissac's mention in 1880 is the first attestation of the MC distributives. This negative evidence (non-occurrence in SC or RoC ; non-attestation before 1880) correlates well with the positive evidence provided by history (presence of speakers of Hindi/Bhojpuri) and with the linguistic evidence itself.

#### Concluding remarks

Although the data are incomplete, there does not seem to be much doubt that the distributive numerals of Mauritian reflect a Hindi/Bhojpuri structure. On the other hand, the manner adverbials formed by reduplicated numerals are so widespread in most of the possible substrate languages that transmission is almost a certainty, again illustrating the multiple converging influences which are a feature of Creole genesis (cf. the discussion on the complete above).

As for the completive, Bantu seems to be the immediate source of the IdeFC usage of *fin*, especially with non-actives, but Malagasy is also clearly important. No-one with any knowledge of the rich complexity of Bantu TMA systems can fail to be struck by how little, proportionately, of their semantax appears in IdeFC. This is perhaps because Malagasy and Bantu do not overlap particularly neatly (and there are also significant differences from one Bantu language to another, in spite of large areas of agreement). One can hypothesize that it is only where these two major substratal language groups do coincide substantially, as in the case of their completives, that there is sufficient impetus to modify the "regular" operation of the bioprogram.

#### REFERENCES

- Alleyne, Mervyn C. 1980. *Comparative Afro-American. An historical-comparative study of English-based Afro-American dialects of the New World*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Ashton, E.O. 1947. *Swahili grammar (including intonation)*. Second edition. London: Longman Group.
- Baissac, Charles. 1880. *Etude sur le patois créole mauricien*. Nancy: Imprimerie Berger-Levrault.
- 1888. *Le folklore de l'île Maurice*. Reprinted 1967. Paris: Maisonneuve et Larose.
- Baker, Philip. 1972. *Kreol. A description of Mauritian Creole*. London: Hurst.
- 1976. *Towards a social history of Mauritian Creole*. BPhil dissertation. University of York.
- 1982a. On the origins of the first Mauritians and of the Creole language of their descendants. A refutation of Chaudenson's 'Bourbonnais' theory. In Baker & Corne, 131-259.
- 1982b. *The contribution of non-Francophone immigrants to the lexicon of Mauritian Creole*. PhD dissertation, SOAS, London.
- 1983. *L'importance des articles français agglutinés dans les créoles de l'Océan Indien et d'ailleurs*. Paper presented to the Fourth Colloque international des Etudes Créoles, Lafayette (Louisiana), May 1983.
- Baker, Philip and Chris Corne. 1982. *Isle de France Creole: affinities and origins*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.

- Barz, Richard K. 1980. The cultural significance of Hindi in Mauritius. *South Asia. Journal of South Asian Studies* 3.1:1-13.
- Baudet, Martha M. 1981. Identifying the African grammatical base of the Caribbean Creoles: a typological approach. *Historicity and variation in Creole studies*, edited by Arnold Highfield and Albert Valdman, 104-117. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Bickerton, Derek. 1975. *Dynamics of a Creole system*. Cambridge: University Press.
- 1981. *Roots of language*. Ann Arbor: Karoma.
- Forthcoming. The language bioprogram hypothesis. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*.
- Bollée, Annegret. 1977. *Le créole français des Seychelles. Esquisse d'une grammaire - textes - vocabulaire*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Chaudenson, Robert. 1974. *Le lexique du parler créole de la Réunion*. Paris: Champion.
- 1979. *Les créoles français*. Paris: Nathan.
- 1981. *Textes créoles anciens (La Réunion et Ile Maurice). Comparaison et essai d'analyse*. Hamburg: Buske.
- Corne, Chris. 1971. Le patois créole français de la Guyane (St-Laurent-du-Maroni): esquisse de grammaire. *Te Reo* 14:81-103.
- 1977. *Seychelles Creole grammar. Elements for Indian Ocean proto-Creole reconstruction*. Tübingen: Narr.
- 1980. A re-evaluation of the predicate in Ile-de-France (sic) Creole. *Generative studies on Creole languages*, edited by Pieter Muysken, 103-124. Dordrecht: Foris.
- 1982. A contrastive analysis of Reunion and Isle de France Creole French: two typologically diverse languages. In Baker & Corne, 7-129.
- Forthcoming. Verb fronting in Creole: transmission or bioprogram? *Pidgin and Creole language: essays in memory of John E. Reinecke*, edited by Glenn Gilbert.
- Curtin, Philip D. 1969. *The Atlantic slave trade. A census*. Madison, Milwaukee, and London: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Dahl, Otto Chr. 1951. *Malgache et maanjan. Une comparaison linguistique*. Oslo: Egede-Instituttet.
- Domenichini-Ramiaramanana, Bakoly. 1977. *Le malgache. Essai de description sommaire*. Paris: SELAF.
- Ferraz, Luiz Ivens. 1978. The Creole of São Tomé. *African Studies* 37:3-68, 235-288.
- Fortune, G. 1955. *An analytical grammar of Shona*. London: Longmans, Green & Co.
- Freycinet, Louis Claude Desaulces de. 1827. *Voyage autour du monde exécuté sur les corvettes de S.M. l'Uranie et la Physicienne pendant les années 1817, 1817, 1819 et 1820 ...* Vol. 2.2. Paris.

Hancock, Ian F. 1973. Malacca Creole Portuguese. A brief transformational outline. *Te Reo* 16:23-44.

----- 1976. *Krio*. Austin: English Department, University of Texas.

Lemaître, Yves. 1973. *Lexique du tahitien contemporain*. Paris: ORSTOM.

Malzac, R.P. 1960. *Grammaire malgache*. Fourth edition. Paris: Société d'Éditions géographiques, maritimes et coloniales.

Montagné, Lucien. 1931. *Essai de grammaire malgache*. Paris: Société d'Éditions géographiques, maritimes et coloniales.

Richardson, I. 1963. Evolutionary factors in Mauritian Creole. *Journal of African Languages* 2:2-14.

Waite, Jeffrey. 1981. Predicate marker combinations in Isle de France Creole. *Te Reo* 24:13-26.

----- 1983. Verbs, adjectives and predicate marking in Isle de France Creole: back to basics. *Te Reo* 26.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> This paper is a revised and expanded version of part of a paper prepared for the Fourth International Colloquium of Creole Studies, Lafayette (Louisiana), May 1983, entitled *Sémantaxe bantbue dans le créole de l'Isle de France*. It is based on research supported by the Research Committee of the University of Auckland. Valuable assistance and data were provided by the following people, to all of whom I am most grateful: Richard Barz (Hindi), John Inniss (Swahili), Mateus Katupha (Makuwa), W.K. Lacey (Latin), Premnath Ramnah (Mauritian Bhojpuri), Guy Savy (Seychelles Creole), Vadivel Vencatachellum (Mauritian Creole), and Yogendra Yadav (Hindi). I am grateful also to Philip Baker and Derek Bickerton for their comments on an earlier version of this paper, and to Jim Hollyman, Frank Lichtenberk, and Jeffrey Waite.

The following abbreviations are used in the morpheme-by-morpheme glosses: CLP - noun class prefix; CNP - concordial prefix; COMP - completive; DEF - definite; DEM - demonstrative; FUT - future, irrealis; NEG - negator; PAS - past, anterior; PL - plural; PRES - present; PROG - progressive; PUNC - punctual.

<sup>2</sup> Bickerton's language bioprogram hypothesis (LBH) claims that some Creole structures reflect inherent language capacity in humans. Cf. also Bickerton, forthcoming, for an impeccable demonstration.

<sup>3</sup> In another paper (Corne, forthcoming), I have tried to show that there are occasions when an apparently obvious case of transmission cannot be sustained on the available evidence, but that such

evidence as is available gives rise to inferential arguments which make transmission a plausible-looking hypothesis as opposed to the language bioprogram hypothesis.

<sup>4</sup> For example, Alleyne (1980) does not list in his bibliography any study of the syntax of a Bantu language. He is hardly alone in this. The overview of the Atlantic slave trade given by Curtin (1969) makes it abundantly clear that it is dangerous to assume anything about the demographic history of a given territory on the basis of a knowledge of any other. Thus, we cannot suppose, for instance, that the substrates were the same in Jamaica and Guyana (in fact, the evidence is that they were not).

<sup>5</sup> In spite of apparent counterexamples as in:

(1) (MC) *Arlet pe al legliz tule dimâs* (cf. Baker 1972:108)  
Arlette PROG go church every Sunday  
'Arlette is going to church every Sunday' (these days)

which in fact represent a combination of unmarked Habitual/Iterative and marked Progressive/Continuative (Jeffrey Waite, personal communication). Note that in Swahili, for example, Habitual/Iterative is marked (by *-hu-*).

<sup>6</sup> This statement accounts for the data as well as does an alternative one, viz. that when *fin* is used with an item which is normally stative, it reverses the polarity of the stative to non-stative, with the result that the predicate as a whole indicates a process which is complete. Each of these two formulations implies a different view of the real nature of the IdeFC predicate head (cf. Waite 1983, in this volume). The essential point to note is the co-occurrence of *fin* with lexical items of an "adjectival" nature, which results in a processive reading.

<sup>7</sup> Traces of this usage exist in Reunionesse. For examples, v. Corne 1982:17, and for the reasons, v. Baker 1982b:834-844 and cf. Corne 1982:104-111.

<sup>8</sup> This may perhaps be the case in Haitian, where *fin* is used to mark the completive with active predicates.

<sup>9</sup> I am, of course, assuming that the question of the relation between Reunionesse and IdeFC is no longer controversial, v. Baker 1982a&b, Corne 1982, cf. Chaudenson 1974, 1979, 1981, *passim*. That is, I am taking the view that Reunionesse and IdeFC are independent creations.

<sup>10</sup> Thus, the alternative statement given in note 6 above seems to put the cart before the horse, at least in an historical sense, in that it is the processive that demands *fin* rather than *fin* triggering the processive reading.

<sup>11</sup> The use of the punctual *efa* in Malagasy does not seem to be the result of any African influence on this Austronesian language, since the pattern punctual/completive + processive occurs elsewhere in the



Austronesian family (v. Dahl 1951:187-190). Completive + processive is widespread in the Polynesian subgroup of Austronesian, cf. Tahitian:

- (11) 'ua pararĩ (Lemaître 1973:17)  
 COMP be.broken  
 'it is broken'

<sup>12</sup> Other evidence is as follows: (a) the IdeFC Final Vowel Truncation rule (FVT) has applied to the verb *peye* in (17), although not to *bate* in (18) or to *tué* (Modern MC *tuye*) in (19); (b) the use of the demonstrative *sa...la* in (18); (c) the position and form of the negator *napa* in (18); (d) the unmarked past-reference active verb in the second clause of (19), cf. Bickerton 1981:83-85. The form *mourí* as well as the early date, indicates the pre-Creole status of (16).

<sup>13</sup> Baker's Table 15 (1982a:230-231) can be complemented by data derived from early Mauritian texts reproduced by Chaudenson (1981) which were not available to Baker. These are: 1734 *fini*; 1777 *va*; 1779 *été*; 1784 *fini*; -1850- *été, té; va; après: fin, fine, fini; té après; té fine; va fini*. Of these the 1734, 1777, and 1779 data are earliest attestations, as are the circa 1850 *té après* and *va fini*.

In this connection, it is worth noting that the discussion in Bickerton (1981:89-90, 308-309 n. 13) is based on incomplete and inaccurate data. The material given above plus a rudimentary knowledge of the history of Indian Ocean colonisation and subsequent evolution, allows us to locate correctly in Mauritius the epicentre of Bickerton's *fin* tsunami. Mauritian CREOLE *fini* is attested in 1784 (above). In 1822, *té fini* is attested (Baker 1982a:230). The *te va* noted for 1828 by Baker (1976:51) is an error. No combination of particles other than *té fini* is attested until the ca. 1850 data listed above. For a less speculative view of IdeFC particle combinations than Bickerton's, see Waite (1981).

<sup>14</sup> In SC the rough equivalent of (20) is (111):

- (111) (SC) *i don 2 butey delo pur kat dimun*  
 s/he give a bottle water for four person  
 's/he gives one bottle of water to/for each group of four people'

<sup>15</sup> Bamboo poles tied in bundles of three are commonly used in house-building. The double *tt* spelling used here and in sentence (30) represents a voiceless retroflex plosive.

<sup>16</sup> Other Creole languages also have this feature, cf. São Tomé:

- (iv) *ne tleš-tleši* (Ferraz 1978:59)  
 they three-three  
 'the three of them'

Ferraz notes, incidentally, that the "contraction" of the first

member of a reduplicated numeral is paralleled in Kongo.

<sup>17</sup> The French "reduplicated" forms seem to be rather restricted in application; most manner adverbials pertaining to this semantic area are formed using the preposition *par*:

(v) (French) *ils se sont mis par quatre*  
'they formed fours, they grouped themselves in fours'

Cf. also in SC:

(vi) (SC) *zot asiz par kat*  
they sit by four  
'they sit in fours'

French has no reflex of the Latin distributive numerals; these are discussed immediately below.

<sup>18</sup> MC has also the more "regular" IdeFC genitive, as in *lakaz Zâ* 'John's house'. The possessive adjective occurs in yet a third IdeFC structure, as in *so koler lerua* 'the king's anger' (cf. Baissac 1888: 21, *passim*; Bollée 1977:42; Corne 1977:27). The sole reported SC case of N $\delta$ N (Bollée, Corne, loc.cit.) is from a written text, and should probably be punctuated as N, s $\delta$  N.

<sup>19</sup> This is colloquial usage; more "correct" Hindi would reduplicate *ek* 'one' as well. Cf. *en-en* in (21) above. Thus, Hindi *ek-ek* and Mauritian *en-en* parallel the distributive sense of *singulum* in (26).

C  
And  
Rose  
Chris  
Elizabeth  
Douglas  
Janet  
Holl  
beta  
support